VOLUME: 10 ISSUE: 6 JUNE, 2025 Review Article

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTS, HISTORY AND CULTURAL STUDIES

The Monument to Lady Jane Cheyne and Its Possible Influence on Three Monuments by John Bushnell

Clive J. Easter PhD*
*Independent Scholar, Plymouth Devon, UK.

Abstract

This study investigated the emotional impacts of textiles, clothing, and fashion design products. A framework highlighted the main aspects affecting consumers' emotions and psychological state. This model was based on three factors: Product, Consumer and Society. These aspects were concluded after analysing and categorising emotions adopted by researchers in textiles, clothing, and fashion design areas. Factors dominating each aspect of the three were identified. A comprehensive list of emotions was developed and employed by designers and researchers. Moreover, lists for each area studied and explored were developed. This study's outcomes will be supportive and informative for textile, clothing and fashion designers and researchers as they will use the developed groups of emotional impacts based on clear and comprehensive understanding.
Keywords: Attitude, behaviour, consumer, emotion, Psychology.

INTRODUCTION

From the sixteenth century onwards, many of the identifiable design trends in British commemorative sculpture are European in origin or were influenced by European examples. Not only did some English monument makers, and their patrons, look to Europe for design inspiration, there were occasions when English clients directly employed Continental artists to realise complete projects. The most notable example of this was that of Pietro Torrigiani who Henry VII directly employed to make monuments to himself and his Queen, Elizabeth of York, as well as his mother, Margaret Beaufort. Both these monuments can be seen in Westminster Abbey.

This paper focuses on a particular effigial format – that of the reclining female figure and its use in three important seventeenth-century monuments. It was not until the early seventeenth century that reclining figures – male and female – made any significant appearance within English commemorative sculpture. This may have its origins in the dissemination of continental prints and drawings of classical figures with images of reclining figures, frequently seen in antiquity, adopting what had become known as the ‘banqueting pose’. Throughout the Renaissance, in particular, painted reclining figures were quite common and Giorgione (1477-1510) was one of the first artists to popularise the reclining female nude. The reclining pose per se does not appear to have been used for commemorative sculpture in the medieval period, the recumbent effigial format being universally popular for both two and three-dimensional monuments. It was not until the very early sixteenth century in Rome that the reclining effigy was seen in a commemorative context and a very early example, that may have influenced later designs, is that of Francesca Carduli (died c1515) in the Cappella Cesi, Santa Maria della Pace, Rome (Fig 1). Sculpted c1560 by Vincenzo de Rossi (1525-87), this monument illustrates not only the reclining pose but also a melancholic, contemplative attitude, a highly unusual feature in itself but there is nothing to suggest that this aspect of the monument was adopted elsewhere for some time to come. The style of the Carduli monument may have been a one-off but the reclining effigial format was successfully employed sometime later on two monuments in the church Santa Maria Sopra Minerva, Rome. These commemorate Silvestro Aldobrandini, who died in 1558, and his wife Lesa Deti Aldobrandini, who died in 1557 (Fig 2). They

were the parents of Pope Clement VIII and the monuments were ordered by the Pope from the French sculptor Nicholas Cordier (1567–1612) and erected c1605. The pose of Lesa Deti in particular shows her reclining on a thin couch, on her left side, her right arm supported by cushions, and the left arm brought across her lower body, her hand holding a book. The resulting overall pose is one of relaxation and is completely within the ideas of the 'banqueting style'. Given that the design of the Aldobrandini monuments was perhaps the choice of the Pope himself, it is possible that the style of the female figure, in particular, could have been influenced by examples in the Vatican Museums, including the famous Sleeping Ariadne, a Roman copy of a Greek original dating from the second century BC.

It is here suggested that these monuments, especially that to Lesa Deti Aldobrandini, are the possible design sources for the monument to Lady Jane Cheyne in Chelsea Old Church and three similar reclining female figures by John Bushnell.

Fig 1 Tomb of Francesco Carduli c1515 by Vincenzo de'Rossi Cappella Cesi Santa Maria della Pace Rome. Internet illustration.

Fig 2 Lesa Deti Aldobrandini, died 1557Santa Maria Sopra Minerva, Rome Internet illustration

The monument to Lady Jane Cheyne

In England in the early modern period, the reclining or semi-reclining effigial format became quite popular, especially amongst metropolitan sculptors, but unfortunately, many of the resulting effigies, often shown with the head supported by an arm resting on a pillow, are stiff, awkward, and inelegant.

