



Hunt, C. (2017). The Saltonstall Family: A Study of Time, Space and Memory. *Artibus et historiae*, 75, 181-193.
<http://artibuset historiae.org/chapter857.html>

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record on the Bristol Research Portal](#)
PDF-document

This is the accepted author manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via *Artibus et Historiae* at <http://artibuset historiae.org/chapter857.html> . Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol – Bristol Research Portal

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/brp-terms/>

The Saltonstall Family: A Study of Time, Space and Memory

In the Tate hangs a remarkable portrait of a family generally assumed to be that of the Saltonstall family, painted in c. 1636–37, and attributed to David des Granges (fig. 1).¹ Its enormous size and vibrant colouring immediately attract the attention of the viewer, but the eye also lingers on the sensitive depiction of members of a family, linked together by gaze, touch, and gesture. As well as representing kinship ties, the picture also clearly conveys the family's wealth and status, as evidenced by the costumes and furnishings. The portrait, however, is a rather curious one, with several puzzling elements, most obviously the partly open door at the foot of the bed and the strange gesture at the centre of the composition in which Sir Richard Saltonstall dangles a glove. It is these details which suggest that this is something other than a straightforward family portrait intended as a memorial of those depicted. In this article I will argue that this portrait articulates specific concerns about dynasty and inheritance. I will also explore more generally the ways in which it uses space to convey complex ideas about time.

It has sometimes been suggested that the scene depicts Sir Richard Saltonstall on the occasion of his wife, Elizabeth, giving birth, while another woman, perhaps an assistant at the birth, holds their child.² However it now seems more likely that the recumbent woman is Sir Richard Saltonstall's first wife, Elizabeth Basse, who died in 1630, and the seated woman is his second wife, Mary Parker, whom he married in 1633.³ The two children on the left are the surviving offspring of Sir Richard's first marriage: Richard, aged about seven at the date of his mother's death, and Ann, aged about three. In Mary's arms is a child of Sir Richard's second marriage, possibly John, who was born in 1634 but died as an infant, or, more likely, Philip, born in 1636.⁴ The painting has often been dated to c. 1636–37, although recent research has suggested that the style of dress may support a slightly later date of around 1640.⁵ Either way, it is clear that the portrait shows the two children on the left, not at the ages they would have been at the time the painting was produced, but at the ages they were at the date of their mother's death. The young age of Richard is confirmed by the fact that he is not yet dressed in breeches, which were usually adopted around the age of six or seven.⁶

The Saltonstall Family is often discussed in the same context as John Souch's *Sir Thomas Aston at the Deathbed of his Wife*, 1635–6, now in Manchester Art Gallery (fig. 2), but in spite of the superficial similarity the two paintings are rather different in many respects. The latter depicts the same woman, Magdalene Aston, twice. Nigel Llewellyn explains that the painting is intended to represent both the social and the natural body of Magdalene; 'Souch's theme is the command that death has

over the natural body, in contrast with the survival of the soul'.⁷ In this sense we are reminded of the late medieval *transi* tombs, also known as cadaver tombs, depicting both a rotting corpse and an effigy of the uncorrupted body, with the latter shown as being outside of the ravages of time.⁸ A good example of such a tomb is that of Bishop Bekynton (died 1464) in Wells Cathedral, where we see the effigy of the bishop above and a skeletal figure and shroud below (fig. 3). In both the portrait and the tomb we are invited to contemplate the contrast of the changing body and the eternal soul. In Souch's portrait, however, we might also understand the unchanging body as representing the timeless image of the woman held in the family's memory, and this is reinforced by the poignancy of the depiction of a grieving husband and child. In *The Saltonstall Family*, on the other hand, two separate women are depicted, Elizabeth Basse is shown as dead, and Mary Parker as living, and the artist emphasises this by ensuring that the eye colouring is clearly and specifically differentiated. This shifts the focus away from a reflection on body and soul. Nevertheless, what these two family portraits do share is an engagement with notions of time, contrasting the timeframes of the living with those of the dead, finite time with eternity.

