

MASUDA QURESHI completed her BA in English Language and Literature at KCL and her MA in Early Modern Studies at UCL. She is undertaking a PhD at Birkbeck, researching early modern women's writing and its relationship to science and astronomy. She is currently Senior Editor of CHASE-DTP open-access journal *Brief Encounters*, a Subject Editor for the *Dandelion Journal*, and the London Renaissance Seminar intern.

Article

Mobile, Malleable, and Modified: Tapestry in Early Modern Literature

Masuda Qureshi



TAPESTRIES AND LITERATURE IN THE EARLY MODERN PERIOD ARE INTERTWINED; they help to preserve one another. Hilary Turner writes that 'species of flowers on tapestries' have been identified from 'external sources' such as Leonhardt Fuchs' printed book *De Historia Stirpium* (1542), and determines that the influence of this book is traceable in tapestry'.¹ The tapestry form has been used to gain an insight into literature, as scholars 'have tended to focus on the surface of a described tapestry in a text in order to tease out the relationship between the fictional woven surface and the narrative's larger objectives'.² Taking a route distinct from this scholarship, this article argues its reverse – that literature acts as an archive of information regarding the preservation, use, and decoration of early modern tapestry.

Both cloth and print in early modern England had a transformative quality. In her article on women's relation to textiles, Susan Frye wrote that 'cloth is, after all, foldable, malleable, and mobile', while Peter McNeil, in an article on early modern fashion, stated how 'print was transformed in creative acts of collecting, recombination, and being coloured'.³ As literature and textile share these metamorphic characteristics, this paper examines the overlap between the tapestry and early modern literature through the concept of breathing as a metaphor for weaving narrative and history, and asks: what can early modern literature tell us about tapestry that is not apparent in collections today? It focuses on how tapestry is: *mobile*, being transported beyond its spatial

surroundings; *malleable*, as the tapestry form can be altered; and finally, *modified* into a paradoxical form that simultaneously has a readable surface appearance but also conceals features and objects. Therefore, just as breath instills life, literature preserves the history of early modern tapestry.⁴

Before examining the mobility of tapestry through literature, the use of tapestry in early modern England (1500-1800) should be taken into consideration. Tapestries in the early modern period were expensive and intensely desirable, where imports totalled ‘more than £5000 in 1559, and 6 years later they rose still higher. Whether as large wall hangings or small cuffs to embellish gloves, the tapestry was both decorative and demonstrated wealth’.⁵ Elizabeth Goldring also highlights the costly nature of tapestries, stating that:

Leading courtiers were willing to pay for tapestries, which—both in England and on the Continent—were the most expensive [...] In the 1590s, for example, the Lord Admiral, Charles Howard commissioned a suite of ten tapestries depicting the defeat of the Spanish Armada from the Fleming François Spiering, whom he reputedly paid more than £1,500.⁶

In both Goldring and Turner’s works tapestries were mobile, not bound to one space, being imported to England and used as practical and ornamental objects of wealth. Furthermore, in a printed account of London in 1603, John Stow writes about a tapestry that was owned by ‘Nicholas Alwin, Grocer, Maior, 1499. Deceased 1505’ who ‘gave his testament, for a hanging of Tapestry, to serve for the principle Days in Guild-hall, 73l. 6s. 8d’.⁷ The overlap between the tapestry as a mobile form and its relation to the written word is evident in this account as, in writing his ‘testament’, Alwin makes a formal declaration in his will that the tapestry should serve in Guild-hall. Stow’s description of the tapestry is particularly striking because of its publication in print. His *Survey* was published in several editions, even after his death: the third edition in 1618 by Anthony Munday; the fourth in 1633 by Humphrey Dyson, and the fifth in 1720 by John Stype. These editions indicate that the text was popular, being published several times, and probably widely read. The description of the tapestry in Stow’s *Survey* becomes a historical ‘testament’ and serves as a monumental object that shaped the landscape of early modern London. His printed text shows the mobility of tapestry between different spaces, as with Turner and Goldring, but also conveys the importance of written ‘testimony’ as a means of tapestry preservation. The tapestry is both mobile, being transported to Guild-hall, but also somewhat stationary in Stow’s account, being preserved as an architectural feature of the hall that can be read about to this day.