From the outbreak of the Civil War in 1642 until the Restoration in 1660, there were no particular developments in English commemorative sculpture. During the Commonwealth, aristocratic patronage of the arts as a whole was at a standstill, and monuments erected to aristocrats were rare.

At the same time, the period also saw a hiatus in the general importation and domestic production of luxury goods, commemorative sculpture being no exception. Of the few sculpture

yards to continue working during the Commonwealth period that of the Marshals was perhaps the busiest, while the Stanton workshop also continued in operation. The Restoration brought with it an increase in the overall consumption of luxury goods, both domestically produced as well as imported, and a corresponding upsurge in the production of commemorative sculpture. The employment of expensive imported materials was now increasingly commonplace, especially amongst the fashionable metropolitan sculptors. The use of these materials for commemorative sculpture was perhaps the ultimate expression of the increasing levels of conspicuous consumption and it was from these new and emerging conditions that new trends in commemorative sculpture began to emerge.

Lady Jane Cavendish was born in 1621, the eldest daughter of William Cavendish, first Duke of Newcastle (1593-1676), and his wife Elizabeth, widow of Henry Howard and the sole heiress of her father, William Bassett of Blore, Staffordshire. Jane married Charles Cheyne (1625-1698) in 1654 and her considerable dowry enabled him to purchase the manor of Chelsea, in instalments, from 1657.ivThe purchase was finally completed in 1661 at a total cost of £13,626.vJane Cheyne died after a series of epileptic fits on the 8 of October 1669 aged 48. In 1670, her husband commissioned a funeral monument to her memory, not from the fashionable London sculptural workshops but from Rome and the workshops of Gian Lorenzo Bernini. The attribution of the monument to Bernini was recorded by Bowack in 1705 where he states that 'This monument was done by the famous Seignior Birnini an Italian, and to cost 500L'. These details were restated by Faulkner in 1810.

Before the Civil War, Bernini had many admirers in the Caroline Court. In his most famous work for an English patron, he carved a bust of Charles I from the famous triple portrait by Van Dyke, now in the Royal collection at Windsor Castle. The bust was lost in the Great Fire at Whitehall in 1698. Bernini's only surviving portrait bust of an English client is that of Sir Thomas Baker, c1638, now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Other English aristocratic patrons also wished to have their portrait busts carved by Italian sculptors or, in the case of Lord Arundel, have an entire monument constructed, but these schemes came to nothing, possibly due to the high costs involved as well as possible references to 'Catholic' art.

Through his purchase of the manor of Chelsea, Charles Cheyne was able to develop the area into a fashionable London suburb although the area had been popular since the reign of Henry VIII, one of its famous residents being Sir Thomas More (1478 – executed 1535). Possibly because of Charles's humble origins – he was the son of an untitled modest gentry family from Buckinghamshire- he was fully aware of his social obligations to Jane's family, to whom he was indebted for providing the means to establish himself as a gentleman in what was rapidly becoming a smart part of London. The monument Charles Cheyne subsequently erected is not only a vehicle for commemoration but is also a highly visible means by which Cheyne can repay the debt he owed his wife and her family for his social standing.

Cheney had visited Rome in the 1640s as a Royalist exile and may well have encountered Bernini during that visit, hence his possible choice of the Bernini workshop for his wife's monument. However, he did not visit the city again and negotiations regarding the monument were entrusted to his cousin, Edward Chaloner who was leaving for Rome in the company of the English ambassador. What is particularly interesting is that the monument, its design, and subsequent manufacture are the subjects of considerable surviving correspondence between the client and the agent. In October 1670 Chaloner wrote to Cheyne saying that he had sent him three 'models' or drawings of possible design ideas along with their prices. Unfortunately, this correspondence fails to identify any designers and the proposed monuments were, in all probability too expensive, too ambitious, or too 'Catholic' for an English parish church. A later letter to Cheney of early 1671 states that a wooden model had been prepared, but, again costs are uncertain.

