The Representation of Children in Elizabethan and Jacobean Portraits: 1560 – 1630

Angela Cox

Department of History, Classics and Archaeology

Birkbeck College, University of London

Submitted for the degree of

Master of Philosophy

2018

The work presented in this thesis is the candidate's own

Angela Cox

Volume 1

The Representation of Children in Elizabethan and Jacobean Portraits: 1560 – 1630

Abstract

This thesis investigates the representation of children through a study of 165 portraits dating from 1560 to 1630. It aims to understand the meanings and functions of child portraiture and the nature of its relationship to contemporary attitudes to childhood and the experiences of children. Portraits of children in this period have been largely neglected and this thesis argues that a more detailed examination of a substantial number of them can yield a rich seam of information.

The approach is interdisciplinary, exploring the interfaces between social history and the history of art. It seeks to establish the relationship between the artistic form of the portrait and the social and cultural context in which it was produced and received. While the study encompasses 165 portraits, a significant proportion of those now extant, the main methodological approach is to discuss critically a focus group of sixty-three images, working 'outwards' from them: unravelling the meanings of the individual portraits and exploring their context and relationship to others. This study is not limited to portraits of named sitters but also engages with those whose names are forgotten. It is, however, restricted to easel paintings in which children appear on their own or with adults.

The study reveals how family structures and familial relationships between children themselves and between their parents are inscribed in portraits. It assesses how concepts of childhood were visualised, engaging with issues of identity and gender. The pictorial record is shown both to affirm certain historical data, but also to question some common assumptions. It asserts the view that there was a distinct notion of childhood in this period, with recognisable stages of development. Finally, it is demonstrated that the portraits were not esteemed for their aesthetic value but rather as objects of significant cultural meaning.

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been written without the support of colleagues, friends and family. I am especially grateful for all the invaluable advice, incisive criticism and meticulous care throughout the process given to me by my supervisors, Professor Vanessa Harding and Dr Kate Retford. Dr Jane Eade's generous reassurance at the start gave me the confidence to proceed with the project. In particular, the staff of the Heinz Archive at the National Portrait Gallery and the Rare Books and Manuscripts Department, at the British Library were unfailingly helpful with my many requests. I should like to express my heartfelt thanks to Dr Arlene Thomas-Ramasut for her encouragement to begin the research and to my daughters, and particularly to Peter for immense patience and support all the way through.

Table of Contents

Volume 1

Abstract **2**

Acknowledgements **3**

Table of Contents **4**

Abbreviations **6**

List of Figures **7-11**

Chapter 1: Thesis Introduction **12-44**

1:1 Introduction **12**

1.2 The Portraits **15**

1.2. i The Portraits: The Corpus and Focus Group 15

1.2. ii The Portraits: compiling the corpus – sources 21

1.2. iii The Portraits: compiling the corpus – process 23

1.2. iv The Portraits: social parameters 24

1.2. v The Portraits: time frame, 1560 to 1630 25

1.3 Historiography **27**

1.4 Approaches and Methodology **39**

1.5 Chapter summary **42**

Chapter 2: Key formats for representing children **45-81**

2.1 Introduction **45**

2.2 Categories **45**

2.2. i Categories: category (1), the child on its own 49

2.2. ii Categories: category (2), siblings 50

2.2. iii Category (3): one parent with one or more children 52

2.2.iv Category (4): the family group 55

2.2.v Category (5): miscellaneous: exceptional types 61

2.2. vi Category (6): family sets and family series 63

2.3 Inscriptions and Identification **74**

2.4 Conclusion **79**

Chapter 3: Gender, Status and Identity **82-103**

3.1 Introduction **82**

3.2 Gender **83**

3.3 Social status and identity **99**

3.4 Conclusion **103**

Chapter 4: Precedents, imagery and symbols **104-126**

4.1 Introduction **104**

4.2 European royal children's portraits known in England **104**

4.3 Influences from Netherlandish Portraits **107**

4.4 Symbols and meaning **109**

4.5 Conclusion **125**

Chapter 5: Conclusions and Afterlives **127-147**

5.1 Introduction **127**

5.2 Family structures and relationships **129**

5.3 Identity and Likeness **133**

5.4 Afterlives **136**

5.5 Conclusion **146**

Appendix 1: The Corpus **149-175**

Bibliography **176-200**

Volume 2

Table of Contents **202**

List of Figures **204-208**

Figures **209-278**

Abbreviations

G.E.C.	George Edward Cokayne, *The Complete Peerage or a History of the House of Lords and all its Members from the Earliest Times*,13 vols., rev. and much enlarged by Geoffrey H. White with the assistance of R.S. Lea (London: St Catherine's Press, 1910-1959)
NPGH	Heinz Archive and Library, National Portrait Gallery, London
ODNB	Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, online edition, http://www.oxforddnb.com/

List of Figures: Focus Group

Artists are unknown unless the name is stated

Figure 1, *William Brooke, 10th Baron Cobham and his Family*, 1567, panel, 91.7 x 120 cm, Longleat House, Wilts.

Figure 2, *Four Children of Sir Thomas Lucy III*, 1619, canvas, 124.5 x 127 cm, Charlecote Park, Warks.

Figure 3, *Sir Thomas Lucy III and his Family*, mid-1620s, canvas, 203.2 x 304.8 cm, Charlecote Park, Warks.

Figure 4, *Lady Katherine Grey, Countess of Hertford and Lord Edward Seymour*, probably later 1560s, panel, 30.48 cm square, Petworth, Sussex

Figure 5, *Anne Fitton, Lady Newdigate and Mary Newdigate*, 1598, panel, 113.8 x 91.44 cm, Museum of Art, Rhode Island School of Design, Providence, Rhode Island

Figure 6, *Lord Francis Clifford*, c.1585, panel, 100.3 x 87.63 cm, Abbot Hall Gallery, Kendal

Figure 7, Daniel Mytens, *Lady Mary Fielding*, 1620, panel, 115 x 78 cm, location unknown

Figure 8, Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger (after), *William Cecil, later 2nd Earl of Salisbury and Frances Cecil*, 1599, canvas, 159.38 x 118.11 cm, Biltmore Estate, Ashville, North Carolina

Figure 9, *Richard Newdigate*, 1606, panel, 99 x 83.1 cm, Arbury Hall, Warks.

Figure 10, *Lettice Newdigate*, 1606, panel, 96.5 x 81.3 cm, Arbury Hall, Warks.

Figure 11, *Stephen and Mary Phesant*, 1623, panel, 111.8 x 104.8 cm, location unknown

Figure 12, *Unknown Lady and Children of the Aldersley Family*, 1560s, panel, 80 x 91.44 cm, Private Collection

Figure 13, Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger, *Barbara Gamage, Lady Leicester and her Children*, 1596, canvas, 203.2 x 260.3 cm, Penshurst Place, Kent

Figure 14, *Edward, 3rd Lord Windsor and his Family*, 1568, panel, 94 x 123.8 cm, Bute Collection at Mount Stuart House, Isle of Bute, Scotland

Figure 15, Paul van Somer, *Frances, Lady Willoughby and Francis Willoughby*, c.1618, canvas, 105 x 94 cm, Private Collection

Figure 16, *Unknown Boy with Carnation and Cherries*, 1596, panel, 58.5 x 48 cm, location unknown

Figure 17, *Unknown Boy in a Landscape*, 1596, panel, 118.1 x 86.4 cm, location unknown

Figure 18, *Unknown Infant with Parrot and Cherries*, c.1600, canvas, 103.5 x 82.5 cm, Boughton House, Northants.

Figure 19, *Four Daughters of Sir Lionel Tollemache* c.1621, canvas, 53.34 x 200.66 cm, Helmingham Hall, Suffolk

Figure 20, *Three Unknown Jacobean Children*, 1613, support not known, 122.6 x 162.4 cm, location unknown

Figure 21, *Four Unknown Children Making Music*, late 1560s, panel, 76 x 137 cm, location unknown

Figure 22, *Two Children, perhaps of the Courtenay Family*, 1633, canvas, 67.8 x 110.5 cm, location unknown

Figure 23, Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger, *Anne Hopton, Lady Pope and her Children*, 1596, canvas, 203.6 x 121.7 cm, on loan to National Portrait Gallery, London, NPG L231

Figure 24, Paul van Somer, *William, 2nd Earl of Devonshire and William Cavendish*, 1619, canvas, 130.8 x 105 cm, North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh, North Carolina

Figure 25, *Sir Walter Raleigh and his son, Walter Raleigh*, 1602, canvas, 199.4 x 127 cm, National Portrait Gallery, London, NPG 3914

Figure 26, *Unknown Man of the Toke Family and his Son*, 1561, panel, 75 x 61 cm, Godington House, Kent

Figure 27, *The Holme Family*, 1628, triptych, panel, 115.6 x 190.5 cm (open), Victoria & Albert Museum, London, W.5-1951

Figure 28, *Anne Hoghton, Lady Cotton and John Cotton*, c.1621, canvas, size unknown, Madingley Hall, Cambs.

Figure 29, *Lettice Cressy, Lady Tasburgh and her Children*, c.1615-16, panel, 178.44 x 135.26 cm, Private Collection

Figure 30, *Sir Arthur Capel and his Family*, 1600-5, panel, 112 x 84 cm, Private Collection

Figure 31, *The 'Bartholomew' Family,* c.1600, panel, 49 x 55 cm, location unknown

Figure 32, *called Ladies of the Cholmondeley Family and their Babies*, 1600-10, panel, 88.6 x 172.3 cm, Tate Britain, T00069

Figure 33, *Sir Edward Pytts and his grandson, Edward Pytts*, 1612, panel, 183.5 x 110.5 cm, location unknown

Figure 34, *called John Dunch and his Nurse*, 1580s-1590s, panel, 79.3 x 63 cm, Private Collection

Figure 35, *called Son of Richard Assheton of Middleton*, c.1604, panel, 48.3 x 29.2 cm, Rochdale Art Gallery, Rochdale

Figure 36, Cornelis Ketel, *Elizabeth Smythe*, 1579, panel, 48.3 x 39.8 cm, location unknown

Figure 37, *The ffolliott Set*, 1603, each panel, 43 x 32 cm (approx.), location unknown

Figure 38, *Frances Wandesford*, 1608, panel, 88.9 x 66 cm, Cusworth Hall Museum and Park, Doncaster

Figure 39, *Rowland Wandesford*, 1608, panel, 88.9 x 66 cm, Cusworth Hall Museum and Park, Doncaster

Figure 40, *Elizabeth Wandesford*, 1608, panel, 88.2 x 66 cm, location unknown

Figure 41, *possibly Anne Wandesford*, 1608, panel, 89 x 66 cm, location unknown

Figure 42, Johannes Priwitzer, *Lady Diana Russell*, 1627, panel, 66 x 50.8 cm, Woburn Abbey, Beds.

Figure, 43, *Unknown Girl from the Deene Park Series*, 1615-20, panel, 76.2 x 58.4 cm, Deene Park, Northants

Figure 44, *Unknown Boy of the Morgan Family*, 1620, panel, 81 x 61 cm, Tredegar House, Newport, Gwent

Figure 45, *Lady Arbella Stuart*, 1577, panel, 56 x 41.5 cm, Hardwick Hall, Derbys.

Figure 46, *Robert Ridgeway*, 1596, panel, 69.3 x 55.3 cm, location unknown

Figure 47, *Catherine Vaux, Lady Abergavenny and John Neville*, c.1617, canvas, 220 x 123 cm, Stonor Park, Oxon.

Figure 48, Gilbert Jackson (attrib.), *Bennet Sherard*, 1629, canvas, 122 x 94 cm, location unknown

Figure 49, Robert Peake, *Lord John Russell and Lady Margaret Russell*, 1623, canvas, 113 x 86.4 cm, Woburn Abbey, Beds.

Figure 50, *Six Unknown Jacobean Children*, 1625, canvas, 148.5 x 196 cm, Hellens Manor, Much Marcle, Herefs.

Figure 51, *Unknown Boy with Open Book*, 1591, panel, 59.8 x 45.6 cm, location unknown

Figure 52, *Unknown Girl with Music Book*, 1589, panel, 58.4 x 45.7 cm, location unknown

Figure 53, Robert Peake (attrib.), *Elizabeth Coningsby, Lady Wyndham and Edmund Wyndham*, c.1608, canvas, 188 x 99 cm, Private Collection

Figure 54, *Abigail Cave, Lady Sherard and Bennet Sherard*, 1622, canvas, 200 x 114.3 cm, Private Collection

Figure 55, Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger, *Unknown Boy with Robin and Pansies*, 1608, panel, 114.3 x 85.7 cm, Compton Verney, Warks.

Figure 56, *Chrysogna Baker*,1579, panel, 66 x 49.5 cm, The Vyne, Hants.

Figure 57, *Three Unknown Elizabethan Children*, c. 1580, panel, 73 x 57 cm, Private Collection

Figure 58, *Thomas Smythe*, c. 1610, panel, 107 x 86.5 cm, Leeds Castle, Kent

Figure 59, *Three Unknown Jacobean Girls*, c.1620, panel, 85 x 117 cm, The Berger Collection, Denver Art Museum, Denver, Colorado

Figure 60, *Unknown Girl with Parrot*, 1571, panel, 115.57 x 74.9 cm, Boughton House, Northants.

Figure 61, *Unknown Boy with Book and Flowers*, 1576, panel, 48 x 36 cm, location unknown

List of Figures: Comparative Material

Figure 62, Cornelius Johnson, *Arthur, Lord Capel and his Family*, c.1640, canvas, 160 x 259.1 cm, National Portrait Gallery, London, NPG 4759

Figure 63, *Richard Wandesford*, 1608, panel, 89 x 66 cm, Cusworth Hall Museum and Park, Doncaster

Figure 64, *Meryall Wandesford*, 1608, panel, 89 x 66 cm, Cusworth Hall Museum and Park, Doncaster

Figure 65, *Two Boys and Four Girls from the Deene Park Series*, c.1615-20, panel, each approx. 76.2 x 58.4 cm, Deene Park, Northants.

Figure 66, *Six Women from the Deene Park Series*, c. 1615-20, panel, each approx. 76.2 x 58.4 cm, Deene Park, Northants.

Figure 67, Jan van Belcamp (attrib.), *The Great Picture*, 1646, canvas, 254 x 492.76 cm, Abbot Hall Art Gallery, Kendall

Figure 68, *The English Gentleman,* engraved frontispiece with full-length portrait of the author surrounded by vignettes by Robert Vaughan, 2nd. ed., 1633, 17.4 x 13 cm, Royal Collection, RCIN 651330

Figure 69, Jan Gossaert, *The Three Children of Christian II, King of Denmark,* 1526, panel, 34 x 46.2 cm, Royal Collection, RCIN 405782

Figure 70, *Pierre de Moucheron, his Wife, their Eighteen Children, their Son-in Law, Allard de la Dale and their Grandchild*, 1563, panel, 108 x 246 cm, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, SK-A-1537

Figure 71, Levina Teerlinc (attrib.), *Katherine Grey, Countess of Hertford and Lord Edward Seymour,* c.1563, vellum, 5.1 cm diameter**,** Belvoir Castle, Leics.

Figure 72, *Katherine Grey, Countess of Hertford and Lord Edward Seymour*, possibly later sixteenth century, panel 73.66 cm diameter, Syon House, Middx.

Figure 73, Workshop of Joos van Cleve, *The Holy Family,* c.1515, panel, 51.8 x 37.1 cm, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Accession No. 41.190.19

Figure 74, *Cobham Family with George Brooke*, after 1568, canvas, 102.6 x 130.5 cm, Devonshire Collection

Figure 75, Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger (attrib.), *Anne Hopton, Lady Pope and her Children*, early seventeenth century, canvas, 242 x 164 cm, Unknown location

Figure 76, Gilbert Stuart, *The Children of the 2nd Duke of Northumberland*, 1787, canvas, 181.61 x 228.6 cm, Syon House, Middx.

The Representation of Children in Elizabethan and Jacobean Portraits: 1560 – 1630

Chapter 1: Thesis Introduction

1.1 Introduction

While it is well known that portraiture in England increased considerably from the mid-sixteenth century and has been critically studied, less attention has been given to the phenomenon of child representation. Scholarly texts on the period rarely focus on portraits of children apart from the much illustrated *William Brooke, 10th Lord Cobham and his Family* (1567) by an unknown artist (Fig. I, No. 152).[1] Children's portraits have been largely neglected by scholars working within the disciplines of art history and social history. As far as is known, there has been no critical investigation of this distinct social group in this time frame. When portraits of children are referenced in the literature they are inadequately analysed and critiqued. The aim of this thesis is to investigate a sufficient number of images for a critical analysis of their purpose and function as material objects with significant cultural value. It sets out to explore the beliefs and mores embedded within them and also to consider their inter-relationship with other historical material. It engages with issues of childhood in Elizabethan and Jacobean England and touches on the bigger picture of family life.

[1] It was the only portrait to feature non-royal children in Karen Hearn (ed.), *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530-1630* (London: Tate Publishing, 1995), no. 51, an exhibition of 153 paintings and drawings.
Henceforth, it should be assumed that the artist is unknown, unless the name is stated.

The analysis of one example reveals the potential of such an investigation into child portraiture. In the Great Hall at Charlecote Park, Warwickshire, there is a portrait of four children (Fig. 2, No. 103). It is a large canvas (124.5 x 170 cm) and the children are shown life-size. They are not named, but their ages are inscribed in Latin beside each head, left to right from the viewer's position: *AETA*^{tis} *SVAE 2, AETA*^{tis} *SVAE 1, AETA*^{tis} *SVAE 6, AETA*^{tis}*SVAE 3* and the date, *ANO[N] DO[MINI] 1619*.[2] The children are arranged in a row facing forward, a small child standing left, the youngest child sitting on a chair and, two older children on the right, clearly girls, are holding hands. They all wear luxurious garments of a matching fabric. The older girl holds carnations and her sister has a rose. There is a robin perched on the right hand of the child on the extreme left and in its left hand, a spray of cherries. At first glance the faces may appear undifferentiated, yet close scrutiny reveals that the seated child has a rounder face, larger in proportion to its body. The background is neutral, apart from the gold inscriptions, patterned carpet and the green curtains that frame the sides and the top of the canvas. The painting glows with colour and it stands out even among the large array of family portraits displayed alongside it in the Great Hall at Charlecote.

In the 1550s Sir Thomas Lucy I (before 1532-1600) had a magnificent brick mansion built on the Charlecote estate near Stratford-upon-Avon that had been in the family since the twelfth century.[3] His grandson, Sir Thomas Lucy III (c.1585-1640) succeeded to the title and estate in 1605.[4] Sometime during 1619, Sir Thomas's family was recorded in the Heralds' Visitation of Warwickshire. The children are listed: *Constantia aet 5, Ric'us [Richard]Lucy 3.fil, Spencer Lucy fil. et haer aet. 3, 1619, Rob'tus 2 filius aet. 2, Margareta aetat. 3*'.[5] At the time of the Visitation, Richard Lucy was probably less than a year old, as months are not recorded in the lists. This information is the only documentary evidence for the

[2] The position of the viewer standing in front of the portrait is maintained throughout the thesis, unless stated otherwise.
[3] Alice Fairfax-Lucy, *Charlecote and the Lucys: the Chronicle of an English Family*, 2nd edn. (London: Victor Gollancz, 1990), p.33, p.69
[4] It is family tradition to distinguish between the three Sir Thomas Lucys who succeeded one after another in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries as Thomas Lucy I, Thomas Lucy II and Thomas Lucy III.
[5] *The Visitation of the County of Warwick in the Year 1619*, ed. by John Fetherston (London, 1887), p. 288. The exact month of the Visitation is not known.

births and ages of the children.[6] The four children in the portrait should be Constance (b.c.1613), who may have reached the age of six by the time the portrait was inscribed; Margaret (b.c.1616) who was three; Robert (c.1617-1658), aged two, standing next to his brother, the infant Richard (c.1619-1677). Spencer Lucy (c.1616-1649), who is also recorded as being three years old in the Herald's list of 1619, may be Margaret's twin or born in the same calendar year. It is surprising that he is not represented in this portrait, as he survived childhood and succeeded his father in 1640. He appears, however, in the large family portrait painted about eight years later (Fig. 3, No. 157).

The documentary sources thus confirm the identity of the Lucy siblings, but leave many questions unresolved. Why are they arranged on the canvas in this particular order, boys on the left and girls on the right, facing the viewer? Why are the children identified by inscriptions stating their ages, instead of their names? Why do the children wear clothes of matching fabric and in what ways are these clothes gendered? Why do they have accessories that are not toys – the bird, fruit and flowers – objects not now generally associated with children? What aesthetic and stylistic conventions are employed in this portrait and are they comparable to those found in others of this period? Can one make any assumptions about the painter, even though he (or even perhaps she) is not identified? Finally, what are the expectations which Sir Thomas Lucy may have had for the portrait? Why would he, or any Elizabethan or Jacobean parent, commission such a substantial portrait of their children and what functions was it intended to perform? Could it have been one of several portraits which were intended? The absence of Spencer Lucy suggests such a possibility.

Some of these questions are not unique to the Lucy siblings' portrait, or to other portraits of elite children whose identity is known. However, they are also applicable to portraits of children whose identity has been lost. The search for answers is akin to throwing a pebble into a pond; ever widening circles of enquiry are opened up. The Lucy portrait is not a rare survival. Many dozens of portraits depicting children remain in private houses or now enhance public collections.

[6] Only the two youngest of Sir Thomas's thirteen children are recorded in the baptismal register of Charlecote. Fairfax-Lucy, *Charlecote*, p.122

1.2. i The Portraits: The Corpus and Focus Group

This thesis is based on a survey of 165 portraits, 'the corpus', executed, as far as may be determined, between about 1560 and about 1630, and on the closer study of a selection of sixty-three portraits (illustrated with sixty-one figures) from the corpus, called 'the focus group'. *Appendix 1: The Corpus* lists all 165 portraits and is integral to the thesis. The portraits comprising the focus group have not been chosen by any sampling method, nor have they been selected on any basis of a percentage of each of the portrait categories described below. The selection for the focus group was made from examples that I decided most helpfully identified, and most fully assisted, an exploration of the issues at the heart of the thesis. They form a sample group representative of the corpus as a whole and are referenced throughout the thesis. All the portraits in the focus group are illustrated and numbered as they occur in Appendix 1 – (Fig. X, No. Y). In compiling the corpus, I have, where possible, visited public collections and private houses in order to see the portraits in situ. The remainder are known only from photographic reproductions. Some other material used for reference or comparison is also illustrated – (Fig. X).

The criteria for selection of the portraits in the corpus have been as broadly-based as possible. The portraits are of known sitters and of sitters whose identities are not known. However, it should be noted that the division between 'known' and 'unknown' is problematic in this period as many portraits have questionable identifications. For clarity I have identified the sitter/s by the name/s by which the portrait is currently known.[7] If this identification is clearly questionable, yet I have been unable to provide an alternative identification, the name is preceded by 'called'. The artist's name or an attribution to a named artist is given in the text and Appendix I, otherwise it should be assumed, as in the majority of portraits, that the artist is unknown. At this period however, more than one painter might be

[7] The exception is *Catherine Vaux, Lady Abergavenny and John Neville* (c.1617) (Fig. 47, No. 137), discussed in Chapter 2, pp.78-79

involved in the production of a portrait.[8] Furthermore, the portraits in this study were not selected on any criteria of aesthetic quality. The survival of this visual material is unsystematic and it is not possible to make a selection in a methodical way without restricting the range and quantity of portrait representation.

Nonetheless, certain criteria have been applied to the process of selection. Firstly, the portraits are all easel paintings of English sitters that were – as far as can be verified – produced in England, or possibly in Wales. Identifying the country of origin of some portraits with certainty is also problematic.[9] Sitters' identities have often been lost and the provenance will have been broken. As the majority of portraits cannot be attributed to a specific painter, artistic style is the only basis on which to make an evaluation of origin. This is also fraught, as much of the style in this period has close affinities with prevailing Netherlandish idioms, so a portrait strongly influenced by Netherlandish styles and composition could be produced by an English painter familiar with them or by a Netherlandish immigrant. In identifying portraits as English, I have thus erred on the side of caution and, where possible, have consulted art historians and costume historians who have generously shared their opinions.[10] Nonetheless I can make no claims for complete accuracy and errors may have occurred. Secondly, I have not included in the total 165 portraits any of the near contemporary copies and versions of portraits. There are, though, two exceptions to this rule. The panel portrait *Lady Katherine Grey, Countess of Hertford and Lord Edward Seymour* (probably later 1560s) (Fig. 4, No. 114) is a replica of a miniature attributed to Levina Teerlinc (Fig 71).[11] The other portrait is *Anne Fitton, Lady Newdigate and Mary Newdigate* (1598) (Fig. 5, No. 125), which is an identical copy of the portrait at

---

[8] Tarnya Cooper and Maurice Howard, 'Artists, Patrons and the Context for the Production of Painted Images in Tudor and Jacobean England' in *Painting in Britain* 1500-1630, ed. by Tarnya Cooper, Aviva Burnstock, Maurice Howard and Edward Town (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 2015), pp. 7-8

[9] Omitted from the corpus is *Alice Barnham and Sons, Martin and Steven* (c.1557) by an unknown artist. Denver Art Museum, Denver, Colorado. The inscriptions on the portrait suggest a date around 1557. The style suggests a Netherlandish artist, although no satisfactory attribution has been found. There is some doubt that the portrait was made in England and Lena Cowen Orlin has speculated that Alice Barnham, like her brother William Bradbridge, was in Flanders around 1557 and the younger boy's portrait may have been added at a later stage. Lena Cowen Orlin, *Locating Privacy in Tudor London* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 61-62

[10] The similarities between English and Netherlandish portrait styles are discussed in Chapter 4.

[11] Levina Teerlinc (attrib.), *Lady Katherine Grey, Countess of Hertford and Lord Edward Seymour* (c.1563). Belvoir Castle

Arbury Hall. This portrait is included in the corpus because restoration has revealed an inscription, not visible in the Arbury portrait. The significance and complexity of copies and versions is, however, explored and discussed in Chapter 5. Thirdly, portraits of royal children, the sons and daughters of monarchs, are not included as primary material in this study, as these have been discussed elsewhere.[12] References are made to royal portraits where relevant to a portrait under discussion. Fourthly, the portraits are all easel paintings on panel or canvas supports. The handful of miniature portraits (limnings) depicting children have been excluded, as they have discrete functions and are a subset of the portrait genre.[13] Finally, the corpus does not include images of children depicted in genre paintings. It is noticeable that scholars have sometimes blurred the distinction between a portrait that was intended to represent a specific individual and an image of a child who appears in a genre painting. The corpus avoids this imprecision, which, in the past, has led to misunderstandings of the function and meanings of child portraiture.

The selection of 165 portraits is, in all probability, only a very small proportion of the total number of portraits of children painted between 1560 and 1630. This assumption is based on a number of factors. Portraits are known from documentary sources, yet their survival is uncertain and/or their whereabouts unknown. One notable example is the 'lost' portraits of Robert Dudley, Baron Denbigh (1581-1584), infant son of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester (1532-1588). Leicester's inventories identify three portraits of the child, two on his own and one with his mother, extant in 1588.[14] New discoveries are constantly being made due to better cataloguing systems and the recovery of archival material. Moreover the increasing popularity of these period portraits, result in their

---

[12] See Roy Strong, *Tudor & Jacobean Portraits*, 2 vols (London: National Portrait Gallery, 1969). The most portrayed prince in this period is Henry, Prince of Wales (1594-1612) and the subject of recent scholarship. Catharine MacLeod, *The Lost Prince: the Life and Death of Henry Stuart* (London: National Portrait Gallery Publications, 2012)

[13] As well as the few miniatures of royal children by Lucas Horenbout, Hans Holbein painted the sons of Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk (1484-1545) in 1541. *Henry Brandon, Second Duke of Suffolk* (1535-41) and *Charles Brandon, Third Duke of Suffolk* (1537-41). Royal Collection. RC1N 422294, RC1N 422295. There are about three miniatures by Isaac Oliver. Roy Strong, *Artists of the Tudor Court: The Portrait Miniature Rediscovered 1520-1620*, (London: The Victoria & Albert Museum, 1983), pp. 102-103

[14] Elizabeth Goldring, *Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and the World of Elizabethan Art:Painting and Patronage at the Court of Elizabeth I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014), pp.127-28

frequent appearance in art sales.[15] The continued existence of portraits four hundred or more years old can depend on chance factors, such as remaining in family houses that have avoided destruction, the survival of family descendants, the status and reputation of the person represented and the perceived attractiveness of the portrait itself. In recent publications, Tarnya Cooper, Maurice Howard and Robert Tittler have grappled with issues of estimating the numbers of portraits produced in this period, and have discussed the difficulties historians encounter when assessing contemporary documents for reliable information.[16] Tittler conjectures that there were several thousand portraits in England around 1600. Cooper and Howard, without speculating on overall numbers, hypothesise that less than thirty per cent of the original number of painted portraits has survived. Of the possible several thousand portraits, one cannot know how many represented children, nor how many of these portraits might have survived. Certain factors do suggest that the survival of portraits of children is likely to be even lower than that of adults. The high mortality rate of children less than ten years old could account for the loss of many portraits depicting them on their own or with adults. If children had no direct descendants, their portraits would have less dynastic significance for later generations, and, if they were not valued as works of art, they were more likely to be abandoned or destroyed.[17] Even portraits of an elite child, like Robert Dudley, who died age three, have not survived; there is only a magnificent tomb to commemorate him.[18] In addition, the loss of the sitter's identity could also impact on the survival rate of child portraiture.

Forming the corpus has required consideration of the definition of 'a child'. The term 'child' has never been a straightforward descriptive category that can be defined simply by biological age. As Ludmilla Jordanova points out the definition

---

[15] For example, *Portrait of a Child,* (1608). Bonham's, *Old Master Paintings*, 2/5/2012, lot 23 This portrait is from the Wandesford family set (Fig. 41, No. 43). *Unknown girl Age Six with Carnation* (c.1580s) (No. 8). Christie's, *Old Master & British Paintings,* 30/10/ 2014, lot 25

[16] Tarnya Cooper, 'The Enchantment of the Familiar Face: Portraits as Domestic Objects in Elizabethan and Jacobean England' in *Everyday Objects: Modern and Medieval Material Culture and its Meanings,* ed. by Tara Hamling and Catherine Richardson (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), pp. 157-159. Robert Tittler, *Portraits, Painters and Publics in Provincial England* (Oxford University Press, 2012), pp.43-9. Cooper and Howard, 'Artists, Patrons and Context', p. 6

[17] Cooper comments that the lack of appreciation of Tudor and Jacobean portraits as objects of aesthetic value until recently, is a factor accounting for their destruction. Tarnya Cooper, *Citizen Portrait: Portrait Painting and the Urban Elite of Tudor and Jacobean England and Wales* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2012), p. 27

[18] St Mary's Church, Warwick. The boy had neither full siblings nor descendants who might have valued his portrait.

of a child shifts according to the variables of class, gender and historical period.[19] There were no hard and fast rules of definition in Elizabethan and Jacobean England. In his study on adolescence, Paul Griffiths found little consistency in the 'vocabulary of age' in common usage during this period.[20] Nonetheless, in much of the contemporary literature on the nurture of children distinctions are made between the 'stages' of being a child. There seems to be a consensus in the literature that birth to seven years represents the first stage.[21] Sir Thomas Elyot's authoritative *The Boke Named the Governour* (1531), for example, asserts that 'after a chylde is come to sevene yeres of age, I holde it expedient that he be taken from the company of women', although he relents sufficiently to allow the child to have a mature woman to attend to his needs for a couple more years.[22] The first stage is frequently subdivided further, for as the unnamed author of *The Office of Christian Parents* (1616) puts it, 'the first period of the infancy of the child, which I comprehend in the first three yeres: & of the other foure I make another period'.[23] The stage after seven years is gender-determined; usually lasting until twelve for girls and fourteen for boys, about the age of puberty and the legal ages of marriage. I have chosen the termination point for 'child' in the corpus of portraits to be around ten years old, if the age is known from an inscription or other reliable evidence. This decision is based on the fact that portraits of children over ten appear to have no distinguishing 'childhood' features: in their clothes or markers of activities relating to being a child. It also chimes with the findings of Griffiths, whose examination of court records demonstrates that most of them use the term 'child' for any individual up to ten years old.[24] The age has had to be presumed for children whose portraits are without supporting documentation, determined by clothes and accessories, as well as by physical appearance. For consistency I have used the following terms:

---

[19] Ludmilla Jordanova, 'Children in History: Concepts of Nature and Society' in *Children, Parents and Politics* ed. by Geoffrey Scarre (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 4
[20] Paul Griffiths, *Youth and Authority: Formative Experiences in England1560-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 22
[21] Ralph A. Houlbrooke, *The English Family 1450*-1700 (London and New York: Longman, 1984), p. 150; Shulamith Shahar, *Childhood in the Middle Ages* (London and New York: Routledge, 1990), p. 22. Shahar's survey finishes about 1520, but there is no evidence that the stages she describes changed during the next hundred years.
[22] Donald W. Rude (ed.), *A Critical Edition of Sir Thomas Elyot's 'The Boke Named the Governor'* (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1992), p. 33
[23] Anon, *The Office of Christian Parents* (Cambridge, 1616), p. 58
[24] Griffiths, *Youth*, p. 24

‘baby’ for a child up to about a year, ‘infant’ for a child between one year and three years and ‘boy’ or ‘girl’ for a child over three.

The corpus of 165 portraits comprises representations of 250 individual children, either named or unnamed, which I have arranged in six categories.[25] There are different possible ways of ordering such portraits for analysis: for example, in strict chronological order, by format (head and shoulders, half-length etc.), by the identity or anonymity of the sitter, or by the identity or anonymity of the artist. For the purposes of this study, however, I decided that the most effective way to analyse and discuss the portraits was by the number of sitters represented and the relationships between them. I thus established six portrait categories or types: (1) a child on its own, (2) siblings (two or more children), (3) one parent with one or more children, (4) the family group of both parents, children and other adults, (5) miscellaneous: portrait types that are exceptions to categories (1), (2), (3) and (4) and finally, category (6) a family set or family series of several individual portraits in a uniform or matching format. These categories have served me most effectively in exploring the interrelationships between child portraiture and contemporary social history which is the aim of this thesis.

As noted above, the portraits were not selected according to aesthetic or stylistic criteria. However, despite a tendency to view this period as artistically static, this study will demonstrate that there were stylistic developments in the manner of picturing children during this seventy-year period. If one compares the portrait *Lord Francis Clifford* (c.1585), by an unknown painter (Fig. 6, No. 9), with the portrait *Lady Mary Fielding* (1620) by the Delft immigrant artist, Daniel Mytens (Fig. 7, No. 67), for example, one can see a more naturalistic depiction of the child and the dog in the later image. The comparative scale of child, dog and chair is convincing. Furthermore, neutral backgrounds with gold inscriptions, most common in portraits executed before 1600 (though not in the portrait of Lord Francis), are sometimes later replaced by more elaborate interiors and even by gardens and landscapes.

[25] Some children are represented in more than one portrait in the corpus. For example, the Lucy children depicted in the sibling portrait (1619) (Fig. 2, No. 103) appear again in the family group, *Sir Thomas Lucy III and his Family* (mid-1620s) (Fig. 3, No. 157)

1.2. ii The Portraits: compiling the corpus – sources

The primary source for compiling the corpus of 165 portraits was the Heinz Archive and Library at the National Portrait Gallery (NPGH), the key resource for research into British portraiture. Since its foundation in 1856 the gallery has collected material in the form of image reproductions (mostly photographs), documents that describe or list portraits and their location in public or private collections and private correspondence between owners and scholars. The image reproductions are housed in over 2,500 'sitters' boxes' and arranged in alphabetical order under the name of the sitter. In addition to the sitter's name and the artist if known, the visual image may have attached to it information such as the medium, size and the portrait's location at the time it was acquired by the Heinz Archive. In addition to the sitters' boxes, the archive holds boxes, filed under the names of artists (native and foreign) who worked in Britain. They are in chronological order. Finally, there is a small selection of boxes with images classified according to a category of portrait types, e.g. 'children' and 'family groups'. In addition, the Heinz Archive's library holds printed catalogues of private family collections where portraits might be expected to have survived. Despite its inestimable value for portraiture research thanks to the diligence of the staff since its inception, it must however be acknowledged that the Heinz Archive's holdings are subject to the vagaries of chance – as to what has been documented – and cannot claim to be totally comprehensive.

I supplemented the resource of the Heinz Archive with that of the Witt Library of the Courtauld Institute of Art. This is likewise an image library of photographic reproductions, in this case of paintings from Western Art. These are mostly of paintings that have passed through sale-rooms or been acquired from the Courtauld's Photographic Survey of Paintings in private collections. Art dealers who specialise in early English portraiture have also provided opportunities for sourcing portraits as they move between private ownerships.

Documentary evidence provides a further means of sourcing portraits. A systematic investigation of all surviving inventories, wills, private letters, personal accounts, and other memorabilia of the period that might yield information on children's portraits would have been an insurmountable task.

Probate inventories would seem to be an obvious source for a more limited search. However in this regard probate inventories and wills are of limited use. If they do list pictures, the subject matter may well not be identified. Still more problematically, easel paintings may not be listed at all. Portraits were excluded from probate inventories if they were considered to be personal heirlooms, or if they were the property of the individual's wife.[26] Probate inventories were, furthermore, only compiled for women who were unmarried or widowed. Not until relatively late in Elizabeth I's reign do inventories show substantial collections of portraits and of these, family portraits with children are a minority.[27] However, four inventories in particular were identified as potentially useful, the Leicester Inventories (1588 and 1590) [28,] the Lumley Inventories (1590 and 1609)[29], the Hardwick Inventory (1601)[30] and the Northampton Inventory (1614).[31] I have benefitted enormously from the efforts of scholars who have painstakingly researched these sources. These inventories do not yield many portraits that are not identifiable from other sources, but they are vital resources for understanding the broader contexts of portrait collections, financial value and display, and also for gaining an understanding of what once existed, but is now lost.

In addition, I have made use of online websites to search all British public collections. Starting in 2004, The Public Catalogue Foundation documented all paintings in public ownership throughout Britain before collaborating with BBC Your Paintings (now Art UK) who digitised the images. Other image collections, such as the holdings of the National Trust and Bridgeman Images, were also used.

---

[26] New goods could also be designated as heirlooms, and therefore they were excluded. Mark Overton, Jane Whittle, Danon Dean and Andrew Hann, *Production and Consumption in English Households, 1600-1750* (London and New York: Routledge, 2004), p. 16

[27] Lawrence Stone, *Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), p. 714. Susan Foister, 'Paintings and other works of art in sixteenth-century English inventories', *The Burlington Magazine*, 123, no. 938, (May 1981), pp. 273-282

[28] Charles L. Kingsford, 'Essex House, formerly Leicester House and Exeter Inn', *Archaeologia*, 73, (Society of Antiquaries: London, 1923), pp. 1-54. Goldring, *Robert Dudley*, pp. 255-311

[29] Mark Evans, (ed.), *Art Collecting and Lineage in the Elizabethan Age: The Lumley Inventory and Pedigree* (London: Roxburghe Club, 2010), especially Part V.