It may not be surprising, then, that this portrait of the Saltonstall family draws strongly on the traditions of seventeenth-century tomb imagery; for example, it was common to find the depiction of a man with several wives (and occasionally a wife with more than one husband).⁹ Tombs often included the living and the dead; many were commissioned during the lifetime of one of the spouses, but would include effigies of both of them.¹⁰ The depiction of the deceased lying in bed was also common, particularly in the case of a woman who had died in childbirth, when the figure of an infant in swaddling clothes was often included.¹¹ It is not known how Elizabeth Saltonstall died, but her depiction in bed recalls brasses such as that of Silvester Lambarde, where we see the dead woman lying in a four-poster bed, or that of Anne Savage, where the hangings of the bed have been drawn aside in a similar way to those in *The Saltonstall Family* (figs. 4 and 5).¹² We also often find, in both brasses and sculpted tombs, children depicted beside their parents, as in Silvester Lambarde's brass and on the tomb of William, Giles and Catherine Savage (fig. 6).¹³

The artist of *The Saltonstall Family* has used the conventions of the family memorial and translated them from a church to a domestic setting. By doing so, the emotional intimacy between the family members has been represented in a way which would not have been possible in a church monument. This is an aspect of the painting which Simon Wilson emphasises when he describes the portrait as a 'warm picture of family life and family history'.¹⁴ Maurice Howard views the painting in a similar way, noting the centrality of the figure of Sir Richard Saltonstall, and suggesting that 'the work chiefly records the grief and the joy that have held his life together'.¹⁵ Both of these views

resonate with the touch and gestures of the individuals depicted, and their positioning within the composition. Once we recognise, though, that *The Saltonstall Family*, in common with the conventions of tomb imagery, includes two spouses, one living and one dead, then it is no longer plausible to see this as a kind of antecedent of the 'conversation piece', or as an image of a family gathered to celebrate the birth of a new child. The inclusion of two wives, who may never have met, and three children whose ages do not correspond with a specific date or with the ages of one another, not only disrupts conventional notions of time, but indicates that the portrait might have served a rather different purpose.

The key, I would suggest, lies in the two rather peculiar elements included in the picture, namely, the glove gesture and the partly opened door. Let us start with the glove: at the very centre of the composition Sir Richard Saltonstall appears to be offering a glove to his dead wife, Elizabeth. Perhaps surprisingly, many scholars discussing this painting do not refer to the glove at all, in spite of its prominence, and the peculiarity of the gesture in such a context. Those that do so tend to focus on the family relationships; for example, Simon Wilson writes, 'the downward pointing glove makes a visual link that completes a chain of hands uniting the first Lady Saltonstall with her husband and children'.¹⁶ David Smith suggests that Sir Richard is offering the glove as a gift to his wife on the birth of their latest offspring,¹⁷ which makes little sense in the context of the more recent identification of the individuals depicted and bearing in mind that it is his *second* wife who has just produced a son.

Gloves were ubiquitous in portraiture of this period, and were often depicted worn or held, or, as here, with the sitter wearing one and holding the other. In many cases the gloves were simply included as fashion accessories, but in some circumstances the gloves should be interpreted symbolically, especially where, for example, the portrait might be described as emblematic, where the gesture is particularly unusual, or where single gloves are involved.¹⁸ Sir Richard Saltonstall's gesture of holding a glove over the hand of his wife is sufficiently striking to raise the possibility of a symbolic interpretation in this case. Gloves carried a range of connotations in the early modern period, and it is important, in my view, to interpret the glove gesture at the centre of *The Saltonstall Family* in this wider context. Most relevant, perhaps, is the fact that gloves were associated with good faith, legal contracts, vows and promises.¹⁹ For example, tenures were often held by the annual delivery of a glove, which William Beck suggests were 'the remains of the ancient practice of binding a bargain, or transfer of property, by the delivery of a glove'.²⁰ He cites the example of the Earl of Arundel and Shrewsbury, who, in 1083, 'vowed the construction of an Abbey to St. Peter at Shrewsbury, and, in token of his intent, placed his glove on the altar of the monastery there'.²¹ M.

Channing Linthicum suggests that 'possibly because of their use in ecclesiastical ceremonies, and in law, gloves were symbolic of trust and honour'.²² In fact the association between gloves and 'truth and trust' was such that, according to Beck, gloves 'came to be sworn upon, as though they were relics or holy things'.²³ These connotations continued from medieval times well into the early modern period, and, as well as references in legal and contractual documents of various kinds, we also find gloves featured in the literature of this period with similar meanings: for example, in Shakespeare's *Merry Wives of Windsor*, Slender swears three times on his glove that it was Pistol who picked his pocket.²⁴