Chaloner left Rome for Venice early in 1671 and negotiations concerning the monument were subsequently handled by Edward Altham, an English merchant resident in the city.x Correspondence from this time indicates that Altham was left more or less to his own devices to find

the craftsmen who could execute the design.Further communications suggest that the architect or designer is a 'kinsman to the famous Cavaliere Bernini and his heir besides'. Whether Cheyne was in any way instrumental in this choice is speculative, but the correspondence strongly suggests that the design was the work of Paolo Bernini, (1648- 1728), the less talented son of Gian Lorenzo and it is almost certain that he selected Antonio Raggi (1624–1686) as the sculptor. Raggi was known to be the best of Gian Lorenzo Bernini's students and carved several pieces independently of the Bernini studio.

By March 1671 Cheyney was asked by Altham to send the lineaments of the face, whether long or round, and the portion of the nose, lips, forehead, fat or lean, of which part I am somewhat already informed by Mr. Sanderson, who was the Lady's kinsman and acquaintance, but I shall expect more to that purpose from yourself.

An oval portrait miniature of Lady Jane by Cornelius Johnson (1593-1661) in the Bridgeman collection shows a remarkable level of similarity with the head on the monument as does an earlier portrait, possibly by Adriaen Hanneman (c1601-71) at Welbeck Abbey, Jane's ancestral home. It is, therefore, reasonable to suppose that the effigy is indeed an accurate portrait (Fig 3).

Fig 3 Lady Jane Cavendish Possibly by Adriaen Hanneman, c1601-1671 after Sir Anthony Van Dyck, 1599-1641 By Kind permission of Welbeck Abbey, Nottinghamshire.

The completed monument was shipped to England from Leghorn in thirty cases on 19 October 1671. However, upon receipt, the effigy of Lady Jane was found to be facing the wrong way but Altham managed to persuade Cheyne that it was all right and he accepted it as it was. At this stage, there was no inscription on the monument and Cheyne consulted the rector of Chelsea Old Church, Dr. Adam Littleton(1627-98),and it was he who composed the final wording. The monument was completed and erected in January 1672. (Fig 4)

Fig 4 Monument to Lady Jane Cheyne d1669 Chelsea Old Church Photo Author

Despite the increasing popularity of Chelsea, the existence of a sculpted monument to the wife of the Lord of the Manor from the workshop of Bernini would strengthen the attraction of the locality and the church as destinations of importance. As it appears now, the monument is in its original position and is placed against the north wall of the nave. The white marble effigy shows Lady Jane, reclining on her left side atop a black marble sarcophagus, her left arm resting on a cushion with a book that her index finger has page-marked. The right hand is brought to the chest. Her dress, an off-the-shoulder gown, is finely rendered and, in the folds at her feet, is a crown. The concave architectural frame is placed forward of the effigy, thus creating a niche, and with a simple moulded base consisting of three black marble panels set within moulded frames while two variegated red marble columns (Mischio di Brecia di Francia) with composite capitals support a plain entablature and segmental pediment. The creation of the niche with the effigy positioned behind the frontal plane is making a carefully planned but deliberate statement of accessibility. Lady Jane can be seen but not approached and the pose is one of surprise, almost as if the spectator is interrupting her reading, the right hand raised to the chest in a display of mild alarm. (Fig 5)

Fig 5 Effigy of Lady Jane Cheyne d1669 Chelsea Old Church Photo Author

The inscription, which must have been completed before the final placing of the effigy, is poorly laid out and painted on the back wall. It reads

M.S.
Pientissimae & Sanctissimae Heroinae
Nec tam Avitis Imaginibus quam Proprijs
Virtutibus Inlustris;
Doninae JANAE CHEYNE
Excmi Dni GUILIELMI Ducis de Novo Castro
Filiae ex tribus Natu maximae;
CAROLI CHEYNE Armigeri
Conjugis Dilectissimae, Desideratissimae
De qua nihil unquam doluit niside Mortua
Ex qua tres Optimae Spei Liberos Suscepit
ELIZABETHAM: GUILIELMI
Venustam Deo CATHARINAM Intra paucos a morte Matris menses Fato functam
Inter caetera Charitatis Opera
Tectum huic Ecclesiae
Densis trabium ordinibus compingendum
(Quod iam, Deo gratia effectum est)
Paullo ante mortem tanquam ex legato dedit
Vitae Curriculum qua Pietate & Patientia

Transegerat Peregit Eid Octob
Salutis
Anno Aetatis
Conugij
Quo toto Propre Tempore hanc Viciniam praesens
Nobilitavit Breavi
Jacet una cum Filiola CATHARINA
Intra Cancellos in medio Conditorio sepulta
Sub ipsa Sacra Mensa