[30] Santina Levey and Peter Thornton, *Of Household Stuff: The 1601 Inventories of Bess of Hardwick* (London: The National Trust, 2001)

[31] Evelyn Philip Shirley, 'An Inventory of the Effects of Henry Howard, K.G., Earl of Northampton, taken on his death in 1614, together with a transcription of his Will', *Archaeologia*, 42, (London: Society of Antiquaries, 1869), pp. 347-378. See, Tittler, *Portraits, Painters, Publics*, pp.45-49, for a discussion of the importance of wills and probate inventories for identifying portrait ownership.

Finally, portraits were located by contacting owners of private historic houses and, where practical, these houses were visited. However, despite this systematic search through all likely sources, there will be surviving portraits that I have not been able to access.

1.2. iii The Portraits: compiling the corpus - process

From the beginning, the decision was made not to construct the corpus solely on the holdings in NPGH, as it would have excluded the portraits I might discover online and in private houses, which were not recorded visually in the Archive. Although my discoveries could not be definitive, I wished to base my statistical calculations and critical observations on as large a dataset as possible. Nonetheless NPGH did yield by far the greatest number of portraits. My search of the sitters' boxes began by targeting elite Elizabethan and Jacobean individuals who had held high office: people whose descendants might still have portraits of their forebears as children. A typical example was the Russell family, the Earls and later Dukes of Bedford, who still own Woburn Abbey, where a family set of child portraits painted in the 1620s is in situ.[32] The sitters' boxes for the Salisbury family, meanwhile, yielded the sibling portrait, *William Cecil, later 2nd Earl of Salisbury and Frances Cecil* (1599) after Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger (Fig. 8, No. 97), the children of Robert Cecil, first Earl of Salisbury (1563-1612).[33] Following the network of elite marriages in this period proved useful too. The portrait, *Anne, Lady Fitton with Edward and Mary Fitton* (1609) (No.131), at Gawsworth Hall led to the portraits of her kin, the Newdigate family at Arbury Hall.[34] Other printed and documentary sources in NPGH supplied more names to pursue, such as the Tollemache family at Helmingham Hall, Suffolk. The sitters' boxes provided portraits of named sitters, but the artists' boxes in NPGH and also

[32] This portrait set is discussed in Chapter 2, pp. 69-70

[33] The portrait entered the Biltmore Estate Collection, Ashville, North Carolina about 1925, but nothing is known of the provenance. Information provided by Lori M. Garst of the Biltmore Estate.

[34] The portrait at Gawsworth Hall is now considered to be a later version, but I discovered the original portrait in NPGH.

in the Witt Library yielded portraits of children whose identity had been lost. Similar finds came from the boxes of portrait types in NPGH.[35]

Contacting owners of private houses and visiting them on public open days, or by request, led to unexpected discoveries. For example, prior to a research trip to Arbury Hall, I knew about the portrait of Lettice Newdigate (Fig. 10, No. 37), but did not know that there was a companion portrait of her brother Richard (Fig. 9, No. 36), to which there is no reference in NPGH.

1.2. iv The Portraits: social parameters

The majority of named sitters are from elite Elizabethan or Jacobean families, children of the nobility, or children from long-established landed gentry. They were most likely to have been portrayed and to have descendants who still, or until recently, inhabited their original Elizabethan or Jacobean houses. In portraits where the identity of the child is unknown, high status may be presumed from the opulent costume and jewellery on display.[36] However, portraits survive from the class below the titular nobility and gentry, that is from those families Sir Thomas Smith identified as gentlemen of the professions: clergy, lawyers, scholars and 'to be shorte [those] who can live idly and without manuall labour, and will bear the port, charge and countenaunce of a gentleman… [They] shall be taken for a gentleman.'[37] For example, the upwardly-mobile Phesant family is represented by two seventeenth-century portraits (Fig. 11, No. 106) and (No. 138), which were commissioned by Peter Phesant (1584-1649), a city lawyer. His successful career culminated in his appointment as Judge of Common Pleas in 1645, by which time he had acquired substantial property in London and Huntingdonshire.[38] Notwithstanding the vast diversity in wealth and land ownership from the greatest magnates to modest gentlemen supported by small estates, all these men and their female dependents were classed by Smith, William Harrison and later

[35] For example, *Three Unknown Jacobean Children* (1613) (Fig. 20, No. 101).
[36] For example, *Three Unknown Elizabethan Children* (c.1580) (Fig. 57, No. 95)
[37] L. Alston, *De Republica Anglorum: a Discourse on the Commonwealth of England by Sir Thomas Smith* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1906), p. 39. Smith wrote *De Republica Anglorum* in 1562-65, but not published until 1583.
[38] J. M. Rigg, 'Phesant, Peter (1584–1649)', rev. Vivienne Larminie, *ODNB*, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22095, accessed 13 May 2017]

commentators as of the 'first sorte', who made up about two per cent of the population.[39]

Next in rank are the citizens and burgesses, some of whom were extremely wealthy, especially those merchants who, like Thomas 'Customer' Smythe (1522-1591), lived and traded in London. Smythe commissioned portraits of his entire family (most probably thirteen portraits in all) from the Dutch immigrant painter Cornelis Ketel in 1579.[40] An earlier example is the group portrait of a woman with her three children, traditionally identified as members of the Aldersley family (Fig. 12, No. 113). On the evidence of the style of their clothes, this portrait dates from the late 1560s.[41] Whether or not that identification is correct, the portrait clearly represents a merchant family at the chronological starting point of this study. It is among the earliest in the corpus, similar in date to *William Brooke, 10th Lord Cobham and his Family* (1567) (Fig. 1, No. 152).

1.2. v The Portraits: time frame, 1560 to 1630

The period chosen for this study, from the mid-sixteenth century to the third decade of the seventeenth century, witnessed a steady increase in the commissioning of portraits, not only by aristocratic families with ancient lineages, but also by the recently ennobled elite and the merchant classes.[42] The distribution of portraits from the 1540s to 1620 in Roy Strong, *The English Icon: Elizabethan & Jacobean Portraiture* (1969) demonstrates clearly how the numbers rose as the sixteenth century progressed.[43] This trend is amply substantiated by the distribution of portraits sourced in this study. The extensive dispersal of church

---

[39] *The Description of England; the classic contemporary account of Tudor Social Life*, ed. by Georges Edelen (Washington D.C.: Folger Shakespeare Library; New York: Dover Publications, 1994), pp. 94-115. Keith Wrightson, *English Society, 1580-1680* (London: Hutchinson, 1982), p. 19. David Cressy, *Society and Culture in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), p. 29

[40] Karen Hearn, 'Merchant-Class Portraiture in Tudor London: "Customer" Smith's Commission, 1579-80' in eds. Olga Dmitrieva and Tessa Murdoch, *Treasures of the Royal Courts: Tudors, Stuarts and Russian Tsars* (London: V&A Publishing, 2013), pp. 37-43

[41] The portrait is discussed in Chapter 2, pp. 54-55

[42] Tittler, *Portraits, Painters, Publics*, pp. 28-29; Tarnya Cooper, *Elizabeth I & Her People*, (London: National Portrait Gallery, 2013), p.11

[43] Roy Strong, *The English Icon: Elizabethan and Jacobean Portraiture* (London: Paul Mellon Foundation for British Art, Routledge and Kegan Paul; New York: Pantheon Books, 1969) pp. 66-338

property from the late 1530s and the expansion of trade in the later decades of the sixteenth century provided wealth that was sunk into the stone, bricks and mortar of new houses, or the reconstruction of old ones.[44] These buildings proclaimed their owners' status by the conspicuous features of heraldic embellishments incorporated into the fabric of the architecture and in parades of portraits, most often displayed in long galleries.[45] This is a productive period to examine closely, coinciding as it does, with the first real flourishing of portraiture as a major art form in English painting.

1560 is the start point of this thesis because before the accession of Elizabeth I there seem to be no surviving easel paintings depicting non-royal English children.[46] The end point at about 1630 is predicated on the view that Anthony van Dyck's prolonged residence in London from 1632 onwards was a significant episode in the development of English portraiture, introducing a sophisticated form of the Continental Baroque style that had considerable appeal for elite patrons. It may be that scholars have exaggerated this pivotal moment, because more traditional styles and modes of presentation certainly continued beyond the 1630s, but there is no doubting that van Dyck's influence was profound.[47] It not only impacted on London court artists, but also on painters in provincial workshops. The temporal boundaries of the thesis from 1560 to 1630 also correspond roughly with three foremost studies of artistic practice in Tudor and Jacobean England. The starting point for Strong's *The English Icon* (1969), his ground-breaking survey of Tudor and Jacobean portraiture, is about 1540 after the death of Hans Holbein the Younger (1497/8-1543) and ends about 1625 with the accession of Charles I. He describes it as 'a bleak [age]… between two golden ages of English Renaissance culture, the reigns of Henry VIII and Charles I', but

---

[44] Mark Girouard has demonstrated that most domestic building was by 'new men', those who had prospered under the Tudors. Mark Girouard, *Elizabethan Architecture: Its Rise and Fall, 1540-1640* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009), p. 4

[45] Girouard, *Architecture,* pp. 69-71. Maurice Howard, *The Tudor Image* (London: Tate Publishing), p.33

[46] There is always the possibility that an earlier portrait will come to light. Currently, the only exceptions seem to be the miniature portraits, dated 1541, by Holbein of the sons of the Duke of Suffolk. See note 13.
Holbein's family portrait of Sir Thomas More completed in 1527/28, of which there are several surviving versions, depict More's adult son and daughters.

[47] Oliver Millar, *the Age of Charles I*: *Painting in England 1620-1649* (London: Tate Gallery, 1972), pp .89-95. Christopher Brown, *Van Dyck* (Oxford: Phaidon, 1982), pp. 222-230

nonetheless 'one which deserves serious reassessment'.[48] Karen Hearn's *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530-1630* (1995) also uses 1630 as the end date and although Hearn does not spell out her reasons, by inference, Van Dyck's second employment in London from 1632 is a turning-point.[49] Finally, the major research project based at the National Portrait Gallery, *Making Art in Tudor Britain* (2007-2014), provides an overview of the wide-ranging fields of academic research and technical advances in conservation in the period since Strong's pioneering study forty years ago.[50] It also ends in 1630.

1.3. Historiography

There is no extensive critical study to date of easel portraits of children in the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods. Such few references as there are occur within a range of contexts – social history studies exploring the nature of childhood and the experience of being a child, accounts of portraiture by art historians, costume studies, investigations of cultural artefacts made for and used by children, or a combination of all these perspectives.[51] This review addresses the historiography in which portraits of children are examined. It acknowledges the contributions of scholarly research in various fields of study and also identifies the gaps and misconceptions that still persist in the understanding of the meanings and functions of portrait images of children.

The starting-point for any discussion of child portraiture since the 1960s has been Philippe Ariès's, *L'Enfant et la Famille sous L'Ancien Régime* (1960), published in an English translation by Robert Baldick two years later as *Centuries of Childhood* .[52] This illustrated edition has twenty-four plates which supplement the text. Ariès's pioneering study of the history of childhood and the relationships between parents and children before modern times sparked off a vigorous debate

[48] Strong, *English Icon*, p. 3
[49] See note 1.
[50] Cooper and others, *Painting in Britain, 1500-1630*
[51] References to individual texts are given as they occur in the review of the literature which follows.
[52] Philippe Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood*, trans. by Robert Baldick (London: Jonathan Cape, 1962). References are to this edition.

in which historians and scholars from various disciplines have explored, challenged and in many cases refuted, Ariès's notions of the evolution of the nature of childhood before the mid-twentieth century. This is not the place to repeat the controversies which stemmed from this study, but rather to focus on how Ariès employed visual imagery to support his arguments.

The twenty-four plates consist of a mix of painted portraits, genre paintings, manuscript illuminations and prints. Other child images from tombs and religious works are referenced in the text, but not illustrated. All these images are invoked as if they were direct transcriptions of past realities. It is only the scarcity of visual material in the early Middle Ages that led Ariès to assume that 'until about the twelfth century…there was no place for childhood in the medieval world'.[53] Interestingly, the time-scale for the appearance of children depicted on their own is problematic for Ariès: 'it is in fact quite remarkable that at that period [the sixteenth century] of demographic wastage anyone should have felt a desire to record and keep the likeness of a child that would go on living or if a child was dead'.[54] However, as he discovered an extensive number of portraits which depicted children separate from adults dating from the early seventeenth century, Ariès situated the arrival of the 'modern' child and a concept of childhood to somewhere in that period.[55]

In response, scholars have provided evidence in more focussed studies to assert that well before the seventeenth century, childhood was conceptualised as a discrete stage in human development, 'not an unimportant phase not worthy of record'.[56] Art historians in particular attacked the superficial discussion of an indiscriminate range of visual imagery without any apparent understanding of their context or function.[57] Lawrence Stone, who narrowed his focus to three

---

[53] Ariès, *Centuries*, p. 33
[54] Ariès, *Centuries*, p. 40
[55] Ariès, *Centuries*, p. 42
[56] Ariès, *Centuries*, p. 38. See for example, Linda Pollock, *Forgotten Children: Parent-Child Relationships from 1500-1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983). Shahar, *Childhood in the Middle Ages* (London and New York: Routledge, 1990). Nicholas Orme, *Medieval Children* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001)
[57] For example, Adrian Wilson, 'The Infancy of the History of childhood: An Appraisal of Philippe Ariès', *History and Theory*, 19 (1980), pp. 132-53, especially pp.146-7. Anthony Burton, 'Looking Forward from Aries? Pictorial and Material Evidence for the History of Childhood and Family Life', *Continuity and Change*, 4 (1989), pp. 203-29. Erica Langmuir, *Imagining Children* (New Haven, Conn.; London: Yale University Press, 2006) p.38. The most recent and

centuries in *Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800* (1977), displays a similarly casual attitude in his employment of visual imagery, which was mostly print material, used as supporting historical evidence to accompany his text.[58] However, he makes no direct textual references to any of the forty-three illustrations. In her discussion of Ariès's use of visual imagery and the debates that followed, Kate Retford concludes that 'a key historiographical development since *Centuries of Childhood* has been the relocation of the arrival of the "modern" child in art to the eighteenth century' and even more specifically to post 1730.[59] This notion had been gaining momentum for some time. J.H. Plumb for example, believes that the experience of childhood was mostly miserable before the mid-eighteenth century, suffered under fierce parental discipline and, as supporting evidence, he also invoked images from the art of portraiture. He states that the English Conversation Pieces appearing post 1730 'show family scenes of mutual pleasure', depicting the 'new world of children'.[60] However, the extensive study most responsible for this paradigm shift is James Christen Steward's, *The New Child: British Art and the Origins of Modern Childhood 1730-1830* (1995).[61]

In other studies of childhood we find that scholars have contributed different disciplinary approaches. Again, the interest here is how they have included analyses of contemporary portraits as evidence in support of their arguments. Two examples will suffice. The essay contributed by literature scholar, Jonathan Goldberg, 'Fatherly Authority: The Politics of Stuart Family Images' is one such example.[62] In their Introduction to the volume of essays, the editors inform the reader that 'literary critics can be observed here turning beyond the boundaries of written texts to ask how and where such texts intersect with other kinds of cultural

---

comprehensive discussion is Kate Retford, 'Philippe Ariès's "discovery of childhood": imagery and historical evidence', *Continuity and Change,* 31,3 (2016), pp. 391-418

[58] Lawrence Stone, *Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1977)

[59] Retford, *Ariès,* p. 401

[60] J. H. Plumb, 'The New World of Children in Eighteenth Century England', *Past and Present*, 67, 1975, p. 67

[61] James Christen Steward, *The New Child: British Art and the Origins of Modern Childhood 1730-1830* (Berkeley, University of California, Berkeley, 1996). The book accompanied the exhibition of the same name with catalogue entries for each exhibit.

[62] Jonathan Goldberg, 'Fatherly Authority: The Politics of Stuart Family Images' in *The Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan and Nancy J. Vickers (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1986), pp. 3-32

production, ranging from maps and paintings to royal progresses'.[63] Goldberg develops Lawrence Stone's analysis of the structural shift in the family from the 'Open Lineage Family (1450-1630)' to the restricted 'Patriarchal Nuclear Family' (1550-1700), the latter emerging in the early seventeenth century as a Jacobean type.[64] He examines the writings of James I, both before and after he succeeded to the English throne in 1603. The king consistently identified himself as the 'father' of his subjects, over whom he has both authority and a duty of care, and Goldberg discusses the visual print material of the Stuart royal family as auxiliary evidence. He then moves on to non-royal examples and asserts that, 'judging by representations of families in the sixteenth century' we can see the restricted patriarchal nuclear family unfolding.[65] Goldberg's examples are Holbein's preliminary sketch for the portrait of the family of Sir Thomas More (1527-8) and the Cobham Family group (Fig. 1, No. 152), to compare with *Arthur, Lord Capel and his Family* (c.1640) by Cornelius Johnson (Fig. 62).[66] In the two earlier portraits he notes the inclusion of adults who were not the parents of the children which suggests that 'the favoured representation was more diffuse, a visual version of the commonwealth as Sir Thomas Smith envisioned it'.[67] Goldberg's argument for patriarchal authority is not the key issue here: what is pertinent is his use of portraiture to support it. One questions the number of family portraits he could have seen to confirm his conclusion from the visual material. In fact, as this research demonstrates, there are remarkably few surviving easel portraits of family groups in the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods which depict both parents with their offspring. As far as the evidence from portraiture is concerned, Goldberg cites just three examples, one of which is Holbein's portrait of Sir Thomas More's family, an exceptional household and an exceptional portrait.[68] The Cobham Family portrait has just one adult apart from the parents. The question should be rather, why are there so few family portraits in this period?[69]

---

[63] Ferguson, Quilligan and Vickers, 'Introduction' in *Discourses of Sexual Difference*, p. xxiii
[64] Stone, *Family*, Chapters 2 and 3
[65] Goldberg, 'Fatherly Authority', p. 6
[66] This painting no longer exists. It is known from Holbein's preliminary sketch and from later painted versions. Hans Holbein, *Sir Thomas More and his Family* (1527/8). Kupferstichkabinett, Öffentliche Kunstsammlung, Basel.
[67] Goldberg, 'Fatherly Authority', p. 6
[68] Stanley Morison, *The Likeness of Thomas More: an Iconographical survey of three centuries*, edited and supplemented by Nicolas Barker (London: Burnes and Oates, 1963), p. 21
[69] This point is considered in Chapter 5, pp. 132-33

Catherine Belsey's investigation, 'Little Princes: Shakespeare's Royal Children', examines the playwright's representation of princes, in which she also discusses their images in royal portraits.[70] Her focus is on the portraits of Stuart princes prior to their portrayals by Anthony van Dyck. She maintains that Holbein's 'delightful' portrait of the infant Prince Edward (c.1538) was exceptional and that '[his] realism was not imitated in England until many years after his death', that is until van Dyck's 'enchanting portrait of 1635 [the children of Charles I] shows childhood triumphant'.[71] In fact, the realism in Prince Edward's portrait is confined to the figure itself, the delicate baby face and the chubby fingers. The pose (albeit with a rattle) and the frontal presentation with a text, echo the manner of adult portraiture. Belsey's non-royal examples are the portrait of Sir Walter Raleigh with his son, Walter (1602) (Fig. 25, No. 128), in which, she says, the boy mimics his father's posture and the Cobham Family group (Fig. 1, No. 152). Here 'stiff little figures…sit solemnly round the dining table'.[72] With reference to these portraits she concludes that 'art historians would point out that the absence of recognisably childlike children was to a high degree a matter of fashion', but that 'from the point of view of cultural history, paintings tend to depict what a culture considers important, and the *difference* of childhood was not considered worth a great deal of attention.'[73] Belsey offers no suggestions as to why, around 1635, childhood becomes triumphant. Although her analysis of the Shakespeare texts is meticulous and carefully nuanced, she affords less critical rigour to the context, function or iconography of the portraits, and feels able to conclude from the visual evidence that 'childhood… was barely visible until well into the seventeenth century as a distinctive state of being.' There is no apparent understanding of portrait conventions in this discussion. Moreover, Goldberg and Belsey cite the same few high-profile portraits that are frequently reproduced and exhibited. It is worth noting that it is rare to encounter any examination, outside the field of costume studies, of a portrait of a child whose identity is not known.

---

[70] Catherine Belsey, 'Little Princes: Shakespeare's Royal Children' in *Shakespeare and Childhood* ed. by Kate Chedgzoy, Susanne Greenhalgh and Robert Shaunessy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 32-48

[71] Belsey, 'Little Princes', pp. 32-3. Hans Holbein the Younger, *Edward, Prince of Wales* (c.1538). National Gallery of Art, Washington. Anthony van Dyck, *The Three Eldest Children of Charles I* (1635). Galleria Sabauda, Turin

[72] Belsey, 'Little Princes', pp. 33-34

[73] Belsey, 'Little Princes', p. 34

The phrases 'stiff little figures' and 'miniature adults' persist in the visual description of children like the Cobhams, when the manner of their representation in portraits is described. It perpetuates two misconceptions. Firstly, it links what is perceived as the stiff appearance of a child, expensively dressed and frontally posed in a portrait, with an assessment of how parents thought of, and treated, their children – as miniature adults in the making, wearing adult clothes and aping adult poses. Secondly, it suggests that the cultural object that is the painted portrait is somehow a direct reflection of the actual experience of childhood. It fails to recognise the artificiality of a portrait executed within historically specific artistic and social conventions.[74] Well before the mid-eighteenth century, there are images of children in artworks that are *not* portraits, where they are represented behaving 'childishly'; in the margins of illuminated manuscripts, or as onlookers in religious paintings and participants in genre pictures.[75]

The approach best described as the 'long view' is a survey of images of children across time. Many of the texts generally endorse notions established by Ariès, and, as in *Centuries of Childhood,* we find a mixed bag of visual material.[76] This broad-brush approach is especially popular for exhibitions and inevitably critical analysis is thinly spread. Portraits often mingle with genre paintings, though a portrait is frequently presented as the earliest image (a family group or a mother-and-child/children portrait) in the chronology and the model against which all later representations are appraised. One example is the catalogue to the Manchester exhibition, *Innocence and Experience* (1992), conceived as 'about the history of the images of childhood rather than the history of children themselves… [The] entries attempt nevertheless to interpret the images…in the light of stimulating research into the alterating [sic] conditions of childhood

[74] Richard Brilliant, *Portraiture* (London: Reaktion Books, 1991), p. 10;
[75] Peter Fuller argues this point with examples; Peter Fuller, 'Uncovering Childhood' in *Changing Childhood,* ed. by Martin Hoyles (London: Writers and Readers Publishing Co-operative, 1979), pp. 79-80. See also Orme, *Medieval Children.* Manuscript illuminations and prints of children playing with toys and participating in games appear throughout the book.
[76] Most surveys start in the eighteenth century. This list of titles is not comprehensive, but they all use images for comparison dating from the sixteenth or early seventeenth centuries. It does not include texts that are referenced separately elsewhere. Madge Garland, *The Changing Face of Childhood* (London: Hutchinson, 1963). Anne Higonnet, *Pictures of Innocence: The History and Crisis of Ideal Childhood* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1998). Anita Schorsch, *Images of Childhood* (New York: Mayflower Books, 1979). Schorsh's text, as do many others, approaches the discussion of images from the artist's perspective, as if he or she has complete autonomy in how the child is represented.

experience, psychological, social and economic which has been undertaken in the last twenty years'.[77] The images come in a range of visual media – paintings, sculpture and prints – organised around themes which structure the essays preceding the catalogue entries. In all there are sixty-eight artworks, of which just four are commissioned portraits. The Cobham Family portrait was not included in the exhibition, but is referred to in the text on the theme, *The Family*. Sara Holdsworth asserts that the lengthy cartouche and the inscriptions of the children's' ages 'were appropriate when aristocratic portraits were used not simply as a record of an individual's appearance but as a diplomatic tool or for marriage broking'.[78] The Capel Family portrait (c.1640) (Fig. 62) is seen to reinforce the 'patriarchal message' but in a manner made 'natural and intimate by the artist's use of gesture'.[79] Then, (by way of Rubens and van Dyck), the viewer is asked to consider the difference between the 'formal symbolic meal' of the Cobhams in which 'exotic fruits and animals … act as an indicator of the family's wealth' and the tea-table 'in the private sitting-room' of the Willoughby de Broke family round which the children 'romp', as if the latter portrait was an unmediated image of family life in the second half of the eighteenth century.[80] What we have here is a narrative of 'improvement', frequently encountered, both in the image of familial relationships and in the aesthetic quality of the painting. Stylistic changes are simplistically equated with social changes.

This narrative is encountered in Karin Calvert's, *Children in the House: The Material Culture of Early Childhood, 1600-1900* (1992), which investigates a wide range of surviving artefacts from Colonial America. She also considers the period around 1750 to be significant as the time of change in the experience of, and attitudes towards childhood.[81] Among the examined artefacts were 900 portraits. In her appraisal of the seventeenth century portraits she notes that 'more

---

[77] Sara Holsworth and Joan Crossly, *Innocence and Experience: Images of Children in British Art from 1600 to the Present* (Manchester: Manchester City Art Galleries, 1992), p.5. Other exhibitions include *Childhood: A Loan Exhibition of Works of Art* (London: Sotheby's, 1988). Andrew Moore and Charlotte Crawley, *Family and Friends: A Regional Survey of British Portraiture* (London: HMSO, 1992). Harriet Loffler and Andrew Moore, *Family Matters: The Family in British Art* (Norwich: Norwich Castle Museum, 2011)
[78] Holsworth and Crossly, *Innocence*, p.16
[79] Holsworth and Crossly, *Innocence*, p.17
[80] Holsworth and Crossly *Innocence*, p.17. Johann Zoffany, *Lord Willoughby de Broke and his Family* (c.1766). The J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles.
[81] Karin Calvert, *Children in the House: The Material Culture of Early Childhood, 1600-1900* (Boston: Northeastern University Press. 1992), p. 8

boys posed… with objects associated exclusively with women and children, such as fruit, flowers, or pets, all of which suggested the cultivation and leisure activities of women and children.'[82] Moreover, 'the stock poses were solemn, dignified and formal…Not only toys, but cradles, go-carts, puddings, swaddling clothes and all other child-related artefacts were also absent from children's portraits'[83] From this, Calvert concludes that 'childhood in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century simply had no positive attributes of its own considered worthy of expression'.[84] Furthermore, she maintains that her conclusions are similar to social and cultural patterns in Europe. A cursory look at the portraits illustrated in this study and those listed in Appendix 1 will indicate that she is mistaken about English portraits, which often do include these child-related artefacts. Moreover, Calvert takes no account of the traditions in visual representation and how certain objects depicted in the portraits may also carry symbolic meanings. Once more we see the portraits treated like 'snapshots' of the past.

In *Children Remembered: Responses to Untimely Death in the Past* (2006) Robert Woods sets out to compare demographic data, that is, early-age mortality rates for England and France, with cultural data.[85] His purpose is to discover 'whether and how the expression of feelings through images and texts can be said to reflect demographic experience'.[86] For this study he examines portraits of children from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries alongside contemporary poems, mostly elegies, written in English between the 1570s and the 1990s. His aim for the images is to ascertain whether evidence from his samples 'can be used to reflect on aspects of parent-child relations over the centuries'.[87] In terms of visual material this formidable challenge is met by the analysis of twenty images, which are illustrated, and a further eighteen images referred to more briefly. Of the twenty illustrated images, dating from the 1520s, only thirteen are painted portraits depicting children, in which all but one are identified individuals. He

[82] Calvert, *Children in the House*, p. 46
[83] Calvert, *Children in the House*, p. 51
[84] Calvert, *Children in the House,* pp. 51-2
[85] Robert Woods, *Children Remembered: Responses to Untimely Death in the Past* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2006)
[86] Woods, *Children Remembered*, p.2
[87] Woods, *Children Remembered*, p.5

acknowledges that the criteria for selection of the images are not systematic, but an example that 'must be of interest in its own right and its original completion dated with a reasonable degree of accuracy'.[88] Woods's discussion encompasses biographical facts about the sitters, some visual analysis and iconography. Unfortunately, the visual descriptions tend to suffer from a disconcerting subjectivity. The portrait of Lady Sidney and her children (1596) (Fig. 13, No. 123) is described as an image of 'expressionless formality and gendered arrangement' and 'the painting of Lord Cobham and his family is positively animated by comparison'.[89] Woods invokes Ben Jonson's poem *To Penshurst* (1616) in order to provide a more positive image of Lady Sidney (by now the Countess of Leicester) as 'a good housewife and loving mother.' Certainly, Woods argues that portraits do not necessarily convey the same meanings about familial relationships as may be found in poetry, but it seems a missed opportunity not to venture a more complex discussion of the images in and of themselves. There is no other context provided for the portraits apart from biography and iconography. Nonetheless, I believe that Woods's interesting study is important for venturing to combine the hard data of demographic information with an evaluation of 'softer' evidence from contemporary portraits and poetry in order to explore parental relationships with children over time.

The historiography that addresses a range of child portraiture roughly coterminous with this thesis is limited.[90] The most scholarly discussion is provided by a study of Netherlandish portraits, *Pride and Joy: Children's Portraits in the Netherlands, 1500-1700* edited by Jan Baptist Bedaux and Rudi Ekkart (2000). It accompanied an exhibition of the same name, but this substantial publication, with its essays and catalogue entries, is still the most comprehensive survey available.[91] The title itself underscores the ideological stance of the study: the sense of love and affection it may be assumed that Netherlandish parents felt for their children, expressed in the abundance of surviving portraits. The selection of eighty-five portraits sought to 'offer the

[88] Woods, *Children Remembered*, p.67
[89] Woods, *Children Remembered*, p.79
[90] For discussions of three portraits in the corpus, see Tarnya Cooper, *Elizabeth I and her People* (London: National Portrait Gallery Publications, 2013), p. 104, p. 108, p. 111.
[91] Jan Baptist Beddaux and Rudi Ekkart, *Pride and Joy: Children's Portraits in the Netherland 1500-1700* Amsterdam: Ludion Press Ghent, 2000).

widest possible variety of types and attributes.' The curators admit that the aesthetic quality in all but a few portraits was also a deciding factor in selection, but knowing the identity of the sitter was not.[92] The essays preceding the catalogue entries, with contributions from specialists in complementary fields of expertise, survey a range of themes that relate directly to portraiture: investigating modes of representation, the meanings attached to symbols and emblems, the significance of other artefacts, costume styles, and the oeuvre of the artists that painted them. The approach and methodology stem from the portraits. They are discussed in the wider context of childhood experiences, with sections exploring issues of child-rearing, education and gender. The authors acknowledge that comparisons with child portraits produced elsewhere in Europe were beyond the scope of their study. However, owing to the artistic influences from the Netherlands on English painting, this publication is of inestimable value for this thesis. Features found in Netherlandish portraits such as the use and meanings attached to symbols, the accessories that appear with the children and the compositional arrangements are comparable with many English examples.[93]

Jean Wilson's engagement with the debates around the history of childhood that stemmed from Ariès focusses on a case-study of the life-size monumental tomb constructed for three-year old Robert Dudley, Baron Denbigh (1581-1584).[94] In order to contextualise the possible meanings of the tomb sculpture of the infant, Wilson discusses other near-contemporary images of children in easel painting. She considers that the composition and activity of the children depicted in the family group portraits of the Cobhams and *Edward, 3rd Lord Windsor and his Family* (1568) (Fig. 14, No. 153) is central to understanding their meanings. Although they are 'stiffly posed', she regards the children as 'strikingly informal' in contrast with the later Capel children who are spaced out across the canvas. She sees both portraits as illuminating contemporary modes of child nurture.[95] The most illuminating section in this paper (often referenced by other authors) is a discussion of the symbolism of the animals, birds and fruit in the Cobham portrait, tracing their origins in Christian iconography. She argues that one of the

[92] Bedaux and Ekkart, *Pride and Joy*, p. 8.
[93] These similarities are noted where they occur, especially in Chapters 3 and 4.
[94] St. Mary's Church, Warwick. Jean Wilson, 'The Noble Imp: The Upper Class Child in English Renaissance Art and Literature' in *The Antiquaries Journal*, 70, part 2 (1990), pp. 360-78.
[95] Wilson, *Noble Imp*, pp. 364-65

portrait's functions was to acknowledge Lord and Lady Cobham as God-fearing parents concerned with the spiritual nurturing of their brood of children. The adults in the Windsor portrait are described as 'supervising' the boys at play, according to humanist theories of education. Wilson's conclusion is that images of aristocratic children can function as an affirmation of dynasty, status and wealth and as images of – as in the case of the Cobham portrait – 'a happy and informal family occasion, with the children being treated to party food and allowed to play with expensive pets'.[96] Such hyperbole and 'present-centredness' is a besetting problem that can trip up even the most rigorous scholar, especially when describing portraits of children.

It is refreshing to find an in-depth focus on a group of English portraits of the period. Martin Spies's aim in 'Tudor and Jacobean Mother-and-Child Portraits and their Patrons' is to investigate and in some instances to challenge Jonathan Goldberg's claim of the pervasiveness of patriarchal authority in family portraits, by considering the iconography and the purpose of the commission in five case studies.[97] Spies's analyses rely heavily on the biographies of the sitters which colour both his approach to the meanings encoded in each portrait and his presumption of the motive behind each commission. Two portraits analysed in the case studies, *Lady Katherine Grey, Countess of Hertford and Lord Edward Seymour* (c.1563) (Fig. 4, No. 114) and *Frances, Lady Willoughby and Francis Willoughby* (c.1618) by Paul van Somer (Fig. 15 No. 142) are discussed in later chapters of the thesis. However, my main reservations lie in the fact that Spies does not appear to have examined enough portraits to support some of his conclusions. He is right to conclude that more mother-and-son portraits than mother-and-daughter portraits have survived, and I agree that this may well be due to a son's claim to inheritance. However, he does not consider that the survival rate might also be a factor, the *fact* of a son's genealogical significance for later generations. It could be this that has a greater bearing on the number of

[96] Wilson, *Noble Imp*, p. 364

[97] Martin Spies, 'Tudor and Jacobean Mother-and-Child Portraits and their Patrons' in Anja Muller (ed.) *Childhood in the English Renaissance* (Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2013), pp. 103-120. This volume contains multi-disciplinary papers delivered at the conference of the same name held at the University of Siegen in 2012.

extant mother-and-son portraits rather than that there was a 'scarcity' (his term) of mother-and-daughter portraits commissioned.[98]

The disciplines of cultural history and the history of costume have provided valuable insights for the history of childhood in the early modern period. Lucy Trusler's investigation of surviving artefacts that were designed specifically for children leads her to refute the view proposed by Karin Calvert among others, that their needs and desires were subordinated to those of their parents in the early modern period.[99] She argues that these objects were designed to keep children safe from harm and to assist their physical development through the stages of childhood. She notes also, that some of these objects were clearly intended for pleasure and recreation.

Jane Huggett and Ninya Mikhaila provide the only quantitative analysis of images of Tudor and Jacobean children in their extensive investigation of the styles and materials of children's clothes.[100] For this excellent and comprehensive study their team examined documentary sources and archaeological material (mostly fragments of surviving clothes) and also 1,155 visual images from across northern Europe. The visual material was broad-ranging – paintings, sculpture, manuscript illuminations and prints. The largest proportion of visual material (28 per cent) comes from portraits, though not all are of English sitters. Huggett and Mikhaila's categorisation of the stages in a child's life is necessarily more demarcated than in this study, as their aim is to chart the subtlest changes that occur in clothes from birth onwards.[101] The forensic analysis of the slight modifications in elite clothing demonstrates the early visible identification of gender. It is, moreover, a rich source of primary material taken from childcare manuals, accounts of the purchase of fabrics, and from letters, journals and wills.

This overview of the historiography on child portraiture of the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods has identified substantial gaps and provides opportunities to contribute to its study. Firstly, the portrait base from which many presumptions originate is often too narrow to bear scrutiny. Consequently much of the literature

[98] Spies, 'Mother-and-Child', p. 117. See consideration of this point in Chapter 2, pp. 53-4
[99] Lucy Trusler, 'The Material Culture of Childhood in Renaissance England' (unpublished MA dissertation, V&A/RCA, 1999). Her conclusions are summarised in pp. 150-58
[100] Huggett and Mikhaila, *Tudor Child*, p.12
[101] Huggett and Mikhaila, *Tudor Child*, p. 12

is bedevilled by assertions based on negatives: the failure to know about or to find a portrait or portraits is taken as proof that it may never have existed. Well-known portraits of identified individuals perform as 'stand-ins', representatives for all child portraits of the period, with conflicting assessments of their value as 'evidence'. Secondly, portraits are used as tools to support arguments about the representation of childhood, without due understanding of their purpose and the traditions in which they functioned. Finally, for all the considerable body of research by art historians into many aspects of Elizabethan and Jacobean portraiture, portraits of children as a discrete social group have received little attention.

1.4. Approaches and Methodology

The approach used here is to survey 165 portraits in which children are depicted and to examine in more detail a focus group of sixty-three images. The study investigates the interfaces between social history and the history of art. It seeks to establish the connection and relationship between the artistic form of the portrait and the social and cultural context in which it was produced and viewed. The questions asked of *Four Children of Sir Thomas Lucy III* (1619) (Fig. 2, No. 103) are not specific to art history's traditional concerns with style, attribution, iconography and artistic quality. However, to employ the portrait merely as contextual material for a social-historical enquiry into the nature of childhood and the experience of children, and to extrapolate from it, is to misunderstand the agency of the portrait itself and the highly mediated social context in which it was both made and experienced.[102] Portraits are visual evidence from the past, and they are part of the historical record, but exactly what that evidence is and how it might be applied and evaluated are questions at the heart of this thesis.

To achieve this, an interdisciplinary approach is deployed, working 'outwards' from the corpus of portraits. Kate Retford's terms of 'thick' and 'thin'

[102] Kate Retford, *The Art of Domestic Life: Family Portraiture in Eighteenth Century England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2006), p.6. Retford's approach and methodology is comprehensively discussed in the Introduction and has informed much of what follows here.

descriptions of an artwork are valuable in understanding the multi-facetted nature of portraiture.[103] The former embraces not only the visual appearance and content of the image, but also the wider context of the relationships that are brought into play to create the portrait: the commission, the selection of the painter, the cost of materials and the intended location for display. 'Thin' descriptions are more elusive, as they involve assessments drawing on a broader range and variety of historical and cultural material from which one might perceive patterns on which assumptions can be based.

Portraits that are also canonical artworks have traditionally been of most interest to art historians. For scholars of history and literature, images of famous (and notorious) figures are also valued and 'interrogated' as a means of approaching the biography of the sitter, regardless of whether, as paintings, they are considered great art or not. This practice has a long history that stems from the attachment of an engraved portrait as a frontispiece to a published work from at least as early as the sixteenth century.[104] The portraits of Elizabethan and Jacobean children scarcely meet the criteria for fame or notoriety, nor would these portraits meet the aesthetic standards of 'great' art, the primary consideration for much art historical interest. Furthermore, whilst the portraits in this corpus have not been selected on any aesthetic criteria, they do represent a significantly numerous class of cultural objects. Dispensing with the requirement to provide an aesthetic evaluation of the portraits, or to assign attributions, or to evaluate them simply as 'by-products' of social circumstances, leaves one free to explore other avenues that are possible from the scrutiny of this primary material.[105] Dawn Ades's comment that the art historian 'starts with the thing, the deposit, the object or picture, and remains primarily concerned with explaining it rather than using it to explain something else' is a claim for the autonomy of art and doubtless a barb aimed at cultural historians.[106] However, with due regard to those elements that are specific to the artwork as 'art', it seems reasonable to propose that it is possible to do both.

