

REVIEW ESSAY

The 'Feminine Dynamic' in Tudor Art: A reassessment

Robert Tittler

I

Susan E James's *The Feminine Dynamic in English Art, 1485–1603* (2009) offered the most comprehensive work to date on English women painters, patrons, and consumers of art in the period 1485–1603.¹ As several reviewers of the book pointed out, a work on this subject promised to fill numerous gaps in what we know about the role of women in producing, patronizing, and generally supporting artistic production in that time and place. Nearly all reviews of the book praised James for pioneering the subject, and for doing so with such elegant expression.² Yet some reviewers were too quick to purchase the product on offer before considering the fine print. Those who did their due diligence in assessing the book at hand roundly criticized the work as overlooking important secondary works on particular issues, and especially for being too prone to argue from supposition in the absence of evidence. As Diane Wolfthal put it best and most delicately, '... the author shows a propensity to convert conjecture into fact.'³

Among the positive and important contributions of James's work is the impetus it provided for further investigation, which is one of the true marks of an important book whatever its flaws might be. Following up on that implicit invitation, a close and deliberative examination of James's claims, tracked down to their sources and placed in context, offers a reassessment of her approach and thus of her conclusions. In addition, a new and comprehensive database of all painters working in the British Isles in the period covered by James may now be employed to provide a firmer evidential footing against which her claims for women painters, if not for their role of patrons, may be assessed.⁴

The present essay begins with an assessment of James's conclusions about women painters and the evidence on which it stands, followed by a re-examination of their role in the period 1485–1603. Employing the fruits of additional research, it seeks to revisit the entire subject, and thus to provide a corrective to James's earnest and pioneering but, in the end, deeply flawed account.

II

Despite the very successful and long-familiar use of unpublished primary source material by such art historians and curators as, eg, Erna Auerbach as early as 1954,⁵ Mary Edmund from 1978,⁶ and Susan Foister from 1981,⁷ James makes much of what she implies is the still novel strategy of resorting to such sources as wills and inventories to support her thesis.⁸ She offers this as a way of 'looking beyond traditional sources' and 'broaden(ing) the base of research by investigating material from primary documents more generally considered the province of [the field of] English History'.⁹ But it is her tendency to argue beyond such evidence, or her

failure to produce it altogether, which leads her repeatedly to make extravagantly questionable claims. In addition, some of her contentions come down to overly enthusiastic interpretation of style and technique for which her connoisseurial expertise appears insufficient. Of the tendency to read too much into her sources there are several glaring examples. For one, she notes that

During the Tudor period, seven men held the position of sergeant painter and of those seven, evidence shows that five of them had wives who were either artists who continued the family business or entrepreneurs who ... took over the control of his workshop.¹⁰

Leaving aside James's failure here and throughout the book to distinguish between 'artists' and 'craftsmen', the subsequent discussion amounts to somewhat less than meets the eye. We read that John Browne's widow Anne Gulliver inherited his workshop *and* continued to work in her husband's occupation. The same may be said of William Herne's wife Alice, who inherited his workshop and is known from other sources to have been a painter in her own right. But Andrew Wright's widow Annis and Antonio Toto's widow Katherine merely inherited workshops without any indication that they continued as painters or kept up the business. James fails to document what such an inheritance entailed, or to explain more precisely how it contributed to a 'feminine dynamic'. Unless they sold them or let them out, the best explanation of what painters' widows did with inherited workshops around this time may lay not in evidence from the London scene, but rather from the much better preserved painters' archives in the provincial city of Chester. Chester was one of very few places in England at that time which sustained a formal guild structure for the painters' occupation. The records of that guild have miraculously survived, sporadically from c1575 and more methodically from 1621. They shed extensive light on the working life of Early Modern English painters.¹¹ Up to c1640 no fewer than seven painters' widows in Chester inherited their husbands' shops and freeman's status, and appear to have kept shops open thereafter. But there is no evidence that any of them worked as painters themselves. Rather, they tended to hire journeymen by the year, both to carry on the work until, in most cases, a young son came to his majority and/or completed his apprenticeship and took it over.¹² The same experience, shared by most occupations, will most probably have pertained as well among the London-based widows whom James cites.

While James accepts that inheritance of a workshop or tools 'did not necessarily mean that a widow took over her husband's business rather than simply selling it', her discussion here and elsewhere strongly implies the opposite presumption.¹³ Audrey Beene, we read, inherited a workshop from her painter-husband Thomas, the son of the painters William and Alice Herne. And when Audrey died a year later we read that 'she mentioned in her will several family paintings and 'the rent of my shoppe in the Exchange'.¹⁴ Given its context, we are left with the distinct impression that Audrey let out the shop to others. But neither the ownership of several paintings by someone who was both the daughter-in-law of two painters and the widow of another, or the possession of a rental property in the Royal Exchange, make one a painter in one's own right. The widows of the painters Gerlach Flicke and Robert Pilgrame are noted merely as having served as executors of their husbands' wills, without any indication that they even inherited a workshop.¹⁵

Of course some widows, as in Chester, did provide occupational continuity in the painters' trade, and James's strongest example of that remains Anne Gulliver, the wife of the Serjeant Painter to the Crown, John Browne (d 1532). In

Susan E James

The Feminine Dynamic in English Art 1485–1603
Ashgate 2009 376pp 52bw ISBN 978-0-7546-6381-2
£85.50 (publishers website price)

leaving his tools to Anne, Browne noted that he did so for 'so long as she occupieth myne occupacion',¹⁶ which indicates his expectation that she would do so. But James offers no evidence that Anne (along with Alice Herne) worked, in her words, as 'unofficial associate serjeant painters' and 'continued [after their husbands' deaths] to practice as artists using the family workshop to provide an outlet for their work'.¹⁷ Browne's full will actually suggests quite a contrasting possibility. He required Anne to *commission* banners and streamers – bread and butter tasks for a working painter-stainer – for two London parish churches rather than to paint them herself as 'an associate serjeant painter' could easily have done.¹⁸ James's comments on Alice Herne's presumed career draws upon the same evidence or, in James's passing reference to (but not citation of) Herne's 'presence on royal payrolls and in royal chamber accounts'.¹⁹

A further and equally striking example of such problems with the use of wills appears in James's discussion of Alice Gammedge of Saffron Walden, Essex.²⁰ James's case for Gammedge as a painter in her own right has struck one reviewer of her book as so persuasive as to allow her name to 'now make its way into the artistic canon'.²¹ Gammedge, James tells us, may be credited with having run 'a workshop in the provinces', and having left painting supplies and frames to her son. She further asserts that Gammedge 'may have been employed as a cloth painter, as her will suggests'; and 'was a practicing artist at her death in 1591'.²²