This widespread use of the glove during the early modern period in England to represent a vow or contract, or good faith in a more general sense, may suggest a meaning for the glove in the portrait of the Saltonstall family. The very deliberate way in which Sir Richard offers his right glove to his dead wife, and the way the gesture is placed centrally in the composition, may indicate that it represents a promise or vow. In the context of those depicted within the painting, I would propose that the gesture has been used to represent Sir Richard making a promise, by swearing on his glove, to protect the interests of the children from his first marriage, in the light of the birth of a child from his second marriage. This makes particular sense if we follow the gaze, touch and gestures of those depicted: Sir Richard holds the hand of his eldest son, who in turn holds the hand of his sister; Elizabeth extends her hand beneath the glove, but seems to gesture towards her two children; Sir Richard appears to look at his second wife, while his eldest son looks at the viewer. The picture then serves as a materialisation of the promise to protect the interests of the children, which should be understood both in general terms and specifically in terms of inheritance. The importance of the protection of the rights of the eldest son may be articulated by the outward gaze of the younger Richard Saltonstall. The glove, I would suggest, is included centrally in the composition to record and make public the intended line of inheritance, and the importance of it to all the members of the family.

Such an interpretation is entirely compatible with the concerns of the time. Ralph Houlbrooke, in his work on the English family in the early modern period, discusses the frequency of second marriages amongst widowers, especially because of the need for help with offspring from an earlier marriage.²⁵ This often led to family disputes: 'quarrels between husband and wife, fears that a second marriage would lead to the neglect of the children of an earlier union, and unfair treatment of younger sons or brothers: all these provoked letters of remonstrance or reminders of family obligations' (from relatives).²⁶ Houlbrooke specifically cites examples of bitterly fought legal cases between second wives and the sons of first marriages which reached the courts.²⁷ It would be entirely

understandable, then, for Sir Richard Saltonstall to seek to avoid such uncertainty, and unpleasant, and no doubt costly, litigation by commissioning a permanent 'visual document' articulating his testamentary intentions. By doing so, he is looking beyond his immediate circumstances, specifically the birth of a new child, and indeed beyond his own lifetime, to address issues of dynastic continuity and the future wellbeing of his family.

The visual representation of the writing of wills or concerns with matters of inheritance was not unique to Des Granges's *The Saltonstall Family*. Thomas Braithwaite of Ambleside was depicted on his deathbed in the process of writing a will (fig. 7). On the paper in his hands are written the words: 'In you, O God, he hoped; in you did he not despair; In you, O God, he was victorious, he wrote his last...'.²⁸ This painting reflects the recommended preparations for dying in the early modern period. Individuals were expected to prepare their souls, but also to make preparations for the transfer of their worldly possessions.²⁹ The writing of a will was often made on an individual's deathbed, as we see in the portrait of Thomas Braithwaite, but the scene was sometimes more crowded than appears in this painting. As Houlbrooke notes, the family and relatives tended to gather around the deathbed:

Self-interest, too, dictated the attendance at the deathbed of a number of close relatives, because it was typically there that wills were made or amended, especially by those with relatively little property. Prospective beneficiaries gathered round the deathbed, not only to bear witness to the dying man's wishes, but also, if need be, to attempt to sway him in their favour.³⁰

Such a gathering around the deathbed can be seen in a detail from *The crie of the poore for the death of the Right Honourable Earle of Huntingdon* (London, 1596), where the dying man, surrounded by family members, attends to both his soul, and to the writing of a will (fig. 8).³¹ This is relevant to *The Saltonstall Family* in that the deathbed, where we see Elizabeth, is the place associated with making arrangements for the financial well-being of family members, and the place where those intentions were often formally recorded. The depiction of Sir Richard Saltonstall at his first wife's bedside, promising to respect the dying woman's wishes, is therefore entirely appropriate.

There were also paintings from this period which showed the importance of inheritance in a different way, in that they were commissioned to record the *reinstatement* of an individual's inheritance. A well-known example is *The Great Picture*, 1646, painted as a triptych, and now in Abbot Hall Art Gallery, Kendal (fig. 9).³² The left panel depicts Lady Anne Clifford, aged fifteen, at the date her father died. As the only surviving child, she was entitled to the Clifford Estate, but her father instead left the titles and property to his brother.³³ The right panel shows her at the age of 56, the point at which, following an extensive legal battle, she regained her inheritance. The central

panel shows her parents with the two brothers who pre-deceased their father leaving Anne as heir.³⁴ Anne's mother gestures towards the two boys who, at this point, would have been heirs to the Clifford titles. This gesture and the placing of the boys, linked together on the left of the composition, are strikingly reminiscent of both the gesture of Elizabeth Basse and the positioning of the children in *The Saltonstall Family*. In spite of clear differences between the two paintings in a number of respects, it seems that Des Granges's family portrait is articulating similar concerns to those expressed in *The Great Picture*: both show the importance of dynasty and rights of inheritance.