On the sarcophagus, between the console brackets, is the painted inscription to Charles Cheyne who died in 1698. It reads

MS
CAROLI CHEYNE
Vics comitis de Newhaven in Regno Scotiae et
Hujus Manerij de Chelsey Domini Qui hoc
Monumentum in Memoria Do IANAE Conjugis suae
Imae dilectissimae annos abhinc viginti er novem
Extruxerat Ac Nunc demum Ipse
(heu nimium cito) demortuus
Et juxta conjugem suam (prout testament
Suo desinnaverat) in eodem Conditorio
Sepultus una cum illa Beatam Resurrectionem
Oraestolatur Obit 30 die Junij
Anno Domini 1698
Aetatis 78

Bowack recalls that a now lost inscription, originally written in Latin and placed at the foot of the chancel near the entrance to the family vault, read

For that most extraordinary Lady,
His most beloved Wife,
That most pious Heroine, the Lady Jane,
Eldest Daughter of the illustrious Prince William, Duke of Newcastle,
Not long since deceased,
And for his own use (when he shall dye)
Charles Cheyne, Esq. Lord of this Manor of Chelsea,
(Which was purchased by the rich dowry of his Wife)
Ordered this vault to be built.
It was dedicated the 3d day of the Calends of Nov. 1669.
I beseech thee, Almighty God,
That she may quietly rest here
Till the resurrection of all flesh. Amen.

Locally, Lady Jane was known for her piety as well as her generosity in the rebuilding of the church and this is reflected in her long funeral sermon, composed and preached by Dr Littleton, and delivered on 1st November 1669. The inspiration for the sermon, taken from Proverbs 30 is titled 'Favour is deceitful, and Beauty is vain: but a Woman that feareth the Lord, She shall be Praised.'

The sermon is unusual in that it argues for Lady Jane's equality with men by virtue of her reasoning and education as well as through the workings of the Holy Spirit. An indirect reference is also made to a 'learned woman of Utrecht' who was actually Anna Maria van Schurman (1607-78), a noted painter, scholar, poet, philosopher, and early feminist with whom Jane's stepmother, Margaret Cavendish, is known to have corresponded. Jane herself may well have been aware of Van Schurman's work which may in turn have influenced her thinking.

The resulting monument, apart from being an expensive imported luxury item, commemorates her not only visually, as any monument would, but through the specific wording within the inscription. Reading deeper into the monument as a whole, it is clear that, although very unusual, in its overall style and intentional detachment of the effigy from everyday accessibility, there is an attempt here to construct a specific social identity. The sermon hints at the independent social identity as does the inscription and we are informed about her piety and good works: it was widely accepted at the time that private Godliness and public morality were feminine concerns. The inscription reminds the reader of these virtues while also commenting on the love she bore her husband despite his lower social status.

In ordering a Baroque monument from Rome – a bold if not unique decision – Cheyne has overcome the difficult question of how to incorporate such a monument into a Protestant church. To a contemporary audience, he has proclaimed his aspirations as well as his cosmopolitan tastes and appreciation of Italian art while demonstrating, as far as commemorative art is concerned, the ultimate level of conspicuous consumption. Local, e.g. metropolitan sculptors could have produced an impressive monument to Lady Jane but by employing the talents of the renowned Bernini workshop, Cheyne is making the definitive status statement. Earlier commentators and thinkers might have considered Roman art as papist, but by the 1670s the luxury consumer trade no longer concerned itself with such issues. However, the depiction of an overtly pious woman in a Protestant church at this period would have posed something of an ethical dilemma – how do you depict such a woman within a Christian Baroque vocabulary? Some control must have been exercised in the design of the monument as it is much more restrained than similar female figures by Bernini and his team, of which Paolo and Antonio Raggi would have been aware and probably participated in making. The figures of St Therese (finished 1652), and the Blessed Ludovica (created 1674) are portrayed in the moment of ecstasy or death with their hands brought to their breasts. There is an echo of this pose with Lady Jane but its subtle rendition here can be seen as a scaled-down version of the earlier sculptures, the emotional intensity of which would not have been acceptable to English protestant tastes. The original intention was to depict her as a wife, a mother, and an heiress wearing a coronet and with her infant daughter Katherine, who died just after her mother. The coronet being worn was rejected as inappropriate and instead lies at her feet within the folds of her gown but it remains a subtle allusion to her aristocratic birth. Although conspicuous displays of heraldry for the purposes of displaying familial descent and extramarital associations had been considerably toned down by the post-Restoration period, this monument is unusual in its total absence of any heraldry whatsoever. Given the status of her birth family and Cheyne's high regard for them, this omission is difficult to explain.

