The Significance of Size and Scale in the Appeal of the Tudor Portrait Miniature

Rachel Katherine Alban

Masters by Research

University of York

History of Art

August 2019

ABSTRACT

This thesis is the first extended analysis of the effects and meanings of size and scale in the sixteenth-century portrait miniature. Although the term 'miniature' is anachronistic, this research suggests that portrait miniatures *were* seen as specially small in this period, and this smallness was a crucial aspect of the experience and portrayals they offered. This research also examines the relationship between the external size and the internal, pictorial scale of the Tudor portrait miniature. By using a corpus of miniatures from three London collections it has been possible to identify the most common features of sixteenth-century portrait miniatures, which serves to correct a scholarly tendency to focus on innovative and unusual examples. Careful analysis of this corpus has revealed the monumental character of these images, offering a more historicised account of their appeal, in contrast to modern appreciation of their delicate rendering of detail. The second chapter goes beyond the well-established descriptions of the portrait miniature as intimate and secretive by describing how miniaturisation also created a surprising, attractive and dynamic aesthetic experience. In addition, the size and scale of the Tudor portrait miniature is proposed as inherently meaningful, creating structural implications of perfection, timelessness and interiority. This allowed Tudor miniaturists to suggest the invisible characteristics of their sitters, without resorting to explicit settings and symbolism. The thesis concludes by suggesting that miniaturisation itself may have been of interest to Tudor viewers, in light of contemporary interest in the theories of optics and the nature of representation, and the perennial appeal of miniature objects.

CONTENTS

ILLUSTRATIONS

1. Nicholas Hilliard, *Young Man Among Roses*, c.1587. Watercolour and bodycolour, with gold and silver, on vellum laid on card, 135 x 73mm. London, Victoria and Albert Museum, no P.163-1910. Photo: https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O17315/young-man-among-roses-portrait-miniature-hilliard-nicholas/

2. Hans Holbein the Younger, *Hans of Antwerp*, c.1532. Oil on panel, 131 x 131mm. London, Victoria and Albert Museum, no. P.158-1910. Photo: https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O78675/hans-of-antwerp-oil-painting-holbein-hans-ii/

3. Nicholas Hilliard, *Robert Dudley, 1st Earl of Leicester*, 1576. Watercolour on vellum, 44 x 44mm. London, National Portrait Gallery, no. NPG 4197. Photo: https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw03852/Robert-Dudley-1st-Earl-of-Leicester

4. Nicholas Hilliard, *Leonard Darr*, 1591. Watercolour and body colour on vellum, laid on card, 70 x 55mm. Worksop, The Portland Collection. Photo: MacLeod, 2019, plate 44.

5. Hans Holbein the Younger, *Georg Giese*, 1532. Oil on wood, 960 x 860mm. Berlin, Gemäldegalerie. Photo: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Portrait_of_Georg_Giese#/media/File:Hans_Holbein_der_J%C3%BCngere_-_Der_Kaufmann_Georg_Gisze_-_Google_Art_Project.jpg

6. Steven Cornelisz van Herwijck, *Richard Martin (obverse)*, 1562. Cast and chased silver, 57mm diameter. London, British Museum, no M.6869. Photo: https://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=952902&partId=1

7. Hans Holbein the Younger, *Anne of Cleves*, 1539. Watercolour on vellum, laid on a playing card, 44mm diameter. Box: ivory base and lid, 61mm diameter. London, Victoria and Albert Museum, no P.153:1,2-1910. Photo: http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O18966/portrait-miniature-of-anne-of-portrait-miniature-holbein-hans/

8. Nicholas Hilliard, *Portrait of a Lady, perhaps Penelope, Lady Rich (1563-1607)*, c.1589. Watercolour on vellum, laid on card, 57 x 46 mm. London, Royal Collection Trust, no. RCIN 420020. Photo: https://www.rct.uk/collection/420020/portrait-of-a-lady-perhaps-penelope-lady-rich-1563-1607

9. Nicholas Hilliard, *Self-Portrait, Aged 30*, 1577. Watercolour on vellum, laid on card, 41mm diameter. London, Victoria and Albert Museum, no. P.155-1910. Photo: https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O72550/self-portrait-aged-30-portrait-miniature-hilliard-nicholas/

10. Anon, *Cameo of Elizabeth I*, 16th century, English. Onyx in gold collet frame, 24 x 20mm. London, British Museum, no. 1914,0926.1. Photo: https://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?partId=1&objectId=83830

11. Nicholas Hilliard, *The Heneage Jewel*, c.1595. Watercolour on vellum, set in enamelled gold locket with table-cut diamonds, Burmese rubies and rock crystal, 70 x 51mm. London,

Victoria and Albert Museum, no. M.81-1935. Photo: https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O33883/the-heneage-jewel-locket-hilliard-nicholas/

12. Nicholas Hilliard, *An Unknown Man*, c.1600. Watercolour on vellum laid on card, 69 x 54mm. London, Victoria and Albert Museum, no. P.5-1917. Photo: https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O16579/an-unknown-man-portrait-miniature-hilliard-nicholas/

13. Isaac Oliver, *A Young Man Seated Under a Tree*, c1590-1595. Watercolour on vellum laid on card, 124 x 89mm. London, Royal Collection Trust, no. RCIN 420639. Photo: https://www.rct.uk/collection/420639/a-young-man-seated-under-a-tree

14. Isaac Oliver, *Isaac Oliver*, c.1590. Watercolour on vellum, 64 x 51mm. London, National Portrait Gallery, no. NPG 4852. Photo: https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw04739/Isaac-Oliver

15. Isaac Oliver, *Henry Stanley, 4th Early of Derby*, c.1590. Watercolour on vellum, 51 x 42mm. London, National Portrait Gallery, no. NPG 6302. Photo: https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw01803/Henry-Stanley-4th-Earl-of-Derby

16. Nicholas Hilliard, *An Unknown Young Man*, 1590-1593. Watercolour on vellum laid on a playing card and contained in a box of turned ivory, 50 x 42mm. London, Victoria and Albert Museum, no. P.3-1974. Photo: http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O81994/an-unknown-young-man-portrait-miniature-hilliard-nicholas/

17. Nicholas Hilliard, *An Unknown Man, aged 24*, 1572. Watercolour on vellum laid on a playing card, 60 x 48mm. London, Victoria and Albert Museum, no. P.1-1942. Photo: http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O16581/an-unknown-man-aged-24-portrait-miniature-hilliard-nicholas/

18. Nicholas Hilliard, *Sir Francis Drake*, 1581. Watercolour on vellum, 28mm diameter. London, National Portrait Gallery, no. NPG 4851. Photo: https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw01931/Sir-Francis-Drake

19. Attributed to George Gower, *Portrait of Lettice Knollys*, c.1585. Oil on panel, dimensions unknown. Private Collection. Photo: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Lettice_Knollys1.jpg

20. Jacopo Tintoretto (Robusti), *Crucifixion*, 1565. Oil on canvas, 5180 x 1220mm. Venice, Scuola Grande di San Rocco. Photo: https://www.wikiart.org/en/tintoretto/crucifixion-1565

21. Hans Holbein the Younger, *Drawing: Design for a Chimney Piece*, c.1537-43. Black and brown ink with grey, blue and red wash on paper, 539 x 427mm. London, British Museum, no. 1854,0708.1. Photo: https://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=720874&partId=1&images=true

22. Flemish, *The Triumphs of Petrarch*, 1500-1523. Woven silk and wool tapestry, 4030 x 8230mm. London, Royal Collection Trust, no. RCIN 1270. Photo: https://www.rct.uk/collection/1270/the-triumphs-of-petrarch

23. John Jones, *Communion Cup and Paten Cover*, 1571-1574. Engraved silver with gilded interiors, 198mm high. London, British Museum, no. 4636-1858. Photo: http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O10949/communion-cup-and-jones-john/

24. Unknown, *Wanli Ewer with English Mounts*, 1560-1586. Painted porcelain with silver-gilt mounts, 256 x 175mm. London, Victoria and Albert Museum, no. 7915-1862. Photo: http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O7758/ewer-unknown/

25. Agostino dei Musi, *Ewer,* London 1583-1584. Silver gilt, embossed and chased with cast details, 330 x 170mm. London, Victoria and Albert Museum, no. M.250-1924. Photo: https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O78507/ewer-musi-agostino-dei/

26. Agostino Veneziano, *Engraving of a Ewer*, 1531. Engraving, 253 x 169mm. London, Victoria and Albert Museum, no. 16842. Photo: http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O77345/engraving-veneziano-agostino/

27. Nicholas Hilliard, detail of *Robert Dudley, 1st Earl of Leicester*, 1576. Watercolour on vellum, 44 x 44mm. London, National Portrait Gallery, no. NPG 4197. Photo: https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw03852/Robert-Dudley-1st-Earl-of-Leicester

28. Michelangelo di Lodovico Buonarroti Simoni, *Madonna of the Stairs*, c.1491. Marble relief sculpture, 567 x 401mm. Florence, Casa Buonarroti. Photo: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Madonna_of_the_Stairs#/media/File:Michelangelo,_madonna_della_scala,_1491_ca,_01.JPG

29. Hans Holbein the Younger and workshop, *Design for a Cup for Jane Seymour*, 1536-1537. Pen and brush drawing in black ink on paper, 375 x 143mm. London, British Museum no. 1848,1125.9. Photo: https://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=720875&partId=1

30. Hans Holbein the Younger, detail from *King Henry VIII; King Henry VII*, 1536-1537. Cartoon in ink and watercolour on paper, 2578 x 1372mm. London, National Portrait Gallery, no. NPG 4027. Photo: https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw03080/King-Henry-VIII-King-Henry-VII

31. Lucas Horenbout, *Portrait miniature of a gentleman, possibly Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk*, c.1532. Watercolour on vellum, laid on card, 40mm diameter. London, Victoria and Albert Museum, no. E.401-2013. Photo: http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O1267671/portrait-miniature-of-a-gentleman-miniature-horenbout-lucas/

32. Anglo-Netherlandish School, *Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester*, 1564. Oil on panel, 1070 x 80mm. Waddesdon Manor, Waddesdon Rothschild Collection. Photo: https://waddesdon.org.uk/the-collection/item/?id=3289

33. Raphael da Urbino, *Madonna della Sedia*, 1513-1514. Oil on panel, 710mm diameter. Florence, Palazzo Pitti. Photo: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Madonna_della_seggiola#/media/File:Raffael_026.jpg

34. Hans Holbein the Younger, *Hermann Hillebrandt von Wedigh*, 1533. Oil and tempera on panel, 390 x 300mm. Berlin, Gemäldegalerie. Photo:

https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Member_of_the_von_Wedigh_Family,_(called_Hermann_Hillebrandt_von_Wedigh),_by_Hans_Holbein_the_Younger.jpg

35. Hans Holbein the Younger, *Jean de Dinteville and Georges de Selve ('The Ambassadors')*, 1533. Oil on oak, 2070 x 2095mm. London, The National Gallery. Photo: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Ambassadors_(Holbein)#/media/File:Hans_Holbein_the_Younger_-_The_Ambassadors_-_Google_Art_Project.jpg

36. Attributed to William Scrots, *Edward VI*, 1546-1547. Oil on panel, 1072 x 820mm. London, Royal Collection Trust, no. RCIN 404441. Photo: https://www.rct.uk/collection/404441/edward-vi-1537-53

37. Steven van der Meulen, *The Hampden Portrait*, 1563. Oil on canvas, 1960 x 1400mm. Private Collection. Photo: https://fr.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fichier:Elizabeth_I_Steven_Van_Der_Meulen.jpg

38. Unknown Netherlandish artist, *Sir Thomas Gresham*, c.1565. Oil on panel, 1003 x 724mm. London, National Portrait Gallery, no. NPG 352. Photo: https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw02737/Sir-Thomas-Gresham?LinkID=mp01905&role=sit&rNo=0

39. Hans Holbein the Younger, *Anne of Cleves*, c.1539. Oil on parchment, mounted on canvas, 650 x 480 mm. Paris, Louvre Museum. Photo: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Anne_of_Cleves,_by_Hans_Holbein_the_Younger.jpg

40. Nicholas Hilliard, *Francis Bacon, 1st Viscount St Alban*, 1578. Watercolour and bodycolour on vellum laid on card, 60 x 47 mm. London, National Portrait Gallery, no. NPG 6761. Photo: https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw115306/Francis-Bacon-1st-Viscount-St-Alban

41. Nicholas Hilliard, *An Unknown Woman, Aged 26*, 1593. Watercolour on vellum laid on playing card, 58 x 48mm. London, Victoria and Albert Museum, no. P.134-1910. Photo: https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O74875/an-unknown-woman-aged-26-portrait-miniature-hilliard-nicholas/

42. Albrecht Dürer, *Erasmus of Rotterdam*, 1526. Engraving, 248 x 191mm. New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Photo: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Portrait_of_Erasmus_(D%C3%BCrer)#/media/File:ErasumsDurer.jpg

43. Jean Fouquet, *Carrying the Cross* in the Hours of Etienne Chevalier, c.1452-c.1460. Illumination on parchment, 165 x 120mm. Chantilly, Bibliothèque Condé. Photo: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Le_Portement_de_Croix.jpg

44. Hans Holbein the Younger, *Mrs Jane Small, formerly Mrs Pemberton*, c.1536. Watercolour on vellum in a decorated case, 52mm diameter. London, Victoria and Albert Museum, no. P.40&A-1935. Photo: https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O16583/mrs-jane-small-formerly-mrs-portrait-miniature/

45. Hans Holbein the Younger, *Henry Brandon, 2nd Duke of Suffolk (1535-1551)*, c.1541. Watercolour on vellum laid on playing card, 56mm diameter. London, Royal Collection

Trust, RCIN 422294. Photo: https://www.rct.uk/collection/422294/henry-brandon-2nd-duke-of-suffolk-1535-1551

46. Hans Holbein the Younger, *Thomas Cromwell, Earl of Essex*, c.1532-1533. Watercolour and bodycolour on vellum, 44mm diameter. London, National Portrait Gallery, no. NPG 6310. Photo: https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw09422/Thomas-Cromwell-Earl-of-Essex

47. Nicholas Hilliard, *Man Clasping a Hand from a Cloud*, 1588. Watercolour on vellum, 60 x 49.5mm. London, Victoria and Albert Museum, no. P.21-1942. Photo: http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O16580/man-clasping-a-hand-from-portrait-miniature-hilliard-nicholas/

48. Isaac Oliver, *Elizabeth I [unfinished]*, 1590-1592. Watercolour on vellum stuck to a playing card, 82 x 52mm. London, Victoria and Albert Museum, no. P.8-1940. Photo: https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O82275/elizabeth-i-portrait-miniature-oliver-isaac/

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis is a presentation of original work and I am the sole author. This work has not previously been presented for an award at this, or any other, University. All sources are acknowledged as References.

INTRODUCTION

'Scale is so fundamental to visual art that it is often overlooked.'[1]

This thesis examines the significance of size and scale in the appeal of the sixteenth-century portrait miniature. Such a topic may seem to stem from a misunderstanding, inspired by the modern meaning of the word 'miniature'. As any introduction to portrait miniatures explains, the word 'miniature' refers, not to size, but to medium, deriving from the Latin 'minium', a red lead-based pigment used in the illumination of early manuscripts.[2] This has led some scholars to argue that 'the only proper definition of miniature painting is in terms of its specialisation and minuteness of technique',[3] and extensive research into the techniques of limning has proceeded on this basis. However, if we look more closely at the language of limning, we find the first signs that size *was* seen to be another crucial element of the portrait miniature's ontology.

Although Goldring has argued that the use of 'miniature' as a general description of the minute only begins in the mid-eighteenth century, [4] associations between this word and the concept of a small image can be traced to a much earlier date. For example, the word is defined as meaning 'A small proportion; a little figure' in an early dictionary of the 'hardest words' by Bullokar in 1616,[5] and Norgate's treatise, *Miniatura*, established the Latinate term in connection to portrait miniatures in 1648.[6] Even the earliest use of the word in English strongly suggests implications of scale and an association with small, limned portraits. In Book II of Sidney's *Arcadia*, published in 1590, the character Zelmane watches a group of ladies splashing in the river Ladon. He describes the anthropomorphised water: 'not to be content to haue the picture of their face in large vpon him, but he would in ech of those bubbles set forth the miniature of them'.[7] In this case, 'the miniature' is already understood as a smaller image of the face 'in large', and one that would have

[1]Susan May in Arts Council Collection, *Size Matters: Exploring Scale in the Arts Council Collection* (London: Arts Council Collection, Hayward Gallery, 2005), 6.
[2] Oxford English Dictionary, "*miniature, n. and adj.*" (OED Online: Oxford University Press, 2019). https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/118826?rskey=vW8NLh. Accessed 2.7.19.
[3] Murrell explains the process in detail, which in basic terms involved the use of tiny transparent hatching strokes over an opaque 'carnation' ground, in Jim Murrell, *The Way Howe to Lymne: Tudor Miniatures Observed* (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 1983), 4.
[4] Elizabeth Goldring, *Nicholas Hilliard: The Life of an Elizabethan Artist* (London: Yale University Press, 2019), 9.
[5] John Bullokar, *An English Expositor* (London: Iohn Legatt, 1616), Image 75, http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:7443:75, Early English Books Online.
[6] Edward Norgate, *Miniatura or The Art of Limning* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1919), https://archive.org/details/cu31924016785572/page/n53, Internet Archive.
[7] Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia* (London: William Ponsonby, 1590), http://www.luminarium.org/renascence-editions/arcadia2.html, Renascence Edition transcribed by Risa Bear, 2003.

resembled a Tudor portrait miniature in terms of the bubble's circular shape and even the blue background of the water.

Nevertheless, during the sixteenth century these portraits were not described as 'miniatures'. In fact, there seems to have been no single or settled term for the portrait miniature. They were referred to as limnings, a term that also highlights medium rather than size, but they were also described as pictures 'in little', 'in small compass' or 'en petit volume', all of which foreground their miniature nature.[8] This preliminary evidence of the significance of miniaturisation provides the starting point for this thesis, which seeks to account for the exact role played by size and scale in the appeal of the Tudor portrait miniature.

That portrait miniatures *did* appeal to contemporary, Tudor audiences is suggested by various indicators. They were not a cheap option in comparison to commissioning a life size panel painting. Hilliard's standard price was £3, and while a panel portrait by the best court painters could cost as much as £5, they tended to be 'items of relatively low monetary value'.[9] For portrait miniatures there was the extra expense of the setting to consider, usually in a turned ivory box or a jewelled, gold locket. It is also probable that finding a portrait miniature painter to commission would have been less easy than securing the services of an ordinary panel painter. There is considerable interest in identifying portrait miniaturists other than Horenbout and Holbein in the Henrican period, and Hilliard and Oliver in the Elizabethan period. Other artists are mentioned in the sources, such as Levina Teerlinc and Jean de Court in Scotland,[10] but there is little scholarly consensus over how many other miniature painters there may have been, who may not be reflected in the documentary evidence and surviving paintings. Although there were many 'limners' employed in heraldic decoration and the illumination of official documents, I think it is unlikely that many of these could also produce fine and convincing likenesses. Moreover, the prominence of Hilliard's name, and the unusual celebrity status he achieved at home and abroad,[11] suggests to me that he and his works stood out: he was not one among many practitioners of portraits in little.