Early modern tapestry, though static once hung, had various aspects of mobility. In addition to the movement of tapestry within a city, as described within Stow’s account, tapestries were spatially mobile in their production, being ‘woven in the well-established continental centres’.⁸ However, tapestries also interacted with and represented spatial areas as they often mapped landscapes. A collection of early modern tapestries called the ‘Sheldon’ Family Collection, found at Chastleton House, consist of four ‘tapestry maps’ portraying ‘the landscapes’ across the ‘counties of Oxford, Worcester, Warwick and Gloucester’.⁹ This concept of mapping spatial dimensions through tapestry is also apparent in literature, particularly Shakespeare’s play *Cymbeline* (1623) in which he depicts tapestry as a form that binds together the act of writing with reconciling spatial surroundings. For instance, Giacomo tries to persuade

Posthumus of his intimate relations with Innogen through describing the tapestry in her bedchamber:

But my design,
To note the chamber: I will write all down:
[takes out his tables]
Such and such pictures; there the window; such
The adornment of her bed; the arras; figures, [...]
Would testify, to enrich mine inventory. (2.2.23-30)¹⁰

It is through this written inscription on his table that Giacomo notes down the arras so that he can testify and give evidence to Posthumus about his intimacy with Innogen.¹¹ Shakespeare's use of the term 'inventory' highlights that, through the act of writing and noting down the tapestry, Giacomo can compile a complete list of his spatial surroundings. This inscription also allows Giacomo to transport the visual imagery of the tapestry beyond the realms of Innogen's chamber. Outside, Giacomo can recount that Innogen's 'bedchamber' was hung with:

tapestry of silk and silver; the story
Proud Cleopatra, when she met her Roman,
And Cydnus swell'd above the banks, or for
The press of boats or pride: A piece of work
So bravely done, so rich, that it did strive
In workmanship and value; which I wonder'd (2.4.68-73)

Giacomo's writing spatially maps Innogen's bedroom and metaphorically displaces the tapestry outside of its original environment. The tapestry becomes a mobile object of conquest, through which Giacomo takes control of Innogen's chastity. Like in the Sheldon tapestries, Shakespeare presents both the landscape, 'the banks and the press of boats', and the value and skill of the tapestry. It is 'a piece so bravely done', 'rich in workmanship' and 'value', suggesting that the tapestry conveys a high degree of skill. As a play, there is a possibility of there being a literal tapestry, or of cloth being used as a stage prop, indicating another form of mobility and of interaction between the visual and the spatial. Therefore *Cymbeline* provides the reader and spectator with descriptions of tapestry that are not apparent in collections that survive today. Through Giacomo's act of writing, and the creation of an inventory, Shakespeare binds the language of collection and legal activity with that of the tapestry description. The tapestry becomes an object that can be transported across spatial boundaries through the act of writing. It becomes a statement, an artefact, used as evidence by Giacomo. Thus, Shakespeare's play demonstrates the mobility of tapestry whereby the act of writing both documents and displaces its spatial surroundings.

Not all writers present the tapestry as a mobile object, in fact, in *Eikonoklastēs* (1649) John Milton uses the image of an immobile tapestry to create a politically charged printed text that provides justification for the execution of Charles I. Milton writes: 'nothing can be more unhappy, more dishonourable, [...] to be blasted, to be struck as mute and motionless as a Parliament of Tapestry in the Hangings'.¹² Nonetheless, Leonard Barkan writes of the multiple uses of tapestry decoration, as in 1593:

Book covers, sweet bagges and even glove gauntlets could all be enhanced by tapestry decoration, an example of this being held at the

V&A museum of tapestries where a sweet-bag intended to hold lozenges is embellished with the tree of life.¹³