Three monuments by John Bushnell

John Bushnell (1636-1701) was perhaps the most enigmatic of all the Post-Restoration sculptors and was the first British sculptor to handle the Italian Baroque style with any degree of confidence. In some of his early work, his ability to express emotion and pathos was far ahead of anything his contemporaries were capable of. The son of a plumber, he was apprenticed c1650 to Thomas Burman (1618-74) but did not complete his training, fleeing to the continent in 1657 after having been trapped into marrying a servant girl that Burman had seduced. He remained on the continent for approximately ten years working in France and Rome before moving to Venice where his contribution to the ultra-baroque Moncenigo monument in the church of the Mendicanti is well documented. Upon his return to England in about 1668 and, presumably, reconciliation with Burman, hewas very soon employed in several sculptural projects, and from the very early 1670s, was in demand as a maker of church monuments.

While in Rome he very probably encountered Bernini, or saw some of his work first-hand, and may also have encountered Paulo Bernini and Antonio Raggi, amongst others. It is also highly likely that the level of pathos he was able to introduce into his early work might also have originated

from seeing Bernini's work as well as in discussion with him. However, given the religious climate of post-Restoration England and the ever-present fear of Catholicism and Catholic influences, Bushnell would have needed to tone down much of the imagery he used in order to satisfy the tastes of his patrons. Nevertheless, he was able to introduce some elements of Catholic imagery into at least one of his monuments although the lack of such imagery, toned down or not, in his later works suggests perhaps that he was not altogether happy with it and nor were his patrons.

The 1670s saw Bushnell produce some of his best-known monuments. His standing figure of Lord Maudaunt (1627-at All Saints, Fulham, London is one of the most ambitious of all his monuments and is far superior to other such standing figure monuments of the seventeenth century.xvDuring this decade he also produced three remarkable reclining effigial monuments to women, viz. Countess Jane Ashburnham, 1672 at Ashburnham, Sussex, Lady Elizabeth Myddleton 1675/6 At Chirk, Wrexham, and Lady Mary May, died 1681, the monument erected 1676, Mid Lavant, Sussex. In all three monuments, there is a clear echo of Lady Jane Cheyne's monument, something that Bushnell was, in all probability, fully aware of. In Jane Cheyne's monument, Bushnell would have seen how a Baroque.

Catholic monument, albeit a very toned-down one, could be adapted for use within a Protestant church. However, the reclining female effigial format was not limited to Bushnell. Other metropolitan sculptors began to adopt this design including Abraham Storey (monument to Lady Hart, 1671 Flitton, Bedfordshire), Thomas Cartwright the elder (monument to Sir Thomas and Lady Adams, 1667/8 Sprowston, Norfolk), and Jasper Latham (monument to Lady Wolryche, 1678 Quatt, Shropshire). Only the effigy of Lady Adams has any real affinity with the figures by Bushnell, the others being rather stiff and not fully in the 'banqueting' style. Bushnell's main contribution to the genre was to make his reclining ladies into more than effigial monuments – they are refined artworks in their own right and he has elevated the design to levels not previously reached. It was not until c1700 that reclining figures – both male and female – began to equal the grace and sophistication of Bushnell's work. If indeed the monument to Lady Cheyne was the starting point for a new and more refined portrayal of the female form, in three monuments, all erected in a very short space of time, Bushnell adapted an overtly classical design into a sophisticated commemorative format.

The first monument in the group of three to be erected, and certainly the most elaborate, commemorates Jane, Countess of Marlborough (1604-1672), and her husband William Ashburnham (1606-79), the monument erected c1672/3 (Fig 6).

Fig 6 William Ashburnham and Jane Countess of Marlborough d1672 Ashburnham Sussex Photo Author.