Despite James's claims to have relied on primary documents including wills and inventories,²³ all these claims for Gammedge derive from one single sentence excerpted from a published secondary source written by the long-time Essex county archivist Frederick Emmison.²⁴ The original will, which James appears not to have consulted, does indeed affirm that Gammedge left a bequest to her son Robert Laxson of her frames 'with painted pictures or stories in them', together with her 'stones, colours and frames and other things belonging to the art, mystery, science or occupation of a painter'.²⁵

Gammedge may, as James tells us, have run a provincial workshop, painted cloths (which would make her a 'stainer' as well), been an 'artist' rather than a mere craftsman, and have remained an active painter at her death in 1591. But none of those possibilities is specifically indicated in the will that she cites from Emmison's two-line excerpt from the original, or in any other documentation on offer. Gammedge may just as likely have been passing on painters' supplies left by her deceased husband Thomas (d 1578), who undoubtedly *was* a practising painter, to her son once he was old enough to have followed the painters' trade. Unsupported by any other evidence of such claims, the will itself makes this an equally plausible possibility.

One further flaw in James's claims for Gammedge's work as an artist serves further to affirm the importance of reading documents in full and in their original. Had that been done here, James would have noted that Gammedge 'signed' it only with her mark: *she could not sign her name*.²⁶ She would thus have found it difficult to run her own workshop, which surely required the ability to read and write contracts, send bills, and so forth. If this is the evidence on which a canon is to be revised, we are in very deep waters indeed.

In sum, barring such an explicit reference to a surviving wife's occupation as James presents for Anne Gulliver, it is always risky to assume that the inheritance of equipment and tools, even an entire workshop, affirms that the surviving legatee continued to practise her husband's trade. Possessed of his occupational effects as he approached death, what else

was a painter to do but leave them to someone else, and that someone was, as often as not, quite logically his wife.

The inference drawn from such legacies when they exist becomes even more suspect when uncorroborated by other evidence which could identify such a widow as a painter herself: that is to say, one who actively engaged in the occupation and not merely possessed the tools or administered the workshop. One conventionally retrieves such verification from primary sources that provide an individual's identity: eg, a court case; parish register or churchwarden's account; bill or bond; chamberlain's, steward's, bursar's, or bailiff's account of payments; freeman's registration; apprenticeship indenture; property transaction; in very rare cases the signature on a painting, or even the eventual will and/or post-mortem inventory of the widow herself which might employ an occupational description. The need for precisely that sort of corroborating evidence reflects a higher standard of verification than James has often met. Yet it is the standard by which a scholarly argument must abide.

III Horenbout

That tendency to argue beyond the evidence underlies the two case studies to which James pays most attention: the oeuvre of Susanna Horenbout and Levina Teerlinc, both of whose identities as painters has long been accepted. To take them in their given order, there can be no doubt that Horenbout's father Gerard (d 1540/41) was a well-established, Ghent-born painter before coming to England sometime in the mid- to late 1520s. Susanna (b c 1503–d before 1554) herself was identified as a painter in 1521, and by no less a figure than Albrecht Dürer, who admired her skills. She may have preceded her father to England, having been invited by Henry VIII himself, presumably for her painting ability. Yet no consensus has formed around a specific oeuvre of her painting in his service or elsewhere in England. Instead, she is recorded as having served, not as a painter, but rather as a 'gentlewoman' in the service of Anne of Cleves, Katherine Parr, and the Princess Mary.²⁷ Although her first husband, John Parker, left what sounds like painting equipment to his sister-in-law, he left nothing of the sort to Susanna.²⁸

James sees Horenbout as having been engaged by Henry to fill a shortage of court painters who could turn out competent portraits of himself and his court circle.²⁹ But she goes even further than that. In her view Susanna 'was the first to fashion the impressive image of Henry himself that Henry had in mind', and thus began 'the evolution of royal portraiture at the Tudor court'.³⁰

This is in itself a bold, sweeping, and highly contentious statement, to which several objections may be raised. First, portraits of Henry VIII's father, Henry VII, in several media survive even to the present, of which a 1505 oil-on-panel painting by an anonymous Netherlandish artist serves as the canonical image marking the beginning of such a tradition under the Tudors.³¹ Secondly, it is impossible to know what self-image Henry VIII himself had in mind when Horenbout first came to England around 1520 or 1521. Thirdly, though we know less about painting and painters in the more poorly documented early years of his reign, Henry did have available to him in England the services of experienced, foreign-born or trained painters such as Antonio Toto (1499–1554),³² Maynard Vewick (d 1525),³³ and Vincente Volpe (*fl* 1511–1536)³⁴ before Horenbout arrived, and on whom he could count for competent court painting had he chosen to do so. Fourthly, Henry's strategy for attracting artists to create royal imagery had already been established by his solicitation of such artists as Pietro Torrigiano (1472–1528)³⁵ and Benedetto



1 *Henry VIII* by Lucas Horenbout (c1490/5–1544), June 1526–June 1527. Watercolour on vellum laid on playing card (the ace of diamonds), diam 4.7 cm. The Royal Collection RCIN 420640

2 *Henry VIII* by Lucas Horenbout (c1490/5–1544), June 1526–June 1527, watercolour on vellum, diam 4 cm. The Royal Collection RCIN 420010

3 The 'Elizabethan Maundy' miniature. Watercolour on vellum on playing card, 7 x 5.7 cm. Private collection

da Rovezzano (1474–1522)³⁶ to produce monumental sculpture. Having drawn on such internationally recognized artists, whose stature reflected on himself as well, it is unlikely that the King would have brought to England a young and unproven woman painter such as Horenbout to do his portraits. Instead, he would, and did, turn to someone like the already well-established and widely renowned Hans Holbein. Surely it is Holbein who ingeniously and prolifically created the enduring image of royal magnificence that fixes Henry VIII in our minds, and it is he who created such an image not in miniature, but in large. It is Horenbout and, for that matter, Teerlinck, whose slim oeuvres we are still trying to work out.