---

[103] Retford, *Domestic Life*, pp. 6-7
[104] Shearer West, *Portraiture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), p. 50
[105] Ludmilla Jordanova, *History in Practice*, 2nd edn. (London: Hodder Arnold, 2006), p. 81
[106] Dawn Ades, 'Objects of Enquiry: An Art Historian's Response to Peter Burke', *Cultural and Social History: The Journal of the Social History Society*, 7, issue 4, 2010, pp. 445-446. Erika Langmuir also asserts the autonomy of art and the persistence of cultural topoi in her criticism of

Portraits are representations of specific individuals, recorded at a particular moment, as evidenced by the frequent appearance of inscriptions with dates and ages of the sitters. Yet, paradoxically, the portrait has both a present and an envisioned future.[107] Sir Thomas Lucy III may have commissioned his children's portrait to record a particular circumstance in 1619, though the significance of that date, if there was one, has been lost. Given its size, it was almost certainly intended for public display, probably in a long gallery, alongside other portraits of individuals to whom the children were connected by lineage.[108] The portrait was indeed commemorative; it fulfilled Sir Thomas's desire for the image of his children to endure, and to actively promote a commendable account of them (and by implication of himself), worthy of remembrance by yet-unborn generations.[109] In other words, the portrait has an anticipated future role in the family's narrative.[110]

This active agency in portraits implies an understanding between the artist and patron (typically a parent, in the case of children's portraits) of what was needed to elicit a fitting response from the viewer.[111] As far as is known, no sources survive for the communication between patron and painter on the content of a portrait in this corpus. However, evidence gained from this study identifies the forms of visual expression that were current for the representation of children: the preferred aesthetic styles, the accessories, the attributes and the compositional arrangements. Regardless of their social disparity, painter and patron inhabited the same society. The painter's style, as Baxandall has so cogently demonstrated, is socially constructed, based on the value system of that society and specifically on those skills which were highly esteemed.[112] Elizabethans and Jacobeans who could afford the luxuries of decorative objects prized ornamentation and pattern applied to their clothes, to textiles and furnishings. They also desired them in

---

social historians who are too literal in their interpretations of visual material. Langmuir, *Imagining Childhood*, p. 10

[107] West, *Portraiture*, pp. 43-4

[108] There was a long gallery at Charlecote until the renovations of the early nineteenth century: Fairfax-Lucy, *Charlecote*, p. 95

[109] Marcia Pointon, *Hanging the Head: Portraiture and Social Formation in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993), p. 178. The Lucy portrait has survived for almost five hundred years.

[110] This point is explored in Chapter 5.

[111] Michael Baxandall, *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth Century Italy: A Primer in the Social History of Pictorial Style*, 2nd. ed. (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 74

[112] Baxandall, *Painting and Experience*, p. 40

architectural exteriors and interiors.[113] Surface pattern seems to have been the guiding principle of design, and, when applied to painting, it helps to account for a flat, linear style that prevailed for most of the period. In painting, the apparent deficiency of three-dimensional perspective and illusionistic realism in the depiction of figures does not necessarily demonstrate lack of technical skill by the painters so much as the patron's preference for a particular aesthetic.[114] In the early decades of the seventeenth century this aesthetic was challenged by more naturalistic styles introduced by continental immigrant painters, but it did not alter the patron's expectations of the function of his or her portrait. It was the desire to be perceived in a manner that was socially valued. The portrait is a surrogate for the sitter and is undertaken with the viewer in mind.[115] The musician Thomas Whythorne (1528-95) had a woodcut of his portrait included in his published works in 1571 and in 1590, so that those who played his music would see the 'form and favour ...[of] a gentleman'.[116]

1.5 Chapter summary

This thesis takes a thematic approach to the subject of child portraiture, although questions of chronology and development remain important. Chapter 2 identifies and discusses the formats of the six categories of portrait depicting children, which have been used in the project. The categorisations allow for trends in representation to be observed and quantified. It also enables the identification of those portraits that are exceptions. A characteristic element, for example, is the use of inscription. A section of the chapter is devoted to investigating the role and significance of these texts in children's portraits.

---

[113] David Evett, *Literature and the Visual Arts in Tudor England*, (Athens, Ga. ; London: University of Georgia, 1990), p. 29
[114] Evett, *Literature and the Visual Arts,* p. 27
[115] Brilliant, *Portraiture*, p. 40
[116] *The Autobiography of Thomas Whythorne*, ed. by James E. Osborn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), p. xxiv. Whythorne's explanation of the value of sitting for a portrait is justly famous, not only because it is rare, but also because he was not an elite individual, although he managed to acquire a coat of arms.

Chapter 3 begins the investigation, continued in Chapter 4, of how childhood was conceptualised in portraiture. Here, documentary sources are more extensively brought into play. Sometimes these sources appear to be complementary, but they also seem to question the representations in the portraits. Much of the chapter explores those features that affirm gender roles: clothes, accessories and the placement of sitters within the portrait. It raises issues that arise in portraits of unknown children and proposes ways to identify gender in several examples. Closely related to gender is the issue of status and social identity. The domestic props that surround the children – carpets, curtains, furniture – situate the child or children in a social milieu.

The first section of Chapter 4 explores sources for the representation of children firstly in Continental royal portraits and secondly in portrait styles popular in Netherlandish portraiture. The imagery employed in pictures of the Virgin and Christ Child was embedded in Western culture and a source for the symbolism to be found in child portraiture. The second section examines the objects themselves, animate and inanimate, which are so pervasive in child portraiture, and investigates the layers of meanings attached to them. Many have their origin in religious iconography, while others are objects which derive from literature and folklore.

Chapter 5 presents the conclusions of this research. The final section explores the evidence for how portraits were displayed in their original setting and considers their function in such a context. It investigates examples of portraits that were replicated and others which were modified in later versions. However, portraits are rarely in their original locations even if they are still in family possession, and this chapter goes on to consider the functions and meanings of these portraits in their 'after lives' to the present-day. Finally, the chapter explores how certain imagery and compositional characteristics of Elizabethan and Jacobean child portraiture survived beyond the second decade of the seventeenth century.

This thesis takes a holistic approach to the portraiture of Elizabethan and Jacobean children. It considers how values and beliefs are expressed in visual terms through the medium of portraits. As primary sources, they are assessed alongside others – cultural material and documentary matter – legal, advisory,

literary and personal. However, it does not propose that a collection of material brought together will, unproblematically, reveal historical 'truths'.[117] The aim is to evaluate to what extent and in what ways the portraits of children complement or challenge what is known about the experience of childhood in the period. It acknowledges that there will be unanswered questions: unanswered because of the lack of reliable evidence even of the 'thinnest' kind.

[117] Ludmilla Jordanova, 'Children in History: Concepts of Nature and Society' in *Children, Parents and Politics*, ed. by Geoffrey Scarre (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 15

Chapter 2: Key formats for representing children

2.1 Introduction

This chapter introduces the corpus of 165 portraits dating from 1560 to 1630 which are reviewed in this thesis. The aim is to identify and examine the various formats that are employed in representing children by arranging them into categories. It begins an exploration, continued in later chapters, of the interrelationship between the visual images in portraiture and other historical sources, to note similarities and to flag up differences. My intention is to consider such questions as who gets to be painted and why. Other studies have either investigated portraits over a longer time period, or have researched a more limited number within the same time frame. Previous investigations have tended to group together portraits with different compositional arrangements or formats. This has often resulted in generalisations that may not stand up to scrutiny. It should be emphasised that, although the portraits discussed in some detail are from the sub-set (the focus group) the identification of broad trends and characteristics as well as conclusions derived from them are based on the corpus as a whole.

2.2 Categories

The categorisation scheme adopted in this study assembles the 165 portraits according to the number of children depicted and with whom they are shown:

- category (1) a child on its own
- category (2) siblings – two or more children
- category (3) one parent with one or more children
- category (4) family group – both parents, children and other adults
- category (5) miscellaneous – portrait types that are exceptions to categories (1), (2), (3) and (4)

- category (6) a family set or family series of several individual portraits in a uniform or matching format

All 165 portraits are listed in Appendix 1: The Corpus

The rationale for this categorisation is to tease out issues to be explored in this and subsequent chapters. It makes visible connections that might otherwise be lost, a crucial theme here being familial relationships. A child portrayed on its own is endowed with an individual identity: depicted alongside one or more siblings he or she participates in relationships that also identify seniority, and amplify gender: alongside a parent, or as a member of a family group, a further set of relationships is observable. In Appendix 1 all portraits are listed according to categories (1) to (5) and follow a chronological sequence. Portraits of children that belong to category (6) are listed as they occur in categories (1) and (2).

Category	No. of Portraits	No. of Children	Male	Female	Babies	Named	Unnamed
1	91	91	50	40	1	43	48
2	19	54	27	27	-	33	21
3	41	63	37	24	2	50	13
4	8	35	22	13	-	35	-
5	6	7	3	1	3	7	-
All	**165**	**250**	**139**	**105**	**6**	**168**	**82**

This table excludes category (6) as the portraits in this category have been included in categories (1) and (2). In the discussion of categories (1), (2) and (3), Arabic numerals are used where they may be easier to follow.

It is important to state once again that the figures and percentages given apply only to the portraits in this corpus: the complex issues of both the survival rates and the sourcing of portraits have been discussed in Chapter 1. The largest category is category (1) with **91** portraits (**55.2** per cent of total) in which a child is depicted on its own. Of these 91 portraits, 19 are known to be also part of a family set or series and are identified by an asterisk in Appendix 1. Category (2) has **19** portraits (**11.5** per cent of total) of two or more sibling children, a total of **54** children. Category (3) has **41** portraits (**24.8** per cent of total) of one parent with a child or children, a total of **63** children. Category (4) comprises **8** portraits

(**4.8** per cent of total) of family groups with a total of **35** children. In Category (5) there are **6** portraits (**3.6** per cent of total) and a total of **7** children. Therefore in **165** portraits, there are **250** individual images of children.

Complete accuracy is impossible when it comes to establishing the named identity of each of the 250 children depicted. In this thesis 'named sitters' covers those whose identity is secure. Furthermore, it also includes sitters who have names traditionally attached to them which it may not be possible to verify, and which I have not been able to disprove. 'Named sitters' also include those children who are certain to be members of a particular family, but whose forename is unknown or unverifiable. For all these reasons, the number of named sitters in 165 portraits is on the generous side – **168** sitters (**67.2** per cent of the total). Therefore **82** sitters (**32.8** per cent of the total) are 'unnamed'. In Category (1), the child on its own, there are **48** unnamed sitters (**52.7** per cent) from a total of 91. Of the remaining **159** sitters in all the other categories, there are **34** (**21.4** per cent) unnamed sitters. This suggests that a child has more chance of being named, or having a name attached, if he or she is depicted with other family members.

In general, identifying the sex of the 250 children is less problematic. The factors for assessment are: knowing the child's name, identifying the child's sex by the gendered characteristics of its clothes and/or by the accessories that accompany it. **139** (**57.2** per cent) of those whose sex is known are boys and **105** (**42.8** per cent) are girls. That leaves just **6** babies whose sex is unknown. Huggett and Mikhaila's study of a broader range of child images, which included tomb effigies and genre paintings, arrived at broadly similar percentages: 56 per cent boys and 39 per cent girls (59 and 41 per cent respectively).[118] It may seem surprising that the disparity in the number of male to female images is not greater, considering boys' dynastic value as inheritors of family titles and estates.[119] However, aristocratic girls were dynastically valuable, too.[120] As daughters (often heiresses) of influential and

[118] Huggett and Mikhaila have a larger percentage of children whose sex is unknown. Huggett and Mikhaila, *Tudor Child*, p. 12

[119] Patricia Crawford, *Blood, Bodies and Families in Early Modern England* (Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd., 2004), pp. 114-115

[120] For example, the marriage in 1584 of the heiress, Barbara Gamage, was bargained over by the most powerful men in the kingdom; Madeleine Gray, 'Sidney, Barbara, Countess of Leicester (***c.***1559–1621)', *ODNB*, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/67993, accessed 1 March 2014]. Wrightson, *English Society*, p. 72

wealthy men, their marriages were important for alliances between powerful families, even though, by this period, marriages taking no account at all of the wishes of the young people involved seem to have been rare.[121]

Dating the portraits is not straightforward. Some are reliable: the date inscribed on the portrait, or there is documentary evidence that secures it. For the rest, estimates of the date are based on the costume style and portraits are listed in the decade in which they are presumed to have been produced. **54** portraits (**32.7** per cent) were painted between1560 and up to and including 1600. **111** portraits (**67.3** per cent) were painted after 1600. The number doubles from 1600. Although the population of England grew steadily from about 1550, the increase in portrait numbers after 1600 is significant and implies a growing popularity for portrait display by rising families in the early seventeenth century.[122] In an entertainment performed before the queen in 1598, a certain painter complained that 'nowe every Citizen's wife that weares a taffeta kirtle and a velvett hatt, and every gentlewoman that can boord a paire of borders must have her picture in the parlour'.[123] A similar sentiment – this time in relation to church memorials – is expressed in John Weever's 1631 observation that the epitaphs on memorials erected to a 'rich quondam tradesman or griping usurer' sometimes ascribed greater honour to them than 'is given to the greatest potentate entombed in Westminster.'[124] Here we can see the underlying anxiety of both writers concerning the visible blurring of societal boundaries and upward social mobility based on wealth.

---

[121] Houlbrooke, *English Family*, pp. 68-70. Lady Anne Clifford recalled that her father, the third Earl of Cumberland, promised not to arrange a marriage that she did not consent to 'as a chief matter'. Richard T. Spence, *Lady Anne Clifford, Countess of Dorset and Montgomery 1590-1676* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1997), p. 5

[122] Keith Wrightson, *Earthly Necessities: Economic lives in Early Modern Britain* (New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2000), p. 121

[123]The 'paynter' is a character in John Lyly, (attrib.), *Queen Elizabeth's Entertainment at Mitcham: Poet, Painter and Musician,* ed. by Leslie Hotson (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953), p. 27

[124] John Weever *Ancient Funerall Monuments within the Monarchie of Great Britain and Ireland…* (London, 1631), p. xi

2.2. i Categories: category (1), the child on its own.

91 of the 165 portraits depict a child on its own. This number includes the portraits known to be part of a family set or series. There are 50 (55.6 per cent) boys, 40 (44.4 per cent) girls and one baby whose sex is unknown. 43 children can be named and 48 children are unnamed. 27 portraits are dated up to and including 1600 and 64 portraits after 1600. It is not always easy to determine the social class of this cohort of portraits. Costume is generally the best clue, in which case *Unknown Boy with Carnation and Cherries* (1596) may be the only child of the 'middling sort' (Fig. 16, No. 21).

In the sixteenth century the standard format for a portrait of an individual child is a figure depicted half or three-quarters in length against a monochrome background on which the age and date are inscribed. The mountainous landscape setting depicted in *Unknown Boy in a Landscape* (1596) is exceptional (Fig. 17, No. 20). The boy, who appears to be about seven or eight years old, carries a bow and arrow, has two sporting dogs at his feet and there is a deer-hunt in progress behind him. In the 1590s, Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger, influenced by Netherlandish styles, provided such landscape settings for certain full-length portraits of elite young men.[125] Although the painter here is not Gheeraerts, he or she could be a Netherlandish immigrant, or an English painter who was influenced by Netherlandish styles.[126] Whoever the artist, the image anticipates Robert Peake's two portraits of 1603 depicting Prince Henry at the chase and Princess Elizabeth standing in a landscape with a deer-hunt occupying the far distance.[127] In 1606, Richard Newdigate (1602-78**)** was painted standing in a landscape, also with a pair of hunting dogs, a diminutive hunting horn hanging below his waist, and – at about four years old – still in his petticoats (Fig. 9, No. 36).

---

[125] For example, Marcus Gheeraerts, the Younger, *Captain Thomas Lee* (1594). Tate Gallery. TO3028. Hearn, *Dynasties*, p.176. Karen Hearn, *Marcus Gheeraerts II, Elizabethan Artist* (London: Tate Publishing, 2002), pp. 18-21

[126] Cooper, *Citizen Portrait*, pp. 52-3. Hearn, *Dynasties*, p. 171. Cooper and Howard, 'Artists, Patrons and Context', pp. 13-15

[127] Robert Peake, *Henry, Prince of Wales with Sir John Harington* (1603). Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. Robert Peake, *Princess Elizabeth* (1603). National Maritime Museum, Greenwich. Hearn, *Dynasties*, pp. 185-6. MacLeod, *Lost Prince*, p. 35, p.70. *Unknown Boy in a Landscape* (1596) was attributed to Robert Peake the Elder (1551-1619) when sold at Christies, 27/6/1980, lot 104.

By the beginning of the seventeenth century most children in category (1) are depicted full-length on larger panels. In general, full-length portraits became more popular among the elite as the spaces for display increased with the provision of long galleries in newly built houses or in the refurbishment of older ones.[128] In these larger portraits the background is generally enlivened, depicting a domestic setting of furniture, carpets and fringed and draped curtains. An infant, too young to stand unaided, might be propped up on cushions (Fig. 18, No. 27). Fewer portraits in this category are painted on canvas, although canvas supports were used more widely for full-length portraits of adults from the 1590s onwards.[129] However, possibly because children are shorter, the use of panel supports for their portraits remained in common use. It may also be that the smaller panel was hung lower and, in comparison with the full-length portrait, conveyed a sense of informality. The Russell set of six portraits commissioned in 1626-27 depicts each sitter half-length on panel, yet the portrait of their eldest brother, eleven-year old William Russell, commissioned in the same year and by the same painter, Johannes Priwizer, shows him full-length on canvas.[130]

2.2. ii Categories: category (2), siblings

A small number, just 19 portraits, depicts two or more siblings; a total of 54 children. There are 27 boys and 27 girls. These figures could suggest that girls were more likely to be depicted with siblings of either sex, than to be portrayed in an individual portrait. Most portraits depict two siblings. There are 9 portraits of 2 children, 6 portraits depict 3 children, 3 portraits depict 4 children, and in 1 portrait there are 6 children. 6 portraits date from before 1600 and 13 are dated after 1600. The subtleties of social differentiation are more difficult to determine. The plainer clothes worn by Stephen and Mary Phesant, whose father was a London lawyer and whose success had brought him increased social standing identify them as children of the lower gentry (Fig. 11, No. 106).

---

[128] Girouard, *Architecture*, p. 71
[129] Karen Hearn, 'The Full-Length Portrait in Early Seventeenth-Century Britain' in *The Suffolk Collection: A Catalogue*, by Laura Houliston (Swindon: English Heritage, 2012), pp. 28-39
[130] See category (6) below, pp. 69-70. Johannes Priwizer, W*illiam Russell, later fifth Earl of Bedford* (1627). Woburn Abbey

With so many portraits inscribed with the children's ages, it is noticeable that often there is merely a year's gap between each child, highlighting the frequency of pregnancy among elite women.[131] There are trends in the positioning of children in a portrait, but these are by no means universal. In portraits of children of the same sex, the usual arrangement is to have the sitters lined up with the eldest child on the viewer's left, as in *Four Daughters of Sir Lionel Tollemache* (c.1621) (Fig. 19, No. 105). In portraits of a brother and sister, the boy will typically be on the left, following the conventional pattern, as we see in *William Cecil, 2nd Earl of Salisbury and Frances Cecil* (1599) (Fig. 8, No. 97). For mixed sex groups of three children the arrangement is flexible: the oldest boy is mostly on the left, but sometimes the youngest child of either sex is placed in the centre, as in *Three Unknown Jacobean Children* (1613) (Fig. 20, No. 101). In just one example of a sibling group, *Four Elizabethan Children Making Music* (late 1560s), the girl is placed on the left but her three brothers are positioned in order of age, leading from the left (Fig. 21, No. 93). In all other sibling portraits the children hold hands, link arms, or an older child puts a hand on a younger sibling's shoulder.

Where it is known by documentation ten portraits in this category are painted on oak panels. However, panels greater than about 107 centimetres in height are rare and so, unless they are used horizontally in a landscape orientation, it is difficult to accommodate adequately more than one sitter. Nevertheless, as late as 1623, the Phesant children are depicted on a panel that is 111.76 x 104.75 centimetres (Fig. 11, No. 106). The conservative taste of the children's parents or possibly a painter from a more traditional workshop may account for the use of a panel for such a large portrait at this date. The earliest example of a canvas support is the portrait of William Cecil with his sister Frances (Fig. 8, No. 97).[132] The children are depicted on the scale of life and posed in front of an architectural structure. The four daughters of Sir Lionel Tollemache, second baronet (1591-1640) are also life-scale depicted on a large canvas 53.3 x 200.6 centimetres (Fig 19, No. 105). Three girls stand hand-in-hand and the baby lies in a cradle, propped up for

[131] Wrightson, *Earthly Necessities,* p. 48. Crawford, *Blood, Bodies, Families*, p. 89

[132] The portrait is most likely to be a copy of an original portrait by Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger. The location is unknown to me. The provenance is unknown prior to 1925 when acquired by the Biltmore Estate, Ashville, NC. Information kindly provided by the Biltmore Estate.

the viewer's inspection. As the inscriptions are abraded, Ellis Waterhouse dated the picture to about 1621 on the basis of the baptism records of the surviving daughters of Sir Lionel Tollemache.[133] From left, the girls are Elizabeth (1617-1671) aged about four years, Katherine (dates unknown) about three, Anne (b.1618/19) about two, and Susannah (b.1621), a few months old.

Included in the corpus, though marginally later in date, is the portrait known as *Two Children, perhaps of the Courtenay Family* (1633) (Fig. 22, No. 110). The children, a boy on the left, and an infant girl propped up on a cushion, are depicted separately, each within faux stone ovals. Only one inscription, beside the boy, seems to have survived, stating that he is three years old. There is no evidence that the portraits were once on separate canvasses, so we must assume that the patron requested the feigned oval format for the two images to be painted side-by-side.[134]

2.2. iii Category (3): one parent with one or more children

41 portraits depict an adult with one, two or more children. It also includes the mother and baby from the Deene Park series (No.136).[135] There are 63 children in this category: 37 boys, 24 girls and 2 babies. 17 portraits can be dated before and up to 1600. The 24 portraits painted after 1600 are on canvas, as are two earlier portraits with multiple figures painted by Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger, both dated 1596, *Barbara Gamage, Lady Leicester and her Children* (Fig. 13, No. 123) and *Anne Hopton, Lady Pope and her Children* (Fig 23, No. 124).

Just six portraits depict a father with his son. Two of them depict a father with an infant son – William Cavendish, second Earl of Devonshire (1590-1628) holding the arm of William, later the third Earl (1617-1684) (Fig. 24, No. 140) and Benjamin Cutler with his son, also Benjamin (No. 146). By contrast, eight-year-old Walter Raleigh (1593-1618) echoes the pose of his father, Sir Walter Raleigh

[133] Ellis Waterhouse, *The Collection of the Pictures at Helmingham Hall* (Suffolk: Helmingham Hall, 1958), cat. no.10, p.13. The incomplete inscriptions beside each girl are original. The biographical inscription, top left, is a later addition.
[134] Information provided by the Weiss Gallery. The Weiss Gallery suggests that both children are girls.
[135] See below pp. 70-73

(1554-1618), in a portrait dated 1602 (Fig. 25, No. 128). Where the sitters' names are known, it is evident that the boy depicted with his father is the heir. A portrait of a gentleman with his son, possibly members of the Toke family, has the inscription *Anno Domini 1561/ Aetatis Suae 51*, but there is no corresponding inscription relating to the boy, although there may once have been an inscription which was damaged and subsequently obscured in restoration (Fig. 26, No. 111).[136] Close observation of the portrait, however, suggests that the child, who fits snugly within the folds of the man's ample cloak, could possibly be a later addition. The handling of the boy's figure appears less assured and may be by a different hand. However, there exists no documentary material or technical examination to support this visual observation of the portrait seen in situ. It is, nevertheless, exceptional to see a skull, a memento mori, in a portrait with a child, but not in one of an adult. Such compositions are found in portraits of elite merchants.[137] Without the boy, the portrait bears comparison with the portrait, dated 1567, of the prosperous merchant John Isham, who is similarly depicted touching a skull placed on a table.[138] If the boy is portrayed posthumously, one would expect to see him touching or holding the skull, as in images of deceased children on memorial tombs.[139] The presence of the skull depicted in *The Holme Family* (1628) (Fig. 27, No. 158) is discussed below.

35 of these portraits depict mothers. 25 portraits depict a mother with just one child. Apart from two portraits (with babies) the sex of the child can be identified: thus 15 portraits depict a mother with one son and 8 portraits depict a mother with one daughter. As noted above, this finding casts into some doubt Martin Spies's assertion of a 'scarcity of mother-and-daughter portraits' compared with mother-and-son portraits.[140] There are 10 portraits of a mother with more than one child: 5 depict a mother with 2 children, 2 portraits depict a mother with 3 children, 1 portrait with 4 children and 2 portraits depict a mother with 6 children. It seems that in all these portraits the boy is unbreeched and in the earliest years of his life

[136] Valerie Newill, who researched the Toke family of Godinton, kindly informed me that she could not match a member of the family with the dates on the inscription.
[137] Cooper, *Citizen Portrait*, Figs. 52, 69; Cooper, *Elizabeth I and her People*, cat. 51, p. 146
[138] Unknown painter, *John Isham of Lamport Hall* (1567) Lamport Hall Preservation Trust. Tittler, *Portraits, Painters, Publics*, p. 106, Fig. 6.1
[139] The memorial tomb of Sir William Garrard (d.1607) depicts his fifteen children, of which five predeceased him and hold skulls. St James the Less, Dorney, Buckinghamshire
[140] Spies 'Tudor and Jacobean Mother-and-Child Portraits', p. 117

when he is closest to his mother's influence.[141] The rearing of children in their earliest years was the responsibility of the Elizabethan and Jacobean mother. In 1603, John Dod and Robert Cleaver assert, 'a child wisely trained by the mother in the young years, will be earlier brought to goodness by the Father's godly care'.[142]

In all but four mother-and-son portraits, the boy is placed on his mother's right side. Lord Edward Seymour (Fig. 4, No. 114) is placed on his mother's left and so is Thomas Penyston (No. 126). There is no apparent reason why young Thomas is placed on his mother's left, but an explanation for Lord Edward's placement in the portrait with his mother, Lady Katherine Grey is considered in Chapter 4.[143] In the other two portraits, the women are widows, depicted with their eldest sons, heirs to their father's titles and estates: this may account for their placement in the superior position. They are Anne, Lady Cotton with her son, John (Fig. 28, No. 144) and Frances, Lady Willoughby with her son, Francis (Fig. 15, No. 142). These portraits are discussed in Chapter 3.

The most common arrangement in portraits of a mother with more than one child is to depict the children on either side of their mother, or else lined up in front of her. An example of the former composition appears in an early panel portrait dated by costume to the mid-1560s. It shows a woman with her two sons standing on her right and her daughter on her left (Fig. 12, No. 113). Her right arm encircles the shoulders of the older boy. The abraded inscription states that the woman is thirty-six years old. She is thought to be Anne Aldersey of Spurstow, Cheshire, an identity suggested by the portrait's provenance. It descended through the Savile family via the marriage of Elizabeth Aldersey (1583-1663) to Lord Coventry (1578-1640), whose own daughter Anne Coventry married Sir William Savile in 1629. Lady Elizabeth Coventry's mother, Anne Aldersey was born in 1549, so could not be the woman in this portrait. The group portrait could represent an earlier generation of the family. However, it has not proved possible

[141] As not enough of the figure of the boy is shown, it may be that the portrait of Mary Penyston (d. 1607) with her son Thomas (1591-1644) (No. 126) is an exception.
[142] John Dod and Robert Cleaver, *A Godlie Forme of Household Government* (London, 1603), p.60. Patricia Crawford, 'The Construction and Experience of Maternity in Seventeenth-Century England, in *Women as Mothers in Pre-Industrial England: Essays in Honour of Dorothy Maclaren*, ed. by Valerie Fildes (London: Routledge, 1990), p. 12
[143] Chapter 4, p. 114

to identify a woman of this branch of the Aldersey family who was born about 1530.[144] The arms displayed on the left are those of the Haberdashers' Company and those on the right are those of the Merchant Adventurers of the Old Trade.[145] These arms advocate a connection with another Aldersey family from Spurstow, Cheshire: Thomas Aldersey (c.1521-98) who married Alice Calthorpe (1526-89) in 1554.[146] Although the dates fit Thomas and Alice Aldersey, it is known that the couple did not have children.[147] Whoever the sitters are, the portrait represents a merchant family with London associations. This portrait is an example that challenges the assumption that the earliest English mother and children groups come only from elite families.

To portray the abundantly fertile Barbara Gamage, Lady Leicester (1563-1621) and her six children, Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger used a substantial canvas measuring 203.2 x 260.3 centimetres (Fig. 13, No. 123). The arrangement of the sitters here is a more subtle combination of the standard line-up of children on either side of their mother and establishes the hierarchy of familial relationships.[148] In contrast, and despite the size of the panel, 178.8 x 137.6 centimetres, Lettice Cressy, Lady Tasburgh (c. 1580-after 1624) and her six children are squeezed into two tight rows (Fig. 29, No. 133).

2.2.iv Category (4): the family group

There are just eight family group portraits in the corpus, with thirty-five children. However, the number of children could well be inaccurate as it is impossible to identify with any certainty those who are under ten years old in *Sir Arthur Capel and his Family* (c.1600-5) (Fig. 30, No. 156). With this proviso, there are twenty-

---

[144] According to the Heralds' Visitation of London of 1633/34 (College of Arms Ms: C.24/1460), John Aldersey, a London merchant, married Anne Looe. Their daughter, Elizabeth married as her second husband Thomas, Baron Coventry in 1610. Richard Cust, 'Coventry, Thomas, Baron Coventry (1578–1640)', *ODNB*, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6483, accessed 21 Feb 2014]. I am most grateful to Robert Tittler for his help with the problems of identity.

[145] The coats of arms were identified by the College of Arms and communicated to the Weiss Gallery.

[146] Thomas Aldersey (1521/22-98) had a distinguished career with the Haberdashers' Company and had dealings with the Merchant Adventurers.

[147] R.C.D. Baldwin, 'Aldersey, Thomas (1521/2-1598)', *ODNB*, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/73473, accessed 17 Nov 2014]

[148] The placement of the sitters is discussed in Chapter 3, p. 97

two boys and thirteen girls. Although the portraits span the entire period, about four portraits before 1600 and four in the seventeenth century, there is no consistency in the manner in which the families are represented. In the two life-scale portraits – *Sir Thomas Lucy III and his Family* (mid-1620s) (Fig. 3, No. 157) and *George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham and his Family* (1628) by Gerrit van Honthorst (No. 159) – there are ten and four figures respectively. These are painted on canvas, while the other six portraits are on panel. All portraits have a family name attached, even though some individuals are not securely named. The identification of social status is relatively straightforward. Three families with peerages are classed as noble. The Lucy and Lygon families (No. 154) are landed gentry with substantial estates. The Capel family and the Holme family may best be described as middling or lower gentry.[149] Although the identity of the sitters in *The 'Bartholomew' Family* (c.1600) is a traditional one by descent, the family is most probably gentry.[150]

In the early modern period the family unit 'denoted above all the body of persons living in one house under one head, including children, kinsfolk and parents'.[151] The two earliest portraits dating from the late 1560s include a woman, additional to the parents. These portraits share a compositional format – the family arranged round a table, children in front and three adults behind. In the portrait *Edward, 3rd Baron Windsor and his Family* (1568) (Fig. 14, No. 153), Lord Windsor (c.1532-75) and his wife, Katherine de Vere (1538-1600), stand behind their four sons, who are engaged in games of chess and cards. Katherine's image, her hand fingering the elaborate pendant suspended from a jewelled looped chain, is identical to an extant half-length portrait, dated 1567, and most likely copied for the family portrait.[152] However, this does not explain entirely the compositional oddities. Lord Windsor faces to the left and not towards his wife. Possibly his image was also adapted from an existing portrait. The woman on the extreme right and facing right, whose age is given as sixty-one, has not been identified. She is not the mother of either Lord Windsor or Lady Windsor. The fact that her

[149] For the Lygon family see Jane Mulvagh, *Madresfield: The Real Brideshead* (London: Black Swan, 2009), p. 85, p.104. For the Capel family see Robert Clutterbuck, *The History and Antiquities of the County of Hertford* (London, 1815), 1, pp. 243-244
[150] Information provided by Philip Mould Ltd.
[151] Houlbrooke, *English Family*, p. 19
[152] Strong, *English Icon*, p. 108, Fig. 55

age is also inscribed, *AETATIS SVAE 61*, in a similar fashion to the other inscriptions, suggests that she is a gentlewoman of status and most probably a family relative.[153]

In *William Brooke, 10th Baron Cobham and his Family* (1568) (Fig. 1, No. 152), the sitters are grouped round a table laden with fruit, and with animals and birds included as accessories.[154] Lord Cobham (1527-1597) and his wife, Frances Newton (1539-1592), stand behind their children. Seated on the left, is a finely dressed woman who has not been satisfactorily identified.[155] The composition bears similarities with Netherlandish family portraits of the period and it is possible that the painter, if not actually from the Low Countries himself, was at least familiar with such compositions.[156] Here the most notable feature is the Latin text placed centrally between Lord Cobham and his wife. It describes the parents as 'of noble race' and compares them with the patriarch Jacob and the pious Job, expressing hopes for their children to flourish and bring further honour to the family.[157] For the text to be read, the portrait must have been hung low enough for close viewing. It brings to mind the monumental mural at Whitehall Palace of Henry VIII with Henry VII, Elizabeth of York and Jane Seymour (1537) painted by Hans Holbein.[158] In the mural, the fulsome text was also placed centrally and extoled the virtues of the Tudor kings. This image would have been

---

[153] Lady Elizabeth Willoughby (1546-95) had a gentlewoman, possibly a distant relative as, lady-in-waiting. Alice T. Friedman, *House and Household in Elizabethan England: Wollaton Hall and the Willoughby Family* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1989), p. 45. Other noble households are known to have included gentlewomen.

[154] The portrait has been the subject of exhaustive study. See especially Hearn, *Dynasties* (1995), pp. 99-100, for a transcription and full translation of the inscription. Maurice Howard, *The Tudor Image* (London: Tate Publishing, 1995), pp. 47-52. Gervase Jackson-Stops (ed.), *The Treasure Houses of Britain: Five Hundred Years of Private Patronage and Art Collecting*, (National Gallery of Art, Washington, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985), pp. 102-3. Wilson, 'The Noble Imp', pp. 364-365. Susan E. James and K. van Stighelen, 'New Discoveries Concerning the Portrait of the Family of William Cobham, 10th Lord Cobham, at Longleat House', *Dutch Crossing: A Journal of the Low Countries Studies*, (Summer 1999), 23, pp. 66-101. See Chapter 4 for a discussion of the symbolic meanings associated with the fruit, animals and birds.

[155] The gentlewoman has sometimes been identified as Lady Cobham's sister, Johanna. Hearn, *Dynasties*, p.99. However, there is no record of a sister with that name in either the Brooke or Newton families. Elizabeth Brooke, Marchioness of Northampton (1526-65) has also been suggested as one of the women. James and van Stighelen, 'New Discoveries', p. 83. There is no firm evidence for this identification.

[156] For example, Cornelis de Zeeuw, *Pierre de Moucheron, his wife and family* (1563). Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. For further discussion of this point see Chapter 4, pp. 122-123

[157] Roy Strong suggests that the text may have been written by Francis Thynne, Lancaster Herald (?1545-1608). Jackson-Stops, *Treasure Houses*, pp. 102-103

[158] It was destroyed in the fire of 1698, but a small version survives executed in 1667 by Remigius van Leemput. Royal Collection. RC1N 405750

familiar to both Lord and Lady Cobham, whose duties in the service of the queen brought them frequently to court.[159] Lady Cobham was Mistress of the Robes and attended the queen regularly from 1558 until her death in 1592.[160]

Though painted in a more naïve manner, the early seventeenth-century portrait of the Capel family (c.1600-5) (Fig. 30, No. 156), bears a passing resemblance to the Cobham Family portrait.[161] The costume style suggests a date in the 1590s or early in the first decade of the seventeenth century. The family is also seated round a table laden with fruit. Family tradition has it that the baby seated on a lady's lap is Arthur Capel, later first Baron Capel of Much Hadham (1604-49), whose dedication to Charles I cost him his life in 1649.[162] If the baby is indeed Arthur Capel, then the family group could represent his grandfather, Sir Arthur Capel (d.1632) with his wife Margaret Grey, their eldest son Sir Henry Capel (c.1574-1622) and his wife, Theodosia Montagu, (Lord Capel's parents) and some of Sir Arthur's and Lady Margaret's many children.[163] However, family traditions can be misleading. In the early seventeenth century there were several 'Capel' families in Hertfordshire who were closely related.[164] However, if the portrait does represent the Sir Arthur Capel who was knighted by James I in May 1603, this event may have prompted the commission of the family portrait. On the folding scroll painted in front of the table is inscribed *PS* [abraded text] *128*, which is particularly apposite. The legible words of the text, Psalm 128, include the lines, 'thy wife shall be as a fruitful vine by the sides of thine house: thy children like olive plants round about thy table … thou shalt thy children's children see to thy great joyes increase…' This text, which does not appear in the Cobham portrait, is characteristic of Netherlandish portraits of families seated round a table.[165] The shadowy figures just visible in the background beneath layers of over-painting would suggest that originally more individuals were

---

[159] Julian Lock, 'Brooke, William, tenth Baron Cobham (1527–1597)', *ODNB*, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/61735, accessed 10 May 2014]
[160] Janet Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe Unlock'd* (Leeds: Maney, 1988), p.101
[161] The portrait descended through a branch of the Capel family to the present owner.
[162] Ronald Hutton, 'Capel, Arthur, first Baron Capel of Hadham (1604-49)'; *ODNB*, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4583, accessed 10 May 2014]
[163] Pedigree in Clutterbuck, *History and Antiquities*, pp. 243-44
[164] See note above.
[165] Jan Baptist Bedaux, *The Reality of Symbols: Studies in the Iconology of Netherlandish Art 1400-1800* (Maarsen: Gary Schwarz, 1990), p. 85. The relationship with Netherlandish portraiture is discussed in Chapter 4, p. 123

depicted. The portrait has been surface cleaned but not subjected to technical analysis, so it cannot be established how many sitters there were originally, nor whether the baby is a later addition.[166]

There are no compositional similarities in the other family groups. Three generations of the so-called Bartholomew family are depicted on a small panel, 49 x 55 centimetres, so that each individual figure is on a miniature scale (Fig. 31, No. 155). The costume style supports a date about 1600. The coat of arms held by the oldest boy bears some resemblance to the arms of the Bartholomew family of Burford, Oxfordshire, although according to a later record of the arms, the colours should be reversed.[167] Another identity, more plausible from the heraldry, is the family of Greswold, of Greete in Yardley, Worcestershire. The Bartholomews are a fit in the numbers and ages of the sitters, whereas the Greswolds are not. Whoever they are, whether the Bartholomews of Burford or the Greswolds of Yardley, they are country gentry. The sitters, four adults and seven children, are positioned on two levels against a monochrome background – adults above and children below. It is an arrangement that resembles a flat monumental brass plate, or a monumental tomb.[168] Each figure has an age inscribed above the head: the adults, left to right – forty-four, fifty-four, thirty-four and twenty-nine: the children – eight, seven, six, five, three, two and one. On the lower register, the children are lined up so that the oldest girl is positioned on the left, followed by five brothers. The youngest child is most probably a girl, an assumption based on the fact that she wears a ruff like her sister and not a collar like the boys. However, unlike many church monuments where the progeny are often depicted significantly smaller than their parents, the figures of these adults and children are closer to scale.[169]

The monumental portrait, *Sir Thomas Lucy III and his Family* (mid-1620s) (Fig. 3, No. 157), contrasts with the intimate scale of the Bartholomew family group, both in the composition and in the range of meanings inscribed. The huge canvas, measuring 203.2 x 304.8 centimetres, depicts ten figures. The patriarchal figure of

[166] Information provided by the current owner.
[167] I am grateful to Philip Mould Ltd. for communicating the genealogical and heraldic research on this portrait.
[168] An example is the late sixteenth century brass monument to Sir Thomas Cokayne (d. 1592) and his wife in St Oswald's Church, Ashbourne, Derbyshire.
[169] For example the tomb of Sir Edward Denny (1547-99), dated 1600 at Waltham Abbey.