The daughter of John Boteler, 1st Lord Boteler of Brantfield, and third wife of James Ley 1st Earl of Marlborough who died 1629, she married William Ashburnham later in the same year. He rose to become a Major General in the Royalist Army and MP for Ludgershall, Wiltshire. The monument shows the effigies of Jane and William placed on a wide black marble slab atop a curved white marble tomb chest and with an inscription panel on the front. The figure of Jane shows her reclining on a low couch, her right arm resting on two cushions that helpsupport her upper body, her head inclined to the right, and gazing downward. Her left arm, bent at the elbow, rests on her raised left knee, the right leg being stretched out to the fullest with the loose drapery of her mantle and under-dress falling in naturalistic folds over the whole body. Commissioned by her husband almost immediately, or very shortly, after death, this is an extremely rare example of a sculpted putto hovering above her and bestowing the crown of immortality. Countess Jane's distraught husband knees at her feet, his hands outstretched in a unique and remarkably intense display of pathos, unknown in England at this time. Although the drapery seen on Countess Jane's figure is well-cut and naturalistic, it lacks the sophistication and detail seen on Lady Cheyne's effigy. As will be shown, the drapery seen on the other two monuments in the group is similarly treated and all three figures are fully in keeping with the 'banqueting' style. (Fig 7)

Fig 7 Effigy of Jane,Countess of Marlborough d1672 Ashburnham Sussex Photo Author

Above the figures of William and Jane is a Baldacchino, another feature that was rare in England at this time because of its Catholic associations that saw it as a symbol of celestial glory as well as signifying the elite status of the individual(s) concerned. The drapery has been drawn back and held in place by two putti, and this allows the spectator to witness, at first-hand, the intensity of William's grief over the death of his wife and her adornment with the crown of immortality. This is a very private scene, one that the spectator is privileged to see. In this composition, Bushnell has achieved something unique - the full use of a classical reclining effigial format combined with an exclusive and unparalleled example of sculptural sophistication. In the figure of William Ashburnham, Bushnell has also managed the ultimate display of pathos and grief, all set within very toned-down catholic imagery.

The inscription, written in English, is placed on the front of the tomb chest and set within a restrained foliate surround. It reads under this Toomb (viz: in the vault for this Family Lie the Bodies of JANE Countess of Marlbrough & William Ashburnham her husband Second sonne of Sr John Ashburnham, She was the Daughter to John Lord Butler of Hartfordshire She was married first to James Earle of Marlbrough Lord High Treasurer of England Who after seaven years died, and left her a young, beautifull & rich widow when this William, coming from beyond the Sea where he was bred a Souldier married her, and after lived almost five and forty years most happily with her, she was a very great lover and (through Gods mercy) a great blessing to this Family which is hoped will ever remember it with honouring her memory. This William Ashburnham her husband lived after her to a great age & gloried in nothing in this World But this his wife, and the almost unparallel'd love and intire freindship that for above fifty years was between his Dare Elder Brother John Ashburnham and himselfe He was Coffered to King Charles the 1st& King Charles the second, h died without issue And

by God's blessing was a happy Preserver of his Brothers Posterity The praise and glory of it be to God alone.

If it is assumed that William composed the inscription he was clearly at pains to emphasise the aristocratic birth and first marriage of Jane, the source of his subsequent wealth but also highlights the social differences between them. William was known to be impoverished and as the second son of Sir John Ashburnham had to make his own way in the world but he was clearly very close to his brother John who inherited the estates of his father. John Ashburnham's monument of 1671, attributed to Thomas Burman, can also be seen in the church. The inscription also describes Jane as 'a great blessing to this Family', presumably a reference to her wealth, something the family will ever remember her for. It is also interesting to note that despite his years of Royal service to both Charles 1st and Charles 11 he was not knighted or known to have received any particular Royal favours.

Lady Elizabeth Myddleton's monument at Chirk, Wrexham of c 1675/6 is considered here as the second in the group of three to have been erected. The daughter of Sir Thomas Wilbraham of Weston Park, Weston –under – Lizard, Staffordshire, she married Sir Thomas Myddleton, 2nd Baronet of Chirk on 6 February 1673. She died in childbirth, or from post-natal complications, aged 22 in 1675. Surprisingly, the inscription gives no precise date of death. Elizabeth's monument was commissioned by Sir Thomas from Bushnell in c1675 at the same time as the monument to his parents Sir Thomas (died 1666) and his mother Mary, nee Napier (died 1674).

Both monuments are very different in style, the parental monument having portrait busts on pedestals and Lady Elizabeth is shown as a reclining effigy. Beneath the main shelf on the parental monument is an inscription tablet in a rather 'fleshy' surround accompanied by winged putti while on Lady Elizabeth's monument, a secondary inscription panel is set in front of a semi-gadrooned flattened sarcophagus. The main feature common to both monuments is a Baldacchino held open by two putti. (Fig 8).