In contrast to Barkan's description of how tapestry decoration was not bound to one physical form and could be used in other material objects, Milton's *Eikonoklastēs* illustrates the immobile nature of early modern tapestry. Milton uses the description of tapestry to relay his political agenda, arguing that, for a member of parliament under Charles I's reign, nothing is more 'dishonourable' than being 'struck as mute' like a 'hanging of tapestry'. For Milton, the tapestry is not a mobile object that is transported across spatial dimensions like in *Cymbeline*: it is a metaphor that is both stationary and speechless. His description indicates that the tapestry was a form of fixity once woven. The title page reinforces Milton's testament against the visual aspect of tapestry: the title *Eikonoklastēs*, for example, deriving from the term 'iconoclast', meaning breaker of the image or icon. This, coupled with the sub-title 'in answer to a book intitl'd *Eikōn basilikē*', a printed royalist biography attributed to Charles I, indicates that Milton wanted to 'break' rather than use imagery. The printed text of the *Eikonoklastēs* is also anti-iconic, as both A. Miller's 1756 edition and G. Krasley's 1770 edition were published in a simple form with no images, just Proverb xxvii, Proverb 16, and Proverb 17 on the 'wicked ruler'. Therefore, Milton's *Eikonoklastēs* demonstrates that printed literature was focused on the text as much as it was on the image. Although the details of the production and 'acquisition' of tapestry 'rarely survive', Milton's political text provides an insight into how tapestry was not characterized by its woven thread or price, instead serving as a symbol of political oppression.¹⁴ Thus, in contrast to the views of tapestry discussed above that weave mobility into its meanings, Milton presents tapestry as stifling form, allowing no breath of dissent.

In addition to being both physically mobile, able to be transported between locations, and metaphorically so in literature, as it was used to map spatial surroundings and displace the tapestry outside of its original environment, the tapestry form was also malleable in that it could be changed out of shape. Early modern tapestry was vulnerable to external factors; it was 'fragile, susceptible to damage by light and insects'.¹⁵ Tapestry in early modern literature also embodied this malleable characteristic. This is noticeable in Shakespeare's *The Rape of Lucrece* (1594) where, through the descriptions of the tapestry, Shakespeare allows Lucrece to identify her perpetrator in Sinon. In Shakespeare's text, Lucrece quotes:

For even as subtle Sinon here is painted,
So sober-sad, so weary, and so mild,
As if with grief or travail he had fainted,
To me came Tarquin armed; too beguiled
With outward honesty, but yet defiled
With inward vice: as Priam him did cherish,
So did I Tarquin; so my Troy did perish. (ll. 1541-1547)¹⁶

Here Lucrece identifies the figure Sinon - a devious Greek character that pretended to have fled from his people and encouraged the Trojans to receive the wooden horse into the city - in the tapestry form. Sinon is depicted as a dual character, conveyed as a mild figure with outward honesty but filled with inward vice. Confronting him in tapestry form, she recognises Tarquin and her own story. Lucrece metaphorically penetrates the surface of the tapestry as she associates Sinon with Tarquin. A little later, however, this act of penetration literally takes place as Lucrece tears the tapestry. Shakespeare writes, 'she tears

the senseless Sinon with her nails, / Comparing him to that unhappy guest / Whose deed hath made herself, herself detest' (ll. 1564-1566). Susan Frye argues that women connected 'through textiles, the designs of their needlework – from patterns shared among women and duly recorded in spot samplers'.¹⁷ However, by tearing Sinon with her nails, Lucrece does not connect with others through the production of the tapestry, but rather finds solace in isolating herself and destroying it. Therefore, through this text we can establish that, in addition to the tapestry being susceptible to 'light and insects', people were able to damage and destroy it. Consequently, the tapestry in the early modern period was a malleable object; instead of breathing connections between women who collectively wove textiles, it demonstrates how they could both compose and destroy it.