Sir Thomas Lucy (1585-1640) sits comfortably in an opulent domestic interior along with his wife, Alice Spencer (d.1648), seven children and the nurse, who holds the youngest child. He is set slightly apart from his children, occupying more of the picture space. His heir Spencer Lucy (c.1614-1649) is stepping in to the room from the formal garden, and with his father, inhabits the spacious left-hand side of the composition.[170] Constance (offering a bowl of cherries to her mother) and Margaret are the two girls, the boy on the right with the bow must be Robert and the two boys in the foreground are Richard and George. The infant girl is most probably Bridget.[171] Although the portrait has every appearance of a dynastic image, it bears none of the traditional inscriptions of ages and dates. This may be explained by a shift in style from a monochrome background towards the greater realism of an interior setting. These changes, introduced by immigrant painters from the Netherlands, became increasingly fashionable from the second decade of the seventeenth century. An inscription on the pillar behind Sir Thomas reads: *Deus mihi haec otia fecit*.[172] The quotation is adapted from Virgil's *Eclogues* and extolls the morality of the state of noble idleness, one of the meanings expressed in the portrait. Sir Thomas Lucy has put his God-given leisure to good and virtuous use: acquiring a scholarly and pious collection of books, pursuing the gentlemanly sport of falconry (and by implication performing the duties required of his class), planting a fruitful Italianate garden and being blessed with seven children.[173] He appears as the embodiment of James Cleland's definition of nobility in which virtue trumps ancestry as the 'onlie essential form of nobilitie'.[174] The social distinction of learning and the leisure required to support it is inscribed on the family group portrait.

The portrait group said to depict Henry Holme (1570-1631) of Paull Holme, Yorkshire, his wife, Dorothy Grymston and their two children is painted on three

---

[170] In the photograph (Fig. 3), Spencer's figure, on the left, is incomplete as are the hawk and Spencer's brother, Robert, on the right. The portrait has not been reduced. The image supplied by the National Trust has cropped the painting.
[171] As noted in Chapter 1, note 6, there is no baptismal record for these children.
[172] The quotation from Virgil's *Eclogues*, I, vi, is: *deus nobis haec otia fecit.* It translates as 'the man to whom I owe this happy leisure is a god'. E.V. Rieu. *Virgil: the Pastoral Poems* (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1954), p. 21. It may be more literally translated as, 'God has given to me/to us (mihi/nobis) this leisure'.
[173] Strong, *Artist and Garden*, pp. 38-39
[174] James Cleland, *The Institution of a Young Noble Man* (Oxford: J. Barnes, 1607), p. 9

joined panels and dated 1628 (Fig. 27, No. 158).[175] The central panel of the triptych depicts the parents, and the two hinged side wings depict their son (left) and their daughter (right).[176] The format is a secular adaptation of a religious altarpiece and though rare, is not unique. Jane Eade has argued that the panel of husband and wife is of an earlier date, possibly executed at the time of their marriage, with symbols (the skull and the death's head ring on Henry's left thumb) characteristic of 'memento mori' portraits. The portraits of the children are considered to be later additions. They are by a different hand and of a different scale, and Eade considers it plausible that the three panels were hinged together sometime later in the seventeenth century. The reverse of the wings reveal more symbols and sacred inscriptions, underscoring the sitters' piety, the passage of time and the belief in eternal life.[177] The format also begs questions about how the triptych was displayed. Hung on a wall, the reverse of the wings would remain unseen, but it does seem improbable that the wings would be closed. It has also been noted that the clothes worn by Henry and Dorothy Holme are 'old-fashioned' in style as would be befit folk living in the provinces.[178]

2.2.v Category (5): miscellaneous: exceptional portrait types

Six portraits do not fit the previous four categories. They depict seven children: three boys, one girl and three babies whose sex cannot be determined. Three portraits date before 1600. Two portraits depict a child with a grandparent (No. 160, No. 165) and one shows a woman with her great-granddaughter (No. 162). All portraits are painted on panels. The portrait *called Ladies of the Cholmondeley Family and their Babies* (c.1600-10) (Fig. 32, No. 164) depicts two women seated upright in a bed, each holding a swaddled baby wrapped in red bearing cloths. It may be a unique presentation, as no other easel portrait of a similar composition

[175] There is doubt about the sitters' identities. When acquired by the Victoria & Albert Museum in 1951, the sitters were thought to represent Thomas and Elizabeth Hill and their children. *Sotheby's*, 31/01/1951, lot. 19. A full transcription of the rear-side of the outer panels is on the V&A website: http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O51693/the-holme-family-painting-unknown/, accessed 27/03/14.
[176] The portrait has aroused considerable interest due to its format and iconography. What follows is based on Jane Eade, 'The Triptych Portrait in England 1585-1646', *The British Art Journal*, 6, 2, Autumn (2005), pp. 3-11.
[177] Cooper, *Citizen Portrait*, pp. 116-117.
[178] Cooper, *Citizen Portrait*, p. 117

seems to be known. Though only one individual is represented, it most closely resembles a church monument, such as the memorial to Lady Margaret Legh who died in childbirth in 1603.[179] These women have been identified as ladies of the Cholmondeley family of Cheshire and the costume dates the portrait in the early 1600s.[180]

Sir Edward Pytts (d.1618) became Sheriff of Worcestershire for 1611-1612. This may have prompted the commission of a full-length portrait with his grandson and namesake, Edward Pytts (1606-1672) (Fig. 33, No. 165). Originally from a yeoman family, Sir Edward is an example of a man who achieved the status of a landed gentleman when he acquired the manor of Kyre Wyard in Worcestershire in 1575 and was knighted by James I in 1603. The portrait is on an exceptionally large panel, 183.5 x 110.5 centimetres. Sir Edward may have had traditional tastes, preferring the sharper quality of the brushstrokes achievable on the smooth surface of a well-prepared panel, which depicts young Edward's elaborately patterned gown to perfection. The inscriptions on the portrait are particularly precise: (upper left) *AETATIS SVAE, 71, AVGUSTI, 10: 1612* and (centre left) *6 FEBRVARI, 22: 1612.* A portrait by the same hand of the boy's mother, Mary Pytts, and also dated 1612, has survived.[181] As young Edward's father, Sir James Pytts (1575-1640), was alive in 1612, it is conceivable his portrait was commissioned at the same time but is possibly lost or no longer extant.

The baby boy traditionally identified as John Dunch is held by his nurse, Elizabeth Field (Fig. 34, No. 161).[182] If the identification is correct, the portrait can be dated to the late 1580s or early 1590s. With few exceptions in this period, upper-class women employed wet nurses to suckle their children and, as the baby looks about a year old, it may be assumed that the woman is his wet nurse. Like the nurse in *Sir Thomas Lucy III and his Family* (mid-1620s) she may have been a

---

[179] The memorial is in All Saints Church, Fulham. Illustrated in Brian Kemp, *Church Monuments* (Princes Risborough: Shire Publications Ltd., 1985), p. 18.
[180] J.T. Hopkins, '"Such a Twin Likeness There was in the Pair": An Investigation into the Painting of the "The Cholmondeley Sisters', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire,* 144 (1991) pp. 1-37. Karen Hearn argues that there is no definitive evidence for their identity, beyond the fact that they are Cholmondeley ladies. Tate Britain Archive. See also Robert Tittler, *Portraits, Painters, Publics,* pp. 118-120.
[181] Information provided by the Weiss Gallery
[182] Cooper, *Elizabeth I,* cat.no. 32, p. 111.

member of the household.[183] The woman appears to be the very model of Sir Thomas Elyot's ideal wet nurse, 'nat under xx (20) yeres or above xxx (30), her body also beinge clene from all siknes, or deformitie and having her complexion most of the right and pure sanguine'.[184] The baby is presented facing forward, while his nurse is depicted in profile looking at him. Despite her fine linen and ruff, her more modest dress befits a woman who is of lower status than the finely dressed infant she carries. The portrait of a boy known as the son of Richard Assheton of Middleton appears to be a small fragment of a larger panel, only 48.3 x 29 centimetres (Fig. 35, No. 163). The boy is positioned in front of a black-coated figure, most probably his father, whose hand rests on his shoulder. The original portrait may once have depicted a father with his son, or it may have had more individuals, and was subsequently reduced in size.

2.2. vi Category (6): family sets and family series

There are four known family sets and two family series in the corpus. For the purposes of this study a 'set' is defined as a group of individual portraits depicting members of the same family, that are all the same size and format, and appear to be essentially the product of a single commission and a single workshop.[185] A 'series' is a more loosely defined group of portraits of close family members alive at the same time. In a series, the portraits may correspond in size and format, but variations might be found: they may have the same date and style of inscription, but they may not all be the product of a single workshop or have been produced as a single commission.[186] Portrait sets and series are not exceptional in this period. Most prevalent are sets or series of public figures – kings and queens are the most common, but other sets and series have survived that commemorate eminent individuals in various religious and secular spheres: the members of civic institutions, or the ancient forebears of an aristocratic family.[187] Two of the family

[183] Houlbrooke, *English Families*, p. 133
[184] Rude, *Elyot's 'Governor',* p. 30
[185] There may be slight variations in the dimensions due to accidental damage.
[186] This definition of 'set' and 'series' is very precise. Some scholars use the terms 'set' and 'series' more loosely and/or interchangeably.
[187] Susan Foister, 'Edward Alleyn's Collection of Paintings', in *Edward Alleyn: Elizabethan Actor, Jacobean Gentleman*, ed. by Aileen Reid and Robert Maniura (London: Dulwich Picture Gallery, 1994) p. 33. Tittler, *Portraits, Painters, Publics*, pp. 34-35. Catherine Daunt, 'Heroes and

sets and the two family series include adults. There are twenty children who are ten years old or less: nine boys, ten girls and a baby (mother-and-child-portrait) whose sex cannot be determined. The nineteen individual portraits of children are in category (1), listed in Appendix 1 and identified by an asterisk. The mother-and-child portrait in category (2) is also listed in Appendix I and identified by an asterisk. The portraits are on panel.

The names of the sitters in the four sets are known, although two of the sets are considered to be incomplete. It seems that sets which descended down the generations, at least until the twentieth century, are most likely to have their identities intact.[188] The identities of the sitters that make up the two family series have not been satisfactorily identified. However, it may be that surviving portraits of individual children were once part of a set or series that has since been dispersed and this begs the question of how many portraits are required to constitute a set.[189] Here it will be taken as more than two portraits of family members, roughly identical in size and format.

The Smythe family set is the earliest, dated 1579/80 and the first English set in which the identities of the sitters and the painter, Cornelis Ketel, are secure. A gap of over twenty years before the next set, the ffolliott brothers, which is dated 1603, could suggest that family sets did not catch on until the early seventeenth century. The Wandesford family set is dated 1608 and the Russell sibling set is dated 1626/7. The series of portraits, surviving at Deene Park, Northamptonshire, dating from the second decade of the seventeenth century, are likely to be family and kin of the Tresham and Brudenell families. The series at Tredegar House, Newport, Gwent, dated 1620, are thought to be members of the Morgan family. The Russell siblings set, sons and daughters of the fourth Earl of Bedford, were aristocratic children. The Smythes were a notable London merchant family. The other families were, broadly speaking, landed gentry, though the Treshams and Brudenells were the most wealthy and eminent.

---

worthies: emerging antiquarianism and the taste for portrait sets in England' in *Painting in Britain*, ed. by Cooper and others, pp. 362-375

[188] For example, a family set, dated c.1625-30, consists of three sibling portraits of boys seemingly older than ten years old. They descended down the family until sold with the effects of the eighth Earl Poulett, Sotheby's, 5/ 3/1969, lot 1. Strong, *English Icon*, 1969, pp. 252-3.

[189] See Chapter 5**,** p. 132 for further discussion of this point.

However, the earliest known family set produced in England, is of the Smythe family, who were neither noble nor gentry. This set has been extensively researched by Karen Hearn, and therefore only a brief account follows here.[190] The portraits were commissioned by the prominent and fabulously wealthy merchant, Thomas Smythe (1522-1591), whose soubriquet 'Customer' Smythe was derived from his lucrative post of Collector of Customs Duties in the Port of London. The painter, Cornelis Ketel (1548-1616), was a Dutch painter and refugee from the continental religious wars who settled in London in 1573.[191] Ketel received portrait commissions from London merchants and this connection may have led to the painter's introduction to Thomas Smythe. Ten portraits are known to be extant: Thomas's wife, Alice Judde, and nine of their children, including seven-year-old Elizabeth (b.1572) (Fig. 36, No. 7). The set is almost certainly incomplete as there were three more children alive in 1579/80. Each panel measures roughly 45.7 x 38.6 centimetres, with the date and age of the sitter inscribed. The figure fills most of the picture space: therefore, the smaller the figure, the larger the portion of the body is visible. Elizabeth Smythe is almost certainly the youngest child and she is depicted at half length.[192] The sitters do not all face the same direction and there seems no obvious logic for this. It may have been dictated by the original location for the portraits, or more simply result from a desire to achieve visual variety.

The set of four portraits of the sons of Sir John ffolliott[193]of Pirton, Worcestershire (b.1567) are inscribed *1603* (Fig. 37, Nos. 31, 32, 33).[194] In 1603, Sir John had five sons living and a baby daughter.[195] His eldest son Aylmer was born in 1591, Thomas in 1593, Francis in 1595, Richard in 1597, Henry in 1601

---

[190] Hearn, 'Merchant-Class Portraiture', pp. 37-43. Hearn lists all the children known to be born to Thomas and Alice Smythe with their dates of birth. All the extant portraits are illustrated with the exception of Elizabeth Smythe. Here she spells the surname 'Smith'. In earlier references, the spelling is 'Smythe'. Hearn, *Dynasties*, pp. 108-110.

[191] Carel van Mander, *Dutch and Flemish Painters (Schilderboeck),* trans. by Constant van der Wall (New York: McFarlane, 1936), p. 331

[192] The portrait of Elizabeth, born in 1572, was sold at Christies, *East & West*, 2/5/ 2013, no. 283. It is noted that the portrait is dated 1573 and is plausibly suggested to be an error. There seems little doubt that this portrait is part of the set.

[193] There are various spellings of 'ffolliott'.

[194] Fig. 37 depicts all four brothers. Aylmer is more than ten years old and not included in the corpus.

[195] William D. Ligon, *The Ligon Family and Connections* (New York: 1947.), p. 102, Los Angeles Public Library, 929.2 L726.
http://freepages.genealogy.rootsweb.ancestry.com/~hwbradley/aqwc2693.htm#60075C2, accessed 14/01/2010.

and Katherine in 1603. According to the parish records another son, John, died soon after his birth in 1599.[196] Unfortunately the inscriptions that give the boys' ages are damaged. However, it can be seen that the youngest boy is two and the second oldest boy is eight. It is unclear from the abraded inscription whether the age of the oldest boy is thirteen or fifteen. By comparing birth records with the portraits, it is most probable that the boys here are Aylmer (b.1591), Francis (b.1595), Richard (b.1597) and Henry (b.1601). This throws up a puzzling question. Where is the portrait of Thomas who was born in 1593? Had he also died by 1603 or is his portrait missing from the group? There is no surviving record of Thomas's death. Katherine (b.1603) may not have been born at the time of the commission, or she may have been omitted as she was only a few months or weeks old. The portraits are small panels, each roughly 43 x 32 centimetres.[197] This set has a visual unity: the boys are presented to the viewer in an identical manner facing slightly to the left, wearing matching outfits and holding objects appropriate for their age. Technical examination revealed that the portraits of the two youngest boys are painted over earlier portraits of girls.[198] This could be explained by the recycling of two panels in the workshop of the unknown painter.[199]

The Wandesford family set of six portraits is dated 1608. Each portrait is inscribed with the sitter's age and date. Thirteen portraits (two adults and eleven children) descended through the family until the twentieth century, when they were sold. In 1987 four portraits, of the parents and two children – a girl age ten and a boy age four – were sold together and are now at Cusworth Hall Park and Museum, Darlington.[200] Portraits of two more children have surfaced in the salerooms since then: a girl, age three, and an infant age one.[201] The adults are

---

[196] John ffolliott was born and died in Wyre Piddle in 1599. See note above.
[197] The portrait of the eldest son, Aylmer, is slightly bigger, 45 x 38 cm.
[198] Information provided by Philip Mould Ltd.
[199] The practice of re-using panels and canvases has also been revealed in recent research for 'The Making Art in Tudor Britain' project at the National Portrait Gallery. Cooper and others, *Painting in Britain*, pp. 80-81
[200] 'A Perfect Likeness', *Lane Fine Art*, 1987, No. 14. I have not been able to establish how many portraits Lane Fine Art acquired and then sold on.
[201] The portrait of Elizabeth Wandesford was sold by the Weiss Gallery in 2002 and by Roy Precious Antiques and Fine Art in 2012. A portrait of an unidentified infant was sold at Bonham's in 2013 as 'Portrait of a child, full-length, in a white dress, standing beside his cot…Most probably a fragment'. Bonham's, *Old Master Paintings*, 2/5/ 2013, lot 23. I am grateful to Jane Eade for alerting me to this sale.

Richard Wandesford (b. 1565) and Meryall Yoward (1573-1612) of Kirklington and Pickhill, NorthYorkshire. The evidence for the identification of the Wandesford children is based on two contemporary sources, neither of which is comprehensive, and it appears to be conflicting. The ten-year-old girl (Fig. 38, No. 40) must have been born in 1598/99. The parish register of Pickhill-cum-Roxby records the baptism on 30 November 1599 of 'Katherine daughter of Mr Wansford of Pickhill'.[202] The Heralds' Visitation of Yorkshire, 1612, lists the children by name, but provides no ages or dates apart from William, son and heir, age fifteen.[203] In the Heralds' list the oldest daughter is Isabel, followed by a daughter, Francys [sic] and then Catherine.[204] However, the parish register clearly lists the baptism on 15 October 1598, of Francis the *son* of Richard Wandesford, followed a year later by the aforementioned daughter, Katherine. It also lists a daughter, Frances, baptised much later on 7 July 1612. Therefore the girl in the portrait, aged ten years old, could plausibly be either Frances or Katherine.[205] The closest fit for a boy age four is Rowland (Fig. 39, No. 41), listed as the second son in the Heralds' list. His baptism is recorded in the parish register on 3 March 1602/3.[206] The girl age three or in her third year is most likely to be Elizabeth (Fig. 40, No. 42): her baptism is recorded in the parish register on 30 September 1605. There is no Wandesford child's baptism listed in the parish register between Elizabeth's entry in 1605 and a 'daughter' baptised on 9 March 1609/10. Two girls on the Heralds' list following Elizabeth are named Margaret and Anne, either of whom could be a one to two-year-old infant in 1608 (Fig. 41, No. 43). The parish register and the Heralds' list suggest that Richard and Meryall Wandesford had sixteen children born between about 1597 and 7 July 1612. Meryall died on 20 July 1612.[207]

---

[202] http://search.findmypast.co.uk/record/browse?id=gbprs%2fyorkshire%2f004003801%2f00008. This is a digital copy of the Pickhill Parish Register. See also, Arthur W. Howard, *The Registers of Pickhill-cum-Roxby, Co. York* (Leeds: Yorkshire Parish Register Society, 1904), pp. 370-371. Howard did not transcribe the entry on 4 March 1603/4 for Jane Wandesford.

[203] Joseph Foster (ed.), *The Visitation of Yorkshire made in the Years 1584/5, to which is added the Subsequent Visitation made in 1612* (London: 1875), p. 585.

[204] Rouge Croix Puirsuivant confirmed that the pedigree on C.13/122 named a daughter 'Francys' as the second daughter of Richard Wandesford. Here 'Katherine' is spelt with a 'C'.

[205] Lane Fine Art identified the girl as Frances Wandesford, as does Cusworth Hall Park and Museum. To avoid confusion, she is named Frances in this thesis.

[206] Rowland Wandesford was the nephew of Sir Roland Wandesford (d.1662), Attorney General of the Court of Wards and Liveries.

[207] Howard, *Registers*, p. 371

All six panels measure 88.9 x 66 centimetres (with only minor differences) and are large enough to show Richard (age forty-three) (Fig. 63) and Meryall (age thirty-five) (Fig. 64) in three-quarter length against a scarlet background. This enhances their black costumes set off with white cuffs and a white collar (for Richard) and a white ruff (for Meryall). In contrast, the sombre background of the children's portraits, are a foil for the light fabric of their clothes. Richard's portrait is embellished with his coat of arms and inscribed: TOVT POVR L'EGLISE ('all for the church')/ *PRO ME MEIS/LAVS TIBI XPE* ('for myself and my [children] praise be to Christ'), a not unexpected text for a pious man.[208] Meryall's portrait has an English inscription: *WHY THESE OR THIS/JUDGE NOT AMISSE*. Her right hand touches a crucifix and the pointing index finger possibly indicates the portraits of her children. It is exceptional in this period for a woman to be depicted making any gesture that would contradict an appearance of humility and modesty.[209] Yet Meryall's gestures may suggest the meaning of this enigmatic phrase. Can we read this as Meryall's appeal not to be judged unfavourably for choosing to bear children instead of devoting herself to the religious life? Could it be that the faith she professes is Catholic? Although there are portraits showing women wearing crosses (both simple gold and be-jewelled ones), it does seem that crucifixes were only worn by women who are known to have adhered to Catholicism.[210] Of course, Meryall's crucifix could be a family heirloom. However, it is also conceivable that she was a 'church papist', that is someone who continued to worship privately as a Catholic, yet attended church just frequently enough to avoid fines for recusancy: or else a 'femme coverte', a woman who was protected by her husband's attendance.[211] More research into

---

[208] 'A Perfect Likeness', *Lane Fine Art*, 1987, No. 14. NPGH *Icon Notes*, 'Wandesford'

[209] Joaneath Spicer, 'The Renaissance Elbow' in *A Cultural History of Gesture: from Antiquity to the Present Day*, ed. by Jan Bremmer and Herman Roodenburg: with an introduction by Sir Keith Thomas (London, Polity Press, 1992), p. 100

[210] Annabel Patterson asserts that by the 1590s wearing a crucifix was an open statement of recusancy. Annabel Patterson, 'Catholic Communities and Their Art' in *Visions of Community in the Pre-Modern World* ed. by Nicholas Howe (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002), pp.109-148. An example of a Catholic woman wearing a crucifix is Maria More in Rowland Lockey, partly after Holbein, *Thomas More Family Group* (1593). NPG 2765

[211] Marie B. Rowlands, 'Recusant Women 1560-1640' in *Women in English Society 1500-1800*, ed. by Mary Prior (London and New York: Methuen, 1985), pp. 149-180. Alexandra Walsham, *Church Papists: Church Conformity and Professional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1993), pp.73-9. Patricia Crawford, *Women and Religion in England 1500-1720* (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), p. 59.

local documents would be needed to discover if Meryall Wandesford could have fitted either of those categories.

All the sitters are presented facing the viewer and the three younger children are depicted full length. Like the ffolliott boys, the Wandesford children wear matching fabrics and have accessories appropriate for their age. Frances Wandesford displays her embroidery (Fig. 38, No. 40), Rowland brandishes the whip that turns his spinning top (Fig. 39, No. 41) and Elizabeth holds out her apron of flowers (Fig. 40, No. 42). The infant stands beside her cradle, supported by an adult hand (Fig. 41, No.43). This imaginative device which fills the empty picture space enables the baby to be painted more or less to scale with her siblings and yet evokes her vulnerability as she stands upright. The portrait is not a fragment, as suggested in a recent sales catalogue, because the panel has the same dimensions and background as the other portraits in the set.[212] The painter is unknown, but workshops are known to have existed in York and elsewhere in the North West.[213]

The Russell family set comprises six portraits. They depict the four daughters and two younger sons of Francis Russell, fourth Earl of Bedford (1593-1641): Katherine (c.1614-1676), age thirteen, Anne (1615-1697), age twelve, Margaret (1618-1676) (No. 79), age nine, Diana (1621/2-1695) (Fig. 42, No. 80), age five and their brothers, Francis (1619-1641) (No. 77), age eight and John (1620-1687) (No. 78), age seven. However, the Earl of Bedford had another son, Edward (d. 1665) who grew to adulthood. The date of his birth is unknown beyond the fact that it was sometime in the 1620s and he was probably the youngest son.[214] There is no portrait of him consistent with this set: possibly there never was one.[215] The set was commissioned in 1626/27 soon after Woburn became the family's

[212] See note 201. Bonham's catalogue does not mention the other Wandesford portraits.
[213] Robert Tittler and Anne Thackray, 'Cultural Relations between London and the Provincial Towns: Portraiture and Publics in Early Modern England' in ed. Bronwen and Paul Yachin, *Making Publics in Early Modern Europe* (New York: Routledge, 2010), pp. 125-126
[214] *Burke's Peerage, Baronetage and Knightage*, 107th edn., ed. by Charles Mosley (Wilmington, Delaware: Burke's Peerage, 2003), 1, p. 319
[215] A portrait of a child inscribed Edward Russell aged two, dated 1627, entered the collection in 1890. However, there are doubts about the identity of the sitter. Information from Chris Gravett, Curator of the Collection, Woburn Abbey. See Appendix 1, No. 81

principal country residence.[216] In all probability the set has always been at Woburn and is complete. The earliest record is a list made for the antiquarian George Vertue in 1727, which also notes the painter's name, 'Jno Priwitzer'.[217] Little is known about Johannes Priwitzer (c.1590-c.1640), apart from his Hungarian origin and the assumption that he was familiar with Anglo-Dutch portrait styles.[218]

Each panel measures 66 x 50.8 centimetres and the sitters are presented identically, inclined slightly to the right. The figures are set within an oval faux stone frame, a compositional format popularised by Anglo-Dutch painters in the seventeenth century. Each head is positioned on the same level within the panel, so that slightly more of the body of the youngest child, Diana, is visible than of her siblings (Fig. 42, No. 80). Her pet jackdaw (or crow) is perched outside the fictive frame, adding a continental Baroque touch to the image. The portraits are inscribed: the sitter's age and the date 1627 appear at the top of each portrait. Exceptionally, Anne's portrait is dated 1626, so possibly it was painted first.[219] The inscriptions with the sitters' names were added later. The oldest sisters, Katherine and Anne, are identically matched in every particular of clothes and jewels, as is Margaret though she wears a collar, not a ruff. Diana is dressed entirely in white and the boys are identically dressed.

A group of twelve portraits at Deene Park, Northamptonshire, is a series. It comprises six portraits of women and six of children – two boys and four girls. One of the women is shown holding a baby (No. 136). All the panels are approximately the same size, 76.8 x 58.4 centimetres, undated and with no inscriptions. Apart from the youngest children, where more of the figure is displayed, the sitters are depicted about half length and enclosed within a painted gold oval frame (Fig. 65, Fig. 66). Unlike the Russell set, where the fictive frames are painted in an illusionistic manner, these frames appear flat, although there are

---

[216] Gladys Scott Thomson, *Life in a Noble Household 1641-1700* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1937), p.22. Chris Gravett confirmed that there are no documents to suggest that the set was ever anywhere other than at Woburn.
[217] George Vertue, 'Vertue Notebooks', *Walpole Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1932), 2, 1931-2, p.40. Oliver Millar, 'The Early Portraits of the Russells', *Apollo*, 1965, 82, July-December, p. 468
[218] Margaret Whinney and Oliver Millar, *English Art*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), p.75
[219] 1626 old style could be as late as March 1627 new style

traces of shadow on some portraits, so possibly they are later additions.[220] Two more portraits could once have been part of this series. One is a portrait of a girl, now at the Yale Center for British Art, New Haven, Connecticut. It has been technically examined, and, although compromised by restoration and reduced in size, the portrait is believed to share a provenance and source of production with at least one of the portraits of a girl in the Deene Park series (Fig. 43, No. 55).[221] The other portrait is of an older woman and has descended through the Cockayne family.[222]

The costume style with a high waist line advocates a date somewhere between 1615 and about 1620. The fact that the woman holding a baby (Fig. 66, No. 136) has no jewellery and wears a plainer costume compared with the other five women has prompted speculation that she is a wet nurse.[223] This is not wholly convincing. Notwithstanding her more modest clothes and lack of adornment, the manner in which she is represented, with her direct gaze and similar proportions to the other women, together with the fact that she is given equal prominence with the baby, suggests that she could be its mother and kin to the women.[224]

There is no record of these portraits before the eighteenth century and the paucity of genealogical material has made it impossible to identify the sitters. However, the close connection of the Tresham family of Rushton Hall with the Brudenells of Deene Park points to the possibility that this series of portraits may depict Treshams. In 1605, Mary Tresham (d.1664) married Thomas Brudenell, later first Earl of Cardigan (c.1583-1663), who the following year inherited Deene Park, which remains the Brudenell family home. Possibly, these sitters are Mary Brudenell, née Tresham, her widowed mother, her sisters, sisters-in-law and some

---

[220] I am most grateful to Jessica David, Assistant Conservator of Paintings, Yale Center for British Art, New Haven, Connecticut, for sharing her thoughts about these portraits and for providing a copy of the technical report on two portraits: *Portrait of a Young Girl* (c.1615) attributed to Paul van Somer at Yale (B1973.1.57) and one of the portraits of a girl in the Deene Park series (Fig. 43, No. 55).

[221] See note above

[222] NPGH *Notes on Collections*, 'Deene Park' for an extensive correspondence relating to the identity of the sitters (not yet resolved) and to the existence of a portrait of a woman now in a private collection, which was almost certainly once part of the set.

[223] Roy Strong's suggestion in 1966. NPGH, *Notes on Collections,* 'Deene Park'.

[224] She can be compared with nurses depicted in other portraits in the corpus, e.g. *Sir Thomas Lucy III and his Family* (mid-1620s) (Fig. 3, No.157) and *called John Dunch and Elizabeth Field* (c.1588) (Fig. 34, No. 161)

of their children. The discovery of the Gunpowder Plot in November 1605 in which Mary's brother, Francis Tresham (1567?-1605) was deeply involved, was disastrous for this Catholic family. In 1619 Rushton Hall was sold and this could account for the portraits' re-location to Deene Park.[225] An alternative identity has also been posited – that the portraits are of members of the Cockayne family.[226] The unknown older woman in the private collection (mentioned above) is also depicted within a gold painted oval like the portraits at Deene Park. This portrait has a Cockayne family provenance and Sir William Cockayne (1560/1-1626) bought Rushton Hall in 1619.

Questions around the familial relationships of the sitters within the group are complicated by several factors. The twelve sitters in the Deene Park series do not all face in the same direction. Four women face slightly to the right and two women face slightly to the left (Fig. 66). Is there a closer family connection between individuals who face the same way? Three children face slightly to the left and three slightly to the right (Fig. 65). The boys, facing the same way, also look alike and wear matching clothes. They are most probably brothers. Of the girls, one faces the same way as the boys (slightly to the left), while the other three girls face slightly to the right. The girls also share facial similarities and could be sisters. They wear identical costume (with an apron for the youngest), but not the same jewellery. The Yale girl is dressed identically to the Deene Park girls and wears an ornament, an eight-pointed star set within a crescent, as does one of them. To complicate matters further, at Boughton House there is a full-length portrait of a woman (unidentified and of a similar date) who is depicted wearing a jewel of the same design.[227] Could she also have some connection with the Deene Park family? The quality of the handling in the twelve portraits is uneven, and it is probable that more than one painter or workshop was involved. The identity of the painter or painters also remains unresolved. Johannes Priwitzer has been suggested for the Deene Park portraits.[228]

---

[225] Sir Thomas Brudenell, rebuilt much of Deene Park, adding the Long Gallery about 1620-1623. Joan Wake, *The Brudenells of Deene*, 2nd ed. (London: Cassell and Co., 1954), pp. 108-9.
[226] NPGH, *Notes on Collections,* 'Deene Park'.
[227] Tessa Murdoch (ed.), *Boughton House: The English Versailles* (Faber and Faber, 1992), p.184. I am most grateful to Diana Scarisbrick for informing me that the crescent was a popular motif in Jacobean jewellery.
[228] NPGH, *Notes on Collections,* 'Deene Park'

Four portraits traditionally identified as members of the Morgan family are at Tredegar House, Monmouthshire ancestral home of a branch of the Morgan family who became Lords of Tredegar. The house was originally built in the mid-sixteenth century and then largely replaced in the late seventeenth century by a magnificent red-brick mansion. Although much of the art collection was dispersed when the house was sold in 1951, some family portraits remained in the house, including these four.[229] Three portraits have ages inscribed: a boy age six, a girl age nine, and a young woman age seventeen. The fourth portrait is of an older woman whose age is not inscribed. The two children's portraits and the portrait of the older woman have a date, 1620. The young woman's portrait is not dated. The older woman could plausibly be the mother of the other three. The portraits are not all the same size – the children's portraits are approximately 81 x 61 centimetres and the women's portraits are approximately 101 x 77 centimetres. The women and the girl wear costumes identical in style, including an aigrette in the hair. [230] The sitters are depicted three-quarter length against a dark background, facing forward. However, the boy's portrait is slightly different (Fig. 44, No. 68): a painted arch frames the figure, a composition known in Dutch portraiture.[231] The painting style of the four portraits, including the calligraphy of the inscriptions, suggests that they are by the same painter or workshop.

A portrait sold in 1958 – identified as Thomas Morgan of Machen (b.?1568) – was recently bought back for Tredegar House.[232] Technical examination confirmed that the inscriptions of the man's age, fifty-two, and the date, 1620, are original although there has been considerable overpainting to restore paint losses. It is slightly larger at 104 x 80 centimetres than the portraits of the two women, perhaps to accommodate the sitter's three-quarter length figure, his right arm resting on a chair. Stylistically, this portrait is compatible with the other Morgan portraits and could have been commissioned at the same time as part of a family series. It is not inconceivable that the older woman and Thomas Morgan were husband and wife, parents of the younger woman and the two children.

---

[229] I am most grateful to Emily Price, Administrator, Tredegar House for information, including a conservation report, on the Morgan portraits.
[230] An aigrette is a hair ornament designed to hold feathers.
[231] A similar arch is depicted in a portrait of an unknown boy, dated 1627 (No. 82).
[232] See note 229.

The ffolliott boys, the Wandesford family and the Morgan family are painted in the vernacular manner of English provincial painters. The Russell portraits and the Deene Park portraits adopt a more recent fashion, the painted feigned oval, and are technically more accomplished.

2.3. Inscriptions and Identification

Of the 250 children represented in 165 portraits that make up the corpus, 168 children have a name attached to them and eighty-two are unnamed.[233] 'Lost' identities occur most frequently in portraits of an individual child or siblings. Four hundred-year-old portraits are rarely in their original location. The evidence from the corpus suggests that a portrait of a child or children depicted with a parent or in a family group is more likely to descend through a branch of the family with the individual's identity intact. Contemporary documents listing portraits by name are extremely rare, as are portraits that have original inscriptions that name the child.[234] Some identification may be 'traditional' or speculative and cannot be verified with certainty. Moreover, inscriptions in themselves are not necessarily reliable.

Inscriptions are such a common feature on Elizabethan and Jacobean portraits of children that when they are absent altogether it is probable that they have been over-painted or abraded. Written in Latin, they most commonly date the portrait – *anno domini* – and identify the individual sitter by age – *aetatis suae.* Generally, the phrases appear in some abbreviated form, or they have been damaged.[235] However, the dates on portraits did not require the precision of modern birth certificates. The inscribed age could be the actual age of the child, for example five years old, or could indicate that the child is actually four years old, but is in

[233] See p. 46
[234] A rare example is the two portraits of Lady Arbella Stuart that are named in the inventory as hanging in the Gallery and Low Great Chamber at Hardwick Hall. Levey and Thornton, *Household Stuff*, p. 50, p. 52
[235] The inscriptions that appear on the portraits are transcribed, where legible, in Appendix 1.

its fifth year.[236] To avoid confusion, I have taken the date on the inscription to mean the *actual* age of the child. In *Four Children of Sir Thomas Lucy III* (1619) (Fig. 2, No. Y), the slight discrepancies in the children's ages were noted when the inscriptions were compared with the Heralds' Visitation list of 1619.[237] A child less than two years old may have its age inscribed in months.[238]

The inscription on the portrait of siblings Stephen and Mary Phesant, however, is unusually precise and reads like an entry in a parish register. The date of birth of each child is recorded: (upper left near Stephen's head) *Natus 22:/May: 1617*; (top centre) *Stilo. Anglia./Pict 7 Jan/ 1622*; (upper right near Mary's head) *Nata 7. Jan:/1615* (Fig. 11, No. Y).[239] Mary's date is her seventh birthday, a traditional milestone in the life cycle. She has passed from 'infantia', the first stage of life lasting up to seven years old and reached 'pueritia', the period that terminates with the onset of puberty at about twelve.[240] The timing of the commission could suggest that, in this family at least, Mary's seventh birthday was an event worthy of commemorating in a portrait.

It is not often one finds an inscription, contemporary with the portrait, which names a child. The extensive inscription on the sibling portrait *Henry, Lord Darnley with Lord Charles Stuart* (1563) by Hans Eworth not only names the boys, but also their parents, and provides the boys' ages (No. 92).[241] This would be explained by the royal connections of the Lennox family, which the boys' mother, Margaret Douglas, Countess of Lennox (1515-1578), granddaughter of Henry VII, never failed to exploit.