What these two paintings also have in common is the variety of ways used by each of the artists to articulate different periods of time. In particular, figures are included at differing ages and both pictures include the living and the dead. In *The Great Picture*, the three sections of the triptych are used to represent different time periods, and the inclusion of portraits within the picture adds a further time dimension to the three main panels. For example, in the central panel hang portraits of Lady Anne Clifford's aunts and in the left panel are portraits of her tutor and governess.³⁵ In an interesting parallel with *The Saltonstall Family*, both of Lady Anne's husbands are depicted in the right panel; her first husband, who had died in 1624, is depicted at the top, and her second husband, from whom she was estranged, is depicted below.³⁶

Whereas the three distinct time periods in *The Great Picture* are shown by means of a triptych format, evoking the doors of a winged altarpiece, in *The Saltonstall Family* we quite literally find the inclusion of a partly opened door at the foot of the bed.³⁷ I have found no references in the scholarly literature to this curious aspect of the painting. The latch and handle are clearly defined, but there is no logic to the positioning of the door within the room; it seems to open from the bed, which would make little sense, but the extensive tapestry hanging along the rear wall precludes any door opening from that part of the room. This strange placing of the door would suggest a symbolic reading, perhaps alluding either to the threshold between life and death, or the concept of access. I will explore each in turn in relation to this family portrait.

The idea of the door as a threshold between life and death had a long history and was well established. Doors featured prominently in classical tomb imagery, with both open and closed doors used widely as a motif on Roman stelae and sarcophagi. In seventeenth-century Italy, the door motif again became popular on tomb monuments,³⁸ and there are also several examples in Dutch funerary art of the same period, although the motif here is less common.³⁹ I have found no early modern English examples in tomb imagery, although the motif may have been familiar in England since a number of classical stelae were in the collection of the Earl of Arundel at this time.⁴⁰

Whether or not the artist who painted *The Saltonstall Family* would have been familiar with the motif is difficult to assess.

There is however a stark difference between these examples and the depiction of the door in *The Saltonstall Family*, in that the former are generally depicted from a frontal perspective, whereas in the latter the door is perpendicular to the picture plane. Indeed, if we look beyond the examples of tomb monuments to a wider range of visual sources, the door is strongly reminiscent of that found in the Mérode Altarpiece, produced by the workshop of Robert Campin in the Southern Netherlands in 1427–32 (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York), where the donors, in the left panel, kneel behind a partly open door which separates them from the sacred space in which the holy figures are depicted, in the central and right panels (fig. 10).⁴¹ In this case, the divide between the left and the central panels, accentuated and given symbolic impact by the door, does not separate two events in a coherent timeline, in the way two related narrative events might be depicted, for example. Instead it represents two distinct *types* of time: sacred time and secular time.⁴² This notion of the door representing the separation of different types of time might also be a useful way of interpreting the door in *The Saltonstall Family*. The door could be read as a symbolic device to divide the space occupied by the living from that occupied by the dead, and in that sense is a marker of both space and time.

Since there is no evidence to suggest that the artist who produced *The Saltonstall Family* would have been familiar with either the classical motif or the Mérode Altarpiece, the door we see in *The Saltonstall Family* may simply be a representation of the expression 'at the door of death' which was used widely at this time, and can be found extensively in sermons, plays and other printed material. For example, we find the metaphor used by the Duchess of Malfi in John Webster's play:

I know death hath ten thousand several doors
For men to take their exits. (Act IV, Scene II, lines 217-8)⁴³

The inclusion of a door, then, in *The Saltonstall Family*, although strange in compositional terms, is appropriate in symbolic terms, placed as it is at the foot of the bed in which we see the deceased figure of Elizabeth. Although its precise meaning is unclear, the door might well represent the threshold between life and death, and in particular signify the point in time at which Elizabeth dies. The placing of the door immediately behind the eldest son might explain why the two children of the first marriage are depicted at the ages they were at the time of their mother's death, rather than at the date of the portrait. More significantly, it would also place within a timeframe the promise represented by the glove at the centre of the composition. The promise is one made at the time of Elizabeth's death, albeit that the importance of the promise relates to a potential future marriage

and the birth of other offspring, an event that has now taken place. It is only at this later juncture, that the promise needs to be re-affirmed, and this we see in the commissioning of the family portrait.