The malleability of the tapestry is affective: its onlookers are altered by its physical form. In *Lucrece*, the tapestry causes a change in emotion. Lucrece's emotions are altered by the visual image of Sinon within the tapestry form. Shakespeare writes:

For men have marble, women waxen, minds,
And therefore are they form'd as marble will;
The weak oppressed, th'impression of strange kinds
Is form'd in them by force, by fraud, or skill. (I I. 1240-4)

Shakespeare characterizes the human mind with material substances. Men, he writes, have 'marble', concrete minds, whereas women have 'waxen' minds, being susceptible to change. He also illustrates the malleable characteristics of the tapestry that are able to alter the emotions of weak women like Lucrece and her maid. They are 'impressed', 'formed', altered by the 'skill' and 'force' of the tapestry. It changes the emotions of women who traditionally would have woven the tapestry. McNeil argues that 'prints can be copied but the copy is always literally a new impression'.¹⁸ Tapestry works in a similar manner to print. Those who look at it, as with Lucrece, are 'impressed' and changed by its visual images, which in turn shape the outcome of the narrative. The tapestry form is a catalyst for Lucrece as, through its imagery, she finds her own identity enwoven within it.

The malleability of the tapestry is not exclusive to Shakespeare. It is made explicit in Homer's *Odyssey*, where Penelope's suitors are interested in her while she completes one continuously woven piece. Homer writes that Penelope:

set to weaving a web of threads long and fine. Then she said to us:
"Young men, my suitors now that the great Odysseus has perished,
wait, though you are eager to marry me, until I finish this web, so that
my weaving will not be useless and wasted" (2.93-106).¹⁹

However, at night she has 'torches set by' to 'undo it [the tapestry] for three years she was secret in her design' (2.93-106). Like in Shakespeare's *The Rape of Lucrece*, malleability is doubled: the dismantling of the tapestry allows Penelope to alter her life. Through physically dismantling the tapestry Penelope, just like Lucrece, takes charge of the narrative, buying her time. Penelope, who suspends the action of weaving the tapestry is, in a sense, holding her breath, suspending the narrative of the tapestry just as Lucrece ripped apart a mythological narrative reflecting her own story. Lisa Jardine suggests that we must 'reweave our ruptured historical narrative again and again in pursuit of that new history in which women's and men's interventions in past time weigh

equally'.²⁰ Through examining tapestry within early modern literature, we can add to Jardine's examination on the historical narrative by suggesting that women may have altered the tapestry form – through unravelling, or causing physical destruction as with Lucrece – rather than, as inventories suggest, merely constructing them.

Tapestries within literature are modified into a paradoxical structure that simultaneously reveal and conceal a surface meaning. Before analysing this duality, the differences between how tapestries and paintings were displayed in the early modern period need consideration. In an inventory of household furniture at Kenilworth Castle belonging to Robert Dudley Earl of Leicester (an. Dom. 1588), tapestries were listed in terms of lengths, for example, 'In primis. Six pieces of the history of Hercules all being in depth five Flemish ells, iii. Qrs, Four in the length 9 ½ ells, one 11 ½ ells, one 9 ½ ells'.²¹ Pictures, however, were characteristically hidden behind a curtain: 'Pictures. The picture of St. Jarome naked, with a curtaine of silke. A picture of my lord of Arundell, with a curtaine'.²² It is evident that paintings were usually hidden with a 'curtain', while tapestries were more open and accessible. However, early modern literature indicates the reverse – that tapestries had some sense of concealment, like the paintings that were hidden from plain sight. This concealed nature of the tapestry is exposed in John Lyly's *Euphues and his England* (1580) where characters are urged to look beyond the tapestry for colours that are not visible. Lyly writes that after Arachne 'wove' a 'cloth of Arras':

it was objected unto hir by a Lady more captious then cunning, that in hir worke there wanted some coulours, for that in a Raine-bow there should bee all: Unto whom she replied, if the coulours lacke thou lookest for, thou must imagine that they are on the other side of the cloth.²³

Rebecca Olsen argues that 'in this passage, the tapestry becomes a useful metaphor for the way printed texts might accommodate readers by suggesting something is unseen beneath the surface'.²⁴ Yet Lyly takes this further. He illustrates that the reader cannot see into both sides of the tapestry at a given moment, and that the imagination must fulfil what the eye cannot see. This text demonstrates that concealment is an inherent characteristic of the tapestry form because it is impossible to view both sides simultaneously. Thus the tapestry is a paradoxical structure; viewable while also containing hidden qualities. Chloe Porter examines the connection between this printed text and concealment, writing that 'Lyly refers to examples of classical painters including Apelles, Nichomachus and Timomachus, who "broke off" the making of images "scarce half-coloured" due to "fear" and being "threatened"'.²⁵ Thus Lyly conceals the gaps in his narrative under the image of classical painters, as Arachne attempts to conceal her works from the cunning lady. The tapestry form is a place of duality that has a surface appearance but, also, contains hidden qualities that need to be imagined as they are not visible to the naked eye.