A generation later in 1577, the infant Lady Arbella Stuart, later Duchess of Somerset (1575-1616), at twenty-three months old is identified by the text inscribed on her portrait (Fig. 45, No. 5). The inscription (top left) gives Arbella's

---

[236] A point elaborated by Laura Houliston in her examination of Jacobean portraits. Laura Houliston, *The Suffolk Collection: A Catalogue of Paintings* (Swindon: English Heritage, 2012), p. 278. 'Old Style' dating also needs to be considered.
[237] Chapter 1**,** p.13
[238] See the portrait of Lady Arbella Stuart discussed below. This was common practice for portraits painted in the Netherlands. Bedaux and Ekkart, *Pride and Joy*, p.156, note 7.
[239] As the inscription states, the dates are given in English Old Style.
[240] Shahar, *Childhood*, pp. 22-23
[241]See Appendix 1, p. 160. I am grateful to Anna Reynolds, Senior Curator of Paintings, Royal Collection, for confirming that there is no reason to suggest that the inscription is not contemporary with the painting.

title, as the Countess of Lennox: *Arabella Cometissa Levenox / AEtate Sue 23 menſes / Ao DNI 1577.* Arbella's father was Lord Charles Stuart, fifth Earl of Lennox (1555-1576), younger brother of Henry, Lord Darnley (1545-1567) and therefore she was first cousin to young James VI of Scotland.[242] When Lord Charles died in 1576, Arbella was barely five months old. Her dynastic importance, as presumptive heiress to the thrones of both England and Scotland should either Queen Elizabeth or James VI die without a direct heir, provides a key to the purpose of the portrait. Arbella was not granted the earldom of Lennox as had been anticipated by her mother and grandmothers.[243] Arbella's mother was Lady Elizabeth Stuart née Cavendish (1555-1582), the daughter of Elizabeth, Countess of Shrewsbury ('Bess of Hardwick'). Lady Elizabeth and Arbella's paternal grandmother, the Countess of Lennox, battled vainly to have the title bestowed on her. From 1582 onwards, her maternal grandmother, the Countess of Shrewsbury, always styled Arbella 'Countess of Lennox', and it was this grandmother who most likely commissioned the portrait, which was at Hardwick Hall in 1601.[244] The entitlement to the Lennox title is also affirmed in Arbella's jewellery. The distinctive pendant attached to her bodice bears the emblem of a crowned heart, which is a Stuart or Lennox device, surrounded by a scroll on which is inscribed *POUR PARVENIR J'ENDVRE* ('to arrive at my ends I stay the course').[245]

Another example of a named inscription appears on the portrait of Lord Francis Clifford (1584-189), son of George Clifford, third Earl of Cumberland (1558-1605) (Fig. 6, No. 9). He was heir to one of the greatest estates in northern England.[246] On the pillar beside him is inscribed: *FRAN* […] *LORD CLIFFORD/ANO DO 158* […], now faint with age. The bold inscription in a different script recording the little boy's death is a later addition.

---

[242] Lord Charles Stuart is the six-year-old boy in the sibling portrait with his brother, Lord Darnley (No. 92)
[243] Rosalind K. Marshall, 'Stuart, Lady Arabella (1575–1615)', *ODNB*, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/601, accessed 30 Jan 2014]
[244] Ruth Norrington, *In the Shadow of the Throne: the Lady Arbella Stuart* (London: Peter Owen, 2002), p. 34. The portrait is listed in the Low Great Chamber. Levey and Thornton, *Household Stuff*, p. 52
[245] http://www.nationaltrustcollections.org.uk/object/1129175
[246] Peter Holmes, 'Clifford, George, third Earl of Cumberland (1558–1605)', *ODNB*, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5645, accessed 25 May 2014]

Such later additions are not exceptional. They often provide updates on a sitter's rank. In the portrait *Barbara Gamage, Lady Sidney and her Children* (1596) the inscribed date *1596* (top right), is contemporary with the painting (Fig. 13, No. 123). The inscription above her head, *Barbara Gamage, Countess of Leicester*, however, refers to a title she did not acquire until 1618. At her daughters' feet are inscribed the names they attained through marriage. In the top right corner of the portrait of Robert Ridgeway (1592-1641) (Fig. 46, No. Y), we find the inscription: *Aetatis Suae. 3./ An^{o} Dni.1596*. Everything else – the elegant lettering with the sitter's name, and the emblems of the Earls of Londonderry – are later additions, made after Robert succeeded his father as the second earl in 1632.

In the pair of portraits, *William Cavendish, 2nd Earl of Devonshire and his son, William Cavendish* (1619) (Fig. 24, No. 140) and *Christian, Countess of Devonshire and her daughter, Anne* (1619) (No. 141), painted by Paul van Somer, the inscriptions of the sitters' ages and the date, 1619, are contemporary. The biographical information inscribed on the white labels, or 'cartellini', attached to the table carpets (lower right) was inserted later, that is after the deaths of Lord Devonshire (1590-1628) and of his younger son, Lord Charles Cavendish (1620-1643).[247] Lady Cavendish's cartellino reads: *Christian Countefse of Devonshire/Wife to William Earle of Devonshire having/ in her hand her daughter* [.] *Lady Rich, and/ then with Child of Coll. Charles Cavendish/ slaine at Gainsboro e in his Ma:tis sarvis*.[248]

In all these portraits, the later inscriptions update the sitters' ranks. However, some of them may give false information. *Three Unknown Jacobean Children* (1613) (Fig. 20, No. 101) is a sibling portrait of a boy and his two sisters, their ages inscribed beside each child (left to right): *AE TATIS 5, AE TATIS 2, AE TATIS 4*. The date, *1613*, appears at the top. Also, centrally placed, in a different script is the text, *James the 1 Familey*. The children cannot be Henry, Prince of Wales (1594-1612), Princess Elizabeth, later Queen of Bohemia (1596-1662), or Prince Charles, later Charles I (1600-1649). In this instance, spotting the

[247] Martyn Bennett, 'Cavendish, Charles (1620–1643)', *ODNB*, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4927, accessed 24 Feb 2014]
[248] I am grateful to Dennis P. Weller, Curator of Northern European Art, North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh for providing me with a transcript of the inscription.

error was straightforward, because the ages of the royal children do not tally with the ones inscribed on the portrait.

Sometimes detecting incorrect information on a portrait is less clear-cut. In an undated portrait Catherine Vaux, Lady Abergavenny (d. 1649), is depicted with a small child about two or three years old (Fig. 47, No. 137). The style of Catherine's costume suggests a date around 1615-1620 and is a full-length version of an extant portrait, depicting her at half-length on her own.[249] The child is traditionally thought to be Catherine's orphaned step-daughter who married Thomas Stonor in 1654.[250] The inscription reads: *CATH LADY ABERGAVENNY/ Dau of EDW LORD VAUX/ & Mother of ye Hon Eliz Nevil/ who was married to Tho Stonor Es/ Ap 16 1654*. However the child has every appearance of being a little boy due to the masculine signifiers of his clothes, the muckinder (handkerchief) hanging from his waist, his hair-style and the placement on the right side of his mother.[251] If these visual clues call into question the child's identity as Elizabeth Neville, then who could it be?

Furthermore, what is the connection that explains the portrait's location at Stonor? Here one needs to evaluate the biographical records. These are scanty and may be summarised as follows. Henry Nevil(le), seventh Baron Abergavenny (before 1580-1641) married twice. His first wife, Mary Sackville (1584-1613), had seven children. Their eldest son Thomas Neville (c.1592-1628) predeceased his father, and one of their four daughters was Elizabeth Neville, whose birth date is unknown.[252] Obviously she was born before her father's second marriage to Catherine Vaux (d.1649), which took place 'by 1616'.[253] The eldest child of this second marriage was John Neville, later eighth Baron Abergavenny (c.1614-62).[254] More children followed, including their youngest daughter, also named Elizabeth, who was probably born in the later 1620s.[255] It was this second

[249] Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. Object No. 3895.
[250] *Stonor: Home of the Stonor Family for 850 Years*, ed. by Oliver Garnett (2010), p. 11.
[251] See Chapter 3 for further discussion of masculine styles of dress and compositional placement.
[252] *Burke's Peerage, Baronetage and Knightage*, ed. by Charles Mosley (Stokesley: Burke's Peerage and Gentry, 2003), 1, p. 20. No birth date is given and she is listed as died unmarried.
[253] *Burke's Peerage,* 1, p. 20
[254] 'He was 8 years old in 1622'. G.E.C, *Peerage*, 1, p.37
[255] None of the printed sources provide her birth date.

Elizabeth Neville who married Thomas Stonor (1626-1683) in 1654.[256] In all probability the child in the portrait is John Neville, born about 1614. The marriage of John's sister Elizabeth to Thomas Stonor would explain the portrait's location at Stonor. John Neville died without issue and his brother George succeeded to the title. The inscription is correct in stating that Catherine's daughter Elizabeth married Thomas Stonor, but she is not the child represented in the portrait. The painting acquired its 'Gothick' picture frame in 1759 when the Great Hall was reduced in size and refurbished in a 'Gothick' manner.[257]

Inscriptions on children's portraits mostly record age and year, so in portraits with more than one child they distinguish each child from its siblings and identify its position within the family structure. They also reveal a desire to record an individual's progression through life's stages, as was noted in the case of Mary Phesant's portrait (Fig. 11, No. 106). The musician Thomas Whythorne stated that one of his reasons for commissioning four portraits in the course of his life, was so that 'folk …from tym to tym [could] see ho tym did alter them'.[258] Occasionally inscriptions carry more weight, as in the assertion of rank in Lady Arbella Stuart's portrait. Inscriptions applied at a later date with biographical information of the kind we might expect to see now on a printed label or attached to the frame highlight the portrait's subsequent role in the narrative of the family's history. They suggest pride in the sitter's later elevated status, or in his reputation as the progenitor of a family dynasty.

2.4. Conclusion

This chapter has examined the formats employed in representing children in six categories of portrait and has identified those characteristics widely shared and

[256] As stated on the inscription. *Burke's Peerage* has the marriage date as 1651. Robert Stonor seems to have mistaken the first Elizabeth Neville, daughter of Mary Sackville, for the second. He states that the first Elizabeth Neville lived with her stepmother after her own mother died, but she would have been about forty years old to have married Thomas Stonor in the early 1650s. Robert Julian Stonor, *Stonor: a Catholic Sanctuary in the Chilterns from the Fifth Century till Today*, 2nd edn. (Newport: R.H. Johns, 1952), p. 277
[257] Garnett, *Stonor*, p.10
[258] Osborn, *Whythorne*, p.134

those that seem to be exceptional. In the literature on child portraiture, scholars mostly attend to examples where the identity of the sitter is known. This helps to flesh out the context in which a portrait may be read, having the advantage of the 'back story' of biography. However, in this study, nearly a third of the portraits depict children who have no family name attached, which is why it is so important to examine these images as well. This study would be distorted without them. Although *Three Unknown Jacobean Children* (1613) does not represent the children of James I, this does not diminish its value as a primary source, both for imagining the lives of these aristocratic young people and for understanding the portrait's role as a record of parental pride and expectations.

Although it is known that portrait ownership existed among people who would not be classed as noble or even gentry, it is difficult to distinguish any portraits in this corpus that are not of privileged children.[259] While portraits themselves were relatively inexpensive commodities – representing a fraction of the value of other luxury items such as textiles and plate – the clothes and jewels worn by the child sitters in these images most certainly were not.[260] At the very least, some children may be from mercantile or professional families, but to extend portrait patronage to include one's children suggests aspirational parents who identified with the cultural customs of the social elite.

Portraits of individual children in category (1) make up the largest proportion in the corpus and it is no surprise that the majority represent boys. Coincidentally in sibling portraits in category (2) the numbers happen to be equal. From this we may conclude that a boy is more likely than his sister to be privileged with his own individual portrait. Although, as we have seen, the Earl of Bedford commissioned a set of half-length portraits of his children in 1627, the heir William Russell (1616-1700) – later first Duke of Bedford – did not feature in the set. Instead, even though the eleven-year-old boy was, like his siblings, portrayed by Johannes Priwitzer, his portrait is a grand full-length image, with a dwarf in

[259] Susan James's examination of Elizabethan wills has revealed that panel paintings were owned by 'all but the very poorest classes.' Susan E. James, *The Feminine Dynamic in English Art, 1485-1603: Women as Consumers, Patrons and Painters* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009), p. 49

[260] The question of whether the costume worn by children in their portraits represents their actual clothes is discussed in Chapter 3, p. 84-85 and note 273

attendance.[261] Notwithstanding the literary evidence for the devotion many fathers expressed towards their children in the early modern period, fathers are far less visible than mothers in portraits of children, either with a son, or in a family group.[262]

There is a consistency of compositional format, posture and placement across all the images comparable to the visual similarities that one might observe in modern family photographs of children: the individuals adopting similar dress-codes, hairstyles, postures, and possibly the same accessories too. In the period covered by this study, painters were not required to create innovative compositional arrangements. By and large, tradition and uniformity were favoured. It conferred a collective identity among family members and, more broadly, among members of a social class. Therefore painters tended to follow established patterns in child portraiture with only minor adaptations at the patron's behest. What choices did the Elizabethan and Jacobean painter have? The following chapters investigate further the visual conventions in the representation of children and show how they expressed and reinforced moral virtues and contemporary values.

[261] Johannes Priwitzer, *William Russell, 1st Duke of Bedford* (1627). Woburn Abbey.
[262] For just one example see the letters Robert Sidney, first Earl of Leicester wrote to his wife while his children were young. Margaret Hannay, Noel J. Kinnamon and Michael G. Brennan, *Domestic Politics and Family Absence: The Correspondence of Robert Sidney, First Earl of Leicester and Barbara Gamage, Countess of Leicester* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005). See also Linda Pollock, *A Lasting Relationship, Parents and Children Over Three Centuries 1600-1900* (London: fourth Estate, 1987), p. 73

Chapter 3: Gender, Status and Identity

3.1 Introduction

In 1613 three children were painted in an interior setting with assorted objects displayed around them (Fig. 20 No. 101). It was noted in Chapter 2 that *Three Unknown Jacobean Children* (1613) could not depict the royal offspring of James I.[263] Their names are unknown and likely to remain so, yet the portrait discloses a significant amount of social and cultural information. In addition to the date, the children's ages – five, two and four – are inscribed above their heads. All are luxuriously and fashionably dressed. The child on the left is in petticoats (the 'small coats' or gowns worn by all young children).[264] However, the child wears clothes and accessories that are masculine-gendered: this is a boy. He has a doublet (jacket), a short dagger is attached to a girdle, his hat rests on a stool beside him and his gloves are on the floor. The child on the right has a hairstyle and a floral decoration, a low-necked bodice and looped gold chains, all of which are distinctively feminine. The youngest child (centre) is dressed in clothes less overtly gendered. The accessories that accompany these children consist of objects from their everyday lives: the silver-mounted coral teething stick, the walking frame, the doll, the ball, and the playing cards. The puppy could be a family pet. The furnishings – draped curtains, upholstered stool and finely carved chair – are objects of status and wealth. In this portrait, the indicators that define gender, social status and identity are distinctive and as unequivocal as any in images of adults. They consist of costume, accessories, background props and the placement of the sitters. This chapter investigates such features and characteristics in portraits that affirm gender roles and identities, contemporary mores, familial identities and social status. Documentary evidence from education and behaviour manuals, memoirs and letters will complement the discussion of exemplary portraits.

---

[263] Chapter 2, pp. 77-78

[264] 'Short coats' or simply 'coats' was the ankle-length garment with a full skirt worn by children from about a year old; Huggett and Mikhaila, *Clothes and the Child*, p. 17

3.2 Gender

The patriarchal society of Elizabethan and Jacobean England sharply defined gender roles, reinforced by education and conduct manuals, and affirmed in personal documents such as memoirs and letters. Conduct manuals were either directed to the nurture of all children or primarily to the upbringing of boys, who were destined to head households and be likely to undertake duties and responsibilities in spheres of public life.[265] A child's gender identity was moulded from birth. In later life, for example, Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle (1623?-1673), reflected that 'the breeding of men were after a different manner of ways from those of women', which accounted, she noted, for her inability to describe in any detail the early 'breeding' of her brothers.[266] Elizabeth Joscelin, fearful of dying in childbirth, addressed *The Mother's Legacie, To Her Unborne Childe* (1624) to the baby she was bearing. In this she imagines first that the child is a boy and then secondly that it might be a girl, explaining to her daughter that 'thou shalt see my love and care of thee and thy salvation is as great, as if thou wert a sonne, and my feare greater'.[267] Painted portraits not only record visible distinctions between boys and girls in clothes and accessories they also stress the superior status of the former.[268] Moreover, as portraits chart the progression of children from one age to the next, it is apparent that each stage was subtly gendered.[269]

In 1602, Sir Walter Raleigh (1554-1618) commissioned his portrait to include his eight-year old son, also Walter (1593-1618), standing beside him (Fig. 25, No. 128). Young Walter's clothes, though less opulent, are practically a match with his father's, as are his masculine accessories – hat, gloves, sword and girdle. These accessories were accoutrements not only for elite boys after they were

---

[265] Rare exceptions are Vives, *The Instruction of a Christian Woman* written for Princess Mary and first published in England by Richard Hyrde in 1540. Watson Foster (ed.), *Vives and the Renascence Education of Women* (London: Edward Arnold, 1912). Richard Mulcaster, *The Training up of Children* (London, 1581)

[266] Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle, 'A True Relation of My Birth, Breeding and Life', in Sylvia Bowerbank and Sara Mendelson, (eds.,) *Paper Bodies: A Margaret Cavendish Reader* (Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 2000), p.43

[267] Joscelin's book, written in 1622, is primarily concerned with her child's spiritual welfare. Elizabeth Joscelin, *The Mother's Legacy, To Her Unborn Childe, 1624,* ed. by Jean LeDrew Metcalfe (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), pp. 57-59

[268] Nigel Llewellyn makes a similar point about tomb sculpture. Llewellyn, *Funeral Monuments*, p. 282

[269] Huggett and Mikhaila, *Tudor Child*, pp. 21-22

breeched, but seemingly for infant boys too.[270] Walter's hair is cropped short and swept back from his forehead. He is positioned on the left of his father in a posture, elbow akimbo, that mirrors his. This portrait is paradigmatic of the features that inscribe masculine superiority.

Clothes are the most informative signifiers of gender. The quintessential manual of gentility, Castiglione's *Il Libro del Cortegiano* (1528), published in English in 1561, asserts the importance of clothes as a key element in self-fashioning and identity: a man 'ought to determine with himself what he will appeare to be, and in such sort as he desireth to be esteemed, so apparel himself, and make his garments helpe him to bee counted such a one'.[271] From such evidence as survives in contemporary accounts and inventories, there is good reason to think that the costume and jewellery depicted in portraits actually belonged to the sitters: likely not to be worn every day, but more probably on significant occasions.[272] Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass note that Nicholas Hilliard in his treatise *The Arte of Limning* (c1598) devotes considerable space to describing his techniques for representing the fabrics and jewellery worn by his sitters as his skill in this important feature of his miniature portraits was especially valued. They argue that 'these portraits then are…mnemonics to commemorate a particular extravagant suit, a dazzling new fashion in ruffs, a costly necklace or jewel'.[273] They also observe that portraits were often inventoried, not by naming the sitter, but by a description of the sitter's clothes.[274] In two extant portraits of Richard Sackville, third Earl of Dorset (1590-1624), a whole length canvas by William Larkin (1613) and a miniature by Isaac Oliver (1616), we can identify with reasonable certainty the extraordinarily lavish clothes he wears from an

---

[270] See below pp. 85-87

[271] Quoted in Susan Vincent, *Dressing the Elite: Clothes in Early Modern England* (Oxford and New York: Berg, 2003), p. 79

[272] Aileen Ribeiro, *The Gallery of Fashion* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 2000), p. 11. Janet Arnold has no doubt that Queen Elizabeth wore the costumes as they appear in her portraits, but ascribes her failure to find an exact match with the documents to the fact that as numerous alterations were made to the multiple parts of her clothing, it is difficult to trace them with any certainty. Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, p.14

[273] Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 34-38

[274] Jones and Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing*, p. 40

inventory and contemporary accounts.[275] If the portraits of adults do in fact record the actual clothes and jewels they owned, it could be that children's portraits did the same. Nonetheless, these are almost certainly 'best' or formal clothes, comparable to the clothes which present-day children might wear for a wedding. Huggett and Mikhaila assert that elite children wore, for every day, other clothes whose function was solely practical.[276]

Susan Vincent argues that the clothes worn by the elite were not merely functional articles, nor simply items to display wealth: they also predisposed the wearer towards particular modes of behaviour and thought.[277] This conditioning started early. Gendered clothing is most evident in older children, yet it may also be traced in the garb of younger ones. Lady Anne Pope's three children, Thomas, Henry and Jane Wentworth were under seven years old when they were portrayed with their mother in 1596 (Fig. 23, No. 124).[278] Jane (b.1592), who is about four years old, wears a stiffened bodice terminating in a point, with a deep fold of fabric at the hips that covers the ridge of her farthingale. The style of her clothes is identical to those worn by adult women. Lady Anne's bodice would have terminated in a similar point below the waist, had not her pregnancy necessitated the loosening of her stomacher. Jane also wears a quantity of jewellery, including pearl earrings. Thomas (1591-1667), standing on the left, is obviously a boy, although, at five or six years old, he is still in petticoats. His doublet, which fastens down the front, echoes the style for gentlemen. At his waist is a fabric girdle to which a sword is attached. He no longer wears an infant's cap, and his hair is swept back from his face. Henry (1594-1644), about two years old, is dressed in the same fabric as his brother, including a girdle at his waist. Huggett and Mikhaila note that the girdle 'immediately distinguished an unbreeched boy from a girl' and, moreover, proclaimed his status as the son of a gentleman.[279] Henry's fine blond hair curls over his cap.

---

[275] William Larkin, *Richard Sackville, 3rd Earl of Dorset* (1613). The Suffolk Collection, Kenwood House. Isaac Oliver, *Richard Sackville, 3rd Earl of Dorset* (1616). Victoria & Albert Museum. No. 721-1882. Strong, *Artists of the Tudor Court*, pp. 166-167
[276] Huggett and Mikhaila, *Tudor Child*, p. 11
[277] Vincent, *Dressing the Elite*, p.4 and pp. 56-60
[278] The three children are from her first marriage to Henry Wentworth, third Baron Wentworth (1525-1584).
[279] Huggett and Mikhaila, *Tudor Child*, p.38

The Wentworth boys have not yet been 'breeched'. The age when the freedom of loose skirts was exchanged for trunk hose or breeches was not a fixed date in the calendar. It seems, from the evidence of dated portraits and personal testimony, to have taken place any time from about five to seven or even eight years old.[280] At eight years old, or in his eighth year, Bennet Sherard (1621-1699/70) still wears skirts under a doublet (Fig. 48, No. 85). Breeching marked the transition from the feminine world of mothers, nurses and babies.[281] It generally heralded the start of a regime of formal, and distinctively masculine, education with tutors. The letters between Sir Robert Sidney (1563-1626) and his wife concerning the education of their son, William (1590-1612) reveals attitudes typical among the Elizabethan elite. In April 1597, Sir Robert, who was Governor of Flushing in the Netherlands, wrote to his wife gently reminding her that their eldest son, William, should now have a tutor.

> For the girls, I cannot mislike the care you take of them: but for the boys, you must resolve to let me have my will. For I know better what belongs to a man than you do. Indeed I will have him lie from his maid [dry nurse], for it is time, and now no more to be in the nursery among women… But then I will have the boy delivered to his [the schoolmaster's] charge only, and not to have him when he is to teach him to be troubled with the women.[282]

Although the letters make no mention of William's breeching, we may assume that he is no longer in the skirts that he wore for the family portrait, dated 1596 (Fig. 13, No. 123).

Bennet Sherard (Fig. 48, No. 85) has a large white linen cloth – a muckinder (handkerchief) – attached by a ring to the girdle at his waist. This practical article seems to have been exclusive to boys and generally to have succeeded the apron

---

[280] Huggett and Mikhaila, *Tudor Child*, p. 31. Vincent, *Dressing the Elite*, pp. 57-59

[281] For a contemporary image of this female environment, see the scene depicted in Unknown artist, *Sir Henry Unton* (c.1596). NPG 710

[282] Margaret Hannay, Noel J. Kinnamon, Michael G. Brennan (eds.), *Domestic Politics and Family Absence: the Correspondence of Robert Sidney, First Earl f Leicester and Barbara Gamage Sidney, Countess of Leicester* (Aldershot: Ashgate), 2005), p. 104

and bib they had worn as babies and infants.[283] Some boys have just a small bib, such as the younger boy on the far left of *Unknown Lady and Children of the Aldersey Family* (c.1565) (Fig. 12, No. 113). Rowland Wandesford (b. c.1603), age four in 1608, also has a muckinder (Fig. 39, No. 41). His skirts have a deep fold at the hips, which may have covered a French farthingale or a padded roll, similar to the one worn by his ten-year old sister, Frances (Fig. 38, No. 40). The masculine features of his costume are the girdle and the rounded shape of the doublet which, unlike Frances's bodice, does not terminate in a point.

In 1623 the Earl of Bedford commissioned a sibling portrait of his three-year old son, John Russell (1620-1687), with his five-year old sister, Margaret (1618-1676) (Fig. 49, No. 107). John wears a bibbed apron over his skirts and a fabric girdle round his waist. A quiff of hair emerges from his cap. His appearance may be compared with two-year old Robert Lucy in the portrait with his siblings (Fig. 2, No. 103), also wearing a bibbed apron and with a similar quiff (or curl) quite distinctly shown. Robert's infant brother Richard (c.1619-1677), who is probably under a year old, has the bibbed apron, but not the curl. Such evidence from portraits indicates that, at the turn of the sixteenth century, and in the first couple of decades of the seventeenth century, this distinctive hairstyle is a male signifier for infant boys between one and about three years old.

The portraits tell us that girls, from about the age of four, wore clothes that closely mirrored adult styles. Margaret Russell wears the fashionable adult clothes of the 1620s.[284] The shape of Margaret's bodice would have been provided by a 'pair of bodies', a garment stiffened by whalebone. Lady Anne Clifford recorded: 'The 28th [April 1617] was the first time the Child [daughter, Margaret] put on a pair of Whalebone Bodice'.[285] She was just under three years old. The three older Tollemache sisters wear clothes that subtly distinguish their ages (Fig. 19, No. 105). On the left, Elizabeth the eldest, who is about four, wears a simplified version of adult costume and a quantity of jewellery – the headdress, earrings and bracelets. Next is Katherine about three years old and Anne aged about two. Although they have identical fine lace-trimmed aprons over their skirts, the age

[283] Huggett and Mikhaila, *Tudor Child*, p.27
[284] For example, *Mary Sidney, Lady Wroth* (c.1620), attributed to John de Critz. Reproduced in Strong, *English Icon*, p. 267, no. 254
[285] Clifford, *Clifford*, p. 55

gap is subtly discernible. Katherine's hair is longer for example. Anne's bonnet fastens beneath her chin, as does that of her baby sister, Susannah, a few months old and wrapped in a red bearing cloth decorated with gold thread.[286]

In addition to what children wear, the objects accompanying them in their portraits are clearly gendered. Toys associated with small boys include spinning tops with whips, battledores and shuttlecocks and tennis racquets. Francis Willoughby (1613/14-1666) holds a tennis racquet and ball in his portrait with his mother (Fig. 15, No. 142). Sir Thomas Elyot approves of tennis as a good exercise for 'yonge men' despite being more violent than shooting 'by reason that two men playe'.[287] As an accessory it confirms the little boy's status, as tennis was especially popular at court. The equivalent of these toys for girls is a doll. Lady Arbella Stuart's doll is dressed in a fashion of about a decade earlier than her portrait, dated 1577 (Fig. 45, No. 5). Like other dolls that feature in portraits, it may have once been a fashion doll.[288]

Games also figure in portraits of young children as they do in instruction manuals. There are playing cards and a ball on the floor of *Three Unknown Jacobean Children* (1613) (Fig. 20, No. 101). Sir John Harrington classifies 'pastymes' according to their comparative elements of chance and skill: 'chaunce with some use of witt, as in cardes and tables (backgammon)' and added 'the trew use of play [is] to recreat the speryts for a short tyme, to enable them better to seryows and wayghty matters.'[289] As for board games, Elyot considers that 'the chesse of all games…is most commended… thereby the wytte is made more sharpe, and remembrance quickened.'[290] Lord Windsor's younger sons play cards, while the two older ones are engaged in a game of chess (Fig. 14, No. 153). The logical and strategic mind required for chess was considered a masculine attribute and

---

[286] See also *called Ladies of the Cholmondeley Family with their babies* (c.1600) (Fig. 32, No. 164). Bearing-cloths were worn for christenings and were usually red. There is evidence from portraits and elsewhere, that babies were wrapped in bearing clothes on later occasions too. They may be 'best' adornments brought out especially for a portrait. Huggett and Mikhaila, *Tudor Child*, p. 17.
[287] Rude, *Elyot's 'Governor',* p. 108. Marcia Vale, *The Gentleman's Recreations: Accomplishments and Pastimes of the English Gentleman* (Ipswich: Brewer, 1977), p. 100-102
[288] Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe*, p. 157
[289] John Harrington, 'A Treatise on Playe' in *Nugae Antiquae, being a collection of original papers in prose and verse…*, selected by H.H., I, (London: 1804) p. 189, p. 202
[290] Rude, *Elyot's 'Governor*, p. 107

although it is known that women played chess, portraiture is silent on the matter.[291]

Accessories associated with martial activities occur in many portraits of boys. They carry swords, rapiers, daggers and bows and arrows, which are all weapons with chivalric origins. Rowland Whyte, Sir Robert Sidney's agent, reported from Richmond Palace on 5 January 1599/1600, that the queen 'has bestowed vpon 200 (code for Sir Robert Cecil) Sonne, a gallant faire Boy, a Coate, Girdell, and Dagger, Hatt and Feather, and a Jewell to weare yt'.[292] Sidney's own son, William, is similarly accoutred in the portrait with his mother and siblings (Fig. 13, No. 123). Roger Ascham published *Toxophilis* in 1545, which commended the practice of shooting with the long bow and later, *The Scholemaster,* written in the 1560s, listed among the essential accomplishments of a gentleman, 'to plaie at all weapones: to shote faire in bow'.[293] The long-bow had ceased to be the quintessential weapon of warfare, but archery was still resolutely recommended for gentlemen.[294] As late as 1607, James Cleland urged that 'al Nobelmen and Gentlemen vnto whom chieflie the honour or dishonour of warfaire redoundeth, shoulde entertaine this pastime of Shooting in the next place vnto Riding of great horses.[295] Two-year old Henry Wentworth holds a bow and arrow (Fig. 23, No. 124), as does Robert Lucy, who is about four years old, standing on a stool on the far right in the large family portrait of the mid-1620s (Fig. 3, No. 157). Moreover, daggers, bows and arrows, like balls and spinning tops were also children's toys, like toy guns, trains, cars and tractors are for today's children.

On a par with archery, 'hawking is the common sport with the gentry', as the German lawyer Paul Hentzner observed during his visit to England in 1598.[296]

---

[291] Miranda plays chess with Ferdinand in *The Tempest,* V, 1**.** William Shakespeare, *The Tudor Edition of William Shakespeare: the Complete Works,* ed. by Peter Alexander (London and Glasgow: Collins, 1961), p. 24. Anguissola's portrait of her sisters playing chess may be unique in Renaissance portraiture. Sofonisba Anguissola, *The Chess Game* (1555). Muzeum Narodowe, Poznan.

[292] Arthur Collins (ed.), *Letters and Memorials of State in the reigns of Queen Mary, Queen Elizabeth, King James, King Charles the First, Part of the Reign of King Charles the Second and Oliver's Usurpation*, 2 (London, 1746), p. 156

[293] Roger Ascham, *The Scholemaster* (Menston: Scholar Press, 1967), p. 19. The book was published posthumously in 1570.

[294] Vale, *Gentleman's Recreations*, pp. 58-60

[295] Cleland, *Noble Man*, p. 219

[296] Paul Hentzer, *A Journey into England by Paul Hentzner in the Year MDXCVIII* (Strawberry Hill, 1757), p. 88

Richard Brathwaite's popular etiquette manual, *The English Gentleman*, recommends '*Recreations* more virile, wherein I will bee briefe…. In this rank may be numbred *Hunting* and *Hawking*, pleasures very free and generous, and such as the nobles dispositions have naturally affected'.[297] The vignette in the top right corner of the frontispiece depicts a gentleman with a hawk and hunting dogs (Fig. 68). Hawking was an exclusive and costly sport, requiring the services of a falconer to train and maintain the hawks, and in English portraiture gentlemen are depicted with their hawks from early in the sixteenth century.[298] There are several portraits in the corpus where boys have hawks. For example, the unbreeched boy on the right in *Six Unknown Jacobean Children* (1625) has a falcon perched on his arm (Fig. 50, No. 108). Hunting was both a sport for gentlemen and also recommended as a preparation for the hardships of warfare.[299] An unknown boy is depicted with his bow and arrow, dogs at his feet, against the background of a distant chase (Fig. 17, No. 20), in a portrait dated 1596. The sports of hawking and hunting were also enjoyed by royal and elite women in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Mildred Cooke, Lady Burghley (1526-1589), for example, owned an Irish goshawk and kept a longbow for recreation.[300] However, in easel painting, the earliest known reference to women's participation in hunting is *Queen Anne of Denmark* (1617) by Paul van Somer, in which the queen is dressed for the chase with hounds beside her.[301] The pendant portraits of Prince Henry and Princess Elizabeth painted by Robert Peake in 1603 were noted in Chapter 2.[302] Whereas the princess is wearing court dress, with a hunt in action in the far distance, Prince Henry is shown with the stag he has slain lying at his feet.[303] It is another reminder that depiction in portraits was constrained by specific codes of representation.

---

[297] Richard Brathwaite, *The English Gentleman* (London, 1630), p. 197
[298] For example, Hans Holbein, *Robert Cheseman* (1533). Mauritshuis, The Hague.
[299] Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995), p. 133
[300] Pauline Croft (ed,), *Patronage, Culture and Power: The Early Cecils* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002), p. 284
[301] Paul van Somer, *Queen Anne of Denmark* (1617) by Paul van Somer. Royal Collection. RCIN 405887
[302] See p. 49, note 127
[303] Robert Peake, *Princess Elizabeth, later Elizabeth of Bohemia* (1603). National Maritime Museum, Greenwich. Robert Peake, *Henry, Prince of Wales with Sir John Harrington* (1603). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

A further marker of masculinity is the printed book. The portrayal of a gentleman holding a book signifies masculine knowledge and privilege, and, in combination with a sword, denotes aristocratic authority.[304] The anonymous writer of *The Office of Christian Parents* (1616) advises that between three and seven years old, 'the children looke for a booke to read and write'.[305] The parents of one three-year old boy have taken this advice to heart, as he is shown with a horn book (Fig. 22, No. 110). In another portrait, a seven-year old boy holds an open book, although it has not been possible to identify the text (Fig. 51, No. 14).[306] The extent of the education provided for upper-class girls varied according to parental attitudes, but they were expected to be literate. Juan Vives was clear on that point, 'let her both learn her boke', because, he opined, 'we shall find no learned woman that ever was ill [evil]'.[307] However, Vives is adamant that a woman should not demonstrate her learning 'abroad and shake off her demureness'. In company she should 'hold her tongue'.[308] Indeed, some Elizabethan and Jacobean women were as learned as their brothers, but if a girl showed intellect it could be problematic.[309] Therefore books do not feature in portraits of young girls.

The accomplishments expected of aristocratic and gentry women are itemised by the fictional Lady Ri-Mellaine, the 'grande dame' of Peter Erondell's language manual, *The French Garden* (1605). She summons her daughters to the 'gallerie' to inspect their tapestry cushions and then questions them about their masters in French, singing and dancing, and playing the lute and viola da gamba.[310] Fine needlework in the form of embroidery and tapestry was a quintessential accomplishment for women and considered the essence of femininity.[311] Several

---

[304] Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (eds), *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 15-16
[305] Anon, *Christian Parents* , p. 64
[306] The portrait is known to me from a photograph, which is not sufficiently clear for the text to be identified.
[307] Foster , *Vives*, p. 43, p. 49
[308] Foster, *Vives*, p. 55
[309] Among the most exceptional examples are Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke (1561-1621) and her niece, Mary Sidney, Lady Wroth (1587-1653). Caroline Bowden, 'The Notebooks of Rachel Fane: Education for Authorship?', in *Early Modern Women's Manuscript Writing,* ed. Victoria Burke and Jonathan Gibson (Ashgate: Aldershot, 2004), p. 160
[310] M. St Clare Byrne, (ed.), *The Elizabethan Home Discovered in Two Dialogues by Claudius Hollybrande and Peter Erondell* (London: Methuen, 1949), p. 43
[311] Susan Frye, 'Sewing Connections: Elizabeth Tudor, Mary Stuart, Elizabeth Talbot and Seventeenth-Century Anonymous Needleworkers' in *Fashion: Critical and Primary Sources*, 1,

early seventeenth-century portraits depict older girls, like Frances Wandesford, displaying examples of their skill (Fig. 38 No. 40). Music also appears, considered to be a desirable female accomplishment.[312] In one example a six-year-old girl holds a part book (Fig. 52, No. 11). However, the errors in the notation would make it impossible to sing and suggests that the painter has not copied a genuine score, but was required to give an impression of one.[313] In the sibling portrait, *Four Children Making Music* (late 1560s) the girl is accompanying her brothers on the virginals (Fig. 21, No. 93). The unique visual evidence for an elite girl's education and accomplishments occurs in a monumental mid-seventeenth century painting, *The Great Picture* (1646), a triptych commissioned by Lady Anne Clifford, Countess of Pembroke and Montgomery (1590-1676) (Fig. 67).[314] The left wing documents retrospectively the learning and accomplishments of Lady Anne at the age of fifteen. She stands in a room surrounded by objects. A lute is propped against a table on which is displayed a musical score and a sampler of fine needlework. Books overflow from the shelves to the floor, among them works by Ovid, Chaucer and Cervantes and fictive portraits of her governess and tutor are hung on the wall. In this autobiographical image, we see evidence not only of Anne's refined accomplishments, but exceptionally, pride in her erudition. No Elizabethan or Jacobean parent would consider a portrait to be an appropriate locus in which their daughters should display learning.

The universal accessory for a baby of either gender is the silver rattle and bells which incorporates a stick of red coral. The rattle-cum-teething stick is generally suspended from a chain, or red ribbon, hung round the neck. This is seen in many portraits of infants aged from about nine months to roughly two years old.[315]

Late Medieval to Renaissance, ed. by Peter McNeil (Oxford and New York: Berg, 2009), p. 276, note 1.

[312] Tessa Murray, *Thomas Morley: Elizabethan Music Publisher* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2014), p. 54

[313] Information kindly given by Tessa Murray.

[314] Jan van Belcamp (attrib.), *The Great Picture*, 1646. Abbot Hall Art Gallery, Kendall. For a critical analysis of the items in the painting, see Karen Hearn, "Lady Anne Clifford's Great Triptych" in 'Lady Anne Clifford: Culture, Patronage and Gender in 17th Century Britain' ed. by Karen Hearn and Lynn Tulse, *Yorkshire Archaeological Society*, Occasional Paper, no. 7, 2009 . The portrait is also discussed in Chapter 5 pp. 143-144

[315] See Appendix 1. Huggett and Mikhaila, *Tudor Child*, p. 4, p. 28. A wolf's tooth was sometimes substituted for coral.