An alternative interpretation of the door is to see it as denoting access, here presumably, access to inheritance. This would make sense in the light of the glove gesture and the fact that the door is positioned as passing directly behind the head of the eldest son. It is possible that there is a similar use of the door in *The Great Picture* in Kendal; although it is difficult to see, even on close inspection, on the left hand side is an undefined panel behind Lady Anne Clifford which appears to be closed. On the right hand side, in contrast, the edge of what might be a door is visible.⁴⁴ These edges, framing undefined spaces, may perhaps represent open and closed access. Furthermore, in the central panel the edge of the arch, which leads into an open recess, passes directly behind the head of the eldest son. The other side of the arch passes through Anne's mother, who is pregnant with Anne at the time represented in this panel.⁴⁵ This may be reading too much into a simple compositional arrangement, but a parallel with the positioning of the door in *The Saltonstall Family* is possible.

Even if it is not clear what the door in *The Saltonstall Family* represents, whether the threshold between life and death, access to inheritance, or perhaps something different again, it certainly creates a spatial divide of some kind. The positioning of the glove gesture also corresponds with a clear dividing device, falling precisely along the edge of the drawn back curtain. Furthermore, it is placed at the intersection between the bed, the place of the dead, the curtain, in front of which is the zone of the living, and a starkly depicted black triangle which takes no account of the continuity of the tapestry along the back wall. This use of the picture space here, divided symbolically in both two- and three-dimensional space, is similar to that found in another painting of the same period, the *Portrait of William Style of Langley*, 1636, by an unknown artist (fig. 11).

The sitter of this portrait holds his right glove in his left hand in a similar gesture to Sir Richard Saltonstall, and again the gesture with the glove coincides with a centrally placed dividing line. In this case, the sitter's gloves are placed across the divide between inside and outside, with the hilt of the sword and the colour contrast of light and dark serving to disconnect the hand and the glove from the rest of the body. This seems to create two disembodied hands, as it were, in keeping with the emblematic qualities of the portrait. This glove gesture might again be interpreted as representing a promise or vow, in much the same way as in *The Saltonstall Family*; here, though, the promise is likely to represent a commitment to the spiritual life. The implications of the portrait are that Style is turning his back on earthly pursuits: 'his books, music and the coat of arms which define

his social position',⁴⁶ and which are depicted on the left side of the painting, and embracing the Christian life represented by the garden on the right side.⁴⁷ The glove gesture in *The Saltonstall Family* is rather more naturalistic than the 'disembodied' hands of William Style of Langley, but both use a glove gesture to represent a promise or commitment, as well as emphasising the significance of the gesture by placing it centrally within the composition, coinciding with a clear compositional divide.⁴⁸

Roy Strong suggests that in the *Portrait of William Style of Langley*, as in other emblematic portraits of this period, the difference between the perspective of the painting as a whole and that of the garden is used as a device to emphasise the emblematic function of the latter.⁴⁹ The introduction of an external landscape takes a rather different form in *The Saltonstall Family*: taking up the entire back wall is a carefully depicted tapestry of a forest. Karen Hearn notes that the level of detail in the textiles suggests that they are likely to have been painted from actual items, rather than being 'composite idealised' textiles.⁵⁰ Whether or not this is the case, there are aspects of the tapestry, and the space in which the members of the Saltonstall family are depicted more generally, which seem to convey something other than a naturalistic rendering of the furnishings of a room. This perhaps should not be surprising, since the family portrait is clearly highly constructed, for example in its inclusion of family members from different time periods. The lack of furnishings, other than the bed and chair, and the fact that the tapestry fills the background entirely, conveys an 'other-worldliness' to the composition. This is accentuated by the opening of the door 'into' the forest. It is possible that, as with the glove and door, the forest is intended to have a symbolic meaning, but if this is the case, the meaning is unclear. Nevertheless, the different types of space, the interior of a room and an external landscape, again seem to correlate with different types of time: the earthly time experienced by the family members contrasts with an unchanging world beyond life, which is perhaps alluded to in the unpopulated landscape. Although the forest is embedded in the picture space in a different manner to William Style's garden, it is tempting to compare the two in the way they seem to serve as a reference to an alternative world.⁵¹