Fig 8 Monument to Lady Elizabeth Myddleton 1675 Chirk, Wrexham Photo Martin Brown

Lady Elizabeth's effigy reclines on a couch exactly as seen on the Ashburnham monument. Overall, the pose of each body is the same, especially the positioning of the legs while the treatment of the clothing is also broadly the same on each monument. The drapery of the Baldacchino in both Myddleton monuments is simpler than that seen at Ashburnham and while the earlier piece has a large cartouche of arms in the centre, the back wall of Lady Myddleton's monument is occupied by a lengthy inscription that reads:

HSJ

ELIZABETHA MYDDELTON

Dni Thomas Wilbraham Baronetti
De Woodhey in agro Cestrensi Filia
Dni Thomas Myddelton Castri Chirk et territory adjacentis domin
Quae
Egregium corporis venustissimi deus
Morum candour, animaeq sibi confeiae pulchritudine
vieit simul et illustrabat
Tanta in primis juventae annis prudential
uf vel tune Matrona
Tanta in conjugio verecundia
ut virgo etiamnum videretur
Postquam per biennium cum Marito conjunctissime agens
Haeredem familite cui niscribebatia intulisset
Variolis puerperio supervenientibus correpta
hune unum Marito querelae locum fecit
quopd invitum deceruisset
summon bonorum omnium desiderio extincta
anno Aera Christianse MDCLXXV Aetatis suae XX11
Filius Thomas sacro fonte susceptus & Deo natus
Posrq dies paucos denatus
Matri se comitem & coelo civem reddidit
Urr?? Superstes eoq nomine calaitosior THOMAS MYDDELTON
Duplici orbitate oppressus hoc monumentum posuitxvii

The wording on the secondary inscription panel, left blank at the time of manufacture, was composed by Sir Thomas's only surviving daughter Charlotte by his second wife Charlotte, daughter of Orlando Bridgeman, who died in 1694. The inscription, extolling the virtues of Sir Thomas, is dated 1722.

What sets Lady Elizabeth's effigy apart from mainstream portrayals of women who died in childbirth, or post-natal complications, is that she is shown suckling her infant child, who also died. By drawing back the drapery of the Baldacchino, the spectator is again witnessing a very rare and deeply personal portrayal of a very intimate act, something that Bushnell has managed to show with great sensitivity.

The third monument in the group and considered here to be the last one to be erected, commemorates Lady Mary May (c1640 – 1681) who was the second wife of Sir John May of Raughmere, Mid Lavant Sussex. She was a widow at the age of 36 when, in 1676, she decided to set up her own monument in Mid Lavant church as the inscription states;

*Lies the Body of Dame Mary May, Second wife to Sr

John May of Rawmere, the only surviving Sister and Sole Heire unto Sr John Morley of Brooms and Daughter to Sr John Morley of Chichester, Son to Sr Edward Morley a second Brother of the Family of Halnaker Place. Piously contemplating ye uncertainty of this life/among other solemn pre parations for her/Funerall Obsequies, Shee erected this/monument in ye time of her Life in ye/year of Our LORD 1676, shee departed this life in ye year of Our LORD 1681/in ye 41st year of her Age.

Her choice of John Bushnell as the sculptor may have been influenced by her uncle, Hugh May (1622-84), the much-respected gentleman architect with influence at Court and who counted the painter Sir Peter Lely, and the diarists John Evelyn and Samuel Pepys among his circle of acquaintances. Pepys may well have known Lady May and he could also have been partly responsible for suggesting Bushnell as the sculptor had already erected a monument to Pepys's wife Elizabeth, who had died in 1669, in the church of St Olave, Hart Street, London.

In Lady Mary's figure, Bushnell has created an almost identical figure to that of Jane Ashburnham. The loose drapery, the undergarment clinging to the upper body while her mantle falls in loose folds from her shoulders is virtually indistinguishable from that seen on Jane Ashburnham's figure while the treatment of the hands and the tilt of the head are also exactly alike. (Fig 9).

Fig 9 Monument to Lady Mary May c1676 Mid Lavant Sussex Photo Author

The monument is well-known for having been removed from the church during a reordering scheme between August 1871 and February 1872 and where the vestry minute book records that a recumbent effigy of Dame Mary May which was fixed against the South Wall of the Nave, and which formerly stood in the Chancel was taken down to make room for another window and placed in the Vault under the Chancel.