Traditionally, coral was thought to have talismanic properties that protected the child from evil and physical harm. Although by this period the belief was regarded by some as mere superstition, coral's association with the well-being of babies still held sway.[316] Thomas Phaire (c1510-1560), who published *The Boke of Chyldren* (1544) the first treatise in English on paediatrics, recommended coral in combination with other preparations. His text was still widely read into the seventeenth century.[317] He advised 'redde coralle… hanged about the necke, wherupon the chylde shulde oftentymes labour his gummes… and is very good to be made in pouder & dronken agaynst all maner of bleedyng of the nose or fundament'.[318] Coral necklaces and bracelets were given to babies of both sexes, expensive items that often became treasured as family heirlooms.[319] Among the 'apparell and necessaryes' purchased for Lord Algernon Percy, later tenth Earl of Northumberland (1602-1668,) was 'a corrall with silver bells, ix s (9 shillings)'.[320]

Gender in portraiture was denoted also by posture, gesture and placement. The first published treatise in Western literature devoted to behaviour and manners was Erasmus's *A Handbook on Good Manners for Children* (1530), translated into English in 1532. Its extensive influence is measured by the many manuals published in the sixteenth century and beyond that drew heavily on its pronouncements.[321] Erasmus prefaces the treatise by identifying the four key elements for 'shaping the young': piety, knowledge of the liberal arts, preparation for the duties of an adult and 'fourthly, that from the earliest stage, the child becomes accustomed to good manners'.[322] It is this fourth element that forms the subject of his text. 'It is appropriate for a man to be well composed in mind, body, gesture and clothing', he continues, in order to make a good impression in society. 'Above all, good behaviour is most important in children, particularly

---

[316] Huggett and Mikhaila, *Tudor Child*, p. 28.
[317] Rick Bowers, *Thomas Phaer and 'The Boke of the Chyldren' (1544)* (Tempe, Ariz: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 1999), p. 10
[318] Bowers, *Phaer*, p. 52
[319] Ann Buck, *Clothes and the Child: A Handbook of Children's Dress 1500-1900* (Bedford: Ruth Bean, 1996), p. 59;
[320] G.R. Batho (ed.),*The Household Papers of Percy, Ninth Earl of Northumberland (1564-1632)* ed. by G.R. Batho (London: Royal Historical Society, 1962), p. 4
[321] Desiderius Erasmus, *A Handbook on Good Manners for Children*, trans. by Eleanor Merchant (London: Preface Publishing, 2008), p. xvii-xviii.
[322] Erasmus, *Good Manners*, p. 3

those born to privilege'.[323] The advice on 'Posture' is especially germane to the discussion here: 'It is proper to hold yourself upright and relaxed. The neck should tilt neither to left or right… unless the conversation or some such requires it'[324] and later, 'keep your knees together when you sit, *or just slightly apart, when standing* (my italics)'.[325] In 1630, Brathwaite provided an image for the frontispiece to *The English Gentleman* (Fig. 68) that depicts 'the Portraiture of a comely Personage drawne to the whole Body'.[326] Portraiture was the means through which such 'good manners', the outward form of good character and the superior mind, could be expressed in visual form.[327] Sir Walter Raleigh's elegant posture and gesture, the arm akimbo, strikes the pose described by Erasmus and illustrated by Braithwaite. It is a model that his young son emulates in their portrait (Fig. 25, No. 128). Boys from about five years old, even before they were breeched, are presented in this manner. Edmund Wyndham (c.1601-1683) stands beside his mother, Lady Wyndham, with his left hand on his hip and holding a hat in his right (Fig. 53, No. 130).

For women, bodily posture was equally important.[328] Castiglione expressed an opinion widely held that, 'above all I hold that a woman should in no way resemble a man as regards her ways, manners, words, gestures and bearing'.[329] In portraiture, as in life, women's passivity and modesty were expressed in meek attitudes with folded hands, or at least with hands that are close to the body, whether holding a fan or, as sometimes in the case of girls, displaying examples of fine embroidery.

The compositional arrangement of sitters in Elizabethan and Jacobean portraits was a matter of considerable forethought. The conventions reinforced gender

---

[323] Erasmus, *Good Manners,* p. 4
[324] Erasmus, *Good Manners,* p. 23
[325] Erasmus, *Good Manners,* p. 27
[326] Brathwaite, 'Frontispiece' , *The English Gentleman* (London:1630)
[327] Anna Bryson, 'The Rhetoric of Status: Gesture, Demeanour and the Image of the Gentleman in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century England' in *Renaissance Bodies:The Human Figure in English Culture c.1540-1660,* ed. by Lucy Gent and Nigel Llewellyn (London: Reaktion, 1990, pp. 141-44. Joaneath Spicer, 'The Renaissance Elbow' in *A Cultural History of Gesture: from Antiquity to the Present Day,* ed. by Jan Bremmer and Herman Roodenburg (London: Polity Press, 1991), p. 85.
[328] Zirka Z. Filipczak, 'Poses and Passions: Mona Lisa's "Closely Folded" Hands' in *Reading the Early Modern Passions: Essays in the Cultural History of Emotion*, ed. by Gail Kern Paster, Katherine Rowe and Mary Floyd-Wilson (Philadelphia : University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), pp. 68-88
[329] Quoted in Filipczak, *Passions,* p. 72

distinctions and confirmed male superiority. Portraits and monumental tombs generally follow the rules of heraldry: males have precedence on the senior 'right' side, ranked according to age.[330] Although there are exceptions, adult males are placed on the viewer's left (that is, the right side from the sitters' position) in portraits where there are two or more figures. Young Walter Raleigh stands on his father's left, but Edmund Wyndham is on his mother's right. In the majority of mother-and-son portraits, the boy stands on his mother's right side. The priority of placement is given to the male child, even over his mother. However, in two exceptions to this rule, where the boy is placed on his mother's left, the women are known to be widows with their eldest sons, heirs to their father's titles and estates. They are *Anne, Lady Cotton and John Cotton* (c.1621) (Fig. 28, No. 144) and *Frances, Lady Willoughby and Lord Francis Willoughby* (c.1619) by Paul van Somer (Fig. 15, No. 142).

Anne Hoghton, Lady Cotton (d.1671**)**, third wife of Sir John Cotton (1543?-1620/21), is depicted seated in the elegant garden at Landswade, Cambridgeshire, with her son, John (1615-1689) standing on her left.[331] She is dressed in black, wears a widow's hood, and the dark clouds massing overhead give the portrait a sombre air. Although a married woman was legally and personally subject to her husband's control, a widow enjoyed greater personal freedom, at least until, or if, she remarried. It was commonplace for a widow to have full management of the family patrimony and the responsibilities for bringing up under-age children.[332] This could account for the placement of these women in the superior position in their respective portraits. Sir John Cotton died intestate and the administration of his estate was granted to Lady Cotton.[333] So possibly a widow depicted with a young unbreeched son positioned on her left signifies her assumption of her husband's status in this regard, as guardian of her son's title and property during his minority.[334]

---

[330] Llewellyn, *Funeral Monuments*, p. 284
[331] For the garden see Strong, *Artist and Garden*, p. 45
[332] Wrightson, *English Society*, p.94; Barbara J. Todd, 'The Remarrying Widow: A Social Stereotype', in *Women in Social Society 1500-1800*, ed. by Mary Prior (London and New York: Methuen, 1985), p. 55; Crawford, *Blood, Bodies and Families*, p. 87; Houlbrooke, *English Family*, p. 209.
[333] P.W. Hasler, *The House of Commons 1558-1603* (London: H.M.S.O, 1981), 1, p. 662
[334] Todd, 'The Remarrying Widow', p. 69

Although her husband did not die intestate, another example is the striking image of Frances Manners, Lady Willoughby of Parham (1588-c.1643) depicted with her son, Francis (1614-1666) on her left. In 1617 Lady Willoughby had suffered two devastating bereavements. Her husband, the third baron Willoughby (1584-1617) died on 28 August and her eldest son, Henry the fourth baron (1612-1617), less than two months later on 14 October.[335] This probably influenced the manner in which she and her eldest surviving son, Francis the fifth baron, are represented by the Flemish painter Paul van Somer, recently arrived in London.[336] Lady Willoughby is depicted head in hand as the personification of melancholy.[337] Writing utensils and sheets of paper are pictorial tropes of melancholy, but here they may allude also to young Francis's learning. It was noted above, that his gender and breeding are affirmed by the tennis racket and ball. Lady Willoughby's grief at the loss of a husband and her first-born son is expressed by a posture also seen in tomb sculpture.[338] But her sorrow is not all-consuming. It is apparently mitigated by the expectations invested in the healthy boy beside her.

For sibling portraits, as noted in Chapter 2, the convention of placing boys on the left and girls on the right seems to have been less rigorously observed. However, it does hold true in *Four Children of Sir Thomas Lucy III* (1619) (Fig. 2, No. 103). Robert, the eldest boy (though younger than his sisters) is on the extreme left, followed by infant Richard. Next is Constance, the older sister taking priority over her younger sister, Margaret. However, in portraits that are exceptions to this rule of placement, other devices are employed to distinguish gender and assign masculine superiority. In *Six Unknown Jacobean Children* (1625), for example, the oldest boy is on the left, posed with his right hand on his hip, followed by his siblings in order of age, two girls and two brothers (Fig. 50, No. 108). One

[335] G.E.C., 12, part 2, pp. 705-709.
[336] He is recorded in London, December 1616. Hearn, *Dynasties*, p. 206
[337] The theme of melancholy appears in portraits of scholarly English gentlemen, associated with learning and the notion of world-weary intelligence. Strong, *Artists of the Tudor Court*, pp. 158-9. The erudite Lucy Harington, Countess of Bedford (1581-1627) is depicted in an identical pose. Unknown artist, *Lucy Harington, Countess of Bedford* (c. 1620). Private Collection. Karen Hearn, 'A Question of Judgement: Lucy Harington, Countess of Bedford as Art Patron and Collector' in *The Evolution of English Collecting: Receptions of Italian Art in the Tudor and Stuart Periods*, ed. by Edward Chaney (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003), pp. 232-34**.** Martin Spies discusses this portrait in Spies**,** 'Mother-and-Child Portraits', pp. 114-115.
[338] Llewellyn, *Funeral Monuments*, p. 101, p. 105

brother holds a bow and another has a falcon on his left wrist, his arm on his hip. The youngest child, a girl, is positioned in front of her sisters.

The placement of sitters crucially affirmed relationships between family members. In his group portrait of Barbara Gamage, Lady Sidney with her six children, the artist, Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger may have considered that lining up four girls in age order on Barbara's left would make for an awkward composition (Fig. 13 No. 123). Nonetheless his solution still confers pictorial priority to the boys. Barbara and her two sons form a visual triangle. William, the heir, is in the centre of the composition, his mother's hand on his shoulder. Though still in petticoats, his pose, hand on hip, distinguishes him from his siblings. In a more traditional portrait, Lady Tasburgh and her six children are standing in rows (Fig. 29, No. 133). Charles Tasburgh (1608-1657), is placed on his mother's right, and her hand is on his shoulder. He and his brother Cressy (b.1609) adopt masculine postures. Although there are exceptions, the evidence of portraits in this corpus, indicates that the established principles that guided the placement of sitters were more likely than not to be observed.

In the portrait group *William Brooke, 10th Baron Cobham and his Family* (1567), Lord and Lady Cobham occupy their respective sides of the portrait, with Lady Cobham on her husband's left (Fig. 1, No. 152). Three daughters, Margaret (b.c.1563) and twins Elisabeth (1561/2-1597) and Frances (1561/2-before 1623) are placed on their mother's side. The three sons (from left), Henry (1564-1619), William (1565-1597) and Maximilian (1560-1583), fit into a narrow space in front of their father. The heir, six-year old Maximilian is positioned directly in front of him. It is possible that one-year old William could have been inserted when the painting was nearing completion and an appropriate place had to be found.[339] He is out of scale with his siblings and the spatial relationship with the woman on the left is awkward. As this unidentified woman is on Lord Cobham's side of the portrait she could be kin to him.

Identifying the gender of unnamed infants can present problems, but the depiction of gendered attributes and the placement of sitters can be decisive. The portraits of named infants and of older unbreeched boys form a 'control group' which can,

[339] William Brooke was born on 11 December 1565.

with some confidence, identify the gender of some unknown children in the corpus. In a portrait dated 1622, Bennet Sherard (1621-1700), the son and heir of William, first Baron Sherard, stands beside his mother (Fig. 54, No. 145). He is about a year old, dressed in an infant's 'short coats' and he has a rattle-cum-teething stick hanging from a ribbon. However this tiny child stamps his authority in the portrait by virtue of the long stick grasped in his left hand and his placement on his mother's right side.[340] There are important points of similarity between his appearance and that of John Russell in the portrait, dated 1623, with his older sister, Margaret (Fig. 49, No. 107). They both wear white aprons with bibs and on their heads they have caps with a quiff or curl of hair combed over them.[341] They also inhabit the superior position in the portrait: as Bennet Sherard stands on the right of his mother and John Russell sits in a chair to the right of his sister. The subtle distinctions in costume, accessories and portrait placement must once have been instantly recognisable to contemporaries. It could be likened to a modern viewer seeing a photograph of an infant dressed in blue and holding a toy tractor, assuming it to be a boy, and almost certainly getting it right. How can we know that the *Unknown Boy with Robin and Pansies* (1608) by Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger is, in fact, a boy (Fig. 55, No. 38)? This elite child wears a green velvet gown over a farthingale, with fine lace on his cap, ruff and cuffs. The key indicators of hair brushed up in front of the cap, and, just discernible by the right elbow, the hilt of a dagger attached to the girdle round his waist.[342] Sir Walter Raleigh's dagger is similarly visible by the hilt near his right arm (Fig. 25, No. 128).[343]

With these characteristic features of masculinity in mind, the identity of a child named by inscription or tradition may sometimes be questioned. In the portrait *Catherine Vaux, Lady Abergavenny and John Neville* (c. 1615-20) (Fig. 47, No. 137), it has been argued that the biographical evidence questions the traditional

[340] A portrait also dated 1622, depicts his father clasping his ceremonial battle-axe as a Gentleman Pensioner. Unknown artist, *William, first Baron Sherard* (1622). Private Collection.
[341] I am grateful to Jane Malcolm-Davies for discussing with me the distinguishing features between male and female infants as they appear in portraits.
[342] The portrait has recently been examined and conserved and it is evident that the dagger's hilt has always been there. Information from Annelise Hone, Collections and Exhibitions Manager, Compton Verney.
[343] A gentleman's sword hung on the left side of the body and his dagger on the right.

identification of the child as Elizabeth Neville.[344] In addition, the child has every appearance of being a little boy. The deciding factors are the quiff of hair in front of his cap, the muckinder (a masculine item) attached to the girdle at his waist and his placement on the right side of his mother.

3.3 Social status and identity

We see masculine superiority asserted and social status affirmed in the portraits of four-year old Richard Newdigate (1602-78) (Fig. 9, No. 36) and his two-year old sister, Lettice Newdigate (1604-25), (Fig. 10, No. 37). These portraits were commissioned in 1606, most probably as companion pieces. Had they had been portrayed on a single panel, Richard, whose body inclines slightly towards the right, would have been placed on his sister's right (left to the viewer), the superior side. He is located, it would seem, on the family estates, accoutred for hunting with a miniature hunting horn hanging at his waist, dogs at his side. Lettice, meanwhile, appears to have entered an interior space from an enclosed garden, a basket of flowers in one hand, a butterfly cupped in the other. Richard's masculine pursuits thus place him in the outdoors, beyond the house, while Lettice has walked no further than the enclosed ornamental garden, beside the house and easily surveyed. The portraits furthermore situate the children in an elite social class – one with game parks and pleasure gardens, showing that they enjoy the benefits of such a privileged world.[345] Similarly, the domestic interior visible in *Three Unknown Jacobean Children* (1613) (Fig, 20, No. 101), places the children in an environment of ease and high status. The finely carved chair, like the baby walker, is fashioned for young children, and the upholstered stool and draped curtains speak of elegance and comfort.

The religious upheavals of the mid-sixteenth century, and a change of dynasty in the early seventeenth, provided considerable opportunities for social advancement. In uncertain times royal service to successive monarchs brought

[344] See Chapter 2, pp. 78-79
[345] Roy Strong notes that 'gardens were considered appurtenances of splendour and magnificence' and comments on the garden in Lettice Newdigate's portrait. Strong, *Artist and Garden*, pp. 31-33

rewards of estates and titles and, as Robert Tittler has argued, there was a need by both the landed and the urban elite to define and establish legitimacy.[346] The scions of noble families, as well as those who had just recently acquired high status, exerted much effort and expenditure demonstrating their superiority.

Heraldic devices, with their link to genealogy, figure frequently in adult portraits, yet they are unusual in portraits of individual children or in sibling portraits unless they are later additions.[347] It is thus striking that family crests are included in two portraits of six-year-old girls, *Chrysogna Baker* (1579) (Fig. 56, No. 6) and *Unknown Girl Age Six with Carnation* (1580s) (No. 8). If these are contemporary with the portraits – and I have no evidence to the contrary – then we could infer that they function as signifiers of status to be read alongside the lavish costume and jewellery, thus presenting the girls as desirable marriage prospects. Sir Richard Baker of Sissinghurst (c.1528-1594) held considerable property in the Weald of Kent. In 1589, his daughter, Chrysogna (c.1572/3-1616) brought a dowry of £2,200 to her marriage with Sir Henry Lennard, heir to the barony of Dacre.[348] Although the family crest featured in *Unknown Girl Age Six with Carnation* cannot now be satisfactorily identified, the portrait leaves no doubt of the family's wealth and status.[349]

The importance of costume as an indicator of status and identity in portraits of this period cannot be over-stated. Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass explore the 'animatedness' of clothes.[350] They point out that clothing encompasses 'a world of social relations put upon the wearer's body'.[351] Contemporary household accounts testify to often phenomenal expenditure on clothes.[352] James Cleland echoed the texts of many a sermon when he warned that 'men should be as moderate in their raiment as in their diet. Then doubtless manie young gentlemen would have rents and possessions, where now they have

---

[346] Robert Tittler, *The Face of the City* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2007), p. 166.
[347] The heraldic features in *Robert Ridgeway* (1596) (Fig. X, No. Y) and *Four Daughters of Sir Lionel Tollemache* (c.1621) (Fig. X, No. Y) are later additions.
[348] G.E.C., 4, p. 12
[349] She is thought to be a member of the Prescott or Hewitt family. Christie's *Old Master & British Paintings*, 30/10/2014, lot 25.
[350] Jones and Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing*, p. 2.
[351] Jones and Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing*, p. 3
[352] Jones and Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing*, p. 21. See also Batho, *Henry Percy*, for detailed accounts of the expenditure on clothes by the ninth Earl of Northumberland over many years.

none.'[353] Clothes, vastly expensive commodities, were inventoried, bequeathed, re-cycled for other purposes, sold and pawned.[354] In 1572-73, the year that Sir Henry Sidney (1529-1586) paid £3 2s 6d for his full-length portrait, he also spent £14 12s 6d on fourteen yards of velvet.[355] George Gower's portraits of Sir Francis and Lady Willoughby cost different amounts in 1573, even though the panels were the same size: 'for the pycture of my Mr – Xs (10 shillings) and for my Mrs. pycture – XXs (20 shillings)'.[356] The double rate for Lady Willoughby's portrait was presumably due to the extra time and skill required to paint her stylish clothes and jewellery. In the enduring and portable form of a painted panel or canvas, the portrait's cultural value was not least as a vector for transmitting social status through the meticulous representation of luxurious costume and adornment.

Fine clothes were not simply a matter of exhibiting wealth. Social status was directly linked with clothing, indeed defined by it, through the sumptuary laws that were intended to control the consumption of certain cloths and furs by rank.[357] The statutes were constantly revised and meticulously detailed so that the broad category of 'gentry' was further stratified to distinguish between the higher rank of gentlemen with lands and annuities to the value of £100 a year, and those with less.[358] Women were included in the legislation when it was revised in 1574. Not only were specific fabrics and furs restricted to certain ranks, but even some colours were subject to restrictions.[359] An intense black was the most expensive dye to achieve and tended to be found only on imported fabrics whose purchase was either officially restricted to the higher ranks, or were beyond the means of all but the most wealthy: hence its prestige and its social importance. It is, significantly, the dominant colour in many sixteenth-century portraits, not only in

---

[353] Cleland, *Noble Man*, p. 215
[354] Vincent, *Dressing the Elite*, pp.190-1; Jones and Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing*, p.24
[355] Strong, *English Icon*, p. 50
[356] Strong, *English Icon*, p. 171. George Gower, *Sir Francis Willoughby* (1573) and George Gower, *Lady Willoughby* (1573). Wollaton Hall, Notts.
[357] N.B. Harte, 'State Control of Dress and Social Change in Pre-Industrial England' in ed. D.C. Coleman and A.H. John, *Trade Government and Economy in Pre-Industrial England: Essays Presented to F.J. Fisher* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1976), pp. 142-143. Maria Hayward, *Rich Apparel: Clothing and the Law in Henry VIII's England* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).
[358] Hayward, *Rich Apparel*, p. 29
[359] Clare Browne, ' "Silks, Velvets, Cloths of Gold and Other Precious Raiments": Clothing and Furnishing the Tudor and Stuart Courts' in *Treasures of the Royal Courts, Tudors, Stuarts and Russian Tsars*, ed. by Olga Dmitrieva and Tessa Murdoch (London: Victoria & Albert Museum Publications, 2013), p. 133

adult clothes, on which metallic thread and jewels can be seen to best advantage, but also in clothes worn by children. Lord Windsor's sons (Fig. 14, No. 153) and Lord Cobham's eldest son and daughters (Fig. 1, No. 152) are dressed in black, as are their parents and the two unidentified women included in the portraits. A contemporary viewer could, in short, identify the nuances of social rank in the portraits of children by the clothes on the sitters' backs. Although the sumptuary laws were repealed in 1604, the desire to maintain sharp distinctions between social groups persisted.[360]

It has been noted that sibling children are often dressed in matching clothes. Apart from the bibbed aprons they both wear, Robert and Richard Lucy are dressed in the same fabric as are Constance and Margaret (Fig. 2, No.103). Queen Elizabeth's tailor, Walter Jones was paid in 1592 'for making of two highe bodied gownes with Trianes facings, and stomachers of watchett velvet by us given to two of the ladie drurie her daughters'.[361] Had a portrait of Lady Drury's daughters been commissioned at the time, one may imagine they would have been depicted wearing the queen's gift of matching gowns. This would not have belied the individuality of each girl, but rather to have asserted their communal identity as members of the same family, in much the same way as bridesmaids today may wear dresses of identical fabric and possibly a matching style for the particular occasion of a wedding.[362]

Sometimes, however, the matching is gendered. For example, Charles and Cressy Tasburgh are dressed in identical fabrics that are different from those worn by their sisters, which also match (Fig. 29, No. 133). In the sibling portrait of six Jacobean children (Fig. 50, No. 108), matching fabric is employed to denote both age and gender. The two older boys wear clothes of a tawny brown colour. The youngest boy still in petticoats is identified as male by his doublet and masculine posture, yet wears clothes of the same scarlet fabric as his sisters. Here, each child's place in the family is demarcated: the youngest boy still inhabits the predominantly female world of his sisters.

---

[360] Harte, *State Control,* p.146

[361] Elizabeth Stafford, Lady Drury (d. 1600) was a Lady of the Bedchamber. Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe,* p. 103

[362] Ludmilla Jordanova, 'Visualizing Identity', in *Identity* by Giselle Walker and Elisabeth Leedham-Green (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p. 146

3.4 Conclusion

This chapter has begun my investigation of how childhood was conceptualised in portraiture in the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods. I have argued that the portrait, *Three Unknown Jacobean Children* (1613) (Fig. 20, No. 101), carries a weight of contextual material. These children's garments are both fashionable and opulent, and the interior furnishings elegant, all indicating a family of high status. By observing the gendered characteristics in portraits of named children, one can conclude that the child in the centre is a girl. As well as holding a doll, she wears a rosette on her left arm, as does her sister, a fashionable item in vogue during the second decade of the seventeenth century.[363] The puppy on a lead may be a family pet, like the exotic guinea pig held in the girl's arms in *Three Unknown Elizabethan Children* (c.1580) (Fig. 57, No. 95). However, dogs were known to be loyal, obedient and capable of training, and their appearance in portraits may also function as a metaphor for the effective upbringing of children as they do in many Netherlandish portraits of children in this period.[364] The next chapter takes a closer look at the objects – animate and inanimate – that layer the meanings of children's portraits.

[363] For example. William Larkin, *Mary Curzon, Countess of Dorset* (c.1610). Knole
[364] Bedaux and Ekkart, *Pride and Joy: Children's Portraits in the Netherlands 1500-1700* (Amsterdam: Ludion Press Ghent, 2000), pp. 19-20.

Chapter 4: Precedents, imagery and symbols

4.1 Introduction

This chapter begins by exploring the precedents for the forms of child representation in Elizabethan and Jacobean portraits, starting with a discussion of European portraits that could have been known in England. These are royal portraits and, to a greater extent, Netherlandish portraits, which would have been familiar to immigrant painters and to English people who had travelled to the Low Countries. The Habsburg royal families traditionally commissioned portraits of their children and at least one of these portraits is known to have been in London, probably as early as the mid-1520s.[365] Netherlandish portraits of royal and non-royal children are rich in objects with emblematic significance.[366] This characteristic feature is also found abundantly in English portraits and forms the substance of this chapter. It attempts to distinguish between the attributes that specifically signify gender and status as discussed in Chapter 3 and those objects that are emblematic and deemed to have symbolic meaning.

4.2 European royal children's portraits known in England

In the 1520s Henry VIII acquired two portraits of European royal children as diplomatic gifts. One portrait depicted the three children of the exiled Christian II, king of Denmark (1481-1559) and was painted by the Flemish artist Jan Gossaert in 1526 (Fig. 69). Multiple copies were made from this image.[367] A version of the

---

[365] Early Netherlandish examples are the half-length portraits of the children of Philip I of Castile. Master of the St George Legend, *The Three Eldest Children of Philip the Fair* (1502). Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna. Jacob Seisenegger, *The Five Eldest Daughters of the Emperor Ferdinand I* (1534). Museo Provinciale d'Arte, Trent. See Lorne Campbell, *Renaissance Portraits: European Portrait-Painting in the 14th, 15th and 16th Centuries* (New Haven and London:Yale University Press, 1990), especially pp. 44, 112, 196-7. This important study has many references to sixteenth century portraits of European royal and elite children.
[366] Bedaux and Ekkart, *Pride and Joy*, pp. 18-20
[367] Jan Gossaert, *The Children of Christian II of Denmark*, 1526. Royal Collection. RC1N 405782. There are seven known versions of this portrait. Bedaux and Ekkart, *Pride and Joy*, p. 90. It is

portrait was displayed at Whitehall Palace, as noted in the inventories of 1542 and 1547. In 1547 it was itemised as 'a Table with the pictures of the thre Children of the Kynge of Denmarke with a Curtayne of white and yellow sarcenette paned togither'.[368] The children are Prince John (1518-1532), in the centre, Princess Dorothea (1520-1562) on the left and Princess Christina (1522-1590) on the right, all dressed predominantly in unrelieved black, presumably in mourning for their deceased mother.[369] Cherries and quinces are pictured on a table in front of the children. Queen Katherine of Aragon was the children's great-aunt and this may account for the portrait's arrival in London probably about 1526-7 and the subsequent listing in Henry VIII's inventories. The other diplomatic gift, presented in 1526, consisted of two miniature portraits set within jewelled lockets. They depicted François I of France and his two young sons. These boys were being held as hostages in Madrid after the release of their father from Imperial captivity. Henry VIII, it was hoped, would continue his support of Francois I in his power struggle with the Emperor Charles V.[370] Unfortunately, these miniatures seem not to have survived nor can they be identified from any of the king's inventories.[371] The sole evidence for these portraits is their description in contemporary letters.[372]

How might these Continental royal portraits have influenced the development of child portraiture in England? No significant precedents were set by Henry VIII's portrait commissions. Only Prince Edward, later Edward VI (1537-53), the long-awaited male heir, was painted with any regularity. His first portrait was most probably Hans Holbein's famous image of the little boy painted soon after his

---

uncertain if the portrait now in the Royal Collection is the version acquired by Henry VIII. https://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/search#/7/collection/405782/the-children-of-christian-ii-king-of-denmark-1481-1559, accessed 24 Jan 2016

[368] David Starkey (ed.), *The Inventory of King Henry VIII*, 1, *The Transcript* (London: Society of Antiquaries, 1998), p. 237

[369] Isabel of Habsburg died in January 1526.

[370] The sources suggest that one miniature showed the king and that the other miniature depicted both his sons together. Roy Strong, *The English Renaissance Miniature* (Ashton-under-Lyne: Thames and Hudson, 1983), pp. 27-8. Lucy Wooding, *Henry VIII* (London and New York: Routledge, 2009), p. 117

[371] Miniature portraits of the 'the frenche kinge and the 'Frenche Queens' and other 'phiseonemies' are lisited. Starkey, *Inventory*, p. 204

[372] Strong, *Artists of the Tudor Court*, p. 35

second birthday clutching a gold rattle, a standard signifier for an infant.[373] The only symbolic attribute depicted in his later portraits is the red rose.

The earliest extant portrait of Princess Mary, later Mary I (1516-1558), is a miniature that cannot be dated later than 1526, and was probably linked to her betrothal to Emperor Charles V.[374] No such opportunities were afforded to Princess Elizabeth, who was declared illegitimate at the age of nearly three, in May 1536, when her mother was executed.[375] Moreover there seems not to have been any circumstance in which Henry VIII might wish to emulate either the Danish king, or the Habsburg rulers, and commission a group portrait of his children. The family portrait of 1545/46, in which the three children are represented with the king and Queen Jane Seymour, is undeniably about dynasty and the succession, a visual equivalent of the Third Act of Succession 1543, which reinstated both princesses in the line of succession.[376] It is worth noting that after Prince Edward's birth in 1537 there were no more royal children in England until the Stuart line in 1603.

If Henry VIII's nobles did commission easel portraits of their children following the example of the depictions of Prince Edward, these have not survived.[377] This echoes the situation in the Netherlands noted by Bedaux and Ekkart, where extant portraits of individual children or a sibling group, unconnected with royalty, are relatively rare before about 1580.[378] Although I have been unable to find a similar comprehensive study of child portraiture at this period other than *Pride and Joy* (2000), a search through online images of portraits in public collections appears to support the view that in other countries in Continental Europe, there is likewise a

---

[373] Hans Holbein the Younger, *Edward, Prince of Wales* (c.1538). National Gallery of Art, Washington. For a discussion of the portrait types for Edward VI see Strong, *Tudor and Jacobean Portraits* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 1969), 1, pp. 87-94.

[374] Lucas Horenbout (attributed), *Queen Mary I*, (c.1525). NPG 6453. Katherine Coombes, *The Portrait Miniature in England* (London: V&A Publications, 1998), p. 19. In 1521, Princess Mary was betrothed to Charles V, an arrangement which lasted until about 1525. John Edwards, *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2011), p. 16

[375] Patrick Collinson, 'Elizabeth I (1533–1603)',*ODNB*, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8636, accessed 23 Jan 2016]. The earliest extant portrait of Princes Elizabeth (later Elizabeth I) was painted when she was about thirteen. William Scrots (attrib.), *Princess Elizabeth* (c.1546). Royal Collection. RCIN 404444

[376] Unknown artist, *The Family of Henry VIII* (c.1545). Royal Collection. RC1N 405796

[377] Possibly the only exceptions are Holbein's 1541 miniature portraits of the sons of the Duke of Suffolk. See Chapter 1, note 13

[378] Bedaux and Ekkart, *Pride and Joy*, p. 8

noticeable increase in the number of surviving portraits of non-royal children towards the end of the sixteenth century. English circumstances may indeed, therefore, reflect a more general trend. One could thus conclude that easel portraits of their children did not feature among the possessions of the English elite until at least the 1560s. One of the earliest references may be the payment by Katherine Willoughby, Duchess of Suffolk (1519-1580), recorded in her household accounts in 1562 for portraits of her children from her second marriage.[379] If these portraits have survived, I have not been able to locate them.

4.3 Influences from Netherlandish Portraits

As noted, Gossaert's portrait of the Danish royal children was brought to England in about 1526 (Fig. 69). The compositional arrangement we see here – sitters grouped round a table set with fruit – is a formula commonly applied in Netherlandish group portraits.[380] An example from the 1560s is the large portrait group of the Flemish merchant Pierre de Moucheron (1508-67) and his family painted in 1563 (Fig. 70).[381] Pierre, his wife Isabeau de Gerbier, their eighteen children, their son-in law and first grandchild appear together. The image has compositional and emblematic features seen in English portraits throughout our period. An inscription centred on a plain background bears the date and the ages of Pierre and Isabeau. The ages of their descendants are also inscribed near each figure. Seniority within the family is shown by gendered placement (males on the left and females on the right) in what appears to be roughly descending age order. Faces are clearly visible and sufficiently individualised to suggest they were recognisable likenesses, and the painter has enlivened an inevitably regimented composition by a variety of hand gestures. One daughter is seated at the virginals. Here we have a tableau that could mirror to some degree the real world of sixteenth-century Antwerp and yet also contains emblematic meanings. These are

[379] Goldring, *Robert Dudley*, p. 16
[380] See Maerten van Heemskerck, *Pieter Jan Foppesz and his Family* (c.1530), Staatliche Gemäldegalerie, Kassel for an early example.
[381] Unknown artist, *Pierre de Moucheron, his Wife, their Eighteen Children, their Son-in Law, Allard de la Dale and their Grandchild*, 1563. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, SK-A-1537

conveyed by the fruits and flowers held by individuals, just as in the portrait of the Danish royal children. To offset the sumptuousness of the de Moucheron banquet and the elegance of the clothes and jewellery on display, the fruit and flowers draw attention also to the sitters' piety and hope for eternal salvation. The meanings that may be ascribed to the individual symbols will be discussed later in this chapter.

How did Netherlandish styles influence portrait production across the Channel? This may be inferred from various social and economic factors. Close diplomatic and commercial ties brought Englishmen frequently to the Netherlands where they took the opportunity to acquire paintings and sit for portraits.[382] Furthermore, immigrant painters from the Netherlands are known to have worked in England before the mid-sixteenth century.[383] However, their numbers swelled after the mid-1560s, as many fled religious persecution and/or the economic disruption that came with civil unrest in their native countries, although not all migrant painters settled permanently in England.[384] This trend continued into the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Certain well-known immigrant Netherlandish painters like Paul van Somer, acquired royal and noble patrons. Generally, they had workshops in London, and some English painters may have worked as their assistants or been employed as copyists. This would account for the many portraits in this period that cannot be attributed to a particular painter or workshop, but are evidently derivative of Netherlandish styles and compositional features.[385]

---

[382] An early example is Petrus Christus, *Edward Grimston,* (1446). National Gallery. L3

[383] Cooper and Howard, 'Artists, Patrons and Context', pp. 13-15

[384] Hearn, *Dynasties,* p. 91; Eric Jan Sluiter, 'The English Venture: Dutch and Flemish Artists in Britain 1550-1800' in ed. Juliette Roding et al, *Dutch and Flemish Artists in Britain 1550-1800* (Leiden: Pimavera Pers, 2003, pp. 13-14; Karen Hearn, 'Picture Drawer, born at Antwerp': Migrant Artists in Jacobean London' in *Painting in Britain,* pp. 204-15 and pp. 279-287

[385] Cooper and Howard, 'Artists, Patrons and Context', p. 15

4.4 Symbols and meaning

Before I explore the possible meanings associated with particular symbols, it is important to make clear how I use terms. A *symbol* is an object, animate or inanimate, that represents or recalls an abstract quality or concept. An *emblem* is the visual representation of an object that embodies a symbolic meaning. The specific meaning of *attribute*, as used here, is an object, animate or inanimate, that is characteristic of, or belonging to, or associated with an individual. Thus a rattle-cum-teething stick is an *attribute* for a young child and an *emblem* of infancy.

The function of the Elizabethan and Jacobean portrait was not solely to record physical likeness at a moment in time. The visual language of inscriptions, heraldic crests and symbolic objects inscribed on portraits added further meanings. Emblems and devices were favoured elements in English court culture: from literature to portraits, from embroidered textiles to garden flowers and ornaments, and in the most sophisticated of entertainments, the tournament and the masque.[386] Although the first emblem books did not appear in England until 1586, the taste for perceiving dual meanings in objects was a legacy from medieval culture.[387] However, raising questions about iconography and establishing how particular symbols were interpreted in sixteenth and early seventeenth century portraits is complex and challenging. In his analysis of symbolism in Netherlandish portraits, Jan Baptist Bedaux cautions against attributing too readily a specific meaning to any object in a painting.[388] Sometimes there does seem to be a specific symbolic association that can be identified in a particular object. However, symbolic objects are often multivalent and meaning is seldom fixed.[389] Bedaux is surely correct in suggesting that in order to enliven a family or children's portrait, the painter might select from a

[386] Rosemary Freeman, *English Emblem Books* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1970), pp. 1-4. Strong, *English Icon,* pp. 30-37; Strong, *Artist and Garden,* pp. 89-96. A masque entertainment is the central image in Unknown artist, *Sir Henry Unton* (c.1596). NPG 710
[387] Freeman, *Emblem Books,* p. 4
[388] Bedaux, *Reality of Symbols,* pp.15-16
[389] Susan Doran makes a similar point about symbols in 'Virginity, Divinity and Power: the Portraits of Elizabeth I' in *The Myth of Elizabeth,* ed. by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (Hampshire and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p. 177

range of visual metaphors in common use.[390] Without the evidence of the communication between a patron and the painter, it cannot be established conclusively whether the presence of a particular symbol or symbols was specifically requested. One should thus approach the matter of symbolism in these portraits with care, avoiding the pitfalls of misinterpretation.

What can be stated confidently, however, is that English children in Elizabethan and Jacobean portraits are frequently shown holding items of fruit, particular flowers and certain birds that had figured in religious imagery, or were known in secular literature or folklore. Flowers, birds and fruit would have naturally featured in the worlds of these children's lives, but the prominence given to an individual object held in a child's hand does often point to a symbolic meaning. By extension, certain objects became signifiers of childhood. Symbolic references can also be traced in other common accessories like puppy dogs and coral-tipped silver rattles. The puppy on a lead featured in *Three Unknown Jacobean Children* (1613) (Fig. 20, No. 101) may also have been intended to exhibit good upbringing. What is meant by the plethora of these objects, animate and inanimate that appeared in children's portraits, and how might they be interpreted?

There is no doubt of the extensive influence still prevalent from religious imagery. Ample evidence exists confirming that religious pictures did not disappear from English royal or aristocratic collections after they were removed from places of worship. Henry VIII's inventories list numerous religious paintings, including several that depict the Virgin and the Christ Child. One example is 'a Table with the pictures of our ladie and Christe suckinge and Joseph loking on a booke…' at Westminster Palace in 1547 (Fig. 73).[391] Detached from a religious building and placed in a secular domestic setting, these images were not considered idolatrous, as scholars such as Margaret Aston and Richard Williams have demonstrated.[392] Half a century later, the Calvinist theologian William

[390] Bedaux, *Reality of Symbols,* p. 103

[391] Starkey, *Inventory of Henry VIII*, Item 10599, p. 237. The description of the painting is similar to a design by Joos van Cleve of which there were many copies and variants produced by his Antwerp workshop. For example, Workshop of Joos van Cleve, *The Holy Family* (c.1615). Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. Accession No. 41.190.19 (Fig. 73)

[392] Margaret Aston, ' Gods, Saints and Reformers: Portraiture in Protestant England' in *Albion's Classicism: The Visual Arts in Britain 1550-1660,* ed. Lucy Gent (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995), p.199; Richard L. Williams, 'Collecting and Religion in Late Sixteenth-Century England', in *The Evolution of English Collecting: Receptions of Italian Art in the Tudor*

Perkins is unequivocal in his assertion that 'the scope and commandment of God [is] onely to forbid the making of images, in respect they are applied to Divine or religious vse' but 'when images are made for the beutifying of houses either publike or private, that serve onely for civill meetings' they are 'lawefull'.[393] In the Gallery at Hardwick Hall, there was a picture of 'Our Ladie the Virgin Marie' displayed alongside portraits of English, Scottish and French monarchs.[394] Religious paintings remained in royal and private collections, and new ones were even purchased by Protestant adherents, such as the Earl of Leicester, later in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as works of art.[395] It is evident that devotional paintings and the symbolism inscribed in them were still present in contemporary culture and readily available to be adapted appropriately for use in portraiture.