In conclusion, there are a number of ways in which *The Saltonstall Family* uses the picture space to explore notions of time: the family members are depicted at ages which do not correspond to a particular date and the living are represented alongside the dead. Finite earthly time is contrasted with eternal time, through compositional devices within the two- and three-dimensional space, as well as through the inclusion of symbolic elements such as the partly opened door. Nevertheless, it remains a commemorative painting, employing conventions of tomb imagery to memorialise the living and the dead, while also conveying the intimacy of the family relationships. Sherlock describes

memory in the early modern period as an 'act' which might include 'a rehearsal of a genealogy, the expression of grief, or the recollection of familial duties'.⁵² *The Saltonstall Family* is very much an 'act of memory' in this sense; it rehearses genealogy through the inclusion of two wives and three children, and it records Sir Richard Saltonstall's 'familial duty', specifically that of ensuring the financial wellbeing of his offspring and the rights of inheritance of his eldest son, by means of the sitter's glove gesture at the centre of the composition. The family's grief is not articulated in an explicit way, as is the case with *Sir Thomas Aston at the Deathbed of his Wife*, but the family portrait nevertheless conveys something of the precarious balance of life and death in this period. Indeed, this extraordinary painting manages to articulate much about memory, family relationships, inheritance, life, and death in early modern England.

I am grateful to Beth Williamson, University of Bristol, for her helpful comments and continued support.

¹ The painting is generally attributed to David des Granges, a London based artist known for his portrait miniatures. In 1933 the painting, described as 'Members of the Saltonstall family', was sold as part of the collection of the Earls of Guildford, from Wroxton Abbey, Oxfordshire, a property which had been owned by the family for generations. This would support the proposed identities of the sitters, although it should be noted that the identification is not secure. The portrait may be dated to c. 1640, based on the costumes, but this would not tally with the ages of the Saltonstall children at that time, Karen Hearn, Catalogue Entry 2008 (<http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/des-granges-the-saltonstall-family-t02020/text-catalogue-entry>, accessed 27 May 2014). Although the identity of the sitters may not be that of the Saltonstall family, I argue here that there is a possible explanation for a discrepancy in the date of the portrait and the ages of the children.

² See for example, David R. Smith, *Masks of Wedlock: Seventeenth-Century Dutch Marriage Portraiture*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI, 1982, p. 80, and Judith W. Hurtig, 'Death in Childbirth: Seventeenth-Century English Tombs and their Place in Contemporary Thought', *Art Bulletin*, Vol., 65, No. 4 (Dec. 1983), p. 610.

³ Karen Hearn, Catalogue Entry 2008 (<http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/des-granges-the-saltonstall-family-t02020/text-catalogue-entry>).

⁴ Karen Hearn, Catalogue Entry 2008 (<http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/des-granges-the-saltonstall-family-t02020/text-catalogue-entry>).

⁵ Valerie Cumming in conversation with Karen Hearn, Catalogue Entry 2008 (<http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/des-granges-the-saltonstall-family-t02020/text-catalogue-entry>).

⁶ Karen Hearn, Catalogue Entry 2008 (<http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/des-granges-the-saltonstall-family-t02020/text-catalogue-entry>).

⁷ Nigel Llewellyn, *The Art of Death: Visual Culture in the English Death Ritual c. 1500– c. 1800*. London: Reaktion Books in association with the Victoria and Albert Museum, 1991, p. 47. Llewellyn explains that, in post-Reformation England, the contrast between the human experiences of life and death was understood in terms of two bodies, a concept adapted from the medieval theory of the 'King's Two Bodies'. The natural body decayed after death, as opposed to the survival of the soul or 'social body'; 'In the process of dying, the death of the natural body was followed by efforts to preserve the social body as an element in the collective memory' (pp. 46-49). The concept of the separation of the body and soul at death is also discussed by David Cressy in *Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), pp. 384-85.

⁸ For a discussion of *transi* or cadaver tombs, see Peter Sherlock, *Monuments and Memory in early Modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008, pp. 46-53.

⁹ Sherlock, pp. 60-2. For example, on one tomb, that of Sir Richard Fitzlewes (died 1528 in Ingrave, Essex), the deceased is represented with his four wives.

¹⁰ Llewellyn, pp. 16-17.