The monument was restored to the church in c1980. Looking at it today we can see that the face is heavily pockmarked and it has long been assumed that this was the result of later treatment to render the effigy more 'lifelike' as she was presumed to have suffered from smallpox. This seems highly unlikely and as the monument was commissioned by Lady Mary in her lifetime she very probably insisted on her effigy being a faithful portrait, including the pockmarks. There is no indication that there was ever any canopy or superstructure over the effigy.

CONCLUSION

This paper has suggested that the monument to Lady Jane Cheyne was not only a work with which John Bushnell was familiar but that he adapted and developed the format of the reclining figure to a level of sophistication unknown in Restoration period Britain. In creating the Ashburnham monument Bushnell was also able to introduce a level of emotional intensity that not only elevated the monument to a new level but made a successful adaptation of the classical banqueting pose into a commemorative art form. The extent to which this monument is experimental remains speculative as the subtle use of toned-down Catholic imagery might not sit easily with many of his clients and as a consequence were not used again.

That the success of the format appears to have been short-lived is again difficult to explain as is the fact that his metropolitan contemporaries failed to adopt it in any meaningful way. Such poses as seen in these three monuments were not used again until c1700, a full generation later. Although the reclining effigy format was nothing new by the time Bushnell came to use it, his contribution was to elevate the style to a new level, one which his contemporaries and successors were not able to equal. Bushnell was known to be a difficult personality but in his early work, he was both innovative and bold. His training on the continent and exposure to continental ideas enabled him to break new ground and it is tantalising to think of what else he might have been capable of were it not for his mental instabilities and challenging character.

REFERENCES

A Bacchi, C Hess & J Montagu (2008). (eds) Bernini and the birth of Baroque Portrait Sculpture. J Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles.

Allestree The Ladies Calling (1705).

E Bathurst Truth Vindicated, (1695) TDS Bayley Lady Mary May's monument in mid Lavant Church Sussex Archaeological Collections Vol CVII 1969 pp1-9

Essex review Vol XVII (1908). pp74-87 and Vol XVIII (1909) pp 134-46 https://www.findagrave.com/memorial/77901519/elizabeth-myddleton

https://www.ancestry.co.uk/discoveryuia5&_phstart=successSource3&_phstart=successSourcecontent/view/78630:1981?tid=&pid=&queryId=eb4c177ba6ab058c80fd16c25f612ce7&_phsrc=Xra1

https://www.ancestry.co.uk/discoveryuicontent/view/31390:62049?tid=&pid=&queryId=eef413cd930b3c167034b1d06a81eabe&_phsrc=Xr

J Irwin Anna Maria van Schurman and Antoinette Bourignon: Contrasting Examples of Seventeenth-Century Pietism Church History, Vol. 60, No. 3 (Sep., 1991), pp. 301-315.

J Montagu, (1992). Roman Baroque Sculpture; the Industry of Art. Yale University Press.

K. J. Norlock ((2019)). Feminist Ethics Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.

L Borean John, (1992). Bushnell in Venice, Church Monuments, Journal of the Church Monuments Society XIV (1999) p88-104 E Bronfen Over Her Dead Body: Death, Femininity and the Aesthetic Manchester University Press.

L Peck (2005). Consuming Splendor Cambridge.

L Peck (2018). Women of Fortune: Money, Marriage and Murder in Early Modern England Cambridge University Press.

M Whinney (1988). (revised J Physick) Sculpture in Britain 1530-1830 Penguin.

M Wynne-Davies ((2010)). With such a wife 'tis Heaven on Earth to Dwell: Memorialising Early Modern Englishwomen Journal of the Northern Renaissance, 128-148

N H Keeble, (1999.) The Cultural Identity of Seventeenth Century Woman Routledge.

Roscoe, Hardy, & Sullivan, (2009). A Biographical Dictionary of Sculptors in Britain 1660-1851 Yale University Press.

S Apetrei Mysticism and Femininity in Seventeenth-Century England. The Way (2007).

S Mendelson & P Crawford, (1997). Women in Early Modern England 1550-1720 Clarendon Press.

T Faulkner, (1810). An Historical and Topographical Description of Chelsea and its Environs 89-90 Huntingdon Library, San Marino, California, USA.

Victoria County History A History of the County of Middlesex: Volume 12, Chelsea. pp108-115.