However, religious imagery was not the only source for the symbolism associated with children. As will be seen, some allusions derive from the Classical tradition and were known through Humanist literature familiar to the educated classes. The natural world of plants and birds provided rich sources for symbolism that appeared in folk-lore and legends. Indeed, some of these had been absorbed into the imagery applied to religious subjects.

Taking into account what Ernst Gombrich calls 'the dictionary fallacy' that 'cut loose from their context', for the unwary, 'symbols are [used as] a kind of code with a one-to-one relationship between sign and signification', I shall start with an analysis of a specific early example.[396] The imagery deployed in the portrait, *Lady Katherine Grey, Countess of Hertford and Lord Edward Seymour* (probably later 1560s) (Fig. 4, No. 114) is particularly rich in its associations and may provide clues as to how symbols were used more generally in portraits featuring children.[397] Fortunately, a plentiful resource of documentary evidence survives from the comparatively short life of Lady Katherine Grey, Countess of Hertford

---

and Stuart Periods, ed. Edward Chaney (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003), p. 162.

[393] William Perkins, *A Warning against the Idolatrie of the last times. And an Instruction Touching Religious or Divine Worship* (Cambridge: John Legat, 1601), p. 2

[394] Levey and Thornton, *Household Stuff*, pp. 49-50

[395] While in Antwerp in February 1582, the Earl of Leicester purchased religious narrative subjects. Goldring, *Robert Dudley*, Appendix III, [L7], p. 286

[396] E.H. Gombrich, *Symbolic Images*, (London: Phaidon, 1975), pp. 11-12

[397] This panel portrait is the subject of discussion, as miniatures are not included in the corpus. See Chapter 1, p. 16 and Chapter 5, p. 141

(1540-1568).[398] At the accession of Elizabeth I in 1558, Katherine became the heiress presumptive in accordance with Henry VIII's Will, which had excluded the Scottish royal line descended from his elder sister Margaret in favour of his younger sister Mary, Katherine's grandmother. Late in 1560, Katherine secretly married Edward Seymour, Earl of Hertford, and, when her pregnancy could no longer be concealed, the clandestine marriage was revealed to the queen. Consequently Katherine and her husband were incarcerated in the Tower of London and their son, Edward, was born there on 21 September 1561. In January 1562, the marriage was judged to be illegal and the baby declared illegitimate. The queen's life-threatening illness in October 1562 caused a crisis within government, not least because of her refusal to name a successor. Katherine's claim was widely supported, especially by the Protestant faction. An outbreak of the plague in London in the summer of 1563, necessitated Katherine's removal from the Tower and she was placed under close house arrest in the custody of her uncle Lord John Grey at Pyrgo in Essex. Here she sought to marshal sufficient backing to secure her freedom. In addition to petitions and letters, Katherine most probably commissioned the miniature from which copies were made. In these circumstances it is almost certain that the production of the portrait was politically motivated. It depicts all the key players in these events – Lady Katherine Grey, the infant Edward and Lord Hertford – in a manner that projects a message of legitimacy and succession.

The portrait of Katherine and her son, Lord Edward Seymour (1561-1612), is one of the earliest easel portraits to depict an English child. The sitters are quasi-royal: Katherine Grey was the granddaughter of Henry VIII's sister, Mary Tudor, Duchess of Suffolk (1496-1533). In addition, Katherine's husband, the Earl of Hertford (1539?-1621), is also included, depicted in the miniature portrait she wears as a locket. The circular format of the composition is contained within a square panel and it is identical in every particular to a round miniature portrait attributed to Levina Teerlinc (Fig. 71), which was most probably executed in the

[398] For the biography of Lady Katherine Grey, I have used Susan Doran, ' Seymour [Grey], countess of Hertford (?1540-68)', *ODNB,* [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25157, accessed 3 Jan 2016]

second half of 1563.[399] As the panel has not been subjected to scientific analysis, its date is not verifiable. However, it is likely to be a copy executed reasonably soon after the miniature. My argument for the dating of the miniature and the probable sequence of the copy and versions is discussed in Chapter 5.[400]

As far as is known, there are no extant English portraits, miniatures or panels which show a mother with her infant child earlier than the Belvoir miniature, of which our panel is an exact replica. As Martin Speis noted, the precedent for this composition is not to be found in secular portraiture, but rather in representations of the Virgin Mary and Christ Child, such as the painting described above in Henry VIII's inventory and the version now in the Metropolitan Museum, New York (Fig. 73).[401] The compositional formula of the Virgin-and-Child picture neatly accommodates Katherine holding her infant son. One would not expect to see her breast exposed as is the Virgin's in religious paintings where she is shown suckling the baby Jesus, but the manner in which she presents her son, crooked in her left arm as he reaches his right hand into her bodice is a telling visual comparison. Furthermore the issue of Lord Hertford's status, which was lower than the ranking of his wife and son, is solved by depicting him in a miniature portrait as an accessory.

The resonance of religious iconography in Lady Katherine Grey's portrait is enhanced further by the apple which her son holds and which is supported by his mother's left hand. Sir George Scharf, first director of the National Portrait Gallery, who saw the easel portrait at Petworth in 1863, thought that the fruit was, in fact, an orange.[402] The apple, like the cherries and quinces in the Flemish portrait of the Danish children, is another sacred symbol.[403] In Christian imagery, an apple or orange held by Adam is emblematic of sin as the fruit plucked by Eve

---

[399] Levina Teerlinc (attributed), *Katherine Grey, Countess of Hertford and Lord Beauchamp* (c.1563). Duke of Rutland. Belvoir Castle

[400] Chapter 5, pp. 141-142

[401] Martin Spies, 'The Portrait of Lady Katherine Grey and her Son: Iconographic Medievalism as a Legitimation Strategy' in *Intersections: Interdisciplinary Studies in Early Modern Culture*, 15, 2010, p.167

[402] NPG *Image files*, 'Lady Katherine Grey, Countess of Hertford'

[403] Cherry symbolism is discussed below. The quince held by the Christ Child is a symbol of the Resurrection: Mirella Levi D'Ancona, *The Garden of the Renaissance: Botanical Symbolism in Italian Painting* (Florence: Olschiki, 1977), p. 324

that caused the first humans to be driven from Paradise.[404] However, in the hand of the Christ Child, it is also the fruit of salvation.[405] As Christ is the new Adam, so traditionally the Virgin Mary is the new Eve and therefore an apple/orange in her hand may also be regarded as an allusion to redemption. The apple, spherical like a ball, is a metaphor for the universe and, like the orb it may be interpreted as a symbol of authority.[406] It is this combination – the sitters' ranked placement in the portrait and the allusions to religious emblems – which makes the political statement proposed above. Lady Katherine Grey is asserted as the legitimate heir to the throne (possibly even the lawful queen). Her son, of royal Tudor blood and positioned on her left as befits his lesser status, was born in wedlock and entitled to succeed her. The bond between *this* mother and her son is both maternal and quasi-monarchical. The emblematic apple/orange suggests that Katherine's Protestant lineage is England's salvation, and that, in the fullness of time, her regal authority will be transmitted to her son.[407] The portrait's significance here, as an example of English child portraiture lies in the characteristics it shares with Netherlandish art and the manner in which symbolism is used to convey meaning.

There are few portraits in which meanings may be proposed as confidently as in the image of the infant Lord Edward Seymour with his mother. As we have seen, the careful positioning of the apple/orange, so that both sitters are touching it, as well as the compositional design, has been borrowed from religious iconography. Such allusions reworked for secular purposes may not seem remarkable in portraits produced prior to the Reformation or in later portraits of Catholic sitters, but Lady Katherine's image fits into neither of these categories. Far from outlawing imagery that had appeared in sacred paintings, it seems that English Protestant patrons considered it appropriate for expanding the meanings of their portraits.

---

[404] Sometimes an orange is depicted in place of the apple. For apple symbolism see George Ferguson, *Signs and Symbols in Christian Art*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), pp. 27-8. D'Ancona, *Garden of the Renaissance*, p. 48

[405] It is worth noting that in many of the versions of the Holy Family produced by the van Cleve workshop, Christ holds an orange. For example, Joos van Cleve, *The Holy Family* (c. 1512-13). Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. 32.100.57

[406] See the shepherds' offerings in Martin Rose (ed.), *The Wakefield Mystery Plays* (London: Evans Brothers, 1967), p. 257

[407] I am not convinced by Spies's argument that Katherine is offering the apple to her son and therefore resigning her claim to the throne in his favour. Spies, 'Lady Katherine and her Son', p. 180

From the evidence of the corpus, more than half of the portraits depict children with objects that may be interpreted as symbolic.[408] If each symbol is individually counted, the overall number is much higher. However, it should also be remembered that some portraits are known to me only from photographic reproductions, so it has not always been possible to identify with certainty the object held in a child's hand. I shall begin by discussing examples of children depicted with items of fruit or flowers, the most familiar emblems in child portraiture. Next are birds and animals. Finally there are portraits with symbols that may be read in combination to produce meanings.

'The fruit of the womb', a metaphorical phrase which likens the child to the product of a fruitful marriage is encountered several times in Holy Scripture.[409] It can also denote good upbringing, for, just as the tree has to be cultivated to bring forth fruit, so too the child must be carefully nurtured.[410] Of all fruit, the cherry (or cherries) is most commonly found.[411] The cherry, a multivalent emblem in Christian iconography, is associated with the Annunciation, the Incarnation of Christ and with Paradise. The sources for the ubiquitous cherry are various. Its association with the Annunciation may derive from its early fruiting after winter, thus symbolising spring.[412] The red colour and juice also suggests blood and has Eucharistic associations with the Last Supper. In *The Second Shepherd's Play*, the baby Jesus is presented with 'a bob of cherries'.[413] The cherry is the fruit of Paradise and symbolises Heaven, but could also allude to fertility and childhood in general.[414]

Cherries appear frequently in Northern and Italian Renaissance religious pictures as fruit held by the infant Jesus, by the Virgin Mary or (in Netherlandish paintings) displayed before the Holy Family on a table or ledge (Fig. 73). In the portrait of the Danish royal children, cherries are laid out on the table and are also held by Prince John (Fig. 69). There is no gender distinction with cherries. In a

---

[408] See Appendix 1
[409] Psalm 127: 3, Deuteronomy 7:13, Isaiah: 13:18
[410] Psalm 1: 3. Bedaux and Ekkart, *Pride and Joy*, p. 242
[411] See Appendix I
[412] D'Ancona, *Garden of the Renaissance*, p. 90. Hall's *Dictionary*, p. 330. Ad de Vries, *Dictionary of Symbols and Imagery* (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co., 1974), p. 94. De Vries notes that the pregnant Virgin Mary requested cherries and berries.
[413] Rose, *Wakefield Plays*, p. 257
[414] Bedaux and Ekkart, *Pride and Joy*, p.112

group portrait it is generally the youngest child who is depicted holding cherries, as, for example one-year-old Robert Sidney does in the portrait with his mother and siblings (Fig. 13, no. 123). However, in the de Moucheron family portrait, several sitters are holding cherries including Pierre himself and his grandchild, thus suggesting a range of overlapping meanings (Fig. 70). In British portraiture, cherries maintained their significance as an emblem associated with infancy well into the eighteenth century. We find them, for example, in William Hogarth's portrait of the Graham children (1748), indicating that their resonance was still current at that date.[415]

Less frequently depicted than cherries, are grapes, pears and apples. Grapes, like cherries, also symbolise the Eucharistic wine.[416] A bunch of grapes held by a child references its mother's fertility – 'a blessing from God' – and her allotted role to bear and nurture children. Apart from the grapes laid on plates in the Cobham portrait, I have not seen grapes held by a child before the seventeenth century. In the portrait with his mother (c.1617), John Neville holds a bunch of grapes (Fig. 47, No. 137), as does the infant Thomas Smyth (c.1610) (Fig. 58, No. 45). In *Three Unknown Jacobean Girls* (c.1620), the oldest girl holds grapes, a reference to her future role, and women's prime function, as a mother of children (Fig. 59, No. 104).[417] The girl in the centre holds a pear, which seems, on evidence from the corpus, to be associated only with girls. As well as its function as a symbol of fertility, the pear can be a metaphor for the sweet taste of a virtuous life.[418]

The language of flowers was familiar from Christian art and from folklore. Pinks (gillyflowers or carnations) and roses are the most common. Both the rose and pinks are associated with the Virgin, denoting spiritual or pure love and the

---

[415] William Hogarth, *The Graham Children* (1748), National Gallery, London, NG4756. The baby reaches for the cherries held by his sister, which in this context may allude to the cherry as a fruit of Paradise, as it is known that he died before the portrait's completion. It could also reference the potential fertility of his elder sister. Judy Egerton, *The British School* (London: National Gallery Publications, c.1998), p. 138, p. 142

[416] D'Ancona, *Garden of the Renaissance,* p. 162. Hall, *Dictionary,* p. 330

[417] Sara Heller Mendelson, *The Mental World of Stuart Women: The Three Studies* (Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1987), p. 8

[418] D'Ancona, *Garden of the Renaissance,* p. 296

expectation of eternal life.[419] Susan Doran notes that in courtly verse the rose also signifies chastity.[420] These flowers are not gender-specific. Six-year-old George Croft holds a pink (No. 10) and Chrysogna Baker a rose (Fig. 56, No. 6). Pinks are also associated with marriage when they appear in portraits of adults, but held by children they denote spiritual purity.[421] William Cecil holds red carnations in his right hand in the sibling portrait with his sister, dated 1599 (Fig. 8, No. 97). It is noticeable that after about 1610, boys are no longer depicted holding flowers, although no conclusive explanation has been discovered for why this ceased to happen.

Birds, particularly song birds, were kept as household pets in Elizabethan and Jacobean England. Lady Diana Russell strokes her pet jackdaw (or crow) perched on the fictive frame in her portrait (Fig. 42, No. 80). However, as robins, goldfinches and parrots – birds frequently encountered in children's portraits – also feature in Christian imagery and legend it is plausible, if not conclusive, that their function in portraits is also emblematic. Where the species of bird can be identified, robins and goldfinches are the most common, and, as far as I can discover, are seen as attributes only for boys.[422] In Christian iconography both the robin and the goldfinch attempted to relieve Christ's suffering on the Cross.[423] The Christ-Child clasping a goldfinch signifies both the Incarnation and the Passion to come. Its appearance in children's portraits – for example, the infant Henry Curwen (1621-1636) in the portrait with his mother holds a goldfinch in his right hand (No. 147) as does the younger Elizabethan boy portrayed with his siblings (Fig. 57, No. 95) – is most probably a general allusion to Christian piety. Robins are known to be tame and, according to legend, a robin covered the dead bodies of the Babes in the Wood, associating the bird with the protection of small

[419] De Vries, *Symbols and Imagery,* p. 82. Ferguson, *Signs and Symbols,* p.29. D'Ancona, *Garden of the Renaissance*, p. 79-80. Bedaux and Ekkart, *Pride and Joy,* p. 136
[420] Doran, *Virginity, Divinity and Power*, p.177
[421] Pinks as emblems of betrothal appear in portraits of young men in sixteenth-century German and Netherlandish portraiture. For Holbein's English portraits see Susan Foister, *Holbein in England* (London: Tate Publishing, 2006), nos., 35, 41 and 42
[422] In some instances it is impossible to identify the species of the bird from a photograph.
[423] According to legend, both birds acquired their red marks from plucking a thorn from Christ's crown of thorns. Ferguson, *Signs and Symbols*, p. 19. James Hall, *Dictionary of Subjects and Symbols in Art,* rev. edn (London: John Murray, 1979), p. 330

children.[424] Two-year-old Robert Lucy has a robin attached to a chain in the sibling portrait of 1619 (Fig. 2, No. 103). His robin could be a family pet, and/or a reference to the diminutive form of his name and yet might also be emblematic.

The association with boys is not the case, however, with parrots. They had been known in Europe since antiquity and by the sixteenth century they were imported from Africa, the Americas and East Asia. [425] They were not only admired for their dazzling plumage but also for their intelligence and their ability to be trained to mimic human speech. These exotic birds were kept as pets and their appearance in portraits signifies wealth and status. In the Classical world, parrots were thought to have prophetic powers. Ancient writers recalled the occasion when a parrot greeted Octavius Caesar after his decisive defeat of Mark Anthony at the battle of Actium (31 BC), with the prophetic words, 'Ave Caesar'.[426] This story was assimilated into Christian iconography: the parrot's greeting to Caesar being regarded as a prefiguration of 'Ave Maria'. Thus parrots became associated with the Virgin Mary. They appear in paintings of the Annunciation and are symbolic of the Immaculate Conception and therefore they are most commonly attributes for girls. The eight-year-old girl depicted in *Unknown Girl with Parrot* (1571) has the bird perched on her arm (Fig. 60, No. 2). A parrot's ability to learn human speech and its Christian association with the Virgin may, in a child's portrait, signify an exemplary upbringing.

Like birds, dogs were also family pets. Dogs, mostly puppies, appear almost as frequently as cherries as a metaphor for childhood. Humanist and Christian teaching alike stressed the importance of training children from the earliest age:'Lernynge is beste instylled and brought in wittes, whiles they be softe and delicate', wrote Plutarch.[427] His treatise, *De Liberis Educandis*, translated by Sir Thomas Elyot as *The Education or Bringinge up of Children* (c.1533), had been adapted and reprinted many times since the fifteenth century. He expounds the

---

[424] de Vries, *Dictionary,* pp. 388-389. Andrew Lack, *Redbreast: The Robin in Life and Literature* (Pulborough: SMH Books, 2008), especially, pp. 1, 50 and 144

[425] Richard Verdi, *The Parrot in Art: From Dürer to Elizabeth Butterworth* (London: Scala Publishers Ltd, 2007), p. 12

[426] Verdi, *The Parrot,* p. 15

[427] Thomas Elyot, 'The Education or Bringinge up of Children. Translated oute of Plutarch by Sir Thomas Elyot' in *Four Tudor Books on Education,* ed. by Robert D. Pepper (SI: Scholars Facsimiles and Reprints, 1966), p. 13. In his Introduction, Pepper notes that there were no doubts about Plutarch's authorship in Tudor England, p. ix

theory that a child's natural abilities should be developed by instilling rules to be learned and constantly practised. In a famous passage, he compares his principles of learning to the successful training of dogs, so the appearance of obedient dogs, in portraits of children may allude to this.[428] In all but two portraits dogs (sometimes hounds) are linked with a boy.[429] The infant Lord Francis Clifford has a puppy sitting on a stool beside him (Fig. 6, No. 9). In *Three Unknown Jacobean Children* (1613) (Fig. 20, No. 101), the boy's puppy, which may be a family pet, is as obedient as the child who controls him on the lead and three-year-old John Russell bids his dog to sit up and beg (Fig. 49, No. 107), a motif popular in seventeenth-century Netherlandish portraits.[430]

A child might have more than one symbolic object associated with him. In *Unknown Boy with Robin and Pansies* (1608) by Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger (Fig. 55, No. 38), the infant holds a posy of heartsease (wild pansies). A robin attached to a cord is perched on the table beside him. The heartsease evokes remembrance and meditation and the robin is for divine protection.[431] Furthermore, he wears coral bracelets, possibly as an amulet against the 'evil eye'.[432] Although these objects are not specifically mementi mori, there is a probability that here, in combination, is a reference to the brevity of life. More explicitly, in a portrait dated 1576 an older boy has several items, which together, suggest meanings of memory and piety (Fig, 61, No. 4). The flowers include a pansy, rosemary, marigolds and a carnation. The boy holds a book and wears a black enamelled miniature case suspended, with a wedding ring, from a ribbon round his neck. It is known that widowed noblewomen commissioned mourning miniatures of their husbands which were bequeathed to their children.[433] The symbolism of these flowers together with a prayer book, the ring and miniature case could be a reference to the pious memory of a deceased parent.[434] In *Unknown Infant with Parrot* (early 1600s) (Fig. 18, No. 27), the bird is pecking at

---

[428] Elyot, 'Education', pp. 10-11
[429] The exceptions are *Unknown Girl Age Nineteen Months* (early 1600s) (No.26) and *Lady Mary Feilding* (1620) (Fig. 7, No. 67)
[430] Bedaux and Ekkart, *Pride and Joy*, p. 19
[431] Ferguson, *Signs and Symbols*, p.36. De Vries, *Dictionary*, p. 357
[432] Jane Huggett and Nina Mikhaila, *The Tudor Child*, p. 28
[433] Susan E. James, *Women's Voices in Tudor Wills, 1485-1603: Authority, Influence and Material Culture* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), p. 85
[434] Weiss Gallery, *A Life Delineat'd: Early Portraits 1545-1690*, (North Walsham: Wildwood Publishing, c.2000), no. 6

the cherries held out by the child. How might this motif be read? It could perhaps be interpreted as Christian instruction being imbibed or absorbed by the infant.

In portraits with a number of children, there may be several objects with symbolic associations. For example, the Lucy children have four, a robin perched on Robert's left thumb and cherries held in his right hand, carnations for Constance and a rose for Margaret (Fig. 2, No. 103). By the seventeenth century such emblems are commonplace in children's portraits. Nevertheless, brought together in one image, they are particularly emphatic in testifying to the children's Christian upbringing and to the care and values of their pious parents.[435] Hugh Rhodes reminds couples of their parental duties, for the 'lack of vertue in youth' is 'the cause of the world being evil' and they should be mindful that children learn from their parents and therefore 'by the chylde, ye shall perceive the disposition of the governor'.[436] In *Three Unknown Jacobean Girls* (c.1620) (Fig. 59, No. 104), each girl is associated with emblems appropriate for their age and gender.[437] While aware of the dangers of over-interpretation, especially with unidentified sitters, it is possible to hypothesise the meaning of at least some of them in this portrait. The combination of the fruit and floral hair ornaments is likely also to be symbolic. Grapes and the pear have already been noted. The oldest girl has a carnation/pink in her hair and her younger sisters have marigolds, both flowers associated with the Virgin Mary.[438] The middle sister appears to have a wedding ring on her left hand and the youngest sister holds an 'adult' doll. Taken together, these items may be read as anticipating marriage and motherhood for 'the fertility of women is a blessing from God'.[439]

The combination of image, emblem and text is a characteristic of portraits in this period. An Elizabethan or Jacobean viewer did not regard a painting as a facsimile of the real world. Rather, it was a flat surface in which image, emblem and text could coexist. It is a way of 'speaking' to the viewer that extends the

---

[435] Fairfax-Lucy, *Charlecote*, p. 107. Henry Summerson, ' The Lucys of Charlecote and their Library, *National Trust Studies*, 1979, p. 150

[436] Hugh Rhodes, *The Booke of Nurture for men seruantes and Children* (London: Imprinted by Thomas East, 1568), no pagination

[437] The symbolism is explored in 'Berger Collection (BCET) Three Young Girls, ca.1620'. The Berger Collection, Denver Museum

[438] For the marigold, see D'Ancona, *Garden of the Renaissance*, p. 226

[439] Christopher Hooke, *The Child-birth or Woman's Lecture* (London, 1590), no pagination

meaning and function of the portrait in addition to recording physical likeness and status.[440] Pious inscriptions were not uncommon, particularly among the 'middling sort'.[441] The portrait image and text might be accompanied by emblems of mortality and objects of piety, such as a skull, clock and/or prayer book. However, texts other than ages, dates and occasionally names are rare in portraits of children depicted on their own. There is only one example in the corpus. *Unknown Boy with Carnation and Cherries* (1596) (Fig. 16, No. 21) has a date and age inscribed on the frame.[442] The Latin text appears on the left of the painting. It reads, *quid caro quid vita […]/ flos. pulvis et vmbra […] : pulvis et umbra sumus,* which may be translated as 'life is a flower followed by dust and shadows'. It is a quotation from Job 14.2 – 'He cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down: he fleeth also as a shadow, and continueth not'.[443] It also recalls an ode by Horace – 'We are but dust and shadow, when once we are gone'.[444] This combination of Christian emblems, the carnation and cherries, with a biblical and/or classical text, suggests a father familiar also with Humanist learning. John Carpenter warns Christian parents that 'cruell death [does not] spare children', so their minds should be kept 'for the use of things heavenlie and divine'.[445] Text and emblems in combination acknowledge the fragility of a child's life and concern for his spiritual welfare.

Humanist and Christian teaching alike stressed the importance of training children from the earliest age.[446] As Erasmus expressed it, 'young bodies are like tender plants, which grow and become hardened into whatever shape you've trained them'.[447] This responsibility and how it reflects on parental diligence can be read in the portrait of *William Brooke, 10th Lord Cobham and his Family* (1567) (Fig. 1, No 152). Here we may assume that the painter was briefed on the content of the

---

[440] Roy Strong, 'The Language of Painting', *English Icon*, pp. 29-41. Cooper, *Citizen Portrait,* p. 33

[441] Cooper, *Citizen Portrait,* Chapter 3 and Figs. 65, 95, 97, 103

[442] There is no reason to doubt that the frame is the original one.

[443] 'quid caro quid vita […]/ flos. pulvis et vmbra […] : 'pulvis et umbra sumus' translates as 'we are dust and shadows'. Job 14:2.

[444] From Horace's Fourth Book of Odes, 7. See *Horace's Odes and Epodes,* trans. by David Mulroy (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1994, p.183

[445] John Carpenter, *Contemplations for the Institution of Children in the Christian Religion* (London, 1601) no pagination

[446] Elyot, 'The Education of Children', no pagination. Hugh Rhodes, *The Booke of Nurture for Men Seruauntes and Children* (London: Imprinted by Thomas East, 1568), no pagination

[447] Erasmus, 'Introduction', in *Good Manners,* p. ix

portrait, as it is so detailed and particular, and he must surely have been familiar with contemporary Netherlandish family portraits.[448] The compositional device of a family seated around an abundantly laden table that echoes the de Moucheron portrait (Fig. 70) has already been noted, as do the inscriptions with date and ages and the emblematic attributes that are linked to the children. The Cobham children are (left to right): Henry (1564-1618) with a puppy, William (1565-1597) with an apple, Maximilian (1560-1583) with a goldfinch, Elizabeth (1562-1596) with cherries, Frances (b.1562) holding a nut and Margaret (1563-1621) with a marmoset.[449] However, the Latin text inscribed in the central cartouche is, as far as is known, unique to the Cobham family.[450] It begins by honouring the Cobham parents' noble birth and goes on to state: 'Such was once the family at the table of the patriarch Jacob; so it was in increased measure at the table of pious Job.' Continuing with the metaphors of rich dishes and fertile seeds, the text concludes with the devout hope that such bounty will endure for the 'distinguished Cobham'. The table has fruit that collectively represent fertility, but, individually the cherries, apples, pears, possibly a quince and grapes ('the vines about the table') signify exemplary Christian virtues.[451] Religious symbolism also can be discerned in the red wine, the walnuts, the goldfinch and the parrot. Red wine symbolises the Eucharist and the walnut is a complex symbol, referencing the Trinity, based on its three parts: an outer green case, its shell and its sweet inner part.[452] The virtues of learning, obedience and loyalty are represented by the puppy and the marmoset. Certainly, these could be the children's actual pets, but more broadly they may also be metaphors for behaviour: the puppy can be taught obedience and loyalty while the marmoset has its mischievous nature curbed by Margaret Cobham. Unpicking these emblematic threads provides an image of the exemplary family, validated by noble birth to exercise authority. Christian morality, piety and good discipline prevail instilled in the children from an early age by their god-fearing parents.

---

[448] To date, there is no consensus on the painter's identity.
[449] The twin girls, Frances and Elizabeth, cannot be distinguished by name, but a guess is that Lady Newton has Frances in front of her.
[450] For a complete translation of the text see Hearn, *Dynasties*, pp. 99-100
[451] The symbolic meanings of the individual fruit, nuts, wine, birds and animals are explored in Wilson, 'Noble Imp', pp. 364-65. She argues that the grapes refer to Psalm 128 and that the Cobham children are like vines growing about William Brooke's table.
[452] Hall, *Subjects and Symbols*, p. 330. D'Ancona, *Garden of the Renaissance*, p. 245

In Chapter 2 it was noted that the Cobham portrait is not a typical composition in English portraiture and the only similar one known to me is *Sir Arthur Capel and his Family* (c.1605) (Fig. 30, No. 156).[453] The Capel family sitters are arranged round a more modest table, also laden with fruit, but without birds or animals. Its close link with Netherlandish portrait groups is enhanced further by the insertion of a painted scroll in front of the table that quotes Psalm 128.[454] The elaborate layering of meanings encoded in the Cobham portrait is here simplified in this portrayal of a family of lesser status.

In *Sir Thomas Lucy III and his Family* (mid-1620s) (Fig. 3, No. 157) we see a more sophisticated composition than in the Cobham Family portrait of about fifty years earlier and it is considerably larger. Nevertheless there are comparable, persistent assumptions about social class, patriarchal authority and Christian values inscribed within it, even though the clutter of symbolic objects has been reduced.[455] Bridget, the baby girl holds a sprig of cherries and Lady Alice Lucy dips her hand into the bowl of cherries held by her eldest daughter, Constance. This might be an indication that Lady Alice is expecting a child like the heavily pregnant Mildred Cooke, Lady Burghley (1526-1589), who is depicted in a portrait dated 1563 holding a sprig of cherries in her right hand.[456] Seven Lucy children are depicted here and it is known that Sir Thomas and Lady Alice eventually had thirteen.[457] A hound lies by his master's chair, whilst the other dog, still a puppy, sits obediently between the youngest boys.

It has been argued that much of the symbolism in portraiture was derived from Christian imagery with which there was an easy familiarity. It is a powerful argument to account for the iconography seen in the mother-and-daughter portrait of Anne Fitton, Lady Newdigate (1574-1618) with her daughter, Mary (1598-1643), dated 1598 (Fig. 5, No. 125). There are strong resonances also with the image of Lady Katherine Grey with her son (Fig. 4, No. 114), discussed above. Lady Anne is depicted frontal view with her right arm encircling and supporting

---

[453] Chapter 2, p. 58
[454] Bedaux discusses a similar composition in a Dutch portrait dated 1583, that also includes the quote from Psalm 128. Bedaux, *Reality of Symbols*, p. 85
[455] Some of these values were discussed in Chapter 2, pp. 60-61
[456] Unknown painter, *Mildred Cooke, Lady Burghley* (c.1563). Hatfield House.
[457]Fairfax-Lucy, *Charlecote*, p. 299. Other sources state fifteen children. http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1604-1629/member/lucy-sir-thomas-1585-1640

her baby daughter who stands on a table. She wears the low square-cut embroidered bodice typical of high fashion in the 1590s, with an embroidered partlet opened to reveal her swelling right breast. Anne Fitton had married John Newdigate (1571-1610) in 1587 when they were both in their teens. The birth of Mary, the Newdigates first child occasioned great joy from family and friends, although there was concern about her decision to nurse the child. Lady Anne's father, Sir Edward Fitton (1548-1606), wrote in the most affectionate terms, ending his letter, ' God blesse yor lytle one and grant thee as muche comfort I beseeche Him as ever mother had of child, but I ame sorry that yor self will needs nurse her'.[458] Her friend, Sir William Knollys (1544-1632) also wrote warmly to Anne, but did feel obliged to comment, 'I shold like nothing that you playe the nurse if you were my wyffe. I must confesse yt argueth great love, but yt breedeth much troble to yourself.'[459] We may gauge from these remarks that it was exceptional for upper-class women to breast-feed their children, despite the barrage of advice in child-care manuals and sermons urging them to do so.[460] The defining gesture in this portrait is the baby's hand reaching for her mother's breast, unmistakably emphasised by the open partlet. I have not seen any other mother-and-child portrait of the period in which a breast is partially revealed in this manner.[461] Anne did feed her daughter and we can read in the portrait her determination to flout convention. We can infer that she also breast-fed her subsequent children because, after giving birth to her fourth child, Lettice, in November 1604, she offered her services as a suitable wet nurse to the pregnant Queen Anne.[462] Although she failed to achieve this position, she was informed that 'the Queen is possest with so good opinion of yor worth and sufficiency'.[463]

---

[458] Anne Emily Newdigate-Newdegate, *Gossip from a Muniment Room* (London: David Nutt, 1898), p. 16
[459] Newdigate-Newdegate, *Gossip,* p. 20
[460] For example, Cleland, *Noble Man,* p. 19. Crawford, *Blood, Bodies and Families,* p. 86
[461] Jane Ashelford considers this feature to be unique in the costumes she has seen depicted in portraiture. Jane Ashelford , *Dress in the Age of Elizabeth I* (London: Batsford, 1988), p. 38
[462] For Princess Mary Stuart (1605-7)
[463] Newdigate-Newdegate, *Gossip,* p. 65-66

4.4 Conclusion

The chapter has traced some precedents in Continental portraits that could have influenced how children were portrayed in English portraits in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Royal portraits of children filtered into England via diplomatic channels certainly from the 1520s onwards, if not earlier. These portraits as well as Netherlandish family pictures would also have been known to English people travelling abroad. The influx of Netherlandish painters ensured that their portrait traditions were practised in England, not least because these painters and their patrons were likely to share religious beliefs and thus were more prepared to adopt those conventions that did not offend reformed religious practice. In turn, they influenced native painters. The device of linking one or more symbolic attributes to a child became customary also in Elizabethan and Jacobean portraits. It chimed with the English predilection for portraits to represent more than the physical likeness and status of the sitter, by expressing personal virtues and beliefs through the visual language of symbols. It is also evident that there was a symbolic vocabulary for children that specifically represented the condition of childhood.

It was noted that although much of the symbolism had its roots in Christian imagery, there were sources also from the Classical tradition and from folklore. The symbolism of the parrot, for example, in itself an object of luxury in Elizabethan and Jacobean England, had a Classical origin that was absorbed into Christian imagery. Evidence from this corpus suggests that certain attributes – robins and goldfinches for example – were gender-biased, and most commonly linked with boys. Others, like cherries, offered differing interpretations and overlapping meanings, depending on the age and the gender of the individual with whom they are associated. The flourishing cherry tree and unblemished grapes in Thomas Smyth's portrait most probably signal his youthful innocence and the Christian nurture that will be the secure foundation for his adult life (Fig. 58, No. 45).

Particular symbols associated with childhood – cherries, flowers and coral teething-sticks – survived in child portraiture at least until the late eighteenth century. However, by then their function was as much decorative as symbolic.

Certainly the compositional format in which each child holds, or is associated with, one or more objects that may be interpreted symbolically was largely abandoned. By the mid-eighteenth century advanced aesthetic taste favoured a more naturalistic and informal depiction of children in portraiture in tandem with changing ideas about the state of childhood.[464] Although the prevalence of symbolism of the kind depicted in Elizabethan and Jacobean portraits gradually became outmoded, some emblems did survive.[465]

[464] Steward, *The New Child*, p. 19
[465] These are discussed in Chapter 5, pp. 144-145

Chapter 5: Conclusions and Afterlives

5.1 Introduction

This thesis began with a close analysis of the sibling portrait, *Four Children of Sir Thomas Lucy III* (1619) (Fig. 2, No. Y), and has explored the broad questions about the representation of Elizabethan and Jacobean children arising from it. Those questions concern family structure and relationships, identity and gender: the meanings inscribed in gestures, accessories and attributes, the aesthetic conventions of portraiture and the functions which these portraits were intended to fulfil. Furthermore, this study set out to consider how the representation of children in their portraits relates to other historical material: to what extent do the portraits confirm or question what is currently known about childhood in the early modern period, largely rooted in textual sources? Addressing these questions has demanded a more comprehensive study of the images of children in portraits than any previously undertaken, to my best knowledge. A corpus of 165 portraits of named and un-named children was compiled for the investigation and constitutes the primary material upon which the conclusions of this thesis are based. All the portraits depict English sitters and, as far as can be verified, they were produced in England.[466] There was no selection process on the basis of any aesthetic judgments. This corpus of 165 portraits by no means constitutes all the portraits that have survived from this period, but I would argue that it is a sufficiently significant number to enable the identification of certain trends and patterns of representation.

For the quantitative and formal analysis, the corpus was divided into five categories of portrait types and formats, as described in Chapter 2: category (1) a child on its own, category (2) siblings (two or more children), category (3) one parent with one or more children, category (4) the family group and category (5) miscellaneous: portrait types that are exceptions to categories (1), (2), (3) and (4).

[466] For the purposes of this thesis the geographical boundary is England and Wales. See Chapter 1, p.16, for an explanation of the complexities of definitive judgments about the place of origin for certain English portraits.

A further category (6) was added for those portraits that are family sets or part of a family series. The ninety-one portraits in category (1) are just over half the total of 165 portraits. The forty-one portraits in category (3) are just under a quarter of the total. The other categories (2), (4) and (5) account for the rest. The chosen categories highlight familial structures and norms of representation. Indeed, the impression of compositional uniformity across images spanning a period of seventy years reveals what appears to be the essentially conservative nature of the portrait genre. Nevertheless stylistic developments can be seen within this timeframe, particularly in portraits of the elite. There was an increasing preference for full-length figures together with a more realistic depiction of the human form in the early decades of the seventeenth century and a new engagement with the illusion of pictorial space. These were features introduced by immigrant painters who mostly served the court and nobility.

The number of portraits dating from about 1600 to 1630 is 111, two-thirds of those dating from about 1560 to 1600. It is possible, therefore, to infer that the number *actually* painted also increased by roughly the same proportion. This rise in number reflects both the increase in the general population towards the end of the sixteenth century and the enhanced opportunities for social advancement following the accession of James I.[467] Inevitably, most portraits in the corpus represent children of the landed elite as verified by the identities of named sitters and, for unnamed children, by their costumes and accessories. Closer examination by costume specialists might probably identify subtle details in the portraits of some unnamed sitters that would enable their social class to be more precisely pinpointed. Recent scholarship on wills and other archival material has also revealed wider portrait ownership among the class of 'citizens and burgesses' than was previously assumed.[468] Unfortunately these portraits that are known only from documents are rarely described in such a way as to identify whether they

[467] E.A. Wrigley and R.S. Schofield, *The Population History of England 1541-1871: A Reconstruction* (London: Edward Arnold, 1981), p. 225. Susan D. Amussen, 'Social Hierarchies' in *The Elizabethan World*, ed. by Susan Doran and Norman Jones (London: Routledge, c.2011), p. 273. Wrightson describes the inflation of peerages awarded under the early Stuart kings and the introduction of baronetcies (1611) which were virtually 'auctioned off' : Wrightson, *English Society*, pp. 23-24

[468] For example, Susan E. James, *The Feminine Dynamic in English Art, 1485-1603: Woman as Consumers, Patrons and Painters* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009), p. 49. Tittler, *Portraits, Painters, Publics*, pp. 55-57

include images of children. One can thus tentatively conclude that the commissioning of portraits of children was limited to the community of the 'first sorte' and to those prominent wealthy citizens like Thomas 'Customer' Smythe and the Aldersley family, 'who be those that are free within the cities and are of some likely substance to bear office in the same.'[469]

Among the families identified in the corpus several are known to be Catholic.[470] Religious affiliation does not appear to have affected the inclination to commission family portraits. Susan Foister asserts that 'in a devotedly Christian age it was important that the preservation of individual human likeness was seen as conducive to virtue …rather than evidence of pride', a sentiment applicable across the religious divide.[471] There is thus every indication that the commissioning and display of portraits of children on their own or with their parents was a cultural practice linked to social status, rather than one associated with particular religious groups.