Nothing daunted, James builds her case. She identifies a miniature in the Royal Collection of Henry at the age of 35 or 36 as one such result of that patronage (Pl 1). She does so on the basis of what appears to be a monogram on a badge on Henry's hat that she construes as bearing Horenbout's monogram 'sh'. She proceeds to identify a similar monogram, which she construes as reading 'lh', in the work of her brother Lucas (Pl 2), and draws distinctions between the two.³⁷ James's reading of the style and other characteristics of that monogrammed miniature leads her to identify several other previously unattributed works to Horenbout by their stylistic similarity to that single point of reference. In the end she concludes that Susanna introduced a new, Flemish-derived format for displaying the monarch on miniatures, and that she pre-dated Holbein in so doing.³⁸

The fulcrum upon which this carefully balanced argument rests is the single appearance of the presumed 'sh' monogram on the initial portrait of Henry VIII. If that monogram appears on any of the other works that James now attributes to Susanna, she does not mention it. We are left to conclude that its presence on that single miniature is unique. The other attributions to Horenbout, including the image of Henry in the capital letter opening the patent to the King's embroiderer, Thomas Forster, on which she expends most effort,³⁹ fail to mention any such emblem. Thus her further attributions to Horenbout rest purely on their perceived similarities of style and content with the single monogrammed work, and with what James sees as their Flemish character.

That same technique leads James to take on a group of 25 or so 'idiosyncratic sixteenth century miniatures' painted between 1522/3 and 1551/2. None of these displays the 'sh' monogram, but she sees them as displaying other characteristics that are similar, if not identical, to those which she attributes to Susanna and her brother Lucas. They also permit her to speculate on yet another female presence in the Horenbout family workshop in the person of Lucas's wife Margaret, née Holsewyther.⁴⁰ James tells us that Katherine Parr commissioned Margaret to paint pictures for her after 'probably' bringing her into the royal service,⁴¹ and that '... in some way, in the context of the court, their work, too, had meaning'.⁴² Later she tells us: 'Margaret Holsewyther appears to be yet another example of a female artist trained by her father who served in her husband's workshop and took over that workshop at his death.' 'The evidence which supports this conclusion', she continues, 'is found for the most part in the chamber accounts of Katheryn [*sic*] Parr.'⁴³ Yet James cites no such evidence here. It is only the payment of 60 shillings to 'Lucas wife' in 1547, three years after Lucas Horenbout's death, that directly supports the view that Margaret painted in her own right, although (as James acknowledges) this may merely be a delayed payment to Lucas rather than one intended for her. All James's other claims for Holsewyther's painting remain speculative and problematic.⁴⁴

The attribution of unsigned paintings to particular painters on the basis of similarities in style and workmanship is certainly a long-standing technique, copiously employed up through the generation of art historians and curators represented by Sir Roy Strong, and still of great value. But the current state of research exposes two sorts of flaws inherent therein. First, without further documentation, attribution by stylistic similarity is always a speculative venture. Sundry painters share similar styles; the style in which a single painter works may change over time; numerous works, and their stylistic characteristics, are copied by one painter from another; most high-end paintings were produced by workshops in which the master may have signed the contract and collected the payment but carried out only part or even none of the actual work. All these common possibilities make it very difficult to distinguish the style of one painter from another without some further corroboration of the sort described above.

Secondly, the most recent research, both technical and archival, has brought the technique of attribution by style alone into question more sharply than ever before. Research carried out by the 'Making Art in Tudor Britain' (MATB) project held at the National Portrait Gallery between 2004 and 2012 enlisted the latest scientific technology rigorously to scrutinize well over 100 portraits of the Tudor and early Stuart era.⁴⁵

Techniques such as advanced dendrochronology, infrared reflectography, microscopy, and chemical analysis of pigments have led to the re-dating of a number of works.⁴⁶ That re-dating has sometimes exposed fallacies in traditional attributions that were made principally on the basis of stylistic similarities. To this rigorous technical examination, members of the MATB team and others added archival techniques which further undermined some such traditional attributions and/or created new ones. The most dramatic example of the latter pattern, but far from the only one, is the work traditionally attributed to Jan de Critz painted after, as Edward Town has now shown, he had lost his sight.⁴⁷

The second flaw in that strategy of attribution, linked to the first, arises from the fact a substantial number of painters working in England at a particular time – perhaps even the majority – remain entirely unknown to us or known only by name. Traditionally, one looked carefully at the stylistic characteristics and (where known) the dating of a painting, ran through a mental checklist of known painters of the same time, and tried to select from that mental list the name which seemed most probable. But that method precludes attribution to painters yet to be discovered and therefore not present on such a checklist. It severely restricts the number of painters who might receive credit for a particular work.

No less an authority than Nicholas Hilliard noted in his treatise on limning that, although Holbein was ‘the greatest master [in the arts of painting and limning] that ever was ‘... yet had the King in wages for limning *divers others*’. Although he continues by way of noting that ‘Holbein’s manner of limning I have ever imitated’,⁴⁸ nowhere does he name the ‘divers others’, nor does he mention Horenbout or Teerlinc at all. The fact that there were always in these years ‘divers others’ whose identities we do not always know should caution us against assigning works to one of the few known painters on the basis of meagre supporting evidence. New painters of this era are being discovered all the time,⁴⁹ while we come with similar frequency to discover the oeuvre of, eg, portrait painters who have been known either by name only or as painters of a different expertise.⁵⁰

James of course does use additional sources to assist in stylistic analysis, prides herself in so doing, and attempts by their use to claim new attributions to painters both known and unknown. But, as we have already noted, her use of that resource is often as flawed as her analysis of style, and she too often fails to corroborate one source by another. While it is still the case that, to cite Bodo Brinkman’s entry on Horenbout in *The Dictionary of Art* that ‘... attempts to attribute particular portrait miniatures to her are even more hypothetical than is the case for her brother Lucas’,⁵¹ that has not deterred James. In the end, her rather idiosyncratic interpretation of stylistic similarities remains a prominent part of her determination to attribute particular works to one painter or another. It is on this basis that she assigns attributions that have not often been accepted or even proposed elsewhere.

IV Teerlinc

The once obscure Levina Teerlinc (*fl* in England c 1545–76) has become the most widely known female painter working in England in the years at hand.⁵² Levina is thought to have been trained principally by her father, the Flemish artist Simon Benning or Bennick (or, in James’s version, ‘Binnick’), one of the most eminent illustrators of his time. She came to England in about 1545 and quickly gained courtly, indeed royal, patronage. This she retained throughout a career at the court of four of the Tudor monarchs.

In the effort to present new findings on Teerlinc’s career, James expands upon her earlier claims which range even more explicitly from the vaguely plausible and merely hopeful to the distinctly imaginative and utterly unfounded.⁵³ In addition, James perpetuates in this discussion her well established pattern of undocumented attributions. She tells us, for example, ‘That Leivine [*sic*] painted Elizabeth’s portrait at least once in 1551 is a matter of record’,⁵⁴ but no such record is cited here or, so far as one can determine, elsewhere. Not only does she attribute to Teerlinc a number of controversial or hitherto unattributed miniatures, but also credits her with the *en large* ‘Phoenix’ and ‘Pelican’ portraits of Elizabeth. As if this were insufficient, she also attributes to Teerlinc the anonymous manuscript discourse on painting entitled *A Very Proper Treatise*.⁵⁵ These are extraordinary claims. Were they valid they would considerably enhance Teerlinc’s growing reputation as a major artist of her time, and would indeed affirm her critical importance to the painting of the Tudor era.