-
- ¹¹ This is discussed in detail in Hurtig, especially pp. 603-9.
- ¹² Hurtig, p. 604. Sculpted tombs might similarly depict the deceased in a bed, as we see in the monument to Arthur and Elizabeth Coke (died 1627), where the latter is shown propped up on pillows and draped in blankets (pp. 606-7).
- ¹³ Hurtig, pp. 605-6.
- ¹⁴ Simon Wilson, *Tate Gallery: An Illustrated Companion*, Tate Gallery, London, revised edition 1991, p.17.
- ¹⁵ Maurice Howard, *The Tudor Image*. London: Tate Gallery, 1995, p. 52.
- ¹⁶ Wilson, p. 17.
- ¹⁷ Smith, p. 80.
- ¹⁸ For a wide-ranging discussion of the significance of gloves in early modern art see Catherine Hunt, *Translation and Transformation: The Depiction of Gloves in Western Art from c. 1400–1660* (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Bristol, 2012). The significance of the unpaired glove is explored in Peter Stallybrass and Ann Rosalind Jones, 'Fetishizing the Glove in Renaissance Europe', *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 28, No. 1, Things. (Autumn 2001), 119–32.
- ¹⁹ There was also a close connection between gloves and marriage, possibly because of the associations with vows and contracts, and gloves were frequently distributed to mourners at funerals and guests at weddings. For further discussion of gloves and their associations in an English context see Valerie Cumming, *Gloves* (London: Batsford, 1982), Phillis Cunnington and Catherine Lucas, *Costume for Births, Marriages and Deaths* (London, A & C Black, 1972), and Robert Tittler, 'Freemen's Gloves and Civic Authority: The Evidence from Post-Reformation Portraiture', *Costume*, Vol. 40, (2006), pp. 13-21.
- ²⁰ S. William Beck, *Gloves: Their Annals and Associations; A Chapter of Trade and Social History*. Montana: Kessinger Publishing, 2008 (first published 1883), pp. 197-8. For example, in 1225 there is documentary evidence of a lease for 22 years from William Segin of Lavinton to William Kemesie 'of land (boundaries described), a messuage and a croft in the township of Lavinton: rent for the whole term to be paid at once because of William Segin's debts with the Jews of Winchester, and thereafter an annual payment of a pair of white gloves is to be made' (<http://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/SearchUI/Details?uri=C7580470>, accessed 2/7/2012).
- ²¹ Beck, p. 199.
- ²² M. Channing Linthicum, *Costume in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*. New York: Russell and Russell, 1963, p. 266.
- ²³ Beck, p. 195.
- ²⁴ William Shakespeare, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, ed. by David Crane. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997 (Act I, Scene 1, lines 121, 124, 131).
- ²⁵ Ralph A. Houlbrooke *Death, Religion, and the Family in England, 1480–1750*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998, p. 233.
- ²⁶ Ralph A. Houlbrooke *The English Family, 1450–1700*. London: Longman, 1984, p. 49.
- ²⁷ Houlbrooke, *Death, Religion, and the Family*, pp. 90-2.
- ²⁸ Llewellyn, p. 38.
- ²⁹ Llewellyn, p. 18.
- ³⁰ Houlbrooke, *The English Family*, p. 202.
- ³¹ Cressy, p. 391. Cressy also stresses the importance of the deathbed as a place where financial and domestic arrangements were put in place (p. 392).
- ³² For a detailed discussion of this painting see, Karen Hearn, 'Lady Anne Clifford's "Great Triptych"', in *Lady Anne Clifford: Culture, Patronage and Gender in Seventeenth-Century Britain*, edited by Karen Hearn and Lynn Hulse (Leeds: Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 2009), pp. 1-24, and Graham Parry, 'The Great Picture of Lady Anne Clifford', in *Art and Patronage in the Caroline Courts: Essays in honour of Sir Oliver Millar*, edited by David Howarth (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 202-219.
- ³³ Parry, pp. 202, 204.
- ³⁴ Parry, pp. 202, 208.
- ³⁵ Parry, p. 208. The portraits in the central panel include two aunts from her mother's side, and two from her father's (her uncle who inherited the estate at her expense is significantly omitted from the gallery).
- ³⁶ Parry, p. 214.
- ³⁷ A family portrait in a similar triptych format can be seen in the portrait of the Holme family (1628, V&A, London).

³⁸ For a detailed discussion of the motif of the door in sepulchral monuments of the classical and Baroque periods see Jan Białostocki, 'The Door of Death: Survival of a Classical Motif in Sepulchral Art', *Jahrbuch der Hamburger Kunstsammlungen*, Vol. 18 (Jan. 1973), pp. 7-32. See also Howard Colvin, *Architecture and the After-life* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1991), pp. 226-30.

³⁹ Frits Scholten, 'François Dieussart, Constantijn Huygens, and the Classical Ideal in Funerary Sculpture', *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art*, Vol. 25, No. 4 (1997), pp. 324-26.