Tapestry is a physical object of concealment as, like the curtain that covers pictures in early modern England, it often hides people. This concealing characteristic is evident in John Skelton's morality play *Magnyfycence* (1533) where Folly states:

That will sit idle all the day,
And cannot set herself to work,

I kindle in her such a lither spark
That rubbed she must be on the gall
Between the tapet and the wall (ll. 1245-49).²⁶

In Folly's description, the tapestry becomes a tangible object through which the lady is hidden. Significantly, she is struck mute: we do not hear from her directly but from the speech of male characters. Tapestry often hides women, stifling their speech in the process. This play indicates that the space between the tapestry and the wall is one of secrecy. This spatial dimension is also explicit in Shakespeare and Fletcher's *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (1634), in which the jailor's daughter alludes to a devious act. She states:

To hear there a proud lady and a proud city
wife howl together—I were a beast an I'd call it
good sport. One cries "O this smoke!"
"This fire!"; one cries, "O, that ever I did it behind
the arras!" and then howls; th' other curses a suing
fellow and her garden house (4.3.53-58).²⁷

The jailor's daughter presents the arras as a place of hidden sexual acts, where 'howling' and 'good sport' take place between 'proud' women and men. Like in the *Magnyfycence*, the arras becomes a place of secrecy. Thomas P. Campbell argues that 'tapestry was so ubiquitous in noble French households that the architect Philibert de L'Orme complained that it was pointless to provide elaborate architectural features for interior doors since everything was hidden by tapestries'.²⁸ However, as little survives on what exactly was hidden behind tapestries, printed literature provides an insight into the spatial surroundings of the arras. The tapestry itself, then, was modified from an object that solely presented an image. It depicted landscapes and history, but also became an object of secrecy that merged with its surroundings.

The tapestry form restricted characters, whereby their voices are lost in the descriptions and visual imagery of the tapestry. Claire Preston argues that in Book 3 Canto 11 of Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queen* (1590) Britomart, like Shakespeare's Lucrece, 'is virtually absent from the account of the tapestries: for more than twenty stanzas, [...] with no allusion to Britomart's presence in the scene or to her reactions'.²⁹ This character absence is purposeful: it allows Spenser to merge the boundaries between the descriptions of tapestry and the written word. The visual imagery of the tapestry becomes a substitute for the human voice and has a function to tell stories. While in the castle, Britomart discovers a room where the walls are clothed 'with goodly arras of great maiesty' (28, l. 1-3) and 'in those Tapets weren fashioned / Many faire pourtraicts' (29, 1-2).³⁰ Spenser couples the narration of these tapestries with that of writing: 'therein was writ, how often thundring Jove' (30.1), 'Long were to tell the amorous Assays' (44.1), 'Was't there *enwoven*,' (36.1), and 'in that fair Arras was most lively writ' (39.1-9).³¹ The verbs of visual imagery 'painted' and 'enwoven' are coupled with that of 'writing' and 'telling'. Thus, by keeping Britomart mute and hiding her voice amid the description of the tapestry, Spenser alludes to the importance of the written word over speech to convey the visual image of the tapestry. Olsen writes that Spenser 'visited court in the company of noblemen such as Sir Walter Raleigh' and 'had opportunities to view arras hangings on display in noble homes'.³² Therefore, his direct exposure to this form could have influenced his descriptions of the 'goodly arras of great magesty'. The tapestry form was modified by Spenser who, through describing its skill and representations of classical stories, muted Britomart's

voice. The tapestry form told stories, but also somewhat concealed them at the same time.