In this, to be fair, James enters a longstanding, if sometimes implicit, and certainly spirited, debate regarding Teerlinc’s accomplishments and artistic output. That debate may be said to have had its first stirrings in tentative attributions to Teerlinc made by Lionel Cust in 1910,⁵⁶ but it blossomed out in a 1934 essay by Simone Bergmans. While acknowledging that ‘at the present time no works by her are known to us’, Bergmans proceeded to attribute nine miniatures to Teerlinc’s hand.⁵⁷ From that time onwards other curators and art historians have speculated that Teerlinc painted several other known works, especially what is known as ‘The Elizabethan Maundy’ miniature, the attribution of which was cautiously accepted by Erna Auerbach in 1961 (Pl 3).⁵⁸ It is that work that long retained the best claim to have been painted by Teerlinc. Noting several other contemporary miniatures which resembled it (‘...whose draftsmanship is weak, whose paint is thin and transparent and whose brushwork loose’),⁵⁹ Sir Roy Strong and Jim Murrell built upon this tradition and assigned them to her hand. That allowed them to add weight to the Teerlinc portfolio, to tie her more firmly to a putative Ghent/Bruges School of illumination, and eventually to propose as well that she was chiefly responsible for instructing Nicholas Hilliard in the art of the miniature.⁶⁰

By the mid-1970s the Teerlinc story came to be picked up by those writing for a wider and largely non-scholarly audience. At a time when scholars as well as the general public were searching for important women who had been overlooked in a male-dominated canon, Teerlinc was an obvious contender for serious attention. Anxious to show Teerlinc’s importance as a female painter, teacher, and even writer of her time, sundry authors jumped at the opportunity.⁶¹ Teerlinc’s place in the emerging canon quickly became prominent. But there has always been a degree of scepticism within the scholarly art-historical and curatorial community about Teerlinc’s achievements. That scepticism has grown from almost the outset of Teerlinc’s appearance as a subject of interest in Carl Winter’s work on Elizabethan miniatures of 1943, in which Bergmans’ attributions were dismissed and none substituted for them to form a Teerlinc oeuvre.⁶² Since that time, Strong and Murrell’s, and now James’s, efforts to champion a Teerlinc oeuvre have provoked a very much closer, deliberate, and scholarly examination of what can be known for certain about Teerlinc and, for that matter, a putative Ghent/Bruges School where she is said to have learned her craft. As that response proceeded, the Teerlinc narrative began steadily to fall apart.

Jane Turner's monumental and multi-volume *The Dictionary of Art* may be counted on for judicious summaries of scholarly research on each of its entries up to the early 1990s. Mary Edmund's entry on Teerlinc pointedly questions several attainments that James was later to summarize and accept as genuine. As for Strong's attribution of five miniatures to Teerlinc, Edmund concludes, 'There is no positive evidence that any of the five works [singled out as hers by Sir Roy Strong] are by Teerlinc, or indeed that any of them are by the same hand.' She makes exactly the same comment regarding other 'attributions' which James would consider as certain. The final point of note in Edmund's entry is to splash cold water on the theory that it was Teerlinc who taught Hilliard the art of the miniature.⁶³

Writing in 1998, and citing work by Graham Reynolds and Susan Foister, Katherine Coombs brought 'a healthy scepticism' to claims that all five of these alleged Teerlinc portraits were by the same hand and implied that none of them may have been by Teerlinc. Coombs also noted that, although Hilliard wrote in his treatise on limning of 'divers' (unnamed) limners in the royal payroll at the time, he failed to mention Teerlinc among them.⁶⁴

Reynolds had expressed his own misgivings about Teerlinc in the *Apollo* essay that Coombs cited. In that piece he took issue with Strong's effort to attribute certain miniatures to 'the chimerical Levina Teerlinc', finding no support for Strong's view that four Hilliards and the designs for the Great Seals of Mary I and Elizabeth were her work.⁶⁵ He ended this discussion with the prediction that 'we shall [hereafter] see the name of Levina Teerlinc used ... as a synonym' for 'any English miniature painted between 1540 and 1570 and not obviously by Hornebolte [*sic*], Holbein or Hilliard'.⁶⁶ Returning to the subject in a 1999 essay, he noted that the figures in the Maundy painting, which has frequently been employed as they key to Teerlinc's oeuvre and style, were '... so minute that it is hard to confirm any identity of workmanship between them and the group of portrait miniatures assigned to [her]'. None of the limnings seemed to him to 'show any trace of the Ghent/Bruges School in which Teerlinc is presumed to have been trained'.⁶⁷ James herself, with her sometime co-author Jamie Franco, has accepted this verdict on the Maundy painting, finding that it has little to do with the Ghent/Bruges School, and thus unlikely to be by her.⁶⁸

In the same essay, Reynolds began to develop the idea that one or more of the early miniatures of Elizabeth were really early works of Hilliard, done in his teens, rather than by Teerlinc. Part of that suggestion was based upon stylistic grounds, but also upon his analysis of handwriting: he found that the writing on a miniature of Queen Elizabeth attributed to Teerlinc closely resembled Hilliard's instead.⁶⁹ In his most recent contribution to this debate, Reynolds offered a strongly documented expansion on that theme, using elements of handwriting, technique, and costume to attribute nine miniatures of the 1560s, most of them linked by James and some others to Teerlinc, to the young Hilliard instead. He did so explicitly to combat what he referred to as '... the current epidemic of unsustainable attributions to Levina Teerlinc'.⁷⁰

The latest word in this discussion appears in a closely argued essay by Katherine Coombs and Alan Derbyshire. They question the Strong/Murrell claims for a Teerlinc oeuvre and their view that Teerlinc trained Hilliard. They also question Graham Reynolds's argument that some miniatures attributed to Teerlinc were actually early works of Hilliard himself. While accepting Reynolds's critique of Strong and Murrell, Coombs and Derbyshire persuasively counter the claim that Hilliard

could have done the miniatures of the 1560s, but they refrain from attributing any of them to Teerlinc.⁷¹ They also point out that several stylistic elements which Strong, Murrell, and then James characterize as unique to a Ghent/Bruges school of illumination, and which James and others some have employed as firm markers of Teerlinc's work, could also be found elsewhere in Europe at the same time and may thus not characterize any such school.⁷² None of this close analysis offers any support for a Teerlinc oeuvre, or for linking Hilliard to a Ghent/Bruges School of illumination, or, indeed, for the existence of such a school itself.