[8] 'in little' from *Hamlet* (II.2.367) in William Shakespeare, *The Complete Works*, 2nd Edition ed., ed. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 695.; 1584 draft patent to grant George Gower a monopoly over painting the queen, excepting Hilliard who was allowed to 'make portraits… in small compass in limning only', Katherine Coombs, *The Portrait Miniature in England* (London: V&A Publications, 1998), 8.; referred to as 'en petite volume' by Catherine de' Medici in Goldring, *Nicholas Hilliard*, 103.
[9] Goldring, *Nicholas Hilliard*, 127 and 25.
[10] Goldring, *Nicholas Hilliard*, 74-75.
[11] Goldring, *Nicholas Hilliard*, 14.

It may have taken some effort and expense, therefore, to acquire a miniature. Once acquired, the impression created by the sources and the number of surviving portrait miniatures is that these objects were treasured, protected and, later, collected. James Melville's account of Elizabeth I's miniatures describes objects carefully wrapped in paper, labelled in her own hand and kept safely in a cabinet.[12] Of course, many have sadly been lost, but a remarkable number of Hilliard's survive. Those that do survive are often damaged and faded, but considering the vulnerable nature of the materials and pigments used to create these paintings, this seems to be evidence of use rather than carelessness. The faded red lake colouring, which make many of Hilliard's miniatures look much more ghostly and flat today than they did to Tudor eyes, testifies perhaps to the frequent holding of these portraits to the light of a window, to allow for ever-closer inspection.

Apart from these conjectures and indirect evidence, we also have many and various statements of admiration and praise from contemporaries, with Donne describing 'a hand, or eye,/By Hilliard drawn' as 'worth an history,/ By a worse painter made',[13] and Richard Haydock asserting that Hilliard's work is 'so much admired amongst strangers' and is, in his estimation, 'the perfection of painting'.[14] Indeed, the recent exhibition, *Elizabethan Treasures,* has raised awareness of the national pride associated with portrait miniature painting.[15] However, the role of size and scale in the appeal of this art form has yet to receive close scrutiny.

At the recent, historic conference on Elizabethan and Jacobean portrait miniatures at the National Portrait Gallery, many of the distinguished speakers were asked what they had learned from the exhibition. One common response was that seeing a collection of these works in person allowed a renewed appreciation of their size and scale. This may seem a little surprising, because every scholar in this field is aware of the dimensions of these tiny works of art, and indeed their extreme size has gradually come to be imbedded in the term which now describes them: miniatures. However, the impression made by the exhibition is not reflected in current scholarship on the Tudor portrait miniature, where issues of size and scale have been at the margins of new developments. One possible explanation for this is the increasing availability of high-quality digital images, which has not only made research possible without constant recourse to the objects

[12] Sir James Melville, *Memoirs of his own life by Sir James Melville of Halhill. M.D.XLIX.-M.D.XCIII. From the original manuscript.* (New York: AMS Press, 1973), 121-122, https://archive.org/details/MemoirsOfHisOwnLife/page/n171.
[13] John Donne, *John Donne : Selected Poetry*, ed. John Carey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 50.
[14] Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo and translated by Richard Haydock, *A Tracte Containing the Artes of Curious Paintinge, Caruinge & Buildinge* (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1598), Getty Research Institute, Image 14, https://archive.org/details/tractecontaining00loma/page/n3.
[15] Catharine MacLeod, *Elizabethan Treasures: Miniatures by Hilliard and Oliver* (London: National Portrait Gallery Publications, 2019), 11-13.

themselves, it has also opened up new discoveries, with artists' techniques revealed by high levels of magnification.

Experiencing the objects routinely at high magnification is one potential distortion of the way they ordinarily presented themselves to Tudor viewers. But almost more problematic is the frequent reproduction of these images just a bit larger than their true size. In both the *Elizabethan Treasures* catalogue and Goldring's recent biography of Hilliard, the images of the miniatures tend to be around twice the actual size of the paintings. This surely reflects a desire to represent the true brilliance and mastery of these artworks, and for the most part this magnification means a difference of only a few centimetres between the real size and the reproduction. However, an important contention of this research is that, in the arena of miniaturisation, a few centimetres is paramount: at this scale, a few centimetres can be the difference between the appearance of an object as merely small, and an impression of the truly, amazingly, miniature. In the portrait miniature, what we are dealing with is the art of extremes, an art which pushes human skill and perception to its limit. Even these small concessions of scale, then, are fundamentally distorting.

Viewing these objects again, in person, reminds us of the immediacy and wonder implicit in their size and scale. In person, it is impossible to ignore the extreme reduction in size of the subjects they depict. As visitors to this exhibition have discovered, even for those who are most familiar with these objects, the miniature scale of these paintings is not incidental to their aesthetic effect: it is an aspect of their ontology which is perennially fascinating and captivating. Of course, certain levels of magnification were available in the sixteenth century. The research of Vincent Ilardi and the self-portrait of Simon Bening suggest that spectacles were used both in the creation and appreciation of portrait miniatures, but this would merely have corrected the viewer's eyesight and improved the clarity of detail.[16] There seems to be less evidence of the use of magnifying glasses, but even this kind of hand-held magnification would not have usurped the overriding impression of a miniature object.

In existing scholarship, attention has been devoted to the size and scale of the portrait miniature primarily in terms of the social and functional roles which their small size facilitated. The earliest history of the portrait miniature is dominated by royal and diplomatic functions. In 1526, for example, the sister of Francis I sent a locket to Henry VIII containing portraits of the Dauphin and his brother, who were being held captive by Emperor Charles V. Presumably the gift was intended

[16] Ilardi has shown that by the fifteenth century eyeglasses were widespread and relatively affordable in England, and their use was no longer limited to scholars and professionals. See Vincent Ilardi, *Renaissance Vision from Spectacles to Telescopes* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2007), 128-136.

to elicit Henry's support.[17] In less grave circumstances, miniatures could also be used in courtly performances as proxies for the person depicted, as in the case of Henri IV of France demonstrating his admiration for Elizabeth I by kissing a miniature of her 'twice or thrice', 'with Passion and Admiration'.[18] Catharine MacLeod provides an excellent summary of wider functionality of a portrait miniature in the Elizabethan period:

> 'They were painted to record the social advancement of the sitter…; to remember a loved one who would soon be far away…; to give as a present to a lover… They were often worn over the heart: the simplest of performances, demonstrating the love felt by the wearer for the individual portrayed. They were a means by which the high points of life could be remembered… and the dead could be kept close… . They could be a puzzle to be enjoyed… or a piece of special pleading…'[19]

Exactly *where* a miniature was worn could also be performative and pertinent. Sir William Browne recorded an interesting incident where the Queen discovered that Elizabeth de Vere was wearing a miniature of her uncle, Robert Cecil. Elizabeth then seems to have used the miniature to articulate her relationship with her foremost advisor by wearing the jewel first on her shoe, before elevating it to her elbow.[20] This public performance seems to have been deliberately ambiguous (though Cecil sought to frame it in terms of his humility and faithful service), but it perhaps indicates that novel uses of portrait miniatures could be improvised in the moment to lend new meanings to an individual portrait. The wearing of a miniature, then, could be a public display, but scholars like Patricia Fumerton have also emphasised the secret uses of the portrait miniature. Elizabeth I, for example, kept her collection concealed in a little cabinet in a private room, wrapped in paper.[21]

But while it is true that portrait miniatures were used in all the ways outlined above, it does not follow that these functions account for why portrait miniatures, as opposed to panel portraits, were chosen for these purposes. If we consider the functions listed, many of them could have been served just as well by a life-sized panel painting as a miniature, such as commemorating an important life event, presenting the viewer with a puzzle or remembering the dead. As Macleod acknowledges, 'a portrait on any scale' could provide a proxy for the absent sitter.[22] Indeed, some purposes would arguably have been better achieved by a life-size portrait. A large portrait, for

[17] Coombs, *The Portrait Miniature*, 18.
[18] MacLeod, *Elizabethan Treasures*, 14.
[19] MacLeod, *Elizabethan Treasures*, 18.
[20] MacLeod, *Elizabethan Treasures*, 17-18.
[21] Patricia Fumerton, ""Secret" Acts: Elizabethan Miniatures and Sonnets," *Representations* 15, Summer (1986): 58.
[22] MacLeod, *Elizabethan Treasures*, 14-15.

example, could more easily communicate the power and status of the sitter, especially considering that, in the realm of panel paintings, larger works were usually more expensive.[23]

If we take the task of representing an absent person, what was desired may sometimes have been a timely and informative representation, rather than a finely worked miniature. A mother like Catherine de' Medici seems to have looked to portraits of her absent children for evidence of their health after a recent illness, remarking with relief: "I see they are much recovered since I saw them".[24] It is notable that when requesting more portraits a few years later, she specified that they should be done in crayon, for the sake of speed.[25] The idea that drawings could provide more timely and equally transportable portrayals is strengthened by the use of parchment as a support for Holbein's full size portrait of Anne of Cleves (Fig. 39). There is some disagreement about whether this portrait was begun in Düren, but it certainly could have been started there and rolled up for transportation. Meanwhile, the miniature was probably completed only on his return to England.[26]

There is also evidence that where accuracy was paramount, a life-size portrait was preferred. While miniaturisation 'erases… physical defects and resolves them',[27] a larger depiction would be less likely to, in Henry VII's words, '[ommit] any feture or circustance' of the face.[28] Even if miniatures had tended to record the blemishes of a sitter (and most conform to a more idealised aesthetic), such details on a miniature scale would have been hard to assess with the naked eye. In addition, the sitter's size could itself be crucial information, either in the case of representing a growing child (Beatrice d'Este described a portrait of her son as inaccurate, because he had since grown[29]) or in the case of marriage negotiations: the Venetian Ambassador to France noted that the Duke of Anjou had sent Elizabeth I 'a portrait of his exact size and stature', presumably in the hope that this would be more impressive and informative than a smaller portrait.[30] More generally,

[23]Jeanne Nuechterlein, *Hans Holbein: The Artist in a Changing World* (London: Reaktion Books, forthcoming 2020), ch. 5.
[24] Lorne Campbell, *Renaissance Portraits: European Portrait Painting in the 14th, 15th, and 16th Centuries* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 196.
[25] Campbell, *Renaissance Portraits*, 197.
[26] John Rowlands, *Holbein: The Paintings of Hans Holbein the Younger*, Complete ed. (Boston: Godine, 1985), 146.
[27] John Mack, *The Art of Small Things* (London: British Museum, 2007), 12.
[28] Campbell, *Renaissance Portraits*, 159-160.
[29] Nicholas Mann and Luke Syson, *The Image of the Individual: Portraits in the Renaissance* (London: British Museum Press, 1998), 9.
[30] Campbell, *Renaissance Portraits*, 162.

Syson suggests that 'phrases like *al* or *dal naturale* or *au vif* mean not merely lifelike but often actually life-sized'.[31]

In sixteenth-century England, official and dynastic portraits were also expected to convey information about the sitter, indicating their status, family, occupation and values. Although MacLeod identifies one miniature in the *Elizabeth Treasures* exhibition as 'recording the social advancement of the sitter', the miniature in question (Fig. 4) shows little evidence of Leonard Durr's status as a prosperous merchant, beyond his tall hat and the unusual inclusion of his name in the inscription.[32] It certainly contains a fraction of the iconographic information of another merchant portrait, the Holbein painting of Georg Giese (Fig. 5), though this is admittedly an extreme case. It is possible that being depicted *without* the tools of one's trade was in itself a claim to gentility. Hilliard depicts himself, after all, without any of the objects which would tie him to the status of an artist (Fig. 9). But even sitters of the highest rank did not use miniature depictions to convey their status in the manner of life-size portraits: monarchs are portrayed without crown or sceptre (Fig. 11), aristocrats without their coats of arms (Fig. 3). Even if such details had been included, such small images were still unsuited to public display.

The wearability of the portrait miniature did lend it a functionality which panel portraits, even very small ones, did not have. This has been explored in detail by Pointon, who reconstructs the miniature painting as a 'three-dimensional object' and explores its resonance as an item of jewellery.[33] As we will see later, the hand-held manipulation of these objects and the meanings implied by their status as jewellery were important aspects of their attraction. Yet, in terms of usage, we can still think of other pocket-sized portrait objects, such as portrait medals, cameos and coins, which could have played similar roles.

This exploration of the functionality of portrait miniatures could be given much more detailed treatment. The intention here is only to suggest that practical considerations, as Martin and Langin-Hooper have recently argued, are insufficient to account for the creation of miniature objects.[34] The existence of other solutions to the problems seemingly solved by miniaturisation (such as rolled up parchment drawings for portability and the use of curtains to conceal panel paintings) means we must look harder for the motivations behind miniature portraits. Not all of

[31] Mann and Syson, *Image of the Individual*, 9.
[32] Rab MacGibbon in MacLeod, *Elizabethan Treasures*, 131.
[33] Marcia Pointon, ""Surrounded with Brilliants": Miniature Portraits in Eighteenth-Century England," *The Art Bulletin* 83, no. 1 (2001), http://www.jstor.org/stable/3177190.
[34] See section on 'Miniaturization Theory' in Rebecca Martin and Stephanie Langin-Hooper, eds., *The Tiny and the Fragmented: Miniature, Broken, or Otherwise Incomplete Objects in the Ancient World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).

these motivations will necessarily involve size and scale. Anne-Valérie Dulac has recently argued that liveliness was a distinctive and valued aspect of portrait miniatures, which owed much to the particularities of the limning technique.[35] However, the role of size and scale dovetailed with and accentuated the effects of artistic style and medium, while also creating a powerful and meaningful kind of experience in its own right.

In order to set out the mechanisms and meanings of miniaturisation as exactly as possible, this study has been strictly limited to sixteenth-century works, both for the sake of clear chronological boundaries and because many scholars have noted a perceptible shift in style and sensibility at the end of the century, with Oliver's mature paintings showing much closer links with large-scale and continental portraiture.[36] More specifically, a limited corpus of miniatures has been analysed, featuring portraits painted in England or by English artists from the collections of the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Royal Collection and the National Portrait Gallery (see Appendices). By excluding any cabinet miniatures and a few anomalous miniatures in oils, a fairly coherent group of portraits has emerged. This quantitative approach has helped to avoid undue emphasis on the most famous works, and facilitated a more objective formal analysis. Boundary cases, like the *Young Man among Roses* (Fig. 1) and small, oil roundels by Holbein (Fig. 2), provide illuminating and challenging comparisons, but the limned portrait miniature provides a more coherent category for examination.

This thesis will approach the issues of size and scale from a few different directions. First, we must begin by questioning whether Tudor audiences did in fact see these portraits as distinctively small, considering the anachronism of the term and meaning of the word 'miniature'. The first chapter will also outline the mechanisms of this miniature mode of portrayal, which combined tiny external dimensions with a monumental sense of scale. Chapter 2 goes on to explore the special experience of viewing a portrait on such a small scale which, in comparison with a life-size image, offered an active, surprising and immersive encounter. Chapter 3 will propose some possible meanings of miniaturisation, including implications of abstraction, perfection and interiority. Finally, we will assess the proposal that the phenomenon of miniaturisation might have been of interest in itself, as part of an increasing awareness during the sixteenth century of the theories of representation, particularly regarding perspective and proportion.

[35] Anne-Valerie Dulac, "The Agency of Limning; Hilliard and the Poets" (Paper presented at Hilliard, Oliver and the Miniature in Context, National Portrait Gallery, London, Unpublished, 2019).
[36] Coombs, *The Portrait Miniature*, 54; Graham Reynolds, *English Portrait Miniatures*, Rev. ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 8-9; Fumerton, ""Secret" Acts," 88.

CHAPTER 1

THE MECHANICS OF SIZE AND SCALE

'If scholars of English art agree about any one thing, it is that Elizabethan painting, large scale as well as small, should be described as flat and decorative.'[37]

An analysis of the role of size and scale in the appeal of the portrait miniature must begin with an account of the physical and pictorial characteristics of these objects. However, it is difficult to find any consensus over the visual mechanics of the Tudor portrait miniature. In the quotation above, Gloria Kury seems to specifically include small scale paintings, which would include portrait miniatures, in a more general evaluation of Elizabethan painting. Although many scholars of the sixteenth-century portrait miniature have emphasised its separation from panel paintings in terms of its origins and medium, there has still been a tendency to interpret the portrait miniature as an articulation, indeed an epitome, of 'English' style in the Tudor period.[38] The recent *Elizabethan Treasures* exhibition at the National Portrait Gallery described the portrait miniature as 'a specifically "English" art form: a means through which an English artistic identity was being forged'.[39] While this is no doubt true in terms of the national pride associated with the works of Hilliard and Oliver, the perceived affinity between portrait miniatures and a broadly Tudor, and specifically Elizabethan, visual culture has perhaps distorted our visual appreciation of these pictures.

The portrait miniature has been seen as partaking in various cultural trends of the period, including an atmosphere of secrecy, a social culture of ornamentation and facade, a delight in symbolism and complexity, and a love of luxury and jewels.[40] An awareness of the wider aesthetic context seems to have guided academic assessments of the miniature towards an over-emphasis of their delicacy, complexity and jewel-like nature. The appraisal of the portrait miniature as secretive, ornamental, delicate and jewel-like was famously outlined by Fumerton,[41] but these sentiments have also appeared more recently, with Goldring describing 'their delicacy, their grace',[42]

---

[37] Gloria Kury, 'Glancing Surfaces' in Lucy Gent, ed., *Albion's Classicism: The Visual Arts in Britain, 1550-1660*, Studies in British Art (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995), 395.
[38] See, for example, Strong's analysis of the portrait miniature as the 'mirror' of the Tudor age, in Roy Strong and Jim Murrell, *Artists of the Tudor Court: the Portrait Miniature Rediscovered 1520-1620* (London: Victoria & Albert Museum, 1983), 9-11.
[39] MacLeod, *Elizabethan Treasures*, 11.
[40] Patricia Fumerton, *Cultural Aesthetics: Renaissance Literature and the Practice of Social Ornament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).; Goran Stanivuković, "Portrait Miniature Painting, the Young Man of Shakespeare's Sonnets and Late Elizabethan Aesthetics," *English Studies* 95, no. 4 (2014).; Graham Reynolds, "The Painter Plays the Spider," *Apollo* 26 (1964): 279-284.; Murrell, *Howe to Lymne*.
[41] Fumerton, *Cultural Aesthetics*.
[42] Goldring, *Nicholas Hilliard*, 15.

Stanivukovic highlighting the 'elegance and delicate handling of detail in the sitter's face',[43] and Leonhard describing the transformation of Hilliard's style from 'the creation of small portraits into something precious and jewel-like'.[44] Hilliard's style especially has been subsumed into a wider, Elizabethan mode of representation. Friedman, for example, compares a Holbein portrait miniature and Hilliard's cabinet miniature of George Clifford as evidence of a shift away from an Italianate manner towards a 'flat and iconic' style, which is 'highly detailed' and full of symbolism.[45] However, such selective and unrepresentative comparisons lead to flawed characterisations of these artworks. When viewing the full breadth of Hilliard's oeuvre alongside other sixteenth-century portrait miniatures, we can see that many of the most important elements of his works actually link back to the earliest examples of the art form.