Overall, very little documentation survives on tapestry: ‘no merchant’s records survive’, ‘tapestry is not mentioned in such shop inventories [...], nor is there any obvious outlet among the shops of the newly built Royal Exchange’.³³ Evelyn Welch correctly writes that ‘words on these pages cannot fully convey the smells, touch or the silks and cottons that created fashion in Early Modern Europe’.³⁴ However, early modern literature gives a useful insight into the tapestry form, providing context as to the preservation, alteration, and use of tapestries in the early modern period. The literary tapestry was also paradoxical: suffocating in the hands of certain writers, being used to stifle the female voice, while elsewhere it became a way for women to breathe life into their own narratives. Through exploring the mobility, malleability and modification of tapestry within printed texts, we can obtain some information about tapestries that may not be evident in collections and inventories today. The tapestry was a decorative and ornamental object that could be moved between spaces but also mapped spatial landscapes. It was susceptible to change, often altering the emotions of its viewers, and had a paradoxical structure that could reveal and conceal objects. Therefore, tapestries were not only categorized by size and price, as some inventories suggest. They had agency: the tapestry was a part of the visual culture of the period and a physical object that could be altered to convey meaning.

Birkbeck, University of London

Notes

- 1 Hilary L Turner, ‘Tapestries once at Chastleton House and their influence on the image of the tapestries called Sheldon: A reassessment’, *The Antiquaries Journal*, 88 (2008), pp. 313-346 (p. 311).
- 2 Rebecca Olsen, *Arras Hanging: The Textile That Determined Early Modern Literature and Drama* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2013), p. 2.
- 3 Susan Frye, ‘Staging Women’s Relations to Textiles in Othello and Cymbeline’, in *Early Modern Visual Culture: Representation, Race, and Empire in Renaissance England*, ed. by Peter Erickson and Clark Hulse (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), pp. 215–50 (p. 220).
- 4 Peter McNeil, ‘Beauty in Search of Knowledge: Eighteenth-century Fashion and the World of Print’, in *Fashioning the Early Modern Dress, Textiles, and Innovation in Europe, 1500-1800*, ed. by Evelyn Welch (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), p. 225.
NB: Transcriptions from manuscripts and early modern texts have been reproduced without modernisation of spelling, capitalization, or punctuation except where ‘u’ has replaced ‘v’ and ‘I’ has replaced ‘j’. Word endings in “d” are not expanded.
- 5 Hilary L Turner, ‘The Tapestry Trade in Elizabethan London: Products, Purchasers, and Purveyors’, *The London Journal*, 38:1 (2013), pp. 18-33 (p. 18).
- 6 Elizabeth Goldring, ‘Art Collecting and Patronage in Shakespeare’s England’, in *The Oxford Handbook of the Age of Shakespeare*, ed. by Malcolm Smuts (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), p. 711.
- 7 John Stow, *A survey of the cities of London and Westminster containing the original, antiquity, increase, modern estate and government of those cities* (London: A. Churchill, J. Knapton, R. Knaplock, J. Walthoe, E. Horne, and 5 others, 1720), p. 42. W. Hefford, p. 42.
- 8 Turner, ‘Chastleton House’, p. 318.
- 10 William Shakespeare, ‘Cymbeline’, in *The Norton Shakespeare* (London: W. W. Norton, 1997), p. 2985.