One other strand of evidence in the Teerlinc brief emanates from the fact that Teerlinc presented Queen Elizabeth with New Year's gifts of paintings at several points in her later life and received gifts in return on several such occasions. All of Teerlinc's gifts are described as pictures of the Queen painted 'upon card', or vellum, which was a standard material for miniatures.⁷³ Although it seems safe to *assume* that these were Teerlinc's own compositions – what else was a miniature painter to give as a gift to the Queen? – none is explicitly identified or described as Teerlinc's. It therefore remains uncertain that any of them survive to provide for the sort of analysis which might sustain that claim.

As for James's novel attribution to Teerlinc of the 'Pelican' and 'Phoenix' portraits of Elizabeth (Pl 4, Pl 5), now reliably and scientifically dated c 1575, one can only say that not even the very close technical scrutiny of these two works carried out by the National Portrait Gallery's 'Making Art in Tudor Britain' research project has sustained such a view.⁷⁴ There has been no prior hint of such an attribution, nor does one seem likely to appear. These two portraits bear only superficial similarity to what we do know of her style ('... whose draftsmanship is weak, whose paint is thin and transparent and whose brushwork loose'),⁷⁵ and have most reliably been associated with Hilliard.⁷⁶ Teerlinc is not known to have done any portraits *en large*, nor is there any independent evidence that she mastered the very different techniques required of *en large* work, much less so close to her death at the then advanced age of 66 in June of 1576.

V Conclusion

In sum, although ample evidence remains of Teerlinc's profession as a painter in general terms, we are still not able precisely to identify her oeuvre or to assess her contributions with much certainty. It remains the case that James's attributions to Teerlinc have been made on the basis of a perceived affinity with a Ghent/Bruges School whence she came; her New Year's gifts of unidentified limnings, presumed to be by her hand, to Queen Elizabeth; some questionable claims for similarities in style and workmanship among a group of mid-century miniatures; the reputation of an earlier generation of scholars; and on a general lack of hard evidence. The sum of James's work has nevertheless contributed to Teerlinc's growing reputation among non-specialists, the general public, and at least two reviewers, Archer and Stockstill, of the book in question. One hopes that the foregoing discussion will offer some pause for thought before that reputation grows further. But James's book concerns more than her claims for Horenbout and Teerlinc. We must still ask what remains of 'the feminine dynamic' which she proposes and the contribution of female painters in general therein. James does not tell us precisely what she means by that term, nor (quite rightly) does she ever claim that there is something distinctly 'feminine' about works painted by women. But the question of female contributions to the art of

the time prompts some serious and important questions, and should not be dismissed out of hand.

James does set off reasonably well in dividing female painters of the Tudor era into those trained abroad like Horenbout and Teerlinc, and those trained domestically. Although she first describes the latter as working from London workshops, it soon becomes clear that she embraces English provincial workshops as well. In this she is also correct. And she describes at least a few women as engaging in various activities connected with the painters' trade, although not necessarily, as she would have it, as painters themselves. Some of that discussion may now be revisited through the use of a scholarly research tool which was unavailable to James, and which sheds some additional light on women painters of this era. This is the comprehensive database which has been compiled over the past nine years (as of this writing) listing all people identified as painters and working anywhere in the British Isles between 1500 and 1640. Entitled 'Early Modern British Painters', this resource includes painters of all descriptions, including figurative and non-figurative painters, 'house-painters' and picture painters, herald painters, glass painters, and limners or illuminators. As of this writing, it identifies and describes nearly 2600 people, of which number 24 are women, and 13, if we accept Gammedge and Gulliver, are women working in England between 1485 and 1603.⁷⁷

Three or four of those women might qualify as artists rather than decorative or 'house' painters', although James uses the former term indiscriminately. Along with Horenbout, Teerlinc, and Holssewyther, one must note what appears to be a brief English appearance of Sofonisba Anguissola (1532–1624), the most celebrated female painter of 16th-century Europe. Anguissola served as court painter to Elizabeth of Valois and Philip of Spain. Very nearly all her known works, amounting to some 50 paintings, were done abroad and remained in continental collections.⁷⁸ It is highly doubtful that she stayed in England long enough to have carried out more than a few still unidentified commissions, or that she made any significant direct contributions to the English scene.

In addition, Katherine Maynor or Maynour, whom James mentions but briefly, was living in Amptill, Bedfordshire, when she was denized in November 1540, and she was known at that time as a widow and painter. Very little else has surfaced in Maynor's regard, save the presumption that, as she required a letter of denization, she would have been from the Continent, and may thus be presumed to have trained outside England.⁷⁹ Most of that list consists, however, of English-born and English trained painters such as Gulliver and Herne. To James's list of such painters, a few more may be added. The wife of the eponymously named John Paynter, whose own forename is not recorded, gilded the tabernacle of St Vincent and painted other images in the Berkshire parish church of St Lawrence, Reading, in 1524–26.⁸⁰ The wife of the painter John Barber of Leicester (*d.* 1549–58), whose forename is also not recorded, worked both with her husband and on her own, especially in painting and gilding the rood carvings of Saints Mary and John in St Martin's Church, Leicester, in 1557/8. The fact that she was paid separately from John tells us that she did her part independently, and not merely as her husband's helper.⁸¹ In fact, John Barber may well have left Leicester in that year to work in the Office of the Revels, where a painter of that name is recorded (qv), and she finished up for him in Leicester.⁸²

Of widows inheriting their husband's painters' supplies and/or stock, we also have Emma Leach (or Leech) of Chester. Leach inherited her husband Robert's shop and freeman's status at his death in 1599/1600, and took on Robert's apprentice Robert

Thorneley, who completed his apprenticeship and became a freeman painter of Chester in his own right in 1605.⁸³ Then we have something of an exception to all categories in Jane Seager [*sic*], the sister of the herald, portraitist, and scrivener Sir William (c1583–1633) and Francis Segar (1590–1615). Jane's lavishly illuminated manuscript 'The Divine Prophecies of the Ten Sibylls' of 1586 was intended to elicit patronage from the Queen, though it is uncertain that the latter ever received it.⁸⁴ The Segars were of Dutch origin, and Jane may well either have been born in the Netherlands and/or trained as a limner or illuminator in the Dutch tradition. She may eventually have worked in her brothers' workshop. By 1603 she was in Russia, probably as the wife of the English merchant Lionel Plumtree.⁸⁵

While Seager may have been trained as a limner, Heron, Gammedge, Barber, Paynter, and others like them were entirely distinct from those 'artists' of the first group. They worked as decorative and/or what we would call 'house painters', born and trained in the native English craft tradition. Their figurative work would have remained very much in the unpolished, native-English vernacular mode which continued to prevail before it was overwhelmed by more contemporary continental influences in the early decades of the 17th century.