5.2 Family structures and relationships

In common with memorial sculpture and brasses, where hierarchy and gender distinctions are clearly evident, portraits functioned as pictorial statements about family structures and relationships. Philippe Ariès equated the absence of individual child portraits before the late seventeenth century with an attitude of indifference towards young children, because so many died as infants. Therefore, he argued, they were deemed not worthy of remembrance.[472] Lawrence Stone maintained similarly that 'before the age of two, infants were not regarded by upper-class parents as fully human'.[473] These assertions are not only refuted by scholars who have researched contemporary letters, journals and memoirs, but also by evidence from the portraits studied here. Infants of two years old and

[469] Harrison, *Description*, p.115
[470] For example, *Edward, 3rd Lord Windsor and his family* (1568) (Fig. 14, No 153)
[471] Susan Foister, 'Remembering' in *Renaissance Faces: Van Eyck to Titian* by Lorne Campbell, Miguel Falomir, Jennifer Fletcher and Luke Syson (London: National Gallery, London; Yale University Press, 2008), p. 83. Margaret Aston, 'Gods, Saints and Reformers: Portraiture and Protestant England' in *Albion's Classicism: The Visual Arts in Britain 1550-1660* ed. by Lucy Gent (New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1995) pp. 187-197
[472] Ariès, *Centuries*, p. 38
[473] Stone, *Family*, p. 116.

under are represented both as members of a sibling group or with a parent, but more significantly, they are also depicted on their own.

The finding that there are more portraits of boys in category (1) than of girls was predictable. There are various factors to account for this gender imbalance. More portraits of boys, the potential heirs to titles and estates, were likely to be commissioned, and these portraits also had a greater chance of survival in the families of their descendants.[474] The bias in favour of boys occurs across all categories apart from the sibling group, in which the numbers of boys and girls are equal.

Another important finding was the popularity of mother-and-child portraits, category (3). In all mother-and-child/children portraits where the sitters are known, or where enough of the figure is visible, it is clear that the boy or boys are still unbreeched. This image of the woman's role of bearing and nurturing children in their early years chimes with the contemporary literature on the subject. In the few father-and-child portraits where the sitters are known, the man is depicted with his son and heir.

It has been shown that family groups that depict children with both parents are comparatively rare. Conventions for portraying complete families on one panel or canvas do not appear to have been firmly established at this date. This contrasts with family groups in Netherlandish portraiture, where parents are frequently depicted with their many children, and sometimes also with grandchildren, a practice that persisted through the seventeenth century.[475] This preference is unlikely to be caused by any dissimilarity in family sizes between England and the Netherlands, but rather to differing political structures and cultural practices. In the United Provinces at least, political power resided primarily with upper middle-class burghers, living in relatively modest houses, rather than with landed nobility.[476] Therefore personal display in the form of portraits was likely to be more restrained. In England, the heightened consciousness of rank and, most

[474] As noted in Chapter 1, at least three portraits were made of the eminently noble infant Robert Dudley, Baron Denbigh, yet none seem to have survived, most probably because he had no direct descendants and, moreover, his father's title passed to the latter's nephew, Robert Sidney, first Earl of Leicester

[475] Bedaux and Ekkart, *Pride and Joy*, p. 221

[476] Mariët Westermann, *A Worldly Art: The Dutch Republic1585-1718* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1996), p. 21

importantly, the desire to display it, may have been a factor in encouraging patrons to favour a range of portrait formats for one generation of a family, to be followed by a similar grouping for the next generation. The impact of such a display may still be seen at Helmingham Hall where the collection of family portraits seems to have remained intact.[477] There are four separate portraits of Sir Lionel Tollemache, second Baronet (1591-1640) and his immediate family. They are two imposing full-length portraits of Sir Lionel (including his coat of arms with eight quarterings) and his wife Elizabeth Cromwell (1594-1650), painted about 1615, the year of their marriage, the sibling portrait of their four daughters, dated about 1621 (Fig. 19, No. 105), and finally an individual portrait of the heir, Lionel Tollemache, later the third baronet (1624-69), their first surviving son, dated about 1630 (No. 91).[478]

The 1933 sale catalogue of the contents of Wroxton Abbey, Banbury, Oxfordshire lists ten portraits of Sir William Pope, first Earl of Downe (1573-1631), his wife, Anne Hopton, Lady Pope (1561-1625) and their immediate family, which were displayed in the Great Hall.[479] The people represented are Lady Pope's three children from her first marriage to the third Baron Wentworth and the three children from her second marriage to Sir William Pope. The grandchildren are the offspring of Lady Pope's six children. This collection of portraits confirms the family's status through three generations more impressively than could a single family group portrait.

The full-length portrait, *Anne Hopton, Lady Pope and her Children* (1596) by Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger was one of the portraits sold in 1933 (Fig. 23, No. 124).[480] The children are Thomas, Henry and Jane Wentworth, offspring from Anne's first marriage to Henry, third Baron Wentworth (1558-1593). She is also conspicuously pregnant with the first child from her marriage to Sir William Pope. The portrait is a reminder that family structures were fluid, parents and their

[477] Waterhouse notes that the Helmingham Hall auction in 1953 did not include family portraits. Waterhouse, *Helmingham*, p. 5
[478] Waterhouse, *Helmingham*, nos. 5, 15, 10, 41.
[479] *Wroxton Abbey Sale*, Wednesday 24 May, 1933, pp. 23-24. Wroxton Abbey was the country estate of the Pope family and the Earls of Downe.
[480] *Wroxton Abbey Sale*, 1933, 22-29/5/1933, p.23, lot 678

children often living together with other kin.[481] Families which included a step-parent and half siblings would also complicate the issue.[482] Lawrence Stone has calculated that about a quarter of all marriages in early modern England were second or later marriages.[483]

A significant finding during the process of sourcing images for this thesis was that some individual portraits were part of sets or series. This supports the conclusion, outlined above, that several single portraits might well be preferred to group portraits of multiple figures. Portrait sets in this period are not exceptional.[484] Apart from the earliest known family portrait set of the Smythe family (1579/80), this study has identified five other family sets or series dating from the early seventeenth century, which suggests that the practice of commissioning them was not fully established earlier than about 1600. Given the poor survival rate of portraits, it is likely that some extant single portraits from the early seventeenth century were also once part of family sets. The portraits dated about 1627, of Mary Hervey (1620-54) age seven (No. 83) and Susan Hervey (b. 1621) age six (No. 84), present just such a possibility. They are identical in every detail – size, composition and costume. The portraits were in the same collection until 1944.[485] These sisters are two of the twelve children of Sir William Hervey (1585-1660) and Susan Jermyn (d.1637), who were born between 1614 and 1631.[486] At least three brothers and another sister are known to be alive in 1627, so one would expect that portraits of these siblings would have been commissioned at the same time. Portrait sets had marked advantages for large families where there was adequate space to display them. Each sitter's face is distinctive, but the

---

[481] Houlbrooke, *English Family*, p. 19. The gentlewoman on the extreme left of the Cobham family portrait is most probably kin, even though her identity is unknown.
[482] Miranda Chaytor, 'Household and Kinship: Ryton in the Late 16th and Early 17th Centuries', *History Workshop Journal*, 10 (1980), p.29
[483] Stone, *Family*, p.56. Sandra Cavallo and Silvia Evangelisti (eds.), *A Cultural History of Childhood and Family. In the Early Modern Age*, 3, (Oxford and New York, Berg, 2010), p.16
[484] See Chapter 2, pp. 63-64
[485] *Sotheby's*, 14/11/1944, lots 36 and 37. They descended through the Hanmer family. Susan Hervey married Sir Thomas Hanmer (1612-78) c.1646. John Martin, 'Hanmer, Sir Thomas, second baronet (1612–1678)', *ODNB*, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/38539, accessed 13 April 2017]
[486] Hervey noted the births of all his children in detail. Sydenham Henry Augustus Hervey, *Dictionary of Herveys, of all classes, callings, counties and spellings*, 3, Suffolk (Ipswich: W.E. Harrison, 1927) Appendix I, pp. 389-391

standardisation of style and presentation conveys their commonality as family members.

The striking impression conveyed by such sets and series is consciousness of family pride. We see this expressed in the inscription and family crest adorning Richard Wandesford's portrait (Fig. 63), which once headed a display of thirteen family portraits.[487] The Russell family set was commissioned soon after Woburn Abbey became the principle residence of Sir Francis Russell in 1626. He succeeded to the earldom in 1627 and his son William was knighted the same year.[488] John ffolliott was knighted in 1603, the year inscribed on the portraits of his four sons. It may be significant that the portrait commissions coincided with a rise in family status.

Evidence from the portraits shows not only the structure but also the size of many elite and gentry families of this period. It was noted from the inscriptions that barely a year often separates one child from the next sibling, and several women, among them Lady Pope (Fig. 23, No. 124), Lady Sidney (Fig.13, No. 123) and Lady Sherrard (Fig. 54, No. 145) are shown to be pregnant.[489] Frequent pregnancy for elite women was regarded as desirable and there was a vogue in this period for women to be portrayed in even advanced stages of pregnancy.[490] Moreover, there was considerable apprehension about surviving the physical ordeal for 'the deliverance from those paines, that therein you perish not, it is the great mercie of God'.[491] That may have been a powerful incentive for the commission of such a portrait.

---

[487] See Chapter 2, p. 68

[488] Woburn Abbey became the principle residence of the fourth earl of Bedford in 1626. Gladys Scott Thomson, *Life in a Noble household, 1641-1700* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1937), p. 9

[489] Keith Wrightson, *Earthly Necessities*, p. 48. Patricia Crawford, 'The Construction and Experience of Maternity', in *Women as Mothers in Pre-Industrial England*, ed. by Valerie Fildes (London and New York: Routledge, 1990) p. 15

[490] Linda Pollock, 'Embarking on a Rough Passage: the Experience of Pregnancy in Early Modern Society', in *Women as Mothers*, pp. 40-41. Amanda L Capern, *The Historical Study of Women: England, 1500-1700* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2008), p. 23. Karen Hearn, *Marcus Gheeraerts II, Elizabethan Artist* (London: Tate Publishing, 2002), p. 42.

[491] Christopher Hooke, *The Child-birth or Woman's Lecture* (London, 1590), no pagination

5.3 Identity and Likeness

Identity and likeness are recurrent themes throughout the thesis. Richard Brilliant reminds us that only facial appearance is naturally visible, all other aspects of identity are conceptual and must be expressed symbolically.[492] He proceeds to point out that an essential element of a person's individual identity is 'a consciousness of the distinction between one's own person and another's and of the possible relationship between them'.[493] The unknown painter of the ffolliott brothers has differentiated the faces and expressions of each of the boys and provided them with age-appropriate accessories (Fig. 37, Nos, 31, 32, 33). Their clothes are identical, modified slightly for the infant, Henry. The inscriptions – some now abraded and indistinct – originally identified each boy by age, so it is evident which of the sons born to Sir John ffolliott each portrait represents. Thus the contemporary viewer could recognise each individual by a combination of his physical resemblance and inscribed age, and he would also perceive that the boys together belong to the communal unit of the ffolliott family and to the wider social community of gentry. Similarly, and despite the formal composition of *Lettice Cressy, Lady Tasburgh and her Six Children* (c.1615) (Fig. 29, No. 133), the artist has clearly differentiated the faces. Cressy Tasburgh, for example, the younger son, has his mother's distinctive broad face, larger eyes and darker hair than any of his siblings.

Not all painters achieve the physiognomic individuality seen in the portraits of the ffolliott brothers and the Tasburgh family, but this is not necessarily due to a lack of technical skill. The siblings Stephen and Mary Phesant have almost indistinguishable faces and so it is the inscription with its precise dates that provides a specific identity for each child, while the details in costume and the accessories denote differences of age and gender (Fig. 11, No. 106).[494] Here, it can be argued, facial resemblance emphasises their sibling relationship/identity, while the inscriptions and accessories provide the essential elements of differentiation.

---

[492] Brilliant, *Portraiture,* p. 9.
[493] Brilliant, *Portraiture*, p. 9
[494] For the inscription see Chapter 2, p. 75 and Appendix 1, No. 106

The display of costume and jewellery was indispensable for self-presentation in portraits. Given the exorbitant expenditure lavished on jewels and apparel in this period, it is not surprising that sitters wished to have them memorialised. The clothes worn by some children are as elaborate and be-jewelled as any seen on adults. Mary Sidney (1587?–1651/53), for example, the eldest daughter in the portrait with her mother and siblings (Fig. 13, No 123) is eight or nine years old. She wears clothes and jewels that nearly approximate to the opulence of the costume worn by Lady Sidney.

The exploration of gender is fundamental to investigations of identity and a major issue in visual representation. Gender distinctions are seen in costume, posture, compositional placement and in the attributes included in children's portraits, some of which, as I have argued, are symbolically charged. The description of young Elizabethan and Jacobean boys as 'dressed like girls' is still frequently met. However, this is a misapprehension that can be countered by the evidence gleaned from their depiction in portraits. Certainly, all children wore skirts ('small coats' or petticoats) until boys were 'breeched'. However, even so, there were subtle differences in the details of what children wore, including their hair styles, which could distinguish gender at a very early age, when it might be difficult to recognise these differences facially.[495] Over the skirts boys wore doublets that approximated to men's styles and boy toddlers had girdles round the waist from which swords and daggers could be suspended when they were older. In *The Winter's Tale*, Leontes gazes fondly on his young son, Mamillius, and 'saw myself unbreech'd,/ In my green velvet coat; my dagger muzzled,/ Lest it should bite its master'.[496] Girls also wore elements of women's fashion in their upper garments and head wear. Boys might have coral bracelets, as amulets against evil, occasionally a gold chain, but not any other jewellery. In 250 images of children, only six babies cannot be identified by their sex.

In addition to clothing, gender identity was reinforced by gendered material accessories, easily recognisable, and usually restricted to standard items. Girls' accessories are dolls, fans and needlework samplers. Although we know that

[495] In today's shops children's clothes are also gendered from infancy, distinguished by colour, style and decorative motifs.
[496] Shakespeare, *The Winter's Tale*, I. 1. 154-6, p. 379

upper-class girls were usually more than basically literate, they are not shown with books in their portraits, nor are they portrayed with any accessory that requires physical exertion. These were restricted to boys. However, what these portraits of boys and girls do share, for the most part, are accessories that, in context, have one or multiple symbolic meanings. They expressed desirable virtues and ideological values, relying on an established visual vocabulary familiar through tradition. Flowers, birds and dogs are the most common. However, certain emblems do seem to have been gender-biased: goldfinches linked entirely with boys and, with few exceptions, robins and dogs also.[497] Goldfinches are held by unbreeched boys, a distinction which could well be due to their association with the Christ Child in devotional paintings. Finally, we have seen that the gendered placement of sitters within these portraits followed heraldic protocol, although it was occasionally disrupted.

5.4 Afterlives

The functions and meanings of portraits are not fixed at the moment of execution, but change as they are viewed in different contexts and over time. This section investigates aspects of these shifting meanings by exploring what is known about the portraits' original locations, and how the portraits may have been modified in copies and versions. I conclude with some thoughts on their legacy, both in the traditions of child representation, and also how they might be viewed by a modern audience.

The portraits in this corpus fulfilled the purposes of those who commissioned them. They were intended to provide a good account of the living, yet they were also forward looking, expected to survive as an inheritance from the past and to demonstrate hope and trust in the future. If we assume that the compiler of the Hardwick Hall Inventory recorded the pictures in the order in which they were displayed, then we can see that in the Gallery, family portraits were hung together with portraits of current and deceased monarchs, other illustrious figures and

[497] See Appendix 1

alongside two religious paintings.[498] The family portraits were members of the Talbot and Cavendish family and included a portrait of Lady Arbella Stuart.[499] In the Low Great Chamber, a less formal setting, there were more family portraits, including another of Arbella Stuart, most probably her depiction as an infant (Fig 45, No. 5), but there was also a further portrait of the queen here, and one of Lord Burghley.[500] At Leicester House in 1588, two portraits of the deceased infant Robert Dudley, Lord Denbigh – one with his mother, Lettice Knollys, Lady Leicester (1543- 1634) and one on his own – were displayed in the Gallery.[501] The inventory of Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton (1540-1614) lists over one hundred pictures at Northampton House in London. Fifty were portraits, but only eight were specifically of family. Northampton had no children, yet displayed in the Little Gallery was a 'picture of the two children of the late Earle of Essex'.[502] As the compiler specified that the picture was of children it could be that the other family portraits were of adults. Northampton had once been closely allied with Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex (1565-1601), which would account for the portrait in his collection.[503]

At Arbury Hall, Warwickshire, a substantial group of Elizabethan and Jacobean portraits of the Newdigate family are hung in the Dining Room, formerly the Great Hall of the Elizabethan mansion. The earliest portraits, attributed to Hans Eworth and painted in the 1560s, are of John Newdigate (1541-1594), a gentleman of the 'upper middling' gentry, and his wife, Martha.[504] Also displayed are portraits of the next two generations, including images of four children, the offspring of his son, Sir John Newdigate (1571-1610) and Lady Anne Newdigate (1574-1618). They are Lady Anne Newdigate with her eldest child, infant Mary[505] (1598-1643), the pendant portraits dated 1606 of Richard Newdigate (1602-1678) (Fig. 9, No. 36) and Lettice Newdigate (1604-25) (Fig. 10, No. 37), and an

---

[498] Levey and Thornton, *Household Stuff*, pp.49-50
[499] Although the format of Arbella Stuart's portrait is not specified, it is most likely to be the full-length portrait of Arbella, age thirteen. NT 1129095
[500] Levey and Thornton, *Household Stuff*, p. 52
[501] Goldring, *Robert Dudley*, p. 288, p. 293
[502] Shirley, ' Inventory', p. 357
[503] Pauline Croft, 'Howard, Henry, earl of Northampton (1540–1614)', *ODNB*, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13906, accessed 12 May 2017]
[504] As described in Larminie, *Wealth, Kinship and Culture: the Seventeenth-Century Newdigates of Arbury and their World* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1995), p. 17
[505] This is the original portrait, not Fig. 5, which is the identical copy

undated portrait of Anne Newdigate (1607-37) (No. 51), who appears to be about seven or eight years old. There are, furthermore, portraits of Sir John Newdigate, his elder son John Newdigate (1600-42) as an adult, and sundry portraits of spouses and other kin, including a double portrait of Lady Anne and her sister Mary Fitton (1578-1647), dated about 1592. There is also a portrait of the pregnant Lady Anne Newdigate, probably executed in the 1590s, and finally, her full-length portrait on canvas, dating from the early 1600s.[506] This collection of Elizabethan and Jacobean family portraits is a significant survival, not least because, unlike the descendants of Bess of Hardwick, the Newdigates were not ennobled until the twentieth century.[507] It echoes the grander family collections of families like the Cavendishes and the Tollemaches in the early seventeenth century noted above. These family portraits were most probably hung in the Long Gallery (still extant), along with the portraits of Elizabeth I and other notable figures of the age, which remain at Arbury. The queen's portrait is one of at least four known versions in circulation in the 1580s and early 1590s, whilst the portraits of other contemporary luminaries were almost certainly versions of original portraits.[508]

The acquisition of portraits of the monarch and prominent individuals was an important cultural activity enjoyed by the elite and gentry in early modern England. The display of portraits of superior rank demonstrated loyalty and affinity to grander individuals and conferred status by association. The extensive collection of royal and semi-royal portraits acquired by Bess of Hardwick was intended, not least, to demonstrate her granddaughter Arbella's kinship with the Scottish king, James VI. There is documentary evidence for requests for versions of portraits of eminent individuals.[509] Lord Herbert of Cherbury (1582-1648) was flattered to discover a copy of his portrait in the Long Gallery at Dorset House when he called on the third Earl of Dorset (1589-1624).[510] Herbert's famous

---

[506] The sitter's age and portrait style suggest a date in the early 1600s.
[507] *Burke's Peerage,* 1, p. 1046
[508] The portrait of Elizabeth I, c.1585-90, has been in the family since the end of the sixteenth century. Roy C. Strong, *Portraits of Elizabeth I* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), pp.69-70
[509] Susan E. James, *The Feminine Dynamic in English Art, 1485-1603: Women as Consumers, Patrons and Painters* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009), p. 47
[510] Jacob Simon, *The Art of the Picture Frame: Artists, Patrons and the Framing of Portraits in Britain* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 1996), p. 14. It is a copy of the original portrait by William Larkin at Charlecote Park. Hearn, *Dynasties*, p. 199

adventures on the Continent had prompted Dorset to acquire the portrait. Often quoted is the request made by Thomas Howard, third Viscount Howard of Bindon (d.1611) to Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury (1563-1612) for a copy of his portrait 'to be placed in the gallery I lately made for the pictures of sundry of my honourable friends in that place where I might see so comfortable a sight'.[511]

Portraits of 'honourable friends' of high status were not the only ones to be copied and distributed. Family portraits, including portraits of children were also replicated and exchanged. It was a means of keeping families in touch. The absent presence of sitters evoked by their portraits occurs in contemporary letters.[512] The process of sourcing portraits for this thesis has revealed the survival of a number of copies and modified versions of portraits in the corpus. At least three portraits of individual children in the corpus are known to have been copied.[513] Wherever possible, in creating the corpus, a judgement was made as to which image is the primary portrait based on evidence such as provenance, location, conservation reports, and inscriptions. However, such judgements may be impossible from photographic images alone. For clarity, I am distinguishing here between the term 'copy' and 'version'. A 'copy' is a faithful replica of the original portrait, whereas a 'version' is a copy with some element added, altered, or removed. The Arbury portrait of Lady Anne Newdigate with her daughter Mary (1598), cited above, is known to have been replicated at least twice. What is almost certainly an identical copy is now at the Museum of Art, Rhode Island School of Design, Providence, USA (Fig. 5, No. 125).[514] The provenance is unknown before 1935, when it was purchased by the museum as 'Portrait of a Mother and Child'.[515] There is no reason to doubt that the Arbury portrait is the original from which the Rhode Island copy was made. A much smaller version, difficult to date, also survives at

---

[511] Letter dated 29 April 1609 and quoted in E. Auerbach and C.K. Adams, *Portraits at Hatfield House* (London: 1971), p. 73

[512] For example, Endymion Porter informed his wife how her portrait gave him great happiness, though without 'that pretty discourse which thy sweet company doth afford'. Undated letter, 1620s. Dorothea Townsend, *Life and Letters of Mr Endymion Porter* (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1897), p. 29

[513] *called Dorothy Winch* (1595) (No. 18), *Robert Ridgeway* (1596) (Fig. 46, No. 22), *Lady Margaret Sackville* (No. 65)

[514] See Chapter 1, p. 16. This is the portrait reproduced in Fig. 5 and the exception to my rule of reproducing only the prime version of a portrait in the focus group. This is because it has been recently conserved so the original inscriptions are visible. It is the portrait listed as No. 125 in Appendix 1.

[515] Information kindly provided by Maureen C. O'Brien**,** Curator of Painting and Sculpture, Museum of Painting and Sculpture Rhode Island School of Design, Providence, Rhode Island

Arbury. A dog has been added to the lower right-hand corner and the embroidery frame removed.

Where the sitters and their biographies are known, one can speculate on the circumstances that prompted the creation of a copy or version. A version of the Cobham Family portrait (Fig. 74) was made after the original painting. Painted on canvas, it is larger, perhaps to accommodate an additional figure: George Brooke (1568-1603), born a year after the first portrait was executed. This would account for the date, 1568, inscribed on the version. George and his puppy appear on the right side of the table. Curiously, he looks older than his brothers, so possibly this version was made some ten years or more after the original one, the image of George perhaps adapted from another portrait. It would account also for the use of a canvas support. One of the twins, Elizabeth Brooke (1562-1597), married Robert Cecil, later first Earl of Salisbury, in 1589. She is a likely patron of the later version, perhaps considering it incomplete as a family memento without the inclusion of her youngest brother. Elizabeth Brooke's granddaughter, Elizabeth Cecil (1619-1689), married William Cavendish, third Earl of Devonshire, in 1639, which explains the portrait's descent through the Cavendish family.[516]

A smaller eighteenth-century version of *Sir Thomas Lucy and his Family* (mid-1620s) descended through the Molyneux family.[517] Sir Thomas's granddaughter, Bridget Lucy (1655-1713), married the fourth Viscount Molyneux about 1675. In 1744, her son Thomas wrote to George Lucy, returning the portrait after the copy had been made and reported, 'the family pice (sic) is very much admired by everyone'.[518] In these examples, we see the significance attached to family lineage and how the descent of family portraits was shaped by marriage.

The portrait of Lady Pope with the three children from her first marriage (Fig. 23, No. 124), was most probably commissioned by her young second husband, Sir William Pope, soon after their marriage in 1595 and (as was noted) when she was already pregnant with their first child, William (1596-1624). A second version

[516]Now at Bolton Hall.
[517] Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool. Alex Kidson, *Earlier British Paintings in the Walker Art Gallery and Sudley* House (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2012), pp. 87-89. Other versions also survive. See NPGH Image files.
[518] Mary Elizabeth Lucy, *Biography of the Lucy Family, Charlecote Park in the County of Warwick* (London: E. Faithful and Co., 1862), p. 55

was made probably about a decade later, even larger than the original (Fig. 75). This portrait has an identical arrangement of the sitters. However the figures are enclosed in a fictive oval frame and the background has an opening on the right revealing a panelled interior. Minor differences occur in the carpet design, the curtains and in the colour of the fabrics worn by the boys. The elaboration of the background is more characteristic of a Jacobean portrait, and suggests a stylish up-dating for this second image, possibly also executed by the Gheeraerts workshop. The portrait's provenance may be traced tentatively to Thomas Wentworth, first Earl of Cleveland (1591-1667), the eldest boy on the left.[519] When, and for whom, the second version was executed remains speculative. A possibility is that it was commissioned by young Thomas Wentworth after he inherited an estate at Toddington, Bedfordshire, in 1614. However, even the original portrait had changes made sometime later. Several inches were added to the length and width, possibly to provide visual unity with other large family portraits hung in a magnificent display in Wroxton Abbey's Great Hall.[520]

It may be inferred from the narrative of her life that at least some of the versions made of the miniature portrait of Lady Katherine Grey, Countess of Hertford (1540-68) holding her son Edward Seymour, styled Viscount Beauchamp (1561-1612) were intended to serve political ends.[521] The miniature itself, now at Belvoir Castle, is undated (Fig. 71). Martin Spies has postulated a date in late 1562 or early 1563, based on the apparent age of the child and the immediate political circumstances, which may have triggered the commission.[522] However, this is problematic. As a prisoner in the Tower, Lady Katherine would not have been permitted visitors without the sanction of the Privy Council, and a visit from a limner does seem improbable.[523] Unfortunately the records are missing for the relevant period, so this cannot be verified unequivocally. A more plausible date,

---

[519] Sotheby's, *Important British Pictures*, 24/11/ 2005, L05123

[520] At the Wroxton Abbey sale, the portrait measured 241 x 149 cm. It has since been restored to its original size.

[521] See Chapter 4, pp. 111-113

[522] Martin Spies, ' Lady Katherine Grey and her Son, pp. 169-170. John Murdoch, Jim Murrell, Patrick J. Noon, Roy Strong, *The English Miniature* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1981), p.76

[523] *Acts of the Privy Council of England*, 7, 1558-1570 (London: H.M.S.O, 1893), p. vii. I am grateful to Dr J. Stephan Edwards for drawing my attention to the Privy Council records. He is of the opinion that Lady Katherine would not have had access to a painter while she was in the Tower.

however, might be soon after her release into the custody of her uncle Lord John Grey in August 1563 and before the latter's death in November 1563, after which she was moved yet again, this time to Ingatestone Hall in Essex.[524] The small panel at Petworth is a faithful copy in every detail (Fig. 4, No. 114). Without technical analysis of the panel and pigment it is impossible to date it precisely, but it is likely to be Elizabethan, perhaps even dating from the 1560s. That the panel was copied directly from the miniature is conceivable because, although the early provenance of neither the miniature nor the panel is known, a direct line of family descent links these portraits at Belvoir Castle and Petworth. Charles Seymour, sixth Duke of Somerset (1662-1748), who rebuilt Petworth, was directly descended from Lord Edward Seymour's second son William Seymour, Earl of Hertford, (1588-1660), who became the second Duke of Somerset in 1660.[525] Lady Frances Seymour (1728-1761), the sixth duke's daughter, married John Manners, Marquess of Grandby (1721-1770), eldest son of the third Duke of Rutland (1696-1779) of Belvoir Castle. At Syon House, seat of the Percy descendants of the sixth Duke of Somerset, there are two versions of the Petworth portrait, one circular (Fig. 72) and the other oval, both painted on panel.[526] However, there are minor differences in costume details, and more significantly, Lord Hertford's image on the miniature worn by Lady Katherine seems to have disappeared. It is as though the focus of the portrait has shifted from Lady Katherine to the descendants of Edward Seymour, whose son, as we have seen, was restored to the dukedom. These later versions signify the eminent antiquity and continuity of the Seymour/Percy lineage, and the importance attached to it by their descendants in more recent times.

Not all paintings survived intact for more than four hundred years, of course. Many have been destroyed, damaged through careless handling, deliberately reduced in size, or have deteriorated in adverse physical conditions. The fragment, *called Son of Richard Assheton of Middleton* (c.1604), (Fig. 35, No.

---

[524] Susan Doran, 'Seymour [Grey], Katherine, countess of Hertford (1540?–1568)', *ODNB*, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25157, accessed 14 May 2017]

[525] He was restored to the dukedom of his great-grandfather (Edward Seymour, first Duke of Somerset, c.1500-1552) in 1660, the year he died.

[526] The Syon House estate was in the possession of the first duke of Somerset, from 1547 until 1552. For other versions see NPGH Image files.

163) is one example.[527] The measurements of *Four Daughters of Sir Lionel Tollemache* (c.1621), recorded in 1821 as 38 x 78 inches (96.5 x 198.1 cm), are now 53.3 x 199 centimetres (Fig. 19, No. 105). The canvas was trimmed down in the 1840s to fit into its current position over the fireplace in the Great Hall, a decision probably made to provide a coherent (and imposing) display of early family portraits in the grandest space in the house for maximum impact.[528] The reverse is also known to have occurred. The portrait of Lady Pope with her children was enlarged and there are possible additions to *Unknown Man of the Toke Family and his Son* (1561) (Fig. 26, No. 111) and *The Holme Family* (1628) (Fig. 27, No. 158) which were discussed in Chapter 2.[529]

Although of a later date than the portraits examined in this thesis we get a real appreciation of the impact envisaged by a substantial hang of family portraits in *The Great Picture* (1646) (Fig. 67). The vast painted triptych commissioned by Lady Anne Clifford, Countess of Pembroke and Montgomery (1590-1676), is presented in an archaic format reminiscent of an earlier age.[530] It was produced soon after she finally took possession of the Clifford family properties. Portraits of Lady Anne herself appear on both side panels; at age fifteen (left), when she became an heiress in 1605, and as a mature woman of over fifty (right). The central panel depicts, life-size, her father George Clifford, third Earl of Cumberland (1558-1605), her mother Lady Margaret Russell (1560-1616) and her two young brothers, Francis (1584-1589) and Robert (1585-1591). Behind the foreground figures are fictive portraits of four women, aunts of Lady Anne. We are explicitly informed that ‘ these 8 Pictures conteyned in this Frame, are Copies drawn out of the Originall Pictures of these Honb^{le} Presonages made by them about the begening of Iune 15[8]9’.[531] Therefore we might assume that the fictive portraits on the right panel, depicting Lady Anne’s husbands, Richard Sackville, third Earl of Dorset (1589-1624) and Philip Herbert, fourth Earl of Pembroke (1584-1650), are also copies of originals. This display of family portraits is what

[527] Chapter 2, p. 63
[528] Waterhouse, *Helmingham*, p. 13
[529] Chapter 2, p. 53, p. 61
[530] Karen Hearn, ‘ “Lady Anne Clifford’s Great Triptych” in ‘Lady Anne Clifford: Culture, Patronage and Gender in 17th Century Britain’, ed. by Karen Hearn and Lynn Tulse, *Yorkshire Archaeological Society*, Occasional Paper, 7, 2009
[531] Hearn, ‘Clifford’, p. 6. The inscription appears on the lowest section of the fictive shield held by Francis Clifford

one might expect to see in a seventeenth-century gallery. Each fictive portrait has a text below the frame which not only identifies the sitter, but also provides further biographical information. It mirrors the practice of adding biographical inscriptions at a later date, so common on Elizabethan and Jacobean portraits. Lady Anne's daughters are not included in *The Great Picture* (1646) because it was essentially a memorial and retrospective portrait, denoting pride in a distinguished ancestry – given additional emphasis by the painted family crests framing both sides of the centre panel – and a legacy for future generations. Two versions of *The Great Picture* (1646) were executed. One version descended through the Tuftons, earls of Thanet, into whose family Lady Anne's daughter, Lady Margaret Sackville (1614-1676), married in 1629.[532] The other version, formerly at Skipton Castle, no longer exists.

The display of family portraits in *The Great Picture* (1646) echoes the presentation of family images that prevail in the historic houses visited by thousands of visitors as a leisure activity today. The narratives of family distinction and legacy are uppermost in the way in which today's tourists experience an historic house. The illusion of being invited guests (not paying customers) is played out. Welcomed by the house guides (in person or in guide books) visitors are given a potted history illustrated by the array of portraits, including early ancestors and royalty that add honour to the family: it is an introduction to their illustrious 'hosts'. Often there will be a canvas portrait of the current occupants to bring the family narrative up-to-date and a collection of photos on pianos and side tables that record the family's status in more recent times.

The endpoint for this thesis is 1630. The impact of the Continental manner introduced by immigrant artists, in particular Anthony van Dyck in the 1630s, does not sweep away older, more vernacular traditions, particularly in representations of non-elite children who were not living within the orbit of London and the court. However, even leading painters are mindful of traditions, such as the deep-rooted connection of certain emblems with children. The packed symbolism in Hogarth's sibling group of the Graham Children (1742) has been

[532] Hearn, 'Clifford', p. 2

noted.[533] Fruit remained an enduring symbol denoting fertility, often appearing collectively in bowls or baskets. Cherries retained their emblematic association with paradise and childhood innocence. Peter Lely's unknown little girl (c.1670) feeds cherries to a parrot, and, in a portrait attributed to John Hayls (1660s), Lady Anne Russell (c.1650-1557) takes the cherries held by her sister, Lady Diana (1652-1701).[534] Flowers continued to feature as attributes of girls, held in their hands or sometimes contained in baskets. Elizabeth Wandesford (Fig. 40, No. 42) and Lady Mary Villiers (1622-1685) (No. 159) have their aprons full of flowers. William Beechey depicted an unknown girl in a portrait dated about 1790, in a similar manner.[535] Coral teething sticks with silver bells hung on ribbons continue to feature in portraits of infants.[536] The traditional placement of children, indicating family hierarchy and masculine superiority, continued to be respected – at least for elite portraits. Joshua Reynolds's portrait of Lady Cockburn (d.1837) with her three eldest sons (1773) depicts the near-naked heir, James Cockburn (1771-1852) on his mother's right, and it is towards him that she gazes.[537] In 1787, Gilbert Stuart posed the son and three daughters of the second Duke of Northumberland (1742-1817) in the relaxed manner of the period, yet was still mindful of the requirement to visually privilege the heir, Hugh Percy, later third duke of Northumberland (1785-1847) (Fig. 76). Still in petticoats, his arms encircling a large greyhound, the little boy is significantly placed on the right of his sisters, Lady Elizabeth Percy (1781-1820), Lady Julia Percy (1782-1812) and Lady Agnes Percy (1785-56) who points towards her twin brother.[538] Although children's physique may be rendered more naturalistically in a later period, it is striking that the conventions of placement and the attributes of childhood, both material and symbolic persist.

---

[533] Chapter 4, p. 116

[534] Peter Lely, *Girl with a Parrot* (c.1670). Tate Britain. NO1016. John Hayls (attrib.), *Lady Anne and Lady Diana Russell* (1660s). Woburn Abbey. Millar, 'Early Portraits of the Russells', p. 470

[535] William Beechey, *Portrait of a Girl* (c.1790). Yale Center for British Art. B1976.7.5

[536] Traditional emblems of childhood were commonplace in American child portraits well into the nineteenth century and feature prominently in folk art.

[537] Joshua Reynolds, *Lady Cockburn and her three Eldest Sons* (1773). National Gallery. NG2077. The bird was Reynolds's pet macaw and likely to have been included for pictorial reasons. Nicholas Penny (ed.), *Reynolds* (London: Royal Academy of Arts and Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1986), cat. no. 88, pp. 259-260

[538] Gilbert Stuart, *The Children of the Second Duke of Northumberland* (1787). Syon House. No. 04317. The identity of these children differs from the record at Syon House, which states that Hugh Percy is the child in the go-cart (centre) and his sister Agnes is seated on the left.

5.5 Conclusion

This thesis has considered questions posited by *Four Children of Sir Thomas Lucy III* (1619) and over a 160 easel portraits of Elizabethan and Jacobean children. This should help to dismiss the notion that images of children in this period are rare. It is clear that the number of representations of children increased in line with the growing number of all portraits, but there is no evidence to suggest that this increase was the result of any differences in attitudes towards children or in concepts of childhood in the early seventeenth century. Portraits have been investigated here as primary sources to gain an understanding of the personal value and significance they had for those that commissioned and owned them, and how they drew from and fed into the cultural beliefs of the society that produced them. The thesis has considered and evaluated the nature of the historical evidence to be found in child portraiture.

It has been argued that Elizabethan and Jacobean children were not simply perceived as 'little adults' in waiting, an assessment supported by a comparison between their 'stiff' depiction in portraits and the apparently more affectionate and relaxed images produced later in the eighteenth century. In fact there was a visual vocabulary specifically for children representing the qualities and characteristics of childhood. I have shown the ways that their portraits distinguish between the stages of childhood in clothes, accessories and attributes. In her survey of childhood studies in 2007, Margaret King lamented the scarcity of information about 'the silent years' from seven to fourteen.[539] I suspect that this may always be the case, but at least I have been able to demonstrate that older girls are depicted with needlework, an accessory that ceases to appear in portraits of adult women. However, just as contemporary conduct manuals promoted the supreme virtue of decorum, so the conventions within portraits intended to be esteemed by contemporaries and destined for posterity, required a reserved demeanour in postures and gestures. Portraiture was a form of cultural expression

[539] Margaret L. King, 'Concepts of Childhood: What we Know and Where we Might Go', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 60, 2, 2007, p. 389

that communicated codes of social respectability, by references to the past, by depicting status in the present and by exhibiting dynastic expectations for the future. The images of children, whether in individual portraits or represented in family groupings, was fundamental to this enterprise. The aesthetic should not blind us to the meanings encoded within portraits, or to the individuality of many of the faces that gaze out from beneath the silks and laces. It is hoped that this thesis has revealed the range, complexity and character of child portraiture in the Elizabethan and Jacobean age and that the old stock prejudices about them have been laid to rest.