- 11 “Arras, n. A rich tapestry fabric, in which figures and scenes are woven in colours”,
OED Online <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/10975?redirectedFrom=arras#eid>>
[accessed 2 January 2018]
- 12 John Milton, *Eikonoklastēs in answer to a book intitl'd Eikōn basilikē, the portrature of
his sacred Majesty in his solitudes and sufferings* (London: printed by Thomas
Newcomb, 1650), p. 222.
- 13 Leonard Barkan, ‘Making Pictures Speak: Renaissance Art, Elizabethan Literature’,
Modern Scholarship Renaissance Quarterly, 48. 2 (1995), 326-351 (p. 226).
- 14 W. Hefford, ‘Flemish Tapestry Weavers in England: 1550–1775’, in *Flemish Tapestry
Weavers Abroad*, ed. by G. Delmarcel (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002),
pp. 43–61 (p. 42).
- 15 Turner, ‘trade’, p. 18.
- 16 William Shakespeare, ‘*The Rape of Lucrece*’, *Norton Shakespeare*, p. 675.
- 17 Susan Frye, p. 216.
- 18 McNeil, p. 228.
- 19 Homer, *Odyssey*, Book 2, trans. by A. T Murray (London: Heinemann, 1995), p. 80.
- 20 Lisa Jardine, *Reading Shakespeare Historically* (London: Routledge, 1996), p. 147.
- 21 *Historical Manuscripts Commission (HMC), Report on the Manuscripts of Lord De
L’Isle & Dudley Preserved at Penshurst Place*, 6 vols (London: HMSO, 1936), Vol. 1,
p. 278.
- 22 Historical Manuscripts, p. 290.
- 23 John Lyly, *Euphues and his England*, ed by A. Mich (London: Proquest LLC, 2011),
p. 125.
- 24 Olsen, p. 34.
- 25 Chloe Porter, *Making and Unmaking in Early Modern English Drama – Spectators,
Aesthetics and Incompletion* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), p. 99.
- 26 John Skelton, *Magnificence*, ed. by Paula Neuss (USA: Johns Hopkins University Press,
1980), p. 142.
- 27 William Shakespeare and John Fletcher, ‘*The Two Noble Kinsmen*’, in *Norton
Shakespeare*, p. 3260.
- 28 Thomas P. Campbell, *Tapestry in the Renaissance: Art and Magnificence* (New Haven:
Yale University Press, 2002), p. 271.
- 29 Claire Preston, ‘Ekphrasis: Painting in Words’, in *Renaissance Figures of Speech*, ed. by
Gavin Alexander and others (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 115-
129 (p. 128).
- 30 Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, ed. by A. C. Hamilton (London; NY: Person
Longman, 2007), p. 295-6.
- 31 Italics are my own.
- 32 Olsen, p. 19.
- 33 Turner, p. 19.
- 34 Welch, p. 30.

Works Cited

- Ariosto, Ludovico, *Orlando Furioso: A New Verse Translation*, ed. by David Slavitt (Cambridge; London: Belknap Press, 2009)
- Barkan, Leonard, ‘Making Pictures Speak: Renaissance Art, Elizabethan Literature’, *Modern Scholarship Renaissance Quarterly*, 48. 2 (1995), 326-351
- Bath, Michael, *Speaking Pictures: English emblem books and renaissance culture* (London; NY: Longman, 1994)
- Bell, Susan Groag, *The Lost Tapestries of the City of Ladies* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004)
- Campbell, Thomas P., *Tapestry in the Renaissance: Art and Magnificence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002)
- Clark, Stuart, *Vanities of the Eye: Vision in Early Modern European Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)