Yet, even with the addition of those names to James's tally, this is a slender group to have advanced, by their work as painters, a 'feminine dynamic' in the English art of that time. Individuals such as Horenbout and Teerlinc may well have helped form the English miniature tradition, although the case for how, when, and why remains uncertain. But the overall trend in the English figurative painting of these years was away from the essentially medieval style and character of northern European illumination in which Horenbout, Teerlinc, probably Holssewyther and possibly Maynor, will have been schooled, and certainly away from the two-dimensional, vernacular craft tradition emanating from native English guild training in which Herne, Gammedge, Paynter, and Barber would have worked. It turned instead towards the more contemporary polite, three-dimensional and classically inspired works of the later Renaissance and eventually to Baroque or Mannerist traditions coming principally from Italy and the Low Countries, within which someone like Anguissola would have worked. With few exceptions, its full reception in England had to wait for the reigns of the first two Stuart kings and their wives, and their extensive patronage of a more formal portrait tradition in which they and others of the court circle indulged as sitters, patrons, and collectors. Hilliard, who was familiar with the writings of GP Lomazzo on such subjects as perspective, understood the essential character of this new wave, but he never mastered it himself and cannot have learned it from almost any painter working in England prior to the Stuart accession.⁸⁶ It remains very difficult indeed to see how the work even of Teerlinc and Horenbout looked forward in that direction, nor does James make such claims. Indeed, the world of Cornelius Johnson, Daniel Mytens, Peter Paul Rubens, Anthony Van Dyck and also of Joan Carlisle (1606–1679)⁸⁷ and Mary Beale (1633–1699),⁸⁸ lay well ahead.

If there was a 'feminine dynamic' in the art of the Tudor era, it lay more conspicuously in the areas of collection and patronage rather than production. Here James stands on somewhat firmer ground. Evidence begins to emerge of women patrons well outside those social groups, and often well outside London and Westminster, commissioning and purchasing paintings in the late 16th and on into the early 17th centuries.⁸⁹ Such evidence adds to the notion that a broad 'public' for the visual arts had begun to emerge in the latter years of the century, and that women were very much a part of that phenomenon.⁹⁰



4 Elizabeth I, 'Pelican' portrait, associated with Nicholas Hilliard (1547–1619), c1575. Oil on cloth. Walker Art Gallery Liverpool



5 Elizabeth I, 'Phoenix' portrait, associated with Nicholas Hilliard (1547–1619), c1575. Oil on panel; 78.8 x 61 cm. National Portrait Gallery, London, NPG 190

My sincere thanks to Katherine Coombs for generously sharing her expertise on this subject, and for her close reading of an early draft, and to Karen Hearn for her encouragement. Any remaining infelicities are entirely my own.

- 1 Susan E James, *The Feminine Dynamic in English Art, 1485–1603*, Farnham, Surrey, and Burlington VT 2009.
- 2 Jane Elizabeth Archer, *English Historical Review*, vol 126, no. 520 (June 2011), pp668–69; Tatiana String, *Gender and History*, vol 22, no. 2 (August 2012), pp470–71; David AHB Taylor, *The Art Book*, vol 17, no. 1 (February 2010), pp34–36; Diane Wolfthal, *Shakespeare Studies*, vol 14 (2013), pp250–253; Marcella Stockstill, *Women's Studies*, vol 38 (July/August, 2009), pp600–604.
- 3 Wolfthal, p253. See also the extensive criticism of String, pp470–471, and Robert Tittler, *Journal of British Studies*, vol 49, no. 3 (July, 2010), pp696–7.
- 4 Robert Tittler, ed, *Early Modern British Painters, 1500–1640*, accessible at <http://spectrum.library.concordia.ca/980096> (= Tittler, EMBP).
- 5 Erna Auerbach, *Tudor Artists: A Study of Painters in the Royal Service and of Portraiture on Illuminated Documents from the Accession of Henry VII to the Death of Elizabeth*, London, 1954.
- 6 Mary Edmond, "'Limners and Picturemakers'", *New Light on the Lives of Miniaturists and Large-scale Portrait Painters working in London in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, *Walpole Society*, XLVII (1978–80), pp60–242; idem, 'The Chandos Portrait, a Suggested Painter', *Burlington Magazine*, CXXIV (March, 1982), pp146–149; idem, 'Bury St. Edmunds, a Seventeenth Century Art Centre', *Walpole Society*, LIII (1987), pp106–118.
- 7 Susan Foister, especially 'Paintings and other Works of Art in Sixteenth Century English Inventories', *Burlington Magazine*, CXXIII (1981), pp273–82, but see also Foister, *Holbein and England*, London and New Haven 2004, and *Holbein in England*, London 2006.
- 8 James, pp4–5.
- 9 James, p4.
- 10 James, p238.
- 11 Cheshire Record Office [hereafter CRO] MSS. ZG 17/1 and ZG 17/2, 'Minute Book, Company of Painter-Stainers, Embroiderers, Glaziers, and Stationers, 1575–1621' and '1621' ff.2.
- 12 Robert Tittler, 'Early Stuart Chester as a Centre for Regional Portraiture', *Urban History*, 41:1 (February 2014) p9, based on CRO MSS. ZG 17/1 and /2 (np) *passim*.
- 13 Based on James, pp238–40.
- 14 James, p241 and n67.
- 15 James, p240.
- 16 James, pp238–9, citing the will of John Browne, The National Archives [hereafter TNA] PROB 11/24/210.