However, there are some signs of a reconsideration of this understanding of the sixteenth-century portrait miniature. Anne-Valérie Dulac has recently explored the 'liveliness' of the limning method,[46] while Christina Faraday has demonstrated that the academic characterisation of Hilliard as artificial in style does not reflect contemporary reactions to his miniatures. At the time, she argues, these paintings 'were thought to offer a direct, unmediated representation of reality'.[47] Faraday emphasises the 'quickness' of the portrait miniature, resulting in 'a sense of economy or concision in his [Hilliard's] rendering of features'.[48] Such qualities of directness and concision can also be addressed through the lens of size and scale. In doing so, we will uncover a set of visual mechanisms which distance these images from a decorative, elaborate aesthetic. Rather than seeming to be the 'perfect complement to the jewelled lockets in which so many miniatures were set',[49] these portraits deployed contrasting visual strategies, which made them stand apart.

Seeing these images as highly distinctive resonates with Hilliard's own opinions about limning. His description of the art form as 'a thing apart from all other *Painting* or *drawing*'[50] has usually been understood purely as a way of emphasising the status and gentility of his occupation.[51] While this is

[43] Stanivuković, "Portrait Miniature Painting," 367.
[44] Karin Leonhard, "Early Modern Color Worlds," in *Painted Gems. The Color Worlds of Portrait Miniature Painting in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Britain* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 347.
[45] Alice T. Friedman, "Did England Have a Renaissance? Classical and Anticlassical Themes in Elizabethan Culture," *Studies in the History of Art* 27 (1989): 98, http://www.jstor.org/stable/42620245.
[46] Dulac, "The Agency of Limning; Hilliard and the Poets".
[47] Faraday, "'it seemeth to be the thing itsefe': Directness and Intimacy in Nicholas Hilliard's Portrait Miniatures," *Études Épistémè* 34 (forthcoming 2019), 2.
[48] Faraday, "Directness and Intimacy," 6.
[49] Murrell, *Howe to Lymne*, 9.
[50] Nicholas Hilliard et al., *A Treatise Concerning the Arte of Limning* (Ashington: Mid Northumberland Arts Group in association with Carcanet New Press, 1981), 63.
[51] Katherine Coombs, "'A Kind of Gentle Painting': Limning in 16th-Century England" in *European Visions: American Voices* (London: British Museum, 2009).

certainly one motivation for the statement, Hilliard goes on to be more specific: '[limning] tendeth not to comon mens vsse, either for furnishing of Howsses, or any patternes for tapistries, or Building, or any other worke whatsoeuer'.[52] Hilliard draws a clear division between decorative painting and portrait miniatures, but more intriguingly he also distances the miniature from 'patterns for tapestries', even though manuscript illuminations could often serve as the basis for tapestry designs. As we will see, this distinction may be explained pictorially, in terms of size and scale.

'La Grandeur'

The following analysis of size and scale accords with another contemporary description of the portrait miniature, which came at a pivotal moment in its history. The faltering survival of the portrait miniature between the deaths of Holbein and Horenbout in the 1540s and Hilliard's emergence in the 1570s has often been noted.[53] However, Goldring's recent biography of Hilliard has emphasised the contingency of its revival in Elizabeth's reign. A crucial moment in the fortune of Hilliard, and thus the portrait miniature, was when Robert Dudley sent a miniature of himself (as Goldring argues, almost certainly by Hilliard) to Catherine de' Medici.[54] Catherine was so delighted with the portrait that she immediately requested one, made in the same manner, of Elizabeth. Fortunately, the aspect of this portrait which so impressed Catherine is recorded: she remarked that, despite being 'en petit volume', it somehow possessed 'la grandeur'.[55] This comment deserves closer attention.

According to 'A dictionarie of the French and English Tongues' by Randle Cotgrave published in 1611, 'grandeur' could be translated as 'greatnesse, bignesse, largeness; hugeness; mightinesse; fullness, ampleness; highness, loftiness, stateliness.'[56] At first glance, it seems an extraordinary comment to make of a miniature portrait, even more so in light of recent assessments of the portrait miniature as delicate and detailed. However, it may be possible to recover this perspective of the portrait miniature by analysing its deployment of size and scale. After all, as the translations above show, 'grandeur' itself implies a sense of magnitude, along with more abstract associations of dignity and 'stateliness'.

---

[52] Hilliard et al., *A Treatise*, 62.
[53] For example, Reynolds, *English Portrait Miniatures*, 8-9.
[54] Goldring, *Nicholas Hilliard*, 103-104.
[55] Goldring, *Nicholas Hilliard*, 106.
[56] Randle Cotgrave, *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues* (London: Adam Islip, 1611), 500, https://archive.org/details/fre_b2062733/page/n1, Internet Archive.

To conduct this analysis, we must begin by arriving at a fairly cohesive, objective description of the pictorial qualities of the Tudor portrait miniature. As we have already seen, such a task has proved difficult and controversial. This may be due to the miniature size of these objects, with their external dimensions casting a strong effect over any visual experience of them. Pictorial accounts may have also been affected by consideration of the portrait miniature in relation to other art forms of the period. However, the most problematic aspect of this task is to address the formal and stylistic variety among sixteenth-century portrait miniatures.

A Successful Formula

The portrait miniature was not a static genre, and from this one could conclude that there was no normative style or format for the art form in the sixteenth century. Hilliard's large oeuvre suggests continuous experimentation, whether as part of initial forays into the possibilities of the format in the 1570s or in response to the competition posed by Isaac Oliver in the 1590s.[57] Holbein's miniatures, though much smaller in number, also display variety in the sitter's pose, the scale of the figure and the direction of gaze. Oliver, meanwhile, is renowned for his versatility of style, with some of his miniatures closely following Hilliard, others displaying a soft and ephemeral style (fig. 15) and yet more painted in a bolder chiaroscuro, his most noted contribution to the development of the miniature (fig. 14). Horenbout's miniatures perhaps display the least variation, but it may be that the entire genre was so innovative at this stage that it did not require the novelty of experimentation.

One approach, when faced with such variation, is to choose a few case studies as representative of the wider genre. However, this selectivity has had a marked impact upon the characteristics which scholars have chosen to emphasise. These selections have often, I believe, been unrepresentative of the most prevalent and successful qualities of the portrait miniature. In part this has been due to seeing the portrait miniature in terms of certain art-historical themes, such as the role of symbolism and ornament, or in relation to other art forms, notably literature and goldsmithing. There is also a natural tendency to focus on the masterpieces rather than the majority, the exception rather than the rule. Finally, scholars have been guided by Hilliard's own writing, which emphasised his techniques for the depiction of jewels and outlined a fashionable theory of colour. As we will see, Hilliard's comments, though immensely interesting and valuable, are not necessarily reliable guides to the actual pictorial mechanisms of the majority of his miniatures.

[57] These phases are explored in Goldring, *Nicholas Hilliard*, Chapters 4 and 7.

This study has used a corpus, comprising the sixteenth-century portrait miniatures from three major collections (the National Portrait Gallery, Victoria and Albert Museum and the Royal Collection Trust), in an attempt to be more objective, and to include the less well-known works alongside the famous masterpieces. In doing so, it has become clear that both the use of counterfeit jewel techniques and 'impresa'-style symbolism are greatly in the minority (only 17% and 6% of our corpus respectively). It could still be argued that, despite being numerically unrepresentative, these works embody the high points of the art form, and so are rightly to be considering normative. Here it is worth considering the self-portraits by Hilliard and Oliver. As we have seen, both artists experimented extensively with the formal possibilities of the portrait miniature. However, to depict themselves both chose to stick with a formula which seems to have proved powerful and successful from the very earliest miniatures of the 1520s and 30s (figs. 9 and 14). The stylistic mode which they both chose for their self-portraits is telling, not least because one could see these images as representations of the art form itself, as much as their own likenesses. This was a mode of depiction, it seems, which both artists were proud to associate themselves with, and the resulting portraits are intense and arresting, no doubt as their creators intended.

Looking at Hilliard's self-portrait in particular, we can identify six key features of this pictorial 'formula'. First, a round format; second a flat, blue background; third, a bold but limited colour palette; fourth, a three-quarter profile; fifth, a centralised, head-and-shoulders composition; sixth, no unusual inscription or symbolism. Oliver's self-portrait differs in a few respects, with an oval pictorial field showing more of the artist's body and stronger chiaroscuro in the facial features. However, allowing for slight variations (such as between a round and oval format), this formula accounts for 75% of our corpus.[58] It seems then, that in addition to being held in high esteem by Hilliard and Oliver, this formula also proved appealing to their courtly clients. Moreover, despite the success of various innovations (Hilliard experimented with background colour, Oliver tried a classical, profile style, both produced beautiful cabinet miniatures) Hilliard and Oliver repeatedly returned to the formula which had been pioneered in the 1530s by Horenbout and Holbein, albeit often in a newer, oval shape. Our corpus reflects this, with 52% of 'typical' miniatures being produced after 1580.

It is possible to account for the persistence of this format in terms of nostalgia, especially in the Jacobean period, when Hilliard provided a tangible connection to an Elizabethan age increasingly missed and mythologised. Yet the use of this formula in the 'signature' work of a self-portrait

[58] See Appendix II for exact conditions.

suggests a pride in the success of this aesthetic. Indeed, it is interesting to note the one-off nature of many deviations from this type, even where the results seem (to modern eyes at least) wonderfully successful. Perhaps in these cases it was important to the patron that their miniature was in some way unique. Certainly, great care seems to have been taken in the production of Elizabeth I's miniatures (which often reused an existing face pattern) to create pictorial individuality through dress and jewels. Sometimes it seems that the unique appearance of certain formats was due to practical difficulties, such as painting the hair of a young man against a black background (fig. 16). In other cases, it appears that the visual results were simply less successful, such as the full-length miniatures of Lady Rich (fig. 8) and Sir Christopher Hatton. Similarly, perhaps the rectangular format of *Man aged 24* (fig. 17) was less tactile and satisfying to hold in the hand.

It seems, then, worth exploring the idea that certain core features were enduringly successful in constructing a portrait miniature and were returned to, for this reason, throughout the century. Indeed, considering the archetypal quality of this format from an early stage, it seems likely that the lost portrait miniature of Robert Dudley which so delighted Catherine de' Medici was in this style (perhaps similar to fig. 3) rather than, as Golding suggests, like the unique grey damask background in the V&A miniature of Dudley. When we analyse these portrait miniatures in formal terms it becomes possible to appreciate Catherine de' Medici's comments in terms of a monumental sense of scale, which was particularly effective in combination with the miniature's external dimensions and the lively, suggestive quality of the limning technique. First, however, we must outline what is meant by size and scale in this study.[59]

The Size of Small

Although the term scale is quite elastic in its common usage, here the terms size and scale are used as part of a conceptual framework which differentiates between the actual extension of an object in space - its size - and *how* that size appears to the viewer, which relies on a sense of scale. In relation to figurative images, there is another kind of scale at work, which operates at the pictorial level, conveying to the viewer the magnitude of the depicted objects or persons. As we will see later, pictorial scale is not simply a question of the size of the represented object versus the area of the pictorial field, though of course this dynamic plays an important role. Instead, a

[59] The distinction used here is borrowed from Lugli and Kee's volume of essays, which explore these issues in relation to a diverse range of art. Joan Kee and Emanuele Lugli, "Scale to Size: An Introduction," *Art History* 38, no. 2 (2015): 250-266.

pictorial sense of scale is multi-factorial and unpredictable, depending upon aspects such as colour, detail, quality of line, shading and a sense of movement.

In contrast with the complexity of pictorial scale, it may seem that the size of the portrait miniature is a relatively simple, inert subject. However, as Emanuele Lugli has argued, even seemingly objective judgements about size are affected by the surrounding culture and standards of measurement.[60] Kant explained the perceptual relativity of size vividly in his *Critique of Aesthetic Judgement*, in relation to the contrast between the sublime and the beautiful. He argued that there is nothing which 'may not be degraded to the level of the infinitely little, and nothing so small which in comparison with some still smaller standard may not for our imagination be enlarged to the greatness of a world'. [61] The extremes described by Kant may have been influenced by advances in telescopes and microscopy which post-date the period considered here, but an awareness of such relativity also predates the sixteenth century, with Alberti explaining that: 'large, small, long, short, high, low, wide, narrow … all these are such as to be known only by comparison'.[62] In the field of material objects we can find some refuge from absolute relativity in the limits provided by our physical capacities of sight, touch and dexterity: something is definitely held to be big when it is too large to be seen all at once, and something can confidently be described as tiny when it is so small that it slips through the fingers.

It is important, then, not to assume that portrait miniatures were regarded as particularly small, especially given the anachronistic nature of the term 'miniature' in this period, and its etymology relating to medium, not size. Reconstructing a Tudor sense of scale in relation to these objects is not easy. However, by looking at which objects would have provided pertinent comparisons, by looking for clues in the miniatures themselves and through an examination of the language of limning, it is possible to argue that these objects were seen as distinctively, specially small.

Having argued for a comparative approach to size and scale, it may seem odd to begin by attending to the portrait miniatures themselves for evidence. However, I find it suggestive that a 'standard' size for the Tudor portrait miniature was never established. In the realm of panel paintings, it seems less surprising to find a range of sizes, since a panel painting could be intended for display in a variety of situations for which different sizes might be suitable. Large, full-length portraits could be used to amplify the status of the sitter, while the Netherlandish tradition often employed

[60] Emanuele Lugli, "Measuring the Bones: On Francesco di Giorgio Martini's Saluzzianus Skeleton," *Art History* 38, no. 2 (2015): 352-355.
[61] Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Judgement* trans. by Walker, Nicholas (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2007), 81.
[62] Leon Battista Alberti and Cecil Grayson (trans.), *On Painting*, ed. Martin Kemp (London: Penguin Books Limited, 1991/2005), 53.

smaller formats for domestic settings. By contrast, the hand-held nature of the portrait miniature constricts any variation in size to a matter of centimetres. Indeed, the general similarity in adult palm size could have lent itself to the development of fairly standardized dimensions. However, in the corpus for this study, almost every gradation of size is represented between the extraordinarily small portrait of Elizabeth in a Tudor rose at 1.8cm in diameter (Royal Collection 420021) to Oliver's *Portrait of an Unknown Woman* (Royal Collection 420063) which falls just short of 8cm in height. Then, of course, we could view the cabinet miniatures as a further experiment in the effects of size and scale, operating very differently in terms of the interaction between sitter and space (fig. 13).

This suggests two interesting points of decision in the creation of each portrait miniature. In some cases, the artist and patron may have discussed the potential size of the painting at the start of the process; perhaps some patrons were interested in particularly small renderings due to the intended setting or because of the kudos associated with owning a painting of such extraordinary skill. Or perhaps the artists themselves exerted an influence, with larger miniatures allowing them to showcase techniques and include certain features which the smallest formats would not allow. At this stage the intended size may have affected the composition (larger examples tended to show more of the sitter's body), and the execution, with some of the smallest miniatures, like that of Francis Drake (fig. 18), being much more granular in appearance. From the evidence of Hilliard's standard fee of £3 per miniature, it seems that, unlike panel paintings, portrait miniatures were not priced according to their size.[63] Variation in size, then, seems to have been primarily an aesthetic decision, whether on the part of the artist or the patron. A secondary point of decision may also have occurred after the portrait was finished, when it could be trimmed either to improve the composition or to fit a setting (evidence of such trimming has been found on the Holbein *Anne of Cleves*).[64]

This experimentation with dimensions suggests that the size of the portrait miniature may have been an active point of interest and consideration. By the mid-seventeenth century, Norgate is able to refer to an 'ordinary size' of miniature, which he believes to be the best option. But in justifying this choice he reveals an element of contention about the subject, criticizing miniatures he has seen in France which were 'about the bignes of a penny, wherein the lives and likenes must be a worke of Faith rather than Sence'.[65] Considering the many tiny English portrait miniatures that

[63] Goldring, *Nicholas Hilliard*, 127.
[64] "Catalogue entry for Portrait Miniature of Anne of Cleves," Victoria and Albert Museum, 2017, accessed 15th July, 2019, http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O18966/portrait-miniature-of-anne-of-portrait-miniature-holbein-hans/.
[65] Norgate, *Miniatura*, 18-19.

survive, the attribution of unduly small pictures to the French may indicate a reluctance to criticise admired works of English art, rather than an accurate description of French miniatures. However, this passage reaffirms the sense that, in the sphere of miniature objects, small differences in size could be of great importance, straining the 'sense'-able limits of artist and viewer.

However, portrait miniatures were not the only small, detailed objects at the Tudor courts. Indeed, when enclosed in a locket, externally similar to any jewelled 'tablet', pendant or brooch, a portrait miniature may not have stood out all. In a portrait of Lettice Knollys attributed to George Gower and dated 1585 (fig. 19), it is easy to miss the jewelled locket clipped to her dress, and attached to a string of pearls around her girdle. The gold embellishment of the locket is camouflaged in the embroidery of her skirt, while its pearl chain matches the long, four-strand pearl necklace and blends into the ivory and gold damask of the forepart and Spanish sleeves. It is not certain that this locket contained a miniature, and this in itself shows that an encased portrait miniature could be mistaken for a pocket mirror, a jewelled pomander or other such girdle pendant.

This portrait, along with many others, testifies to the Tudor love of ornament and surface embellishment in their costume. Sometimes this intricate decoration was in the form of fashionable patterns woven into the fabric itself, but often further embellishments were added, including buttons, pins, lace, ribbons and jewellery.[66] In Elizabeth's court the jewels themselves could be complex and figurative, forming a coterie language of symbols between the queen and her courtiers.[67] Indeed, jewels could feature other kinds of portrait in the form of cameos, intaglios and medal-like busts (see figs. 10 and 11). Some cultured members of court, such as Robert Dudley, owned collections of antique coins and medals (another form of miniature portraiture), while Hilliard himself designed medals and seals for the queen.[68]

Given this range of jewelled ornaments and small, portrait objects, it could be that the size of the portrait miniature seemed unremarkable: no smaller than cameos and medals, no more intricate than similarly jewelled objects. However, it may be that contemporaries responded to the size of portrait miniatures, not as items of costume or jewellery, nor as analogous to coins and medals, but rather in reference to panel portraits. The existence of a number of technical treatises on limning by 1650 suggests an awareness of and interest in the painterly methods and materials of portrait miniatures, as distinct from the creation of medals or jewels. Indeed, Hilliard's *Treatise* was

[66] Tracy Borman, *The Private Lives of the Tudors: Uncovering the Hidden Secrets of Britain's Greatest Dynasty* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2017), 318.
[67] Eleri Lynn, *Tudor Fashion: Dress at Court* (London: Yale University Press, 2017), 90.
[68] Elizabeth Goldring, *Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester and the World of Elizabethan Art: Painting and Patronage at the Court of Elizabeth I* (London, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014), 155.

written partly in response to Haydocke's preface to Lomazzo's *Tract Concerning the Curious Arts*, where he compares Hilliard to the renowned *painter*, Raphael, and calls limning 'the perfection of painting'.[69] Similarly, although portrait miniatures could be referred to simply as jewels - famously in Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night*: 'Here, wear this jewel for me. 'Tis my picture.' (3.4.203)[70] - this seems to have been a synecdoche-like shorthand to refer to the whole jewelled object, rather than just the painted miniature. The less poetic descriptions found in the 1547 inventory of Henry VIII make the pictorial nature of these objects clearer (emphasis added):

- Item a Tablet of golde having on thone side the kinges *Picture peynted* and on thesame side is a roose of Dyamountes and Rubies…
- Item a *Picture* of the Frenche King set in a rounde Tablet of golde Enamelede.[71]

If the natural point of comparison for contemporaries was the panel painting rather than coins or items of jewellery, then these portraits would have indeed seemed tiny by comparison, especially since most English portraits tended towards life-size dimensions.