-
- Cook, Elizabeth, *Seeing Through Words: The Scope of Late Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986)
- Evet, David, *Literature and the Visual Arts in Tudor England* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1990)
- Frye, Susan, 'Staging Women's Relations to Textiles in Othello and Cymbeline', in *Early Modern Visual Culture: Representation, Race, and Empire in Renaissance England*, ed. by Peter Erickson and Clark Hulse (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), pp. 215–50
- Gilman, Ernest B., *Iconoclasm and Poetry in the English Reformation* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1986)
- *The Curious Perspective: Literary and Pictorial Wit in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1978)
- Goldring, Elizabeth, 'Art Collecting and Patronage in Shakespeare's England', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Age of Shakespeare*, ed. by Malcolm Smuts (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 704-723
- Heffernan, James A.W., *Museum of Words: The Poetics of Ekphrasis from Homer to Ashbery* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993)
- Hefford, W., 'Flemish Tapestry Weavers in England: 1550–1775', in *Flemish Tapestry Weavers Abroad*, ed. by G. Delmarcel (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), pp. 43–61
- Hemptinne, Thérèse de, Veerle Fraeters, and María Eugenia Góngora, eds., *Speaking to the Eye: Sight and Insight Through Text and Image (1150-1650)* (Belgium: Brepols, 2013)
- Historical Manuscripts Commission (HMC), *Report on the Manuscripts of Lord De L'Isle & Dudley Preserved at Penshurst Place*, 6 vols (London: HMSO, 1936), Vol. 1
- Homer, *Odyssey*, Book 2, trans. by A. T Murray (London: Heinemann, 1995)
- Hulse, Clark, 'A Piece of Skilful Painting in Shakespeare's Lucrece', *Shakespeare Survey: An Annual Survey of Shakespeare Studies and Production*, Vol.31 (1978), pp. 13-22
- *The rule of art: literature and painting in the Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990)
- Jardine, Lisa, *Reading Shakespeare Historically* (London: Routledge, 1996)
- Lyly, John, *Euphues and his England*, ed. by A. Mich (London: Proquest LLC, 2011)
- McNeil, Peter, 'Beauty in Search of Knowledge: Eighteenth-century Fashion and the World of Print', in *Fashioning the Early Modern Dress, Textiles, and Innovation in Europe, 1500-1800*, ed. by Evelyn Welch (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 223-254
- Meek, Richard, *Narrating the Visual in Shakespeare* (Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2009)
- O'Connell, Michael, *The Idolatrous Eye: Iconoclasm and Theatre in Early-Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)
- Olsen, Rebecca, *Arras Hanging: The Textile That Determined Early Modern Literature and Drama* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2013)
- Parshall, Peter W., 'Imago Contrafacta: Images and Facts in the Northern Renaissance', *Art History*, 16 (1993), 554–79
- Phillippy, Patricia, *Painting Women: Cosmetics, Canvases, and Early Modern Culture* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006)
- Porter, Chloe, *Making and Unmaking in Early Modern English Drama - Spectators, Aesthetics and Incompletion* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014)

-
- Preston, Claire, 'Ekphrasis: Painting in Words', in *Renaissance Figures of Speech*, ed. by Gavin Alexander and others (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 115-129
- Shakespeare, William, 'Cymbeline', in *The Norton Shakespeare* (London: W. W. Norton, 1997)
- 'The Rape of Lucrece', in *The Norton Shakespeare* (London: W. W. Norton, 1997)
- and John Fletcher 'The Two Noble Kinsmen', in *The Norton Shakespeare* (London: W. W. Norton, 1997)
- Skelton, John, *Magnificence*, ed. by Paula Neuss (USA: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980)
- Smith, Helen, *Unannotating Spenser* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)
- Milton, John, *Eikonoklastēs in answer to a book intitl'd Eikōn basilikē, the portrature of his sacred Majesty in his solitudes and sufferings* (London: printed by Thomas Newcomb, 1650)
- Spencer, Edmund, *The Faerie Queene*, ed. by A. C. Hamilton (London; NY: Person Longman, 2007)
- Stow, John, *A survey of the cities of London and Westminster containing the original, antiquity, increase, modern estate and government of those cities* (London: A. Churchill, J. Knapton, R. Knaplock, J. Walthoe, E. Horne, and 5 others, 1720)
- Sypher, Wylie, *Four Stages of Renaissance Style: Transformations in Art and Literature 1400–1700* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1956)
- Tassi, Marguerite A., *The Scandal of Images: Iconoclasm, Eroticism, and Painting in Early Modern English Drama* (Cranbury, N.J.: Susquehanna University Press, 2005)
- Thorne, Alison, *Vision and Rhetoric in Shakespeare: Looking Through Language* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000)
- Turner, Hilary L., 'Tapestries once at Chastleton House and their influence on the image of the tapestries called Sheldon: A reassessment', *The Antiquaries Journal*, 88 (2008), 313-346
- 'The Tapestry Trade in Elizabethan London: Products, Purchasers, and Purveyors', *The London Journal*, 38:1 (2013), 18-33
- Wace, A. J. B. 'A Pair of Gloves with Tapestry-woven Gauntlets', *Embroideress*, 42 (1932), 990–94