- 17 James, op cit, pp2, 240. The rendering of the more common accepted version of Alice's Herne's name as 'Heron' is one of James's several idiosyncratic spellings of generally accepted, indeed canonical, name-forms employed throughout the book: eg, *Kateryn* Parr for Katherine Parr, *Lievine* for Levina Teerlinc and Susanna *Hourenboul* for Horenbout, etc. Save when quoting directly from James's text, I have reverted to the more commonly employed spellings, as recognized in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, with which readers will be more familiar.
- 18 James, pp18, 238.
- 19 James, pp263.
- 20 James persists in calling this town 'Walden' rather than giving it its full and proper name, but it is obviously Saffron Walden which she has in mind.
- 21 Stockstill, pp600–601.
- 22 James, pp2, 47–8, 89, 240–41.
- 23 James, pp4–5.
- 24 FG Emmison, *Elizabethan Life, Home, Work and Land*, Chelmsford 1976, p78.
- 25 Essex Record Office [hereafter ERO] MS. D/ACW1/100, fols. 1–3; will of 12 April, 1591.
- 26 ERO MS. D/ACW1/100, fol. 3.
- 27 Lorne Campbell and Susan Foister, 'Gerard, Lucas, and Susannah Horenbout', *Burlington Magazine*, CXXVIII vol 128 (October 1986), pp719–27; Susan Foister, 'Gerard Horenbout', *ODNB*.
- 28 Cited in Campbell and Foister, pp719, 725, and n79.
- 29 James, pp270–71.
- 30 James, p271.
- 31 Anon, *Henry VII*, 1505, National Portrait Gallery [hereafter NPG], no. 416. See also SJ Gunn, 'Henry VII', *ODNB*, 'Likenesses'.
- 32 Antonio Toto came to England in 1519 at the request of the sculptor Pietro Torrigiano to work on the projected tomb of Henry VIII, but stayed on as a prolific painter in the Royal Household and elsewhere. PG Matthews, 'Antonio Toto', *ODNB*.
- 33 The Dutch-born Maynard Vewick or Wewicke flourished as a figurative and portrait painter in England and Scotland from c 1502–1525, turning out at least one and probably two portraits of Lady Margaret Beaufort at Cambridge among other works. London Metropolitan Archives (hereafter LMA) MS.DL/C/B004/MS09171/07/62v; Michael R Apted and Susan Hannabuss, eds, *Painters in Scotland, 1301–1700, a Biographical Dictionary* (Scottish Record Society, ns, 7, Edinburgh, 1978), pp68–69; Robert Willis and John Willis Clarke, *The Architectural History of the University of Cambridge and of the Colleges of Cambridge and Eton*, 4 vols, Cambridge 1886, II, p195; CH Cooper, *Memoir of Margaret, Countess of Richmond and Derby*, ed JEB Mayor, Cambridge 1874, p198; RF Scott,