⁴⁰ Scholten, pp. 315-6.

⁴¹ A general discussion of the iconography of the door in the Mérode Altarpiece can be found in Margaret B. Freeman, 'The Iconography of the Mérode Altarpiece', *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, New Series, Vol. 16, No. 4 (Dec., 1957), pp. 135-36. Alfred Acres refers to the Mérode Altarpiece in his discussion of temporal dimensions in sacred imagery in 'The Columba Altarpiece and the Time of the World' (*The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 80, No. 3 (Sep., 1998), pp. 422-51). Lynn F. Jacobs discusses the door in the context of 'miraculous thresholds' in her article 'Rubens and the Northern Past: The Michielsens Triptych and the Thresholds of Modernity' (*The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 91, No. 3 (September 2009), pp. 302-24), and in her book *Opening Doors: The Early Netherlandish Triptych Reinterpreted* (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2012), pp. 10-11, 42-43 and 48-52.

⁴² See footnote 39.

⁴³ John Webster, *The Duchess of Malfi*, second edition, ed. by John Russell Brown. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009.

⁴⁴ Hearn notes that the triptych is covered by a thick layer of discoloured varnish (p. 4), which would make it particularly difficult to decipher details in the darker parts of the painting. Later copies of the painting, a 1878 woodcut and a copy by George Perfect Harding, c. 1836-39, reproduced in Hearn (figs. 17 and 18) do not make any clearer what these spaces might represent.

⁴⁵ Parry, p. 208.

⁴⁶ Howard, p. 74.

⁴⁷ On the left hand side, as well as the books and music, there are discarded outdoor clothes placed across a chair, above which, set in the window, are Style's coat-of-arms and the motto 'vix ea nostra voco' ('I scarcely call these things my own'). On the right of the composition, Style points with his cane to an emblematic globe in a flaming heart, above which is written 'Microcosmus Microcosmi non impletur Megacosmo' ("The microcosm (or heart) of the microcosm (or man) is not filled (even) by the megacosm (or world)" – that is to say that the human heart is not sated with the whole created world, but only with its Creator'). The iconographical programme of the portrait seems to derive in large part from a German religious text by Johann Michael Dilherr, *Contemplations, Sighes and Groanes of a Christian*, first published in 1634, and translated by Style in 1639. Significantly, the frontispiece to Style's translation of Dilherr's work shows a similarly symbolic garden on the right hand side of the composition (*The Tate Gallery 1978–80: Illustrated Catalogue of Acquisitions*, London, 1981, published online at <http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/british-school-17th-century-portrait-of-william-style-of-langley-t02308/text-catalogue-entry> (accessed 31/8/2012)). There is a useful discussion of the symbolism of the painting in John Dixon Hunt, 'The Portrait of William Style of Langley: Some Reflections', *John Donne Journal: Studies in the Age of Donne*, Vol. 5 (1986), pp. 291-310. Strong also discusses the painting in *The Artist and the Garden*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000, pp. 97-98, and includes a reproduction of the Frontispiece to William Style's translation of J. M. Dilherr, *Contemplations, Sighes and Groanes of a Christian*.

⁴⁸ William Style was a lawyer and law reporter, and his familiarity with the usage of gloves in legal contexts to represent contracts and good faith may have contributed to the motivation to include gloves in this portrait as a symbolic gesture of commitment. J. H. Baker in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography: <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26755> (accessed 31/8/2012).

⁴⁹ Strong, p. 98. It is worth noting that the vanishing point in this picture (following the lines on the floor, and excluding the garden) is on the divide between the interior scene (the 'worldly' side) and the garden scene (the 'spiritual' side), and is on a level with the gloves. It is also significant that Style's 'disembodied' gloves are depicted on the picture plane as part of the garden scene, and so serve to evoke the disembodied hands of emblems. See for example the garden emblem from Henry Peacham's *Minerva Britannia* (1612), reproduced and discussed in Strong (p. 89).

⁵⁰ Karen Hearn, Catalogue Entry 2008 (<http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/des-granges-the-saltonstall-family-t02020/text-catalogue-entry>).

⁵¹ In *The Artist and the Garden* (p. 95), Strong discusses the contrast between the iconography of the garden and that of the greenwood tree, which was associated with melancholy. This can be seen, for example, in Isaac Oliver's *Portrait of a Young Man*, c. 1590–95. In *The Saltonstall Family* the emphasis is on dynasty and commemoration, so an association with melancholy would probably be inappropriate in this case.

⁵² Sherlock, p. 1