As will be discussed further in the following chapter, contemporary viewers seem to have experienced a sense of life-like encounter in the portrait miniature. This, too, distanced the portrait miniature from the more iconic, profile portraits in cameos and medals, and brought it closer to the sense of presence conveyed by panel portraits. This impression of presence also created a double sense of miniaturisation: not only were these pictures miniature versions of larger panel portraits (literally, in some cases), they also miniaturised the people they depicted. No wonder then, that in addition to describing these works as 'limnings', contemporaries also referred to them as pictures 'in little', 'in small compass' or 'en petit volume'.[72]

Referring to portrait miniatures as items of jewellery may also have implied their small size, and much has been made of the jewel-like qualities of these pictures, emphasised both by Hilliard himself in his *Treatise* and by modern appreciations of the Tudor miniature. There is a great deal of resonance in this language: as will be discussed in Chapter 3, the jewel provided a metaphor of concision, permanence and value which epitomised the appeal of this art form. Moreover, as Pointon has argued, 'reassembling' the portrait miniatures in their original, jewelled settings helps to reconstruct contemporary interactions with them, particularly the structure of revelation which

[69] Lomazzo and Haydock, *A Tracte*, 14.
[70] William Shakespeare, 'Tweflth Night', in Shakespeare, *Complete Works*, 735.
[71] David Starkey, ed., *The Inventory of King Henry VIII : Society of Antiquaries MS 129 and British Library MS Harley 1419*, Reports of the Research Committee of the Society of Antiquaries of London, (London: Harvey Miller for the Society of Antiquaries of London, 1998), 78 and 83.
[72] See footnote 8.

attended the viewing of a miniature.[73] For Hilliard, the connections between the portrait miniature and jewellery seem to have assumed particular importance, no doubt due to his familial background and training in goldsmithing. From his *Treatise* we know that he was meticulous in the preparation of his colours for the sake of their brilliance and purity, and took great pride in his pioneering techniques of depicting jewels with burnished silver leaf and coloured resin, such that they seemed 'the thinge it se[l]fe' rather than mere imitations.[74]

However, the rhetoric of jewels had other motivations and can be misleading if considered as an exact reflection of the *pictorial* properties of the vast majority of sixteenth-century portrait miniatures. As someone with constant money troubles, in an age where goldsmithing was far more lucrative than painting, Hilliard had every reason to associate his creations with the precious condition of jewellery.[75] His treatise is an invaluable document, but it is as much a work of self-promotion as it is a sober account of the techniques of limning. Thus, Hilliard emphasises his flashy innovations in the depiction of jewels despite the fact that, in our corpus, these techniques are prominent in only 31% of his works. Similarly, Hilliard's discussion of the five 'perfect' colours and their associated gemstones does not reflect his choice or use of colours in miniature painting, but rather displays his awareness of contemporary colour theory.[76] In fact, if one excludes flesh/hair tones and details, 88% of the corpus miniatures deploy restrained colour palettes of three colours or fewer.

Guided by Hilliard's own writing and focusing on particular miniatures which showcase his innovative techniques, scholars have tended to describe the portrait miniature in terms of meticulous detail, and as 'a highly stylized jewel-like object, whose rich variety of colours and metals became a perfect complement to the jewelled lockets in which so many miniatures were set'.[77] However, if we analyse the pictorial qualities of the more common style of portrait miniature (the 'norm' discussed above), we can see that they actually provided a visual contrast with their jewelled cases and with many other elements of a visual culture which delighted in elaboration and ornamentation.

[73] Pointon, ""Surrounded with Brilliants"," 63. See also Fumerton, ""Secret" Acts," 60-67.
[74] Hilliard et al., *A Treatise*, 62.
[75] Goldring, *Nicholas Hilliard*, 25, 201, 75.
[76] Karin Leonhard, "Early Modern Color Worlds", 445-449.
[77] Murrell, *Howe to Lymne*, 9.

Detail and Pictorial Scale

Earlier, we noted that pictorial scale refers both to the relationship between a depicted object and the picture frame, and to the impression of size created by the image as a whole. Detail plays an important role in pictorial scale. A representational image can be, broadly speaking, detailed in content or in finish. If the objects or figures represented are multiple and small in scale, the whole composition is likely to look detailed. Tintoretto's enormous *Crucifixion* scene at the Scuola Grande di San Rocco (fig. 20, 136 x 1224cm) is a powerful example of a complex and dynamic treatment of scale, contemporary with the Elizabethan portrait miniature. Here, the comparatively small scale of the figures and the sense of turmoil created by their active gestures evokes the magnitude and drama of this moment, especially when contrasted with the stillness of Christ, which anchors the otherwise detailed composition. This shows the unpredictability and subtlety of pictorial scale, whose effects depend on numerous factors and interactions within an individual painting.

The majesty and magnitude implied by small-scale design en masse could be deployed in a secular, as well as a religious, context. Large buildings and art objects covered in complex imagery and detail implied wealth, power, sophistication and abundance. In the competitive field of European courtly art and decoration, we can see this strategy at work in architecture, fashion, painting, tapestries and silverware. The Tudor court was no exception, where aesthetic value was often 'a matter of monetary value, of complexity and curiosity of design and execution, and of sheer size'. [78] We have already noted the use of pattern and embellishments in courtly dress, but we can also consider the 'intensely artificial, elaborately composed' architecture of houses such as Wollaton Hall, the ornamentation of interiors with dense designs for wood and stone carving (see Holbein's design for a fireplace, fig. 21) and decorative objects such as silverware and tapestries (fig. 22, *The Triumphs of Petrarch,* bought by Cardinal Wolsey in 1523). Tapestries are a particularly interesting case, as they were used extensively as wall coverings (Henry VIII had amassed over 2000 by his death) [79] and so would have been an important aesthetic backdrop for Tudor courts. Moreover, despite the radical difference in size between a tapestry and a portrait miniature, they can be linked to the art of limning in two ways. First, the design of many tapestries was taken from illuminated manuscripts. Wolsey's tapestries of the Triumphs of Petrarch, for example, are thought to be based on the miniature paintings in an illuminated manuscript of the same work, presented to King Louis XII of France in 1503.[80] Second, the mosaic-like composition of wefts is somewhat

[78] Michael Snodin, 'Who Led Taste?' in Michael Snodin and John Styles, *Design and the Decorative Arts: Britain, 1500-1900* (London: Victoria and Albert Publications, 2001), 71.
[79] Maurice Howard, 'The Court of Henry VIII', in Snodin and Styles, *Design and the Decorative Arts*, 72.
[80] "'The Triumphs of Petrarch'," Royal Collection Trust, 2012, accessed 24.07.2019, https://www.rct.uk/collection/1270/the-triumphs-of-petrarch.

analogous to the innumerable discreet brushstrokes which compose a limned portrait miniature. This makes a comparison between the treatment of size and scale in portrait miniatures and tapestries more telling than it might appear at first.

Over and above the generic use of size and scale in pursuit of wonder and display, there seems to have been an association between complex detail and a particularly 'English', native style. The picture is complicated by a Protestant culture which was deeply suspicious of images, particularly during the reign of Edward VI. This is reflected in the plainness of post-Reformation communion cups (fig. 23) and in the sombre mood of citizen portraiture, as described by Tarnya Cooper.[81] However, two examples suggest that when foreign aesthetics were appropriated by Tudor England, adding ornamentation was a way of asserting native taste. First, we have the ornate metal mounts which were appended to items of foreign pottery and decorative curiosities (fig. 24). These devices seem to frame the exotic in a familiar visual language, which was more easily absorbed into the native aesthetic. Similarly, we can look at the interpretation of printed images, which were used as sources for all kinds of design and ornamentation. Craftsmen and artists could adapt printed designs to suit the tastes and needs of their clients. In figures 25 and 26, we can see that the Italian design for a ewer by Agostine Veneziano was significantly altered by a London goldsmith in the 1580s. Veneziano's design is balanced and restrained, with large areas of the surface left plain, so that the motifs of a crab, two grotesque heads and a lion on the handle stand out with boldness and clarity. By contrast, the London ewer is much more ornate and uniform in terms of decoration, and less hierarchical in terms of the focus on some areas of ornamentation over others. The head opposite the handle no longer stands out amid several horizontal bands of design featuring acanthus leaves, garlands, geometric patterns and a central scene of a sea-creature amidst waves and bulrushes.

What is important here, in terms of size and scale, is not simply the detail in and of itself, but the distribution and quality of that detail. On this ewer, in the Wolsey tapestry and Holbein's fireplace design, the detail is not subtle and subservient, but overt and sharply delineated. In addition, the even distribution of detail across the surface of these objects and designs precludes an overall visual focus, making the broad structure of the design (where there is one) difficult to discern. Not only does this involve the use of small-scale detail, it almost negates a sense of scale altogether, emphasising the extent of the object's surface rather than creating an internal hierarchy.

[81] Tarnya Cooper, *Citizen Portrait: Portrait Painting and the Urban Elite of Tudor and Jacobean England and Wales* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2012), 19.

In terms of *size* the portrait miniature was part of this appreciation of virtuoso skill and detail: the best portrait miniatures are astonishing in their execution. Moreover, the limning method which, as Hilliard says, proceeds 'by little and little', is intrinsically detailed, creating a delicate mosaic of tiny, hatched brushstrokes which compose even the more simple areas of skin (see fig. 27). The magic of miniaturisation also means that features which would be unremarkable in a life-size picture require extraordinary precision when depicted in such diminished dimensions. However, a rhetoric of detail and intricacy can create an impression of these pictures as fussy and florid. In fact, the effect of the detail in most sixteenth-century portrait miniatures is very different in nature. In terms of pictorial scale, these pictures are actually monumental rather than miniature in character.

Monumental in Miniature

How, then, is monumentality related to pictorial scale, to detail and to the portrait miniature? The quality of monumentality is umbilically linked to size and scale, referring to a structure's ability to function as a monument. One would expect such a structure to be large, bold and imposing, creating the impression of enduring solidity in order to carry out its commemorative function. Indeed, it should presumably display 'la grandeur'. Not only do the external dimensions of the miniature make it better suited to secrecy than public display, the suggestive, lively techniques of limning seem to be the very antithesis of monumental stone carvings.

In terms of internal scale, however, monumentality is achieved by a powerful, focused design, in which a depicted object dominates the picture plane. A highly ornamental approach is likely to complicate and weaken the image in terms of its monumental impression. Interestingly, in his introduction to the concepts of size and scale, Emanuele Lugli uses a Renaissance relief sculpture by Michelangelo as an example of monumental scale. In the *Madonna of the Stairs* (fig. 28), a sense of grandeur and importance is created by the way the figure of the Madonna 'takes up the entire visual field'.[82] The large scale of the Madonna is also complemented by the strong, simple dynamics of the composition, with the figure occupying a diagonal line from top right to bottom left, seated on a simple step. Indeed, the steps behind seem to measure out, almost quantify, the extent of the seated figure. There are small boys or putti in the background, but these are carved in shallow relief, so as not to detract from the whole. As with the portrait miniatures, this scene is

[82] Kee and Lugli, "Scale to Size: An Introduction."

by no means bereft of virtuosic detail, but here the lines of the drapery are subtle and serve to accentuate the contours and posture of the Madonna.

It can be difficult to appreciate the similarities between this treatment of scale and the portrait miniature, but there are instances in Tudor decorative art where monumental, classical motifs are borrowed and integrated into a larger decorative framework. In such cases, it becomes possible to make a direct visual comparison between ornamental and monumental treatments of scale. A pertinent example is Holbein's pen and ink design for a cup intended for Jane Seymour (fig 29), which exhibits the contrasting treatments of scale all the more clearly for being a two-dimensional, linear design. Like the London ewer, this cup is built up in layers of contrasting pattern and ornamentation, producing a sense of intricate, interlacing movement. However, at the centre of this design is a point of stillness, a roundel antique bust. The decisive focus and clarity of this roundel jumps out from the busy ornamental language around it. The gentleness of Holbein's line in the roundel bust is also important, contrasting with the more emphatic arabesques around it. Müller has argued that half of the design is in a heavier hand due to being finished by an assistant, but clearly, this only accounts for the most extreme contrasts of line.[83] In fact, the same contrast is seen more clearly in the preparatory cartoon for the enormous wall painting of the Tudor dynasty for the Privy Chamber at Whitehall (fig. 30). Here the incisive lines of architectural decoration and textile patterning shout out from the paper, while the strong features of Henry VIII are conveyed in the subtlest shading.

If we turn to Horenbout's portrait miniature of an unknown man (possibly Charles Brandon, fig. 31), we can see a similarly bold design, the pictorial field dominated by the sitter's face and satisfyingly bisected by the shoulder line. Accentuating this simplicity of design is the restraint in colour, with the man's costume restricted to a harmonious palette of black, sable and ochre, and the black hat balanced by the outer coat on either shoulder. One can certainly point to and delight in detail here: the gentle damask on his doublet, the fur lining of the coat, his delicate lace collar and gold hat badge. But none of these details grab attention or detract from the overall simplicity of the composition. They may delight the attentive observer, but the focus of the miniature is clearly on Brandon's grave and steady expression. This miniature displays all the characteristics which would be repeated and returned to throughout the sixteenth century: the round format, the simple head-and-shoulders composition, the plain blue background, the restrained colour palette, the subtlety and intensity of the gaze.

[83] Susan Foister, *Holbein in England* (London: Tate Publishing, 2006), 87.

The traditional narrative contends that the portrait miniature may have begun in this vein, but under Hilliard in particular the art form became more decorative, emblematic and ornate. In fact, in the corpus used here over half of Hilliard's works feature no inscription at all and two thirds involve no overt symbolism. It is easy to recognise the detail and intricacy of Hilliard's royal portraits and cabinet miniatures, but even miniatures which follow the 'formula' we have been discussing have been described in these terms. Hulse's assessment of Hilliard's self-portrait (fig. 9) emphasises its elaborate aspects: 'The ruff is infinitely more *showy*… and the bonnet, *adorned* with badges, is pushed back at a rakish angle, Hilliard's doublet is fashionable, with *extravagantly* puffed sleeves and a sash tied at the neck' [emphasis added].[84] To modern eyes, certainly, the ruffs seem rather ostentatious, but it is easy to forget that aristocratic life was lived in this theatrical apparel. And while the ruff is intricate, the rest of Hilliard's costume ties in with his dark hair and eyes, with only tiny gold and green highlights. Hilliard's use of shading also contributes to the power and simplicity of his miniatures, his self-portrait included. Although many of the red lake pigments Hilliard used in facial modelling have faded, leading to a deceptively flat appearance in many miniatures, the well-preserved examples show a clear and minimalist approach, capturing the characteristic contours of the face without getting lost in lines and blemishes. Comparing the miniature of Robert Dudley (fig. 3) with his oil portrait at Waddesdon manor (fig. 32) we can see this contrast. The miniature, I would argue, is no less characterful in its likeness, but the simplified contours in the forehead and cheeks create a clearer image, contributing to a stronger pictorial composition and greater focus on the piquant rendering of the eyes. Indeed, if the miniature of Dudley and the oil painting are placed side by side and imagined to be the same size, the powerful pictorial qualities of the miniature become apparent: the image is almost overbearingly forceful, with Dudley's face close to and dominating the picture plane. Goldring has described the composition of Hilliard's miniatures as 'deceptive in its apparent simplicity', but perhaps the secret of the portrait miniature is not so deceptive.[85] These compositions *are* simple and dramatic, more monumental than miniature.

Tudor Portraiture and Monumentality

It may seem that both the genre of portraiture and the round or oval shape of most portrait miniatures serve to determine the focused nature of their visual style, but it is important to note

[84] Clark Hulse, *The Rule of Art: Literature and Painting in the Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 118.
[85] Goldring, *Nicholas Hilliard*, 15.

that this monumentality was an artistic choice, rather than an inevitability. Roberta Olson's comprehensive work on the Tondo format in Renaissance Florence shows that the circle did not intrinsically suggest the singular compositions of the portrait miniature.[86] She does explore the challenge of creating a sense of architectural space in this format, but in Florence multi-figure, devotional Tondi far outnumbered portraits in the round.[87] Olson demonstrates many and varied uses of the circular format, which could facilitate ambitiously complex scenes (Ghirlandaio's *Adoration the Magi,* for example) and dynamic, interlinking compositions (Botticelli's *Madonna of the Magnificat*) as well as simpler, domestic pictures, such as Raphael's *Madonna della Sedia.* This last example, figure 33, is an interesting case, because the three figures fill the circular space, but the painterly style is so soft and the postures of mother and child so intertwined that the effect is intimate and naturalistic rather than stately and monumental.

Monumentality in panel portraiture is also far from inevitable and, in sixteenth-century England, uncommon. At times this is due to the ubiquity of ornamentation and detail, which we previously discussed in relation to more decorative objects. Portraits where the figure is subsumed in decorated costume and surroundings can be found across the period, from portraits by Holbein, John Gower, William Scrots to the various iconic portraits of Elizabeth I. This is not to collapse these varied artists and artworks into a single style or pictorial strategy, nor to claim that oil portraits with a monumental sense of scale did not exist. Holbein in particular could range from the iconic-style portrait of Hermann Hillebrandt von Wedigh (fig. 34), which is very similar to a typical portrait miniature in its vivid background, simple composition and restrained palette, to complex and detailed compositions like the portrait of Georg Giese (fig. 5) or the famous double portrait of Jean de Dinteville and George de Selve (fig. 35). In a portrait attributed to William Scrots (fig. 36), Edward VI is swamped with rich fabrics, which blend into the red and gold curtain behind him. Many portraits of Elizabeth, similar to the painting of Lettice Knollys we considered earlier, deliberately focus on elaborate dress and symbolic details rather than her face, but the early Hampden portrait by Steven Van Der Meulen (fig. 37) shows that this was not simply a function of her later desire for iconicity. In this portrait, the queen's face is a small area of restrained modelling amid a richly decorated pictorial surface, a patchwork of competing patterns and textures. Such pictorial strategies are by no means unsuccessful: the effect here is sumptuous and rich; it perhaps suggests that Elizabeth is synonymous with such magnificence, beauty, complexity and abundance. Meanwhile the minimalism and simplicity of her face allow her, at the same time,

[86] Roberta Olson, *The Florentine Tondo* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
[87] Olson, *The Florentine Tondo*, 106-130.

to look modest, serious and authentic. This is a marvellous image, but its use of detail inhibits potential monumentality of a single-figure composition.

Royal portraits are, of course, liable to prioritize a sense of magnificence over monumental simplicity. But even the more sober, citizen portraits explored by Tarnya Cooper often lack the same powerful composition. The most common alternative to a complex background – be it a patterned curtain or ornate interior – is a dark, shadowy space. Firstly, this tends to emphasise the sense of space around the sitter, and while it may be more realistic in this way, such a sense of recession and space can reduce the apparent size and impact of the figure. By contrast the abstract, flat colour used as the background for most portrait miniatures pushes the sitter towards the picture plane and emphasises the planar design. The second effect of the dark background is felt when the sitter's clothes are similarly dark. This was frequently the case, as dark clothes could simultaneously display the sitter's wealth (dark dyes were expensive) and create a sombre, austere effect which satisfied the pious anxiety of many citizen sitters. Any number of portraits could demonstrate these effects, but the portrait of Sir Thomas Gresham at the National Portrait Gallery (fig. 38) shows how this strategy almost amounts to an absence of planar design. Relative to the pictorial field, Gresham's figure dominates the space in terms of size, not unlike Michelangelo's Madonna of the Steps, but here the insubstantial figure recedes into a shadowy space, with the face and hands emerging from the dark like beacons. The eye focuses on the beautiful, expressive rendering of the face, but not due to a focused composition or monumental sense of scale. As Cooper suggests, a reduced emphasis on the body may have been a deliberate statement which separated the humanist values of mind and character from the value of inherited blood among the nobility.[88] Scale, it seems, can be meaningful in multiple ways.

Implications

The point is clearly not that a portrait must be monumental to be successful, only that the majority of portrait miniatures presented a distinctive visual mode which, in its own way, proved captivating and powerful. It must also be stressed that a monumental sense of scale is not enough to explain the appeal and success of the sixteenth century portrait miniature; it is not a generically 'good thing' in and of itself. The portrait miniature's sense of scale interacts with other artistic choices. Its small size, for instance, made these monumental compositions intimate and immediate rather than overbearing, while the lively, incremental technique of limning created a subtlety and

[88] Cooper, *Citizen Portrait*, 6.

ambiguity which justifies the composition's intensive focus on the face. Moreover, this mode of monumentality in miniature was potentially meaningful, as well as effective in visual terms. In a more extended sense of the term, monumentality implies a sense of endurance, dignity and ambition or scope. As we will see in Chapter 3, these qualities do seem to be implicated in the style and miniaturisation of these portraits.

This analysis does nothing to diminish the intimacy or privacy of the portrait miniature, not does it deny the sense of wonder elicited by virtuoso execution at such a small scale. It is also true that there are portrait miniatures, notably those of Elizabeth I, which are less restrained and monumental in composition. But perhaps this perspective helps to explain why these little images are so captivating and powerful, while at the same time depicting their sitters with subtlety and delicacy. Perhaps it brings us closer to Catherine de' Medici's influential assessment, resolving the apparent paradox between the portrait miniature's 'petite volume' and its sense of 'la grandeur'.

CHAPTER 2

THE EXPERIENCE OF SIZE AND SCALE

'Minuteness in itself is of no aesthetic merit.' [89]

In the introduction we explored the possible and actual functions of the portrait miniature, and concluded that practical considerations were insufficient explanations for the portrait miniature's appeal and popularity. An analysis of the mechanisms of the miniature has taken us a step further, by suggesting how these diminutive objects offer the viewer powerful images through a monumental sense of scale, while retaining liveliness and subtlety through the particular techniques of limning. We now aim to go beyond a description of the artistic and physical properties of these portraits by reconstructing the distinctive kind of viewing experience they offered, with a focus on the role played by size and scale. This analysis suggests that, contrary to Reynolds' assertion above, minuteness can play a powerful role in aesthetic experience.

The occasion when Elizabeth I showed Sir James Melville, ambassador from Mary Queen of Scots, her collection of miniatures is often used in order to bring the process of viewing a portrait miniature to life.[90] And indeed, this scenario probably represents a fairly typical encounter with a portrait miniature: Melville is taken to a private space - the Queen's bed chamber – and is shown at least two miniatures in the process of discussing the persons portrayed. As Patricia Fumerton has described, the experience would involve a process of revelation as one reached the private room, as the box was opened, as the tissue was unwrapped, and the even smaller ivory box or locket, which contained the miniature, was opened.[91] It is at this point that most reconstructions of the experience end, particularly when, as in the case of James Melville's experience, the miniatures he gazed upon are not known to have survived.

However, by using a combination of logic, conjecture, vision science and analysis of surviving miniatures we can re-imagine this kind of encounter, and attempt to identify some aspects of the experience which would not have been offered by other portrait objects of the period. The use of vision science and cognitive psychology in the field of art history is potentially problematic, and raises questions about the historicity of visual experience. In the case of portrait miniatures two aspects of perception might have altered in the centuries since their creation. The first is the way artworks are viewed and appreciated, and the second is a visual sense of scale. This study aims to be sensitive to the potential historicity of both aspects, with an awareness of the emerging

[89] Graham Reynolds in Murrell, *Howe to Lymne*, 19.
[90] Fumerton, ""Secret" Acts," 58.; MacLeod, *Elizabethan Treasures*, 14.
[91] Fumerton, ""Secret" Acts," 60-67.

discourse of art appreciation infiltrating from Italy during the sixteenth century, in a context where portraits had primarily been valued for the sitters they depicted rather than the talent of the artist. The perception of size and scale may also have had an historical dimension, particularly in relation to art objects, which operate in a more arbitrary realm than items of utility. As such, in the previous chapter, we tried to put portrait miniatures into a contemporary context of size and scale, concluding that they *were* viewed as distinctively small, despite the existence of other superficially similar objects.

However, there is arguably an element of perceiving scale which is more transhistorical. This sense relies on the human body as a consistent means by which people estimate and respond to size. As John Mack has explained in his global history of 'The Art of Small Things', this bodily context is involved in three ways: in the ability of the eyes to perceive tiny things, in the ability of the hands to fashion tiny things and in our sense of the human body as a scale against which all other phenomena are measured.[92] This is not merely a modern observation of miniature theory; in the Renaissance the role of the human body as the measure of all things was, if anything, much more explicit. In his architectural treatise, Francesco di Giorgio Martini asserts the centrality of the body as the source of architectural measurements: 'Diligent and curious architects have obtained the measure for everything they need to build as the finger, the palm, the arm and the foot from the human body'.[93] Emanuele Lugli's article on this treatise emphasises that although the word 'misura' could be taken as a synonym for 'proportion', Martini is not talking about an abstract, relative system of ideal proportions but the physical size and measure of buildings.[94]

Alberti's *De Pictura* presents both a more influential version of this idea, and one directly related to painting. Section 18 of Book I is concerned with the perceptual relativity of scale, light and colour, such that if all things were halved in size, 'everything that we see would in no respect appear to be diminished from what it is now'.[95] In the face of this radical sense of relativity, Alberti states that 'comparison is made with things most immediately known', which leads him to quote Protagoras in saying 'that man is the scale and measure of all things'.[96] Since the size of the human body and the mechanisms of the human eye have changed little, if at all, in five hundred years, it is perhaps reasonable to look to recent discoveries in vision science and cognitive psychology for suggestions as to how size and scale is perceived. As it happens, much of the current research in this area is being done in relation to the aesthetics of television and film, but if one removes the element of

[92] Mack, *Small Things*, 47.
[93] Lugli, "Measuring the Bones," 347-348.
[94] Lugli, "Measuring the Bones," 348.
[95] Alberti and Grayson (trans.), *On Painting*, 53.
[96] Alberti and Grayson (trans.), *On Painting*, 53.

motion from these discussions, many of the discoveries relating to the experience of scale and screen size can be recontextualised for still images. Given the emerging nature of this field and the inferences required to resituate these findings in a historical context, the following hypotheses can only be conjectural. However, hopefully they will seem conjectures worth making.

The privacy, intimacy and liveliness of experiencing the portrait miniature has already been thoroughly explored in the literature.[97] Rather than rehearsing these factors again, I propose to consider three other significant and distinctive features of experiencing a Tudor portrait miniature, which relate more or less closely to size and scale: a sense of surprise and defamiliarization, a sense of attraction and desire, and finally an active and dynamic encounter.

Surprise and Defamiliarization

Depending on the quality and finesse of the miniatures in Elizabeth's cabinet in 1564 (prior to Hilliard's first surviving miniatures), as the Queen unwrapped and opened the boxes containing her 'little pictures' we might imagine Melville's first reaction as one of wonder and surprise. He may well have seen such miniature portraits before, and perhaps one would usually expect a sense of surprise only on encountering this art form for the very first time. But, surprisingly, the sense of novelty and astonishment which attends the portrait miniature seems persistent and perennial. As mentioned in the introduction, even experts in Tudor portrait miniatures can experience a renewed admiration of their size when the opportunity arises to see them in person, rather than in reproduction. In a sixteenth-century context these objects, even at the height of their popularity, were not a common sight, being usually covered or hidden away. As such, one can imagine that every fresh encounter involved a renewed sense of wonderment, as it does today. This sense is reinforced by the frequent descriptions of portrait miniatures as items of 'curiosity', which in this period had a double meaning, indicating both the careful and intricate workmanship involved, and also an element of novelty and ingenuity.[98] Haydocke's brief discussion of Hilliard's portrait miniatures at the beginning of his translation of Lomazzo describes limning not only as 'ingenious', but 'so extraordinarie' that it merited its own treatise.[99]

There does not seem to be a similar sense of surprise in relation to life-size panel paintings, even when such works are revered and admired. As such, an attempt to scrutinize this sense of surprise

[97] Dulac, "The Agency of Limning"; Fumerton, ""Secret" Acts."
[98] ""curious, adj."," Oxford University Press, 2019, accessed 24.07.19, http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/46040?rskey=Tz0nJB&.
[99] Lomazzo and Haydock, *A Tracte.*

a little more closely may reveal aspects of the portrait miniature which were particularly appealing to Tudor audiences. We can begin by questioning why a miniature portrait should create a sense of novelty or surprise at all, especially when there are many situations in which humans experience the same object in different actual or perceived sizes. Sixteenth-century jewellery, for example, often featured miniaturisations of larger objects, from the frogs which symbolised the Queen's suitor, the Duke of Anjou, to miniature crosses and prayer books.[100] In the case of miniature representations of people, one answer might be a strong sense of the 'canonical', or real size of human beings, which is disrupted by the extremes of miniaturisation. Professor of neurobiology, Margaret Livingstone, has also hypothesised that extreme changes in scale can disrupt certain specialised modes of visual processing, such as those involved in facial perception.[101] Our enormous visual sensitivity to human faces is well documented, but it is possible that apparently small changes to the image of a face (orientation, colouration, tonal range, linearity) can have a marked impact on their readability.[102] As such, while these portraits are still vivid and realistic representations of human faces, at a subconscious level their scale may affect our visual fluency, creating an enjoyable sense of surprise and unfamiliarity.[103]

Mitigating the potential disruption caused by miniaturisation could be a phenomenon known as 'size constancy', which describes our ability to maintain a constant idea of the size of an object, regardless of the distance at which the object is viewed. As Alberti observed, this sense of size constancy is informed by previous experience of how large an object is, as well as contextual clues. In the context of a picture, size is also inferred (in the absence of other pointers) by how large the object is relative to pictorial field.[104] When encountering a miniature portrait, therefore, we might expect size constancy to kick in, and for our brains to quickly adapt to this new sense of scale. In one sense, this is exactly what happens: we have no trouble inferring the true (normal) size of the sitter, despite the miniature representation. However, a number of other factors may be working against the usual operation of size constancy in the case of portrait miniatures. The first is that one would usually see a person on this scale from a great distance, and in this situation the kind of high definition visible in a portrait miniature would be blurry, while the three-dimensional structure of light and shade would still be visible.[105] The crisp details and minimal modelling in the miniatures of

[100] Anna Somers Cocks, *An Introduction to Courtly Jewellery* (London: Compton Press, 1980), 11.
[101] Margaret Livingstone, *Vision and Art: The Biology of Seeing*, Reprint ed. (New York: Harry N Abrams, 2008), 208-209.
[102]Vicki Bruce and Andrew W. Young, *In the Eye of the Beholder: The Science of Face Perception* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), for example 71, 163.
[103] The impact is probably less profound for modern viewers familiar with photographs.
[104] H. Zettl, *Sight, Sound, Motion: Applied Media Aesthetics* (Belmont: Wadsworth Pub. Co., 1990), 99-102.
[105] Bruce and Young, *Eye of the Beholder*, 64-65.

Holbein and Hilliard produce an entirely different experience: confusingly intimate and exact despite the sense of separation evoked by the miniature scale.

Another factor confusing the operation of size constancy may be the visual influence of the pictorial and real-world context on the apparent size of the sitter. As we have seen, most of the bust-length portrait miniatures feature plain blue backgrounds, which provide no sense of scale or context to absorb the miniaturisation of sitter. In this regard, it is interesting to analyse the few, full-length miniatures which retain the dimensions of a normal portrait miniature, rather than expanding to the size of a cabinet miniature. On the face of it, full length miniatures such as Hilliard's 'Unknown Woman Standing in a Room' (also known as Lady Penelope Rich, fig. 8) should strike us as even more 'miniature' than the more common bust-length figures, given that the head of Lady Penelope is only millimetres tall, rather than centimetres. However, although doll-like in her impression, Lady Penelope's scale accords with the context of the interior she stands in. In this way, her absolute miniature size is absorbed and neutralised by the congruity between her scale and her surroundings. She exists in the scale of the room she inhabits, rather than in relation to the viewer's hand which would dwarf the tiny painting.

By contrast, the ubiquitous blue background on miniatures like Holbein's Anne of Cleves (Fig. 7) and Hilliard's Leonard Darr (Fig. 4) provides no sense of scale or context. As we saw in Chapter 2, one effect of this is to allow the figures to seem monumental within the picture frame. Yet this pictorial monumentality is juxtaposed by the real-world context of the hand holding the portrait miniature, preventing the viewer from forgetting its real-world size. As Martin and Langin-Hooper have beautifully described, in the tactile encounter the hand bridges or perhaps emphasises the 'disorienting and discordant scalar difference between the figurine and "real life"'.[106]

This surprising disjunction depends on the sense of encounter and presence created by many, if not all, portrait miniatures. This is where the limned portrait miniature differs from other minute portrait objects, such as cameos and portrait medals and creates a sense of incongruous astonishment where the others do not. Both cameos and portrait medals were known and produced in England, though in much smaller numbers than portrait miniatures. Where they were produced, however, they mostly resulted in stiff, generic or official depictions, such as the blackamoor cameos on the Gresley and Drake Jewels, and portrait medals and cameos of Elizabeth I (Figs. 10 and 11). In the case of cameos one might point to the materiality of gemstones as a reason for the difficulty of producing a subtle, lively likeness. However, the casting method of producing medals could produce portraits of considerable finesse, and Goldring's recent

[106] Martin and Langin-Hooper, eds., *The Tiny and the Fragmented*, 3.

highlighting of a silver medal depicting one of Hilliard's Cheapside neighbours (Richard Martin) by medallist Steven van Herwijck (Fig. 6) suggests that such portrait objects were available from exactly the same circle of London craftsmen and artists.[107] However, even this, more domestic depiction, has little of the presence, liveliness or intimacy of a portrait miniature.

In part, this is due to the contrast between the sculptural properties of cast metal and the illusory modality of pictorial representation. Where a sculptured medal replicates the volume and shape of the face, albeit in a flattened and miniaturised form, a limning creates an illusion which captures the *appearance* of a person, including transient features of skin tone, hair and eye colour, effects of light and translucency. While the medal transforms the very substance of the soft, malleable skin into metal, the miniature limning purports to present the eye with 'the thinge it se[l]fe'.[108] These general differences were perhaps heightened by the particular techniques of limning, which created a lively and expressive painted surface. At close quarters, the flawless image dissolves into a dance of tiny hatched and stippled strokes, which creates a subtle yet pulsating effect.

This contrast between the lasting material of metal and the delicate transience captured by the limned miniature is used explicitly in the structure of the Heneage Jewel (Fig. 11). The gold, medal-like profile on the front cover of the locket represents the official image of the queen as monarch, corresponding to the inscription identifying the subject as 'Elizabeth, by the grace of God Queen of England, France and Ireland'.[109] The locket opens to reveal one of Hilliard's most ethereal depictions of the queen, with a softness to her skin and a delicate blush which testifies to the inner inscription (in Latin): 'Alas, that so much virtue suffused with beauty should not last for ever inviolate'.[110] Like the rose which the motto encircles, the queen has dual nature, as enduring icon and mortal woman. Even in later miniatures by Hilliard which portray the queen according to the 'mask of youth', there is still a human frailty to his depictions.

Finally, in addition to the liveliness and subtlety of technique, the portrait miniature often added an element of relationship and encounter through its (usual) three-quarter composition. With very few exceptions, medals and cameos portrayed their subjects in profile, a choice which echoed the composition of classical Roman coins, and suggested a concern with objective identity rather than creating the illusion of presence. The profile line was seen to capture important and recognisable characteristics of a person, and was less likely to be altered by the vagaries of a person's fleeting

[107] Goldring, *Nicholas Hilliard*, 72.
[108] Hilliard et al., *A Treatise*, 62.
[109] "The Heneage Jewel," Victoria and Albert Museum, 2017, accessed 05.06.19, 2018, http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O33883/the-heneage-jewel-locket-hilliard-nicholas/.
[110] "The Heneage Jewel."

facial expressions. In this way, portrait medals were seen to provide a more objective record of visual identity.[111] A more important effect of the profile format, in terms of an experience of encounter, is that it locks the sitter's gaze within the picture plane. Even where the sitter in a portrait miniature does not look directly at the viewer (and 65% do), recent research suggests that the dark pupils of a person's eyes have a huge impact on the life-like effect of a portrait, an element, of course, which is missing from most sculpted and medallic portraits.[112] Moreover, dilated pupils (creating a darker eye) indicate attraction and attention, while a prolonged, direct gaze implies persuasion or intimacy. [113] As such, the distinctive dark eyes of Hilliard's miniatures, which he himself identified with 'the life of the picture',[114] have much to do with their disconcerting sense of intimacy and presence, which runs counter to the miniaturisation of the image.

The difference may be summed up with reference to an influential statement made by Susan Stewart in her seminal work about scale, *On Longing*: she identifies the natural tendency of miniaturization as weakening the relationship between a representation and its real-world referent, thereby increasing 'the significance of the object within the system of signs'.[115] Unlike the portraits on medals, coins and cameos, the limned miniatures resist this kind of abstraction, and present a real experience of encounter in miniature. Although the factors which create this sense of presence are not directly related to size and scale, the combination of this realism and the effects of miniaturisation explain, in part, the sense of surprise and defamiliarization created by these portraits.

'Defamiliarization' is a term with a specific intellectual history which significantly post-dates this period. However, it articulates the important and counter-intuitive way in which art that makes objects unfamiliar can intensify and revivify our experience of what they depict. Arguably Shklovsky's theory is anachronistic for many art objects of this period, where it is the subject rather than the manner of depiction which is most important. However, herein may lie one distinctive element of experience offered by the portrait miniature, which does, perhaps, harness the

[111] Bayer et al, 'Preface', in Keith Christiansen, Stefan Weppelmann, and Patricia Lee Rubin, *The Renaissance Portrait: from Donatello to Bellini* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2011), x.
[112] Bruce and Young, *Eye of the Beholder*, 164-165.
[113] Bruce and Young, *Eye of the Beholder*, 9, 212.
[114] Hilliard et al., *A Treatise*, 78.
[115] Susan Stewart, *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection*, 1st paperback ed. (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1993), 48.

'technique of art' by making the process of perception unfamiliar, slightly difficult and prolonged in a way which 'removes objects from the automatism of perception'.[116]

Attraction and Desire

On the way to Elizabeth's bed chamber, Melville would no doubt have passed several portraits hanging on the walls of adjoining chambers. It is possible that some of these could have been covered by curtains: the 1542 inventory of Whitehall records that 61 of the 157 paintings included curtains, though this does not tell us when the paintings were covered.[117] However, it seems unlikely that paintings intended to create an impressive display were covered most of the time, so perhaps these curtains were largely used to protect the paintings when the monarch was not in residence. Although we have seen that very small oil portraits existed (fig. 2), the surviving panel portraits in collections like the National Portrait Gallery suggest that most were over 50cm in height, and so would have been viewed from a little distance. Although one *can* view a panel painting close up (unless it is displayed at a great height), research into viewing distances in a gallery context have found a minimum range of about 1.5 metres, even when viewing the small painting of "Portrait of a Carthusian" by Early Dutch painter Petrus Christus.[118]

By contrast, viewing a portrait miniature usually required action: an invitation or a request, and the opening of a box or a locket. As Catharine MacLeod has proposed, there seems to have been a deliberate performative element to the exchanges which preceded such a viewing, involving the feigned reluctance of the owner, and the urging of the guest.[119] MacLeod portrays this as a kind of required etiquette, and though a certain feigned theatricality seems likely, Melville's description of having 'pressed to see my lord's [Dudley's] picture' conveys a more authentic and active effort to see the painting at close quarters.[120]

This sense of attraction to and desire for the portrait miniature has been explored in modern theories of miniaturisation. In theory, it is attributed to the way in which the miniature object seems possessable and desirable, yet its extreme diminution of scale excludes the viewer from the depicted realm of reality: however tightly we hold a miniature object and however closely we look

---

[116] Viktor Shklovsky in Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan, *Literary Theory: An Anthology*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2017), 26.
[117] Maria Hayward, *The 1542 Inventory of Whitehall: The Palace and Its Keeper* (London: Illuminata Publishers, 2004).
[118] Claus-Christian Carbon, "Art Perception in the Museum: How we Spend Time and Space in Art Exhibitions," *i-Perception* 8, no. 1 (2017):8.
[119] MacLeod, *Elizabethan Treasures*, 15.
[120] Melville, *Memoirs*, 122.

at it, it remains, in some sense, out of reach. The dynamic of longing and desire is central to Susan Stewart's analysis of the phenomenon of the souvenir which, like a miniature, intrinsically refers away from itself towards the 'original'.[121] I suggest the portrait miniature induces this same dynamic of attraction and longing, despite offering the viewer a powerful representation of the absent 'original', rather than a token-like souvenir. Cleverly, while the structure of the miniature format seems to declare its own insufficiency and the loss of the larger, real person, the image itself offers a captivating sense of presence.

The evidence of the romantic uses of the Tudor portrait miniature suggest that this dynamic of desire and attraction is more than an abstract, modern theory. The motif which MacLeod notes, of owners being reluctant to show or share their miniatures may sometimes, then, have had an authentic basis. Melville notes, for example, that Elizabeth was loath to show, let alone part with, her miniature of Robert Dudley, an object which perhaps perfectly expressed how close she was to the original, while also being firmly and painfully separate. In a more positive situation, a letter from Henry VIII to Anne Boleyn shows the gift of his own portrait in miniature both articulating his desire for her ('Wishing myself in their place') and satisfying her presumed longing ('as I cannot be with you in person, I am sending you the nearest possible thing').[122]

While the external size of the portrait miniature initiates the dynamic of desire and longing, the finesse and detail of the painting is another crucial element. As observed in Chapter 2, the nature of the detail in limned portrait miniatures is not declamatory and highly delineated, but subtle and hard to see, challenging the viewer to strain at the limits of their vision. This mode of address differs from the large, impressive panel portrait. Where one imposes itself upon the viewer, the other draws the viewer in. Where the sitter gazes directly at the viewer, this too 'calls' for attention. Such a gaze seems expectant, requiring relationship and reciprocity. As we noted earlier, a prolonged gaze implies attraction and intimacy, and thus invites the close involvement of the viewer. In these ways, the portrait miniature was and is, quite literally, an 'appealing' form of portraiture.

Active and Dynamic

In Melville's case, he does not explain whether Elizabeth allowed him to handle any of the miniatures himself, but Hilliard's treatise suggests that this kind of tactile manipulation of the

[121] Stewart, *On Longing*, 135.
[122] Diana Scarisbrick, *Tudor and Jacobean Jewellery* (London: Tate Publishing, 1995), 10.

object was an expected, even necessary, part of the experience.[123] While some panel portraits do feature heraldry on their reverse side, it is questionable whether this implies that panels of up to and over a metre long were routinely handled as part of the viewing experience. By contrast, the miniature's size both enabled and elicited such an active interaction. And the active involvement elicited by the portrait miniature goes beyond the visible actions of the hands: looking at an object so 'near unto the eye' requires the optical axes of the eyes to converge, creating a tension in the muscles that signals to the brain that one is examining a small object at close range, rather than a large object at a distance.[124] This may create a bodily, as well as cognitive, experience of focus and intimacy.

Furthermore, recent analysis of eye movements when viewing images may allow us to probe even deeper into the psychology of this active process. Recent findings may be interpreted to suggest that viewing a portrait miniature would have been a more active and independent visual process than looking at a life-size panel painting. Research suggests that certain pictorial features seems to result in great uniformity among viewers in terms of the focus and movement of their gaze. Where such synchronicity is found, we can infer that the image is controlling the gaze of the viewer, resulting in a more passive experience. Two factors encouraging such synchronicity are the size of the figure in comparison to the image area and the presence of a viewing task.[125] The greatest synchronicity of gaze occurs when viewing a person at medium close-up, where the face is small enough that it can be analysed by the eye in a single fixation. While most panel portraits conform to this format, the face tends to take up a much greater proportion of the portrait miniature surface. When viewed up close, this would encourage the viewer's gaze to move around the face, fixating on a number of individual details.

In terms of a viewing task, it could be argued that political and dynastic portraits presented their viewers with much clearer viewing tasks, involving various objects and symbols from which the viewer was meant to infer the sitter's status, occupation, values, characteristics, allegiances, etc. As we have seen, although a few of the most famous portrait miniatures feature a more enigmatic kind of symbolism (fig. 47), their small, circular format mean that the majority lack the sort of clues which would encourage the kind of interpretative, task-driven approach invited by most larger portraits. Where the panel portrait will often speak to the viewer about the identity of the sitter,

[123] Hilliard et al., *A Treatise*, 86.
[124] Alfred Yarbus, *Eye Movements and Vision* (New York: Springer Science and Business, 1967), 156-157. https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=kRf3BwAAQBAJ.
[125] Tim J Smith, "Watching You Watch Movies: Using Eye Tracking to Inform Film Theory," in *Psychocinematics: Exploring Cognition at the Movies*, ed. A Shimamura (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

the portrait miniature is silent. These factors suggest that viewing a portrait miniature possibly involves a more contemplative, independent, free-ranging gaze, which may encourage the viewer towards more of an appreciation of the aesthetics and artistry of the portrait, and diminish the emphasis on interpreting any puzzling inscriptions and detailed iconography.

This active/attractive experience is important in its own right, but the mobility of the object within the viewer's hand also created a dynamic and shifting experience of the image. At one moment the picture might be at arm's length, looked at by another companion. At such a distance the simplicity and strength of the pictorial composition is evident, and the whole painting can be 'swallowed' by the eyes in a single fixation. The next moment, the miniature might be lifted close the face, transforming the visual experience. Suddenly this tiny image might occupy most of the viewer's visual field, creating an immersive experience. Cognitive science has recently explored the phenomenon of 'immersion' and a sense of 'presence' in relation to the effect of cinema screen size.[126] Despite the operation of size constancy, it has been found that 'physical size still has considerable influence on how we perceive and feel about screen images'.[127] Although the general conclusions of this research has been that 'bigger is better',[128] the perceptual focus involved when viewing a miniature at great proximity could be posited to result in a *greater* experience of immersion than that provided by movie screens or the enormous tapestries and wall paintings of the sixteenth century.

At this distance the very nature of the image is altered, as the eye sees 'beneath the surface' of a painting which seems flawless at all but the closest examination. Suddenly the dual nature of the picture is revealed, with even the smoothest areas of skin now seeming to swarm with tiny brushstrokes in a mosaic of translucent red and brown hatching (fig. 27). In the best examples, the direction of these strokes expresses the shape and contours of the face, adding to the sense of life and character. As we will see later, the dual nature of the limned portrait could have had interpretative implications of interiority, but for now it is enough to note the dynamic and multi-faceted experience it offered.

'A Thing Apart'

[126] Tom Troscianko, Timothy S Meese, and Stephen Hinde, "Perception While Watching Movies: Effects of Physical Screen Size and Scene Type," *i-Perception* 3, no. 7 (2012): 414; Smith, "Watching Movies."
[127] Zettl, *Sight, Sound, Motion*, 103.
[128] David H Silvera, Robert A Josephs, and R Brian Giesler, "Bigger is Better: The Influence of Physical Size on Aesthetic Preference Judgments," *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making* 15, no. 3 (2002).

When Hilliard described limning as 'a thing apart from all other painting or drawing', he perhaps intended to highlight the elevated social status he claimed for limning, as opposed to the manual stigma attached to oil painting.[129] However, this chapter perhaps shows that the portrait miniature did offer a distinctive experience, which differed in crucial ways from other portrait objects of the period. Indeed, the sense of separation implied by miniaturisation, as well as the experience of immersion when held close to the eye, lends another meaning to the idea of a miniature as a 'thing apart'. The portrait miniature engaged the viewer in a surprising, active and immersive encounter which perhaps drew the Tudor viewer 'apart' from the present moment and created the sense of a special, privileged experience.

[129] Hilliard et al., *A Treatise*, 62.

CHAPTER 3

THE MEANINGS OF MINIATURISATION

'To change the size of an object is to disrupt everything, from its form and function to its interpretation and meaning'.[130]

We have now explored various ways in which the Tudor portrait miniature's size and scale lent the art form a powerful aesthetic and offered a distinctive viewing experience. This chapter goes a step further, by contending that their combination of miniaturisation and monumentality was not only a useful and appealing format, but an inherently meaningful aspect of the art form. Miniaturisation, I suggest, engendered subtle implications about the nature of these portraits and the people they depicted. These implied meanings cluster around three areas: first, the suggestion of value and perfection, second the impression of abstraction and timelessness, and finally the implication of interiority and scope. Some of these structural meanings have already been explored in relation to the Tudor portrait miniature, notably the implication of value through the perceived jewel-like qualities of these paintings. Other possible meanings explored here are indebted to Susan Stewart's seminal work on scale, though her general theories have often been reworked in order to better capture the particular effects of the Tudor portrait miniature.

It may seem overambitious to link the generic qualities of size and scale to such specific ideas and meanings, but the interpretative implications of size are increasingly being recognised in the field of art history. The opening quotation above comes from the catalogue for the 2005 exhibition of recent British art, which was based on the premise that 'Size Matters'. Arguably, this statement is most applicable to those objects which have an agreed, normative size. In sixteenth-century Europe, there was no such standard size for painted portraits, either in oil or even within the field of limning. However, it could be argued that the portrait miniature's extreme size explicitly problematized the question of scale, giving it an unusually meaningful role. Nevertheless, we will question how explicit the potential meanings may have been to contemporaries, and whether each individual miniature necessarily triggered these associations.

Value and Perfection: 'Can the world buy such a jewel?'[131]

'The world is perfected by miniaturisation', asserts Marius Kwint in the 'Size Matters' catalogue.[132] He gives no explanation or justification for this claim, yet considering the exquisite miniature by Holbein of Anne of Cleves (fig. 7), we are inclined to agree. Though Anne herself was, by some

[130] Natalie Rudd, in *Size Matters*, 9.
[131] From *Much Ado About Nothing* (1.1.171) in Shakespeare, *Complete Works*, 572.
[132] Marius Kwint in *Size Matters*, 17.

accounts, plain or even outright unattractive, the symmetry, simplicity and delicacy of this image gives the impression of visual perfection. The finesse of her eyebrows and eyelashes is fascinating, her porcelain skin tone flawless against the blue background and enlivened by her coral dress. Rather than seeming vacant and plain, Holbein has given her face a serene clarity, in contrast with the subtle details of her hat and neckline. In part we can attribute this effect to Holbein's precise, crystalline style. However, when we consider the impression created by Holbein's oil portrait (fig. 39), created from the same sitting and surely using the same face pattern, the difference (to my eyes) is remarkable. This painting is also symmetrical, balanced, attended by even more fine detail and executed with the same subtlety and skill. Yet there is something more ordinary about the woman in this painting: her features have more physicality and contrast less with the gold colour of her bodice and headdress. Although the background is an indistinct black-green, she seems much more a part of our earthly realm of time and space.

It is possible to point to various subtle differences in order to account for this contrasting impression. We have already noted the different background colour. The composition is also different, being rectangular and half-length. Her headdress is slightly larger in the oil painting and more three-dimensional. The skin tone in oil is also heavier, with a greater sheen on the forehead. Finally, the eyes in the miniature do appear slightly bigger, due to the delineation of the lower lashes. Yet the difference seems greater than the sum of these parts. This is the great power and challenge of miniaturisation: it is one thing to record its distinctive effects, which seem to inspire an instinctive homogeneity of response, with smaller objects usually seeming more beautiful and perfect. It is quite another thing, however, to explain this phenomenon.

One potential explanation is that small things often seem more perfect because they are, in fact, more perfect: they demand greater care and precision. Because the tiniest mistakes are so clear and so detrimental to a miniature painting, the most successful works are usually those which exhibit an apparently flawless execution. It would be tiring work to examine the oil painting of Anne of Cleves for the kind of blemish which could not be concealed in the miniature painting. Moreover, because the limning technique challenges the very limits of ordinary visual acuity, these paintings give the impression of presenting us with the kind of 'ad infinitum' detail of real life, which only increases under closer observation. This means that any flaws are usually beyond observation with the naked eye, so that faults are effectively erased. With a life-size oil painting, even by the masters of realism such as Holbein and Vermeer, a close inspection usually gives the impression that the eye has access to all the detail which the artist has provided: one has seen all there is to see.

This apparent visual perfection has interpretative implications. Firstly, physiognomic reading of faces often interpreted any external blemish as an indication of internal corruption, so a perfect face did make a statement about the sitter's character and mind. Moreover, by reducing physical imperfections these images seem to focus instead on less corporeal qualities, as we will discuss later. They therefore represent a more subjective gaze, appropriate to the romantic context in which many miniatures were commissioned and viewed. The link between love and a perfect portrait is drawn by Hilliard himself. He openly admits to a kind of idealisation, aiming to capture not just the likeness in terms of 'favour and complexion' but a sitter's '*best* graces and countenance notably expressed' [emphasis added].[133] This kind of idealisation was not understood as a kind of distortion or evasion of the truth, but a representation of the best truth, the kind of truth that an amorous gaze might perceive.

This amorousness is a two-way process, according to Hilliard, because it is engendered first by 'the comeliness and beauty of the face', above all 'the grace in the countenance'. If the artist notes this aspect properly, Hilliard claims that 'it will hardly fail that he shall be amorous'. This amorous attitude then turns out to be vital in the process of portrayal, as the artist 'can hardly take them ['those lovely graces'] truly, and express them well, without an affectionate good judgment, and without blasting his young and simple heart'.[134] This perfected subjectivity, then, represents the look of love, which perceives the best character of the beloved. The blemishes are not so much erased, they are simply not noticed by the amorous gaze. This reduction in physicality was, as Roy Strong has noted, particularly appropriate to the model of courtly love, which turns the loved one into an abstract ideal rather than a perishable human body.[135]

Surveying the paintings in our corpus, it is hard to find a blemish or a wrinkle. Not every sitter is portrayed as very attractive; Holbein's portrait of Cromwell (fig. 46) and some of Horenbout's miniatures of Henry VIII portray portly gentlemen with small, narrowed eyes and, in Cromwell's case, a rather pointy nose. Yet these appear to be represented as characterful features rather than blemishes. Even Oliver, renowned for a more 'realistic' style, portrays his subjects in this idealised way. His unfinished miniature of Elizabeth is often suspected to have been abandoned for being an 'imperfect' representation (fig. 48). It is admittedly less baby-faced than Hilliard's late miniatures, but again we find here no wrinkles or pockmarks, only the suggestion of cheekbones, large eyes, a

[133] Hilliard et al., *A Treatise*, 75.
[134] Hilliard et al., *A Treatise,* 75-77.
[135] Strong and Murrell, *Artists of the Tudor Court*, 10.

firmer mouth and a more arched nose. Moreover, these features would possibly have been softened with the more advanced stages of the limning process.

At the heart of this characterful perfection is, of course, a judgement about value, specifically the immeasurable value of a loved person. It is easy to overlook the significance of the observation made by Strong, that 'from the outset miniatures were regarded as precious'.[136] But this assertion should give us pause. The constituent parts of a miniature painting are materially insignificant. Even when expensive resources were used, such as shell gold for inscriptions and burnished silver leaf for pearls, the quantities were so tiny that the finished article cannot claim any significant material value. Nor did portraiture itself usually attract great prices in this period.[137] The explanation for the perceived preciousness is then usually attributed to the visual analogy between these paintings and the jewels of which they became a part. However, as we have seen, jewel-like descriptions of Tudor portrait miniatures belie their actual visual properties.

If not for their colour, how then were portrait miniatures able to partake in the rhetoric of jewel-like value? Certainly, the jewelled settings provided an aura of value, even if, as we have seen, the interior image usually provided a contrast with its casing, rather than visual continuity. As Pointon has observed, this visual contrast could actually heighten the perceived value of the sitter, as it simultaneously placed the image in the realm of monetary value and suggested that the portrait may depict something more transcendent, 'something that is beyond price'.[138] The figuring of a loved one as a precious jewel was widespread in Renaissance literature, but Shakespeare characteristically draws out the potential ambiguity of this metaphor in an exchange between Claudio and Benedick in *Much Ado About Nothing:*

> **Claudio:** Can the world buy such a jewel?
> **Benedick:** Yea, and a case to put it into. (1.1.171-2)[139]

While Claudio intends the metaphor of a jewel to suggest that his love, Hero, is beyond price, Benedick uses the same image to situate her firmly in a rhetoric of materiality and cost.

Although their jewelled context made it easy to discuss these portraits as 'jewels', I suggest that miniaturisation is equally important in the generation of perceived value. The implicit size of jewellery is, like so many questions of scale, largely unspoken. The proto-dictionaries of the period offer no help, as they focused only on 'hard words'. Nor is the mysterious etymology of the word

[136] Strong and Murrell, *Artists of the Tudor Court*, 9.
[137] Goldring, *Nicholas Hilliard*, 25.
[138] Pointon, ""Surrounded with Brilliants"," 54, 61.
[139] Shakespeare, *Complete Works*, 572.

illuminating - some argue for a derivation from 'jue', meaning 'play', while others link it to various forms of 'joie' or 'joy'.[140] However, considering the internationalist nature of jewellery making and buying in the early modern period, perhaps the contemporary Germanic term of 'Kleinod', referring to jewels and jewelled works of art, can provide some evidence that, first and foremost, these were 'small things'.[141] Certainly, Pointon's highly respected cultural history of gemstones and jewellery begins by describing them as 'small-scale precious artefacts' and 'miniature objects'.[142] While the size of jewels may seem incidental to their meaning and value, their small scale could be seen to represent their rarity and to connotate intensity, hardness and potency. This counter-intuitive relationship between size and value deserves greater study, but its dynamics have already been noted by Bachelard in *The Poetics of Space*, where he posits that 'values become condensed and enriched in miniature'.[143] Like a jewel, the miniature seems to offer a precious, distilled version of the sitter which, as Pointon suggests, 'might be understood to provide the essence' of the person.[144]

Abstract and Timeless: 'These insubstantial pageants'[145]

Alongside the implication of value, the association with jewels also allowed the portrait miniature to partake in jewel-like 'narratives of continuity' which, according to Pointon, performed 'the transvaluation of the material into abstract qualities such as history and spirituality'.[146] In this way, I suggest, the miniaturisation of these paintings could imply more enduring and less material values than the more official portrayals offered by life-size panel paintings.

Recent scholarly interest in the Tudor portrait miniature has emphasised, not the stillness and timelessness of these portraits, but rather their 'liveliness'. [147] A quotation from Shakespeare's *As You Like It* has been influential in this regard: at the end of Act 2, Duke Senior welcomes a fellow exile, Orlando, because he is the son of the late Rowland de Bois. The Duke has no reservations about Orlando's identity, because:

---

[140] Oxford English Dictionary, *"jewel, n."* (OED Online: Oxford University Press, June 2019). https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/101213?rskey=jk2hzG&.
[141] Anna Somers Cocks, 'The Status and Making of Jewellery', in Victoria and Albert Museum, *Princely Magnificence : Court Jewels of the Renaissance, 1500-1630* (London: Debrett's Peerage Ltd, 1980), 4.
[142] Marcia R. Pointon, *Brilliant Effects: A Cultural History of Gem Stones and Jewellery* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 1,2.
[143] Gaston Bachelard, *The Poetics of Space* (New York: Orion Press, 1964), 150.
[144] Pointon, ""Surrounded with Brilliants"," 49.
[145] From *The Tempest* (4.1.155) Shakespeare, *Complete Works*, 1238.
[146] Pointon, ""Surrounded with Brilliants"," 55.
[147] Faraday, "Directness and Intimacy."; Dulac, "The Agency of Limning ".

> … mine eye doth his [Rowland's] effigies witness
> Most truly limned and living in your face (II.7.197-198).[148]

Here, this association between liming and liveliness marked by alliteration, but also in the metaphor of Rowland's limned image coming to life in the face of Orlando. Equally important here is that limning can stand as an analogy for 'true' likeness.

If we look at the well-preserved portrait miniatures from the sixteenth century (Figs 3, 4, 9, 15 and 40, for example), we can see how the modulation of flesh tones create a characterful and vibrant impression of the sitter. Yet we do not encounter a sense of liveliness in terms of animated facial expressions or a sense of movement. Moreover, although these portraits all seem 'realistic' in some important sense, we feel they are probably evading a more scrutinizing kind of truth, one which delineates every wrinkle, every oily forehead, every mole and blemish. This sense is even greater in the case of miniatures where some pigments have faded over time, such as Hilliard's portrait of an unknown woman, aged 26 (fig. 41). Here, the lady's flawless face is almost devoid of modelling or colour, and there are no ostentatiously individual facial features. The woman does not appear to be on the brink of action or to convey any clear emotion from her expression. In what way, then, can this be a '*truly* limned and *living*' likeness? I would argue that Hilliard here depicts, not the likeness of a moment, but a more persistent kind of likeness, consisting of a slight expression of scepticism, distinctively dark eyebrows, a forthright gaze, a slim nose and firmly set mouth. This is a lady at 26, but we can imagine these same features continuing to 'live' on while in other ways she ages and changes. Just as the colour palette relies on an essential combination of black, white and blue, so her likeness rests on these essential, timeless features.

The association between miniaturisation and a sense of timelessness is emphasised by Susan Stewart in her wide-ranging chapter on 'The Miniature' in Western art and literature. However, her observation that 'the miniature is a world of arrested time' involves a number of complex elements and arguments, not all of which can be applied to the portrait miniature.[149] The stillness she attributes to the miniature is conceptualised as a kind of tableau, in which a particular moment is frozen in time. The force of miniaturisation then causes a 'generalization of the moment' in which 'that instance comes to transcend, to stand for, a spectrum of other instances'. Stewart explains this effect of miniaturisation as due to the reduction of the 'tactile and olfactory dimensions of the object [which] increases the significance of the object within the system of signs'. This account of the connection between miniaturisation and timelessness does not seem to work well in relation

[148] Shakespeare, *Complete Works*, 666.
[149] Stewart, *On Longing*, 47-69.

to the portrait miniature. As we saw in Chapter 2, while miniaturisation and the head-and-shoulders compositions of these portraits do seem to diminish the corporeality of the sitter, there does not seem to be a corresponding impression of the sitter as a sign or symbol. Instead, there is still a vivid sense of representation and encounter.

The idea of a tableau also seems unsuitable for the Tudor miniatures. Some critics would question the impression of any kind of stillness, with Roy Strong arguing that the limning technique aimed 'to record spontaneity of expression',[150] and Christina Faraday recently drawing a connection between Hilliard's concise linearity and 'quickness', both in the sense of pictorial vitality and in the sense of speedy execution.[151] There is something in both of these assessments.[152] They usefully challenge the idea that portrait miniatures offered cold, artificial representations and claim instead that these powerful images 'present the men and women of the age as they really were'.[153] Strong and Faraday also seem to be supported by Hilliard's interest in watching 'those louely graces, wittye smilings, and thosse stolne glances wch sudainely like lighting passe'.[154] However, not only does this view seem contradicted by the visual evidence, it also sits uneasily alongside sixteenth-century conceptions of character.

While modern viewers might look for evidence of character in spontaneous and unguarded moments, a sixteenth-century viewer may have seen such expressions as *limiting* the perception of character. As Girouard notes, in an age when Platonic modes of thought were the default for 'most thinking Elizabethans', the transient observable world was understood to comprise merely 'pale copies of the reality of the ideal'. [155] In this context the Renaissance physiognomist, Giambattista della Porta, rejected the usefulness of facial expressions, which were seen to provide 'little insight into a man's character [and]… merely denote[d] volatile passions'.[156] A more careful reading of Hilliard confirms this position: although the artist must observe the fluctuating expressions of the sitter, it is these small movements that Hilliard blames as 'the greatest cause of leesinge the liknes in pictures'.[157] As there is 'no person but hath variety of looks and countenance', Hilliard emphasises the role of the artist's wisdom and 'good judgement', so that after observing the

[150] Strong and Murrell, *Artists of the Tudor Court*, 12.
[151] Faraday, "Directness and Intimacy," 4-5.
[152] Though I would question the idea that the limned portrait miniature was painted quickly.
[153] Strong and Murrell, *Artists of the Tudor Court*, 12.
[154] Hilliard et al., *A Treatise*, 76.
[155] Mark Girouard, *Elizabethan Architecture: Its Rise and Fall, 1540-1640* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2009), xvii.
[156] Sibylle Baumbach, 'Physiognomy', in Michael Hattaway, ed., *A New Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture* (Chichester; Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 587.
[157] Hilliard et al., *A Treatise*, 80.

varied features of each individual he is able to select and 'placeth them in order'.[158] The miniaturist's role is thus an interventionist one, but not necessarily with the aim of flattery or idealisation.

Donne's Elegy, 'His Picture', which almost certainly features a portrait miniature as its subject, suggests one way in which a 'fair and delicate' portrait might better represent a sitter than their own body. The speaker offers a loved one his picture as they 'bid farewell' to each other. He goes on:

> 'Tis like me now, but I dead, 'twill be more
> When we are shadows both, than 'twas before. [159]

This implies, not only the image's ontology as a copy or shadow of a living man (recalling Plato's analogy of the cave), but also perhaps that it captured that which will survive the speaker's bodily death: an eternal spirit or character. If the speaker does return, he imagines his appearance greatly altered: 'weather-beaten', 'torn', 'tanned', 'broken'. In this case the speaker wants the image to serve as an important reminder and a truer reflection of his 'judging mind' than his damaged body, which may *seem* 'foul and coarse'. Indeed, the speaker hopes that his appearance in the painting as 'fair and delicate' will nourish the recipient's love so that on his return it will be 'strong enough/ To feed on that, which to disused tastes seems tough.'[160] The word 'seems' appears twice in this poem, and it is crucial in its suggestion of appearances belying a deeper truth. In both cases it is the speaker's body which falsely 'seems' and the portrait which offers greater truth.

This assessment of the relationship between mind and body, and the kind of representation which could most accurately reflect the character of a sitter, was pertinent to sixteenth-century portraiture, big and small. As in portrait miniatures, oil portraits seem to avoid transient expressions. Nuechterlein has described how Holbein seemed to aim for 'a kind of weighted average' of how his sitters looked at a certain time in their life.[161] However, the particular motivations and effects involved in the timeless, perfected quality of miniature portraits is subtly different. In Holbein's case, for example, the larger panel portraits create an air of objectivity and seem to reconcile both 'momentary specificity… with essentialised truth'.[162] This effect is slightly different from the more subjective miniature depictions, and the impression of perfection created by miniaturisation. In addition, while panel portraits usually seem to have something to say about

[158] Hilliard et al., *A Treatise*, 75 and 77.
[159] Donne, *Selected Poetry*, 28-29.
[160] Donne, *Selected Poetry*, 29.
[161] Jeanne Nuechterlein, *Translating Nature into Art: Holbein, the Reformation, and Renaissance Rhetoric* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2011), 1.
[162] Nuechterlein, *Translating Nature*, 185.

the sitter, be that their social position (fig. 32), their occupation (fig.5), their abilities (fig. 42) or their dynastic connections (fig. 19), miniature portraits seem less tied to worldly concerns. Instead, miniatures like the portraits of Robert Dudley (fig. 3), Francis Bacon (fig 40) and Thomas Cromwell (fig 46) seem to provide an image of their sitter 'in themselves', which remains perennially 'true' despite, or because of, a lack of objective, physical detail.[163]

Why was the miniature format so suited to this kind of depiction? It is not, as we have seen, the effect of a tableau: a moment frozen in time. Instead, miniaturisation introduces a dramatic disjunction between the real world and the realm of depiction. As Stewart puts it, 'the miniature does not attach itself to lived historical time'.[164] The abstract quality of miniaturisation in general is enhanced by the artistic style of most Tudor portrait miniatures, with the dimensionless blue backgrounds, for example, seeming to lift the sitter from everyday life into an abstract space. The circular and oval shape of most Tudor miniatures may have strengthened this impression. Olson has argued that, in Renaissance Florence at least, the circle was 'synonymous with divinity and eternity, both of which have no beginning or end'.[165] The use of the oval may have weakened this association, but considering the classical origins of these meanings and the humanist culture in which miniatures were appreciated, it seems plausible that some such resonance existed for Tudor viewers. Lastly, miniaturisation has an indirect tendency towards the abstract, in that these portraits allowed little room for indicative settings or objects which would tie the sitter to a particular place, time and stage of life. As Pointon has observed, the head-and-shoulder format also had the effect of 'omitting [many] details of dress, which would rapidly go out of fashion'.[166]

These features of the portrait miniature create a sense of stillness which centres on a pictorial sense of time, but there are perhaps other forms of timelessness at work. A painting can be said to imply three points in time: the time of the depicted person/object/scene, the time of the viewer looking at it and finally the instance of making the image. Miniaturisation arguably affects all three, by lifting the sitter out of the everyday relations of space and time, by engendering an immersive focus in the viewer which separates him/her from the ordinary passage of time, and finally in the way that the miniaturisation of these images effectively erases the 'marks of their making'.[167] When routinely viewed at high magnification, it can be easy to forget how extraordinarily effortless these seem at all but the closest observation. But in their visual perfection these portraits escape

[163] This list features only male sitters. Another avenue of exploration in this field would be whether men tended to be depicted with a greater level of characterisation, but this is beyond the scope of this study.
[164] Stewart, *On Longing*, 65.
[165] Olson, *The Florentine Tondo*, 34.
[166] Pointon, ""Surrounded with Brilliants"," 49.
[167] Mack, *Small Things*, 47.

the human timeframe of drawing and painting, and seem instead to be images that might always have existed.

However, it is perhaps the coincidence between miniaturisation and monumentality (outlined in Chapter 1) that is most responsible for the sense of timelessness and stillness in these portraits. In a non-monumental pictorial composition, space can often be used to imply the passing of time. We could return to Tintoretto's *Crucifixion* here (fig. 20) and note how the busyness of the lower half of the painting suggests action, movement and a broad concurrency of time. We see another cross in the process of being levered up, the time taken to console Mary at the foot of the cross, a man digging the hole for the third cross. When we consider this painting it is hard to forget its sheer size and the impression of power and dynamism which this alone creates. However, we can look at narrative manuscript paintings for a similar deployment of space as time. In figure 43, for example, we can see several different passages of time represented in one pictorial space, with Judas hanging from a tree in the background, a woman blacksmith making arrowheads for a soldier in the foreground and Jesus carrying the cross along the centre of the page. The time taken by his journey to Golgotha takes up visual space in the form of the path, which curves away to either side of the painting. Moreover, the inset historiated initial projects the timeline forward, as Saint Veronica holds up the facecloth imprinted with the image of Christ, though in the main body of the painting she has not yet offered it to him. Finally, in the top left corner we encounter a different window of time, with an idealised depiction of medieval Gothic architecture. This narrative sense of time relies on complex manipulations of space, divided up into different 'time zones' and implied by the known stories of multiple represented characters. The complicated composition also takes the eye on multiple journeys, each of which takes time and represents time. By contrast, the monumental portrait composition focuses the gaze, rather than taking it on a journey.[168] The centralised composition creates a sense of stillness and balance, while the strength of the composition gives it that lasting, definitive, complete quality.

This sense is enhanced by the artistic styles of Horenbout, Holbein and Hilliard, who all employ minimal shadowing and a diffuse sense of light. While the same could be said of many panel paintings, the effect is enhanced by the conjunction between this timeless monumentality and miniaturisation. If space can be used to create a sense of time, then the compression of the miniature intensifies this effect. In addition, while we saw how the face and hands of Sir Thomas Gresham (fig. 38) seem luminous, thanks to the lustre of the varnished oil and the contrasting dark

[168] As we observed in Chapter 2, on closer inspection the eye is free to explore various details, but not in a linear, directed way.

background, the vivid blue grounds and matt finish of the watercolour miniatures reduce the sense of directional light. These images convey no sense of sunlight or the illumination of a candle in the darkened spaces of many panel portraits. Instead, they seem divorced from such physical conditions and the daily passage of light and time.

The size, scale and style of most sixteenth-century portrait miniatures, then, engenders a contemplative sense of timelessness, and produces a focus on abstract, rather than material qualities. Remarkably, these implications seem to be achieved without reducing the sitter themselves into something abstract and symbolic. Indeed, as Faraday and others have claimed, they offered their contemporaries (and modern viewers) vivid 'representations of the "presence" and true features of sitters'.[169]

Depth and Interiority, Part 1: 'that within which passeth show'[170]

In the previous section the implication of timeless and abstract qualities was closely linked to the portrayal of the most immaterial aspects of a person, which can be variously termed as human self, character, spirit, personality, consciousness or soul. However, there have been many critics who would judge these concepts, and the intention to depict them in a portrait, as highly anachronistic in the Tudor period. In part, this contentious debate has been facilitated by a network of overlapping terms for an inner life, each of which represents a subtly different proposition about the nature of conscious experience, and scholarly battles about the existence of the self have been waged on these shifting and dislocated battlegrounds.

These issues pertain to portraiture in general and the following section will first address the broader question of the visibility of the interior self in Tudor culture. My analysis of interiority and depth in the portrait miniature avoids the issues of individualism, agency and self-determination which can readily be challenged as retrospective, modern projections.[171] Instead, my proposed model is fairly limited: that Tudors experienced, like us, a world of thoughts, feelings, aptitudes and perceptions which seemed somehow contained within themselves. Although this world could be shared in various ways – through gestures, expressions, speech, touch, art, music, etc. – this realm of experience was recognised as essentially a private domain, separate from a person's public

[169] Faraday, "Directness and Intimacy," 3.
[170] From *Hamlet* (1.2.85), Shakespeare, *Complete Works*, 685.
[171] The link between individualism and Renaissance culture was most famously made by Burckhardt and most famously refuted by Stephen Greenblatt, who saw the self as a social construct that was shaped by social pressures. Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: from More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).

embodiment and behaviour. This potentially raised a problem for any portraitist. However, the issue seems even more contentious in relation to the portrait miniature. On the one hand, this format could be seen as conducive to more intimate, revealing portrayals, yet one of the foremost analyses of the portrait miniature challenges even the most limited notion of interiority. In Patricia Fumerton's assessment, the Tudor sense of self was, at a deep level, illusory. Though 'supported and, indeed, constituted by bric-a-brac worlds of decoration, gifts, food stuffs, small entertainments, and other particles of cultural wealth and show', at the centre of this drive for self-expression was a void, epitomised by the 'façade-food' of the sweetmeat or 'void' course, which Fumerton likens to 'jewelled miniatures'.[172] The link between decorative sweetmeats and portrait miniatures is a weak one, stemming largely from a flawed equation of the small with the trivial, and the misleading characterisation of portrait miniatures as dainty and 'jewel-like'. At a more basic level, the portrait miniature was not made to be consumed, but to be treasured, and did not represent empty conceits but the face of a person, presumed to be important to the viewer.

More importantly, an analysis of sixteenth-century literature makes the idea of an internal void hard to defend. From Wyatt to Syndey, Shakespeare to Donne, the literary evidence shows that when these men, at least, looked inside themselves they found sorrow, uncertainty, love, ambition and ideas about the world. Indeed, the inner world seems more often a crowded and expansive terrain than an empty void. In Wyatt's version of Petrarch's *In Vita* 140, the speaker's thought becomes a physical space where love 'doth harbour', while in his heart love 'doth keep his residence'. When his lady's displeasure causes love to flee from the face, we learn of even deeper recesses in the landscape, as love hides in 'the hert's forest'.[173] In the early Elizabethan period Sidney takes up the inner voice in his sonnet sequence, *Astrophil and Stella*, in which Astrophil struggles to find an appropriate way of voicing his love, which is figured as a foetus within his body:

> Thus great with child to speak, and helpless in my throes,
> Biting my truant pen, beating myself for spite,
> 'Fool', said my Muse to me, 'look in thy heart and write'.[174]

In neither of these cases is the expression of interiority easy or unproblematic. For Wyatt and Sidney their interior self is a source of danger, despair and shame. But they both assume a division between the interior and exterior person. As John Jeffries Martin has argued, the most consistent

[172] Fumerton, *Cultural Aesthetics*, 1,125.
[173] Thomas Wyatt, 'The Long Love', in Michael Payne and John C. Hunter, eds., *Renaissance Literature: An Anthology* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003), 106.
[174] Payne and Hunter, eds., *Renaissance Literature*, 528.

feature of the varied Renaissance ideas about the self is a constant anxiety about the dynamics of that inner-outer relationship.[175] Martin proposes five models of Renaissance selfhood, each of which posits different relations between the interior and exterior self. For the prudential self, for example, a certain degree of concealment of the inner self was seen to be necessary, though the ideal of the sincere self gradually came to challenge the desirability of this model. The pertinence of these models for the portrait miniature is indicated by Martin's emphasis on the body and skin as a crucial site of mediation between the internal and external self. The role of this interface was problematic and unstable: for the prudential self the face can be a protective barrier, for the performative self it is the means of expression, for the sincere self, like Hamlet, it is a constant source of anxiety because any outward signs are, by definition, 'actions that a man might play'[176] without really meaning them.

Concern about the congruity between a person's interior feelings and their outward appearance is potentially of great importance to the art of portraiture. However, this depends on the assumption that an artist or sitter actually *wanted* something of the subject's inner life to be represented. For some critics, this idea is also anachronistic, with Richard Williams arguing that 'the ideal of the portrait as an exposure of the private self or as a revealing index of individuality belongs to a later tradition'.[177] It is true both that the primary motivations of panel paintings were largely official and dynastic, and also that Renaissance estimations of what could be represented in a portrait were generally pessimistic. Nevertheless, I would propose that these very anxieties make it reasonable to suppose that Tudor viewers would have considered these issues in relation to the painted portrait.

Renaissance drama provides interesting evidence about the range of possible attitudes towards the visibility of interiority, where the role of the face as a site of both concealment and true revelation is often of crucial importance. The plot of *Much Ado About Nothing* largely depends on the *un*reliability of appearances, with Benedick and Beatrice being tricked into misreading each other's behaviour as signals of love. Similarly, when Hero is accused of premarital sex, her innocent blushes are susceptible to the preconceptions of the viewers and wrongly judged to be signs of 'guiltiness, not modesty' (4.1.42).[178] However, in this same scene it is the close 'noting of the lady'

[175] John Jeffries Martin, *Myths of Renaissance Individualism* (Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 7.
[176] From Hamlet (1.2.84), Shakespeare, *Complete Works*
[177] Richard Williams, 'The Visual Arts', in Susan Doran and Norman L. Jones, *The Elizabethan World*, 1st ed., (Abingdon; New York: Routledge, 2011), 575.
[178] Shakespeare, *Complete Works*, 584-585.

(4.1.160) by the Friar that confirms her true innocence. A correct reading of a face may rely upon the skill of the viewer, but this play seems to suggest that the face *can* convey inner truth.

As we have seen, the kind of interiority denoted by blushes and overt facial expressions was regarded as transient and an unreliable indicator of character. Yet, according to the humanist scholar Erasmus, it was only these passing passions which a portrait could hope to show. In his dialogue, *Ciceronianus* (1528), the character Bulephorus gives a very sceptical account of portraiture:

> Zeuxis was able to depict his subjects' features, complexion, age, even a suggestion of the feelings. It is this that demonstrates his supreme artistry – he could show grief, joy, anger, fear, attention, or boredom. Now the man who could offer all this surely realised the full potential of his art? As far as was possible, he transferred the form of the living person to the mute image… But what an enormous amount of the real person was missing from the portrait! We find represented everything it is possible to ascertain from the outermost layer, the skin. Yet man consists of soul as well as body. … Where are life, movement, feeling, voice, and speech? Where finally are man's special characteristics, mind, intelligence, memory, and understanding? The painter in fact finds it impossible to represent the most distinctive features of a person.[179]

While Bulephorus declares the depiction of 'man's special characteristics' to be impossible, the portraiture of the period seems to show a desire to overcome such limitations, and occasional frustration about a perceived lack of success. The problem was heightened, of course, in the case of portraying humanist scholars, who prided themselves on their intellectual abilities. In Dürer's 1526 engraving of Erasmus (fig. 42), the artist has clearly tried to capture the scholar's intellectual life. Erasmus's scholarship is symbolised in the volumes piled on a foreground ledge, in the act of writing, in his absorbed focus on his writing and internal thoughts. Even his heavily lined and furrowed face could be seen to suggest the inscribing of thought on flesh. In case the viewer missed all these clues, a plaque behind the sitter declares the limitations of the image, claiming (in Greek) 'The writings will show the better one [portrait]'.[180] Probably stipulated by the sitter, this inscription suggests an anxiety on the part of Erasmus that his exterior did not reflect his inner qualities. It suggests, clearly, that he identified more with his writings that with his bodily person. Yet, in pointing to the 'portrait' provided by his work, this inscription indicates a desire, confirmed by the other clues in the engraving, to make Erasmus's intellect visible.

[179] Nuechterlein, *Translating Nature*, 180.
[180] The same inscription appears on a medallion of Erasmus by Metsys, translated by Harry Vredeveld, "'Lend a Voice': The Humanistic Portrait Epigraph in the Age of Erasmus and Dürer," *Renaissance Quarterly* 66, Summer (2013): 521-523, https://doi.org/10.1086/671585.

If we turn to the miniature portrait of Francis Bacon (fig. 40), we find an inscription which seems to echo the disappointment of Erasmus, reading 'si tabula daretur digna animum mallem' ('if one could but paint his mind')[181]. Yet, in bold contrast with Dürer's engraving, this portrait seems to use none of the strategies which imply the active mind of Erasmus: the composition is monumental and plain, the sitter is unoccupied, his brow is unfurrowed by thought and there are no objects or symbols to suggest that this is a young man of learning. Yet this portrait still seems, in some way, meaningful. It appears, however ambiguously, to imply the character of the sitter. As human viewers, skilled in the interpretation of human faces, it seems possible to infer something from the face itself, the narrow eyes suggesting perhaps an element of scrutiny and intelligence, the small set mouth possibly indicating a youthful stubbornness and yet reserve, and the relaxed but ruddy cheeks signifying an underlying confidence and vitality. This kind of analysis is as instinctive as it is subjective, but it is perhaps one which a Tudor audience would have recognised.

We see something like it in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, when the protagonist confronts his mother, Gertrude over her marriage to his uncle.[182] In this scene (3.4) Gertrude is shown two portraits as visual evidence of the internal differences between his late father and his uncle. (This scene can be played using either panel paintings or portrait miniatures, but the way Hamlet refers to the paintings as 'this' thing rather than 'that', and instructs Gertrude to look 'here' rather 'there' (lines 52, 63, 70), suggests a physical proximity to the objects which fits better with holding a miniature than looking a wall-mounted painting. In addition, Hamlet later refers to his father's 'picture in little', which makes it more likely that he or his mother would own one.) On the one hand, Hamlet's description of the portraits relies on generic attributes of Roman gods – his father having 'the front of Jove himself,/ An eye like Mars' (lines 55-56). But these mythical analogies signal corresponding virtues or internal qualities, such as the ability 'to threaten or command' (line 56). Moreover, despite these generalised descriptions, Hamlet stresses the importance of Gertrude's own observations, asking her twice, 'Have you eyes?' (lines 64 and 66). The implication is that these faces are meaningful in their own right, and by looking closely at them it should be clear to Gertrude the error she has made.

In the Renaissance period this mode of meaning could be rationalised by the art of physiognomy, which was as influential as it was inconsistent and controversial. It is more important for its premise – 'an intrinsic relation between form and content'[183] – than the particular interpretations it offered, which were often based on comparisons between certain facial characteristics and the

[181]Goldring, *Nicholas Hilliard*, 163.
[182] Shakespeare, *Complete Works*, 703-704.
[183] Sibylle Baumbach, 'Physiognomy', 582.

putative nature of similar animals. Yet even the most rigorous minds of the age, such as Francis Bacon (depicted in figure 40), held that 'the lineaments of the body do disclose the disposition and inclination of the mind in general'.[184] However, this does not explain why the miniature portrait in particular might have been seen to 'create an illusion of greater intimacy',[185] or why some critics claim that these works are somehow 'constructed in depth'.[186]

An important strategy in accounting for the portrait miniature's impression of depth and interpreting the meaning of these paintings has been in terms of inscription and symbolism. This kind of analysis runs into two important problems. In the first place, some of the symbolic readings seem simplistic and unpersuasive, such as Reynold's theory of the use of colour symbolism.[187] In Hilliard's miniature of 'An Unknown Man, Aged 24' (fig. 17), for example, the green ribbon round his neck is read as a symbol of joy. To me this adds little to an interpretation of the portrait, and seems positively incongruous considering the slight severity of the sitter's steely gaze. This is a rather blunt and generalizing strategy: given that about half of our corpus feature only the colours black, white and gold in the sitter's costume, it is of limited use for the interpretation of most Tudor miniatures. Secondly, in Chapter 1 we saw that the analogy between portrait miniatures and the popularity of *impresa* in Italy has been overstated. Instead of taking this kind of iconographical approach to implications of interiority, the final section of this chapter will look for structural implications of interiority and depth.

Depth and Interiority, Part 2: 'the world's contracted thus'[188]

Although the depiction of inner qualities was a potential issue for all kinds of portraiture, we now explore the ways in which the format, size and scale of the portrait miniature tended to suggest the depth and interiority of the sitter. We start by considering how the contraction of the miniature format created a sense of discrepancy between surface and depth, and suggested analogies between textual and microcosmic modes of meaning. We will also assess the effect of pictorial scale in suggesting what *kind* of interiority the sitters embody, and the role of other artistic, social and material aspects of these paintings.

[184] Sibylle Baumbach, 'Physiognomy', 591.
[185] Richard L Williams, 'The Visual Arts', 575.
[186] Reynolds, "The Painter Plays the Spider," 282.
[187] Reynolds, "The Painter Plays the Spider," 283.
[188] From 'The Sun Rising', line 26, Donne, *Selected Poetry*, 85.

Many critics have noted, alongside Roy Strong, that portrait miniatures seem to have an effect which is 'out of all proportion to their actual size'.[189] This discrepancy, I suggest, is not merely a testament to the artistry of the great Tudor miniaturists; it is a structural meaning embedded in the miniaturisation of these portraits. It operates by accentuating man's already elastic condition, mirroring an existing discrepancy between the physical limitations of the human condition and a belief in man's infinite epistemological nature. This idea can be found across English Renaissance literature, but is beautifully summarised by Hamlet:

> What a piece of work is a man! how noble in reason!
> how infinite in faculty! in form and moving how
> express and admirable! in action how like an angel!
> in apprehension how like a god! the beauty of the
> world! the paragon of animals! And yet, to me,
> what is this quintessence of dust? (2.2.305-10)[190]

Here Shakespeare bookends his magisterial picture of man's reason, faculty and action with striking contractions in scale: he is also just a 'piece' of work and, even smaller than dust itself, its mere essence.

The extraordinary effect of the portrait miniature is that, though the physical 'surface' of a person is dramatically diminished, the signification of character and mind is unchanged. This structure is not a code-like correspondence between a sign and its meaning, but an invitation to see the scope of the person behind the face. The drama of this discrepancy is perhaps particularly acute when the sitter is a great explorer or political figure. When we look into the tiny eyes of Sir Francis Drake (fig. 18) we encounter a mind which has circumnavigated the globe, while the multiple Hilliard miniatures of Queen Elizabeth (fig. 11) perhaps served to emphasise the discrepancy between her delicate facial features and the political power the representations embodied. Alternatively, the few portrait miniatures of children seem, not to suggest their doll-like smallness, but rather their future potential (all the more poignantly in the case of Charles and Henry Brandon (fig. 45), who died from sweating sickness before reaching adulthood).[191]

This symbolic yet representational mode of understanding was perhaps more readily adopted by a sixteenth-century mind, which was conditioned to view the material world as a quasi-text, which could be 'read' for deeper meanings. As Stewart has remarked, 'one of the great *topoi* of Western literature has been the notion of the face as book'.[192] While all faces, real and depicted, could be

[189] Strong and Murrell, *Artists of the Tudor Court*, 11.
[190] Shakespeare, *Complete Works*, 694-695.
[191] Foister, *Holbein in England*, 108.
[192] Stewart, *On Longing*, 127.

'read' in this way, the portrait miniature was especially susceptible to such an analogy. For a start, it shared the materiality of a text, being painted on vellum using many of the same techniques and pigments as manuscript paintings. In addition, these fragile surfaces would almost always have been contained in a locket or box, which had to be opened like the binding of a book. Indeed, Goldring has shown that records of a 'booke of portraitures' produced by Hilliard in 1570-1 must refer to a girdle book, or 'booke of gold'. These were miniature, jewelled replicas, which opened like a book and could contain either a tiny (usually religious) text or one or more portrait miniatures.[193] Stewart has explained that the appeal of miniature books depended 'on the contrast between the physical and abstract features of the mark' and the 'tension [miniature writing] creates between… surface and depth'.[194] This same rhetoric of discrepancy, I suggest, attended the miniature portrait as much as miniature writing.

However, the link between the portrait miniature and a condensed form of text goes beyond its materials and settings. The portrait miniature also shared the same discursive and physical spaces as the 'miniature' verse forms of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Sonnets, epigrams and short lyrics were passed from hand to hand at court on small roles of parchment, and would often have been kept in the same boxes as the equally secretive portrait miniature. Patricia Fumerton has explored the structural analogies between Sidney's sonnets and the portrait miniature, while other critics have noted the prominence of the 'pictured face' in Shakespeare's collection of sonnets.[195] At times the face seems to be a direct conduit between the speaker's feelings and the outside world. In Wyatt's translation of Petrarch's sonnet 140, love:

> Into my face presseth with bold pretence
> And therein campeth, spreading his banner.[196]

The metaphors here argue for the pronounced visibility of Wyatt's emotion, given the physicality of the verb 'presseth' and the sense of display in love 'spreading his banner' across the speaker's face. In this sonnet the direct connection between the face and the heart leaves the speaker vulnerable to his love's disdain. Indeed, the act of looking at another's face and being looked at in return could be fraught with danger. Thijs Weststeijn has explained how, according to some Renaissance vision theories, an "ocular spirit", originating in the viewer's mind, could emanate

[193] Goldring, *Nicholas Hilliard*, 100-102.
[194] Stewart, *On Longing*, 38 and 41.
[195] Fumerton, ""Secret" Acts."; Peter Sacks, 'The Faces of the Sonnet', in Jonathan F. S. Post, ed., *Green Thoughts, Green Shades: Essays by Contemporary Poets on the Early Modern Lyric* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).
[196] Wyatt in Payne and Hunter, eds., *Renaissance Literature*, 106.

from them and 'infect' the other person.[197] According to this model, the eyes were a crucial site of exchange and offer a direct channel to and from the heart, as Castiglione explains in *The Life of a Courtier*: 'those quick spirits… issue from the eyes, being generated near the heart, enter again by the eyes (whither they are aimed like an arrow at the mark), and naturally reach the heart as if it were their abode'.[198]

This understanding of the face could have been applied to larger panel portraits, as well as portrait miniatures. However, the association between the portrait miniature and the poems which express such ideas may have made viewers more likely to see a miniature as a conduit to the sitter's heart, especially at a time when panel portraits often had more formal, official roles. Indeed, Zöllner has argued that depicting the soul in a portrait could be undesirable in some contexts, representing an unwelcome intrusion and a violation of privacy. However, the private nature of the portrait miniature may have sanctioned a direct and intimate encounter between the viewer and sitter.

Indeed, Hilliard seems to accentuate the crucial role of the eyes in providing access to the sitter's inner spirit by giving particular attention to rendering the eye. In his *Treatise* he twice states that 'the eye is the life of the picture' and argues that the correct placing of the pupil and the 'whit spek' of reflected light is crucial, though it 'seemeth but a slight thing'.[199] The importance of the eyes is also borne out by their manner of depiction. While Hilliard describes how other features of the face are developed incrementally and suggestively 'by little and little',[200] the eye is painted in a bold and linear manner, piercing the delicate rendering of the face and offering a window beyond the (sur)face of the painting. We can see this clearly in several of the miniatures illustrated, including figures 4, 12, 27 and 41, where the intense black pupil and lash line contrast dramatically with the translucent hatching of the skin. Although not every Tudor miniature deploys the direct gaze of sitter, the London corpus testifies to the preference for this format, with 65% of sitters looking directly at the viewer, more so in as the century progresses.

What is it that we find, then, when we pierce beneath these miniature painted surfaces? In a literal sense, we usually find a playing card, and the recent work of Karin Leonard has suggested that this too provided a layer of meaning beneath the painted image.[201] The kind of statements implied

[197] Thijs Weststeijn, 'Seeing and the Transfer of Spirits in Early Modern Art Theory', in John Shannon Hendrix and Charles H. Carman, *Renaissance Theories of Vision* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), 150.
[198] Baldesar Castiglione and Leonard Eckstein Opdycke (trans.), *The Book of the Courtier (1528)* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901), 232, https://warburg.sas.ac.uk/pdf/enh660b2449259.pdf, Warburg Institute Online.
[199] Hilliard et al., *A Treatise*, 78.
[200] Hilliard et al., *A Treatise*, 96.
[201] Karin Leonard, "Game of Thrones: Early Modern Playing Cards and Portrait Miniature Painting" (Paper presented at Hilliard, Oliver and the Miniature in Context, National Portrait Gallery, Unpublished, 2019).

about the sitter from the choice of playing card have yet to be fully explored, but they might have indicated elements of social status and a hierarchy of values. In a pictorial sense, a magnifying glass could have been used to look beneath the flawless surface and see lively complexity of the limning technique, perhaps thereby suggesting a similarly hidden complexity in the physical and spiritual make-up of the sitter.

At a more abstract level, our work so far suggests that the miniature's rhetoric of discrepancy between surface and depth, and little and large, pointed to a greater reality behind the painted surface, rather than a diminished void. This sense of scope, of *multum in parvo,* is the hallmark of one of the most dominant conceptual models of the Renaissance: the microcosm.[202] It may seem superficial to view the portrait miniature as a visualisation of man as microcosm, but in fact this telescopic habit of thinking may have influenced the way a Tudor audience responded to the size and scale of the portrait miniature. As Barkan notes, the most common form of this model in the Renaissance was the 'epistemological microcosm', where man contains the world within himself by virtue of the reach and capacity of his mind. This focused the microcosmic image on the human head, which of course is the compositional focus of the typical portrait miniature. Since Plato, the spherical shape of the head had been seen as evidence of its perfection and correspondence with a bigger reality, embodying the shape and completeness of the cosmos.[203] The oval or circular shape of most portrait miniatures (99% of the London corpus) has rarely been remarked upon, except insofar as this shape makes them easy and inviting to handle. However, in light of their possible association with the microcosmic model, this pervasive format may have heightened the impression of the sitter as a self-contained internal world, with its fathomless blue background a further suggestion of the encompassing celestial sphere.

Moreover, there is a linguistic link between the language of microcosm and descriptions of the portrait miniature. Just as portrait miniatures were referred to as pictures 'in little' (Hamlet refers to his uncle's 'picture in little', for example),[204] man is also linguistically miniaturised in these terms by George Herbert.[205] In his poem 'Man', Herbert paints the quintessential picture of man as microcosm, containing all things and reaching, both with figurative limbs and physical sight, the limits of the universe. This expansive vision is explicitly conveyed in geometrical terms – 'Man is all

[202] The seminal work on this paradigm of Early Modern culture is still Leonard Barkan, *Nature's Work of Art: The Human Body as Image of the World* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975).
[203] Barkan, *Nature's Work of Art*, 12.
[204] From *Hamlet* (II.2.367) in Shakespeare, *Complete Works*, 695.
[205] Though Herbert falls outside our sixteenth century time frame, the microcosmic impulse is described by Barkan as a fundamentally conservative one, which remained 'remarkably unshaken by new visions of the universe', Barkan, *Nature's Work of Art*, 48.

symmetry,/ Full of proportions, one limb to another' (lines 13-14)[206] – evoking a mathematical sense of scale. The human microcosm, however, is summed up in a simpler and more familiar phrase: man is 'in little all the sphere' (line 22). Herbert's poem indicates, not only the microcosmic nature of man, but microcosmic potential of language. The poem acts as an extended, lyrical definition of its diminutive title, showing the immense richness of signification which may be contained in a small space, be it a word or a miniature image.

This act of expansion suggests the ambition and scope of microcosmic thought, a quality which seems to be echoed in the monumental quality of most portrait miniatures. The sitters declare their inherent value by dominating the picture plane and the round compositions uncompromisingly focus