- 'On the Contracts for the Tomb of Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby, Mother of King Henry VII...', *Archaeologia*, 66 (1915), pp 365–72; Lorne Campbell, *The Early Flemish Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty The Queen*, Cambridge, 1985, p. xv.
- 34 Vincent Volpe was mostly a decorative painter employed in the Royal Works, but the extent of his known commissions suggest that he was highly skilled and capable of portraiture. Edmond, 'Limners and Picturemakers', p66; LMA MS. DL/C/B004/MS09171/010/220; Auerbach, p190; Edward Croft-Murray, *Decorative Painting in England, 1537–1837*, London 1962, p166; HM Colvin, et al, *The History of the King's Works*, 7 vols, London 1963–82, IV, pp102, 418, 732.
- 35 AP Darr, 'Pietro Torrigiano', *ODNB*.
- 36 Louis A Waldman, 'Benedetto da Rovezzano in England and After: New Research on the Artist, His Collaborators, and His Family', in Cinzia Maria Sicca and Louis A Waldman, eds, *The Anglo-Florentine Renaissance: Art for the Early Tudors*, London and New Haven 2012, pp81–148, and Francesco Caglioti, 'Benedetto da Rovezzano in England: New Light on the Cardinal Wolsey-Henry VIII Tomb' in Sicca and Waldman, pp177–202.
- 37 James, pp272–3 and figs. 6.3 and 6.4.
- 38 James, pp274–79.
- 39 James, pp276–77.
- 40 James, pp279–81.
- 41 James, pp27, 58.
- 42 James, p263.
- 43 James, p279. Holselyther's father was the immigrant painter Garrard van Holtyswyller, whose name is recorded with that spelling in the subsidy assessment of 1525. REG Kirk and Ernest F Kirk, eds, *Return of Aliens Dwelling in the City and Suburbs of London*, 4 vols, Aberdeen, 1900–1908, I, p8.
- 44 James, pp280–81.
- 45 <http://www.npg.org.uk/research/programmes/making-art-in-tudor-britain>.
- 46 For example, the anonymous painting of Thomas Sackville, first earl of Dorset, NPG no. 4024.
- 47 Edward Town, "'Whilst he had his Perfect Sight' – New Information on John de Critz the Elder", *Burlington Magazine*, CLIV (July 2012), pp482–486.
- 48 Cited in Katherine Coombs and Alan Derbyshire, 'Nicholas Hilliard's Workshop Practice Reconsidered', in Tarnya Cooper, Aviva Burnstock, Edward Town, and Maurice Howard, eds, London 2015, p244, from RKR.Thornton and TGS Cain, eds, *A Treatise Concerning The Arte of Limning by Nicholas Hilliard together with A More Compendius Discourse Concerning ye Art of Limning by Edward Norgate*, Edinburgh 1981, p69.
- 49 MJH Liversidge and Wendy Nelson-Cave, 'W. Baylis: A Seventeenth Century English Painter Identified', *Burlington Magazine*, CXXVIII (October 1986), pp728–31; Robert Tittler, 'George Cottingham and the Dering Family Portraits of 1626', *Burlington Magazine*, CLI (April 2009), pp208–11.
- 50 Robert Tittler and Shaun Evans, 'Randle Holme the Elder and the Development of Portraiture in North Wales, c1600–1630', *The British Art Journal*, XVI, 2 (Autumn 2015), pp22–27.
- 51 Bodo Brinkman, 'Susannah Horenbut', in Jane Turner, ed, *The Dictionary of Art*, 34 vols, London 1996, XIV, p761.
- 52 Roy Strong, 'Levina Teerlinc', *ODNB*; Christopher Brown, 'British Painting and the Low Countries', in K Hearn, ed, *Dynasties, Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England, 1530–1630*, London 1995, p27; John Murdoch, Jim Murrell, Patrick J Noon and Roy Strong, *The English Miniature*, London and New Haven 1981, pp41–45 *et passim*; Auerbach, pp187–8; Jane A Lawson, ed, *The Elizabethan New Year's Gift Exchanges 1559–1603*, Oxford 2013, items 59.149; 62.147; 63.137; 64.125; 65.64; 67.135, 68.135; 71.140; 73.103; and 76.168; Liana De Girolami Cheney, Alicia Craig Faxon, and Kathleen Lucey Russo, *Self-Portraits by Women Painters*, Aldershot 2000, pp35–6 and pl III.3; Susan Frye, Pens and Needles, *Women's Textualities in Early Modern England*, Philadelphia and Oxford, 2010, pp79–86.
- 53 First expressed in Susan E James and Jamie S Franco, 'Susanna Horenbut, Levina Teerlinc, and the Mask of Royalty', *Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten*, (2000), pp91–125. The title, incidentally, takes as its last component the subtitle of Lacey Baldwin Smith, *Henry VIII, the Mask of Royalty*, Boston 1971, and both title and text employ the conventional spelling of 'Levina'.
- 54 James, p305.
- 55 James, pp296–7.
- 56 Lionel Cust, *Handlist of Portrait Miniatures in Windsor Castle*, London 1910, cited in Graham Reynolds, 'New Light on Nicholas Hilliard', *The British Art Journal*, XII, 2 (Autumn 2011), p20.
- 57 Simone Bergmans, 'The Miniatures of Levine Teerling' [sic], *Burlington Magazine*, LXVI (1934), pp232–236.
- 58 Erna Auerbach, *Nicholas Hilliard*, London 1961, p52.
- 59 Roy Strong and VJ Murrell, *Artists of the Tudor Court, the Portrait Miniature Rediscovered, 1520–1620*, London 1983 p52.
- 60 Strong and Murrell, pp52–8; Roy Strong, *The English Renaissance Miniature*, London 1983, pp54–64; Jim Murrell, *The Waye Howe to Lymme; Tudor Miniatures Observed*, London 1983, pp12–13, 28.
- 61 Eleanor Tufts may have been the first to bring this tradition to a wider public in *Our Hidden Heritage: Five Centuries of Women Artists*, New York 1974, writing even before Strong. Among those who followed up were Ann Sutherland Harris and Linda Nochlin, *Women Artists, 1550–1950*, Los Angeles and New York 1976, pp102–04; and Carole Levin, Debra Barrett-Graves, Jo Eldridge Carney, WM Spellman, Gwynne Kennedy, Stephanie Witham, eds, *Extraordinary Women of the Medieval and Renaissance World, a Biographical Dictionary*, Westport CT, and London 2000, pp278–80.
- 62 Carl Winter, *Elizabethan Miniatures*, London 1943, p5 *et passim*.
- 63 Mary Edmond, 'Levina Teerlinc', in *Dictionary of Art*, XXX, pp411–12.
- 64 Katherine Coombs, *The Portrait Miniature in England*, London 1998, pp24–27, citing as well Graham Reynolds, 'The English Miniature of the Renaissance: a "Rediscovery" Examined', *Apollo*, 118 (1983), pp308–311, and Susan Foister, 'Exhibition Review; Tudor Miniatures at the V & A', *Burlington Magazine*, CXXV (1983), p635.
- 65 Reynolds, 'English Miniature', p309.
- 66 Reynolds, 'English Miniature', p310.
- 67 Graham Reynolds, *The Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Miniatures in the Collection of Her Majesty The Queen*, London 1999, p64.
- 68 James and Franco, pp107–08.
- 69 Reynolds, 'The Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Miniatures', p64.
- 70 Reynolds, 'New Light on Nicholas Hilliard', *passim* and particularly p19.
- 71 Coombs and Derbyshire, pp242–4.
- 72 Ibid, pp242–3.
- 73 James, pp308–310. Gifts from Teerlinc to the Queen are noted in Lawson, entries 59.149 (1559), 62.147 (1562), 63.137 (1563), 64.125 (1564), 65.64 (1564), 67.135 (1567), 71.140 (1571), 75.103 (1575), and 76.168 (1576). Those given to Teerlinc by the Queen are noted in entries 59.360 (1569), 62.329 (1562), 63.310 (1563), 64.177 (1564), 65.230 (1565), 68.303 (1568), 71.310 (1571), and 76.362 (1576).
- 74 <http://www.npg.org.uk/research/programmes/making-art-in-tudor-britain/the-phoenix-and-the-pelican-two-portraits-of-elizabeth-i-c.1575.php>.
- 75 Roy Strong and VJ. Murrell, op cit, p52.
- 76 <http://www.npg.org.uk/research/programmes/making-art-in-tudor-britain/the-phoenix-and-the-pelican-two-portraits-of-elizabeth-i-c.1575.php>.
- 77 Tittler, <http://spectrum.Library.concordia.ca/980096>.
- 78 NPG, Heinz Archive painter files, *vide* Anguissola, Sofonisba; *Dictionary of Art, vide* Anguissola.
- 79 William Page, ed, *Letters of Denization and Acts of Naturalization for Aliens in England* (Publications of the Huguenot Society of London, vol VIII, 1883), p168; James Gairdner and RH Brodie, eds, *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, 1540–1541*, vol 16, 1898, item 305, no. 25; James, pp235–6.
- 80 Berkshire Record Office MS. BRO D/P 97 5/2, 131 and 157, as cited in *Records of Early English Drama Pre-Publication Collections*, Alexandra F. Johnston, eds, St. Lawrence Parish, Reading, Berkshire, nd, p2. Joan Dils, ed, *Reading St. Lawrence Churchwardens' Accounts, 1498–1570* (Berkshire Record Society, vol 19, 2013), pp142, 148.
- 81 Thomas North, ed, *Accounts of the Churchwardens of St. Martin's Leicester*, Leicester, 1884, pp67, 70, 72, 78, 79, 88, 96; Mary Bateson, ed, *Records of the Borough of Leicester*, Cambridge 1905, vol III, p64.
- 82 Croft-Murray, p86; North, pp67, 70, 72, 78, 79, 88, 96; Bateson, vol III, p64.
- 83 CRO MS. ZG 17/1 (np; see by date).
- 84 Jane Seager (*sic*), 'The Divine Prophecies of the Ten Sibils', British Library Additional MS.10,037; CF Paz, 'Translation and Rewriting of Sibylline Prophecies: the case of Jane Seager', *Medievalia*, 16 (2013), pp55–63.
- 85 Frye, pp86–102.
- 86 The key work here was Lomazzo's *Trattato della Arte della Pittura* of 1584, published eight years after Teerlinc's death, and translated into English by Richard Haydocke in 1598. See also AF Kinney and Linda Bradley Salamon, eds, *Nicholas Hilliard's Art of Limning*, Boston MA, 1983, pp27–8 and Clark Hulse, *The Rule of Art: Literature and painting in the Renaissance*, Chicago and London 1990, pp120–22.
- 87 Employed by Charles I as a copyist and portrait painter, Carlile worked as one of the few female professional painters of her time. Most of her work post-dates 1640. Carlile married the dramatist Lodowick Carlile in 1626. Arianne Burnette, 'Joan Carlile', *ODNB*; Daphne Foskett, ed, *A Dictionary of British Miniature Painters*, London 1972, p194; Christopher Wright, Catherine Gordon, and Mary Peskett Smith, eds, *British and Irish Paintings in Public Collections*, New Haven and London 2006, p229.
- 88 Christopher Reeve, 'Mary Beale', *ODNB*.
- 89 James, esp p112.
- 90 Robert Tittler, *Portraits, Painters, and Publics in Provincial England, 1540–1640*, Oxford 2012, esp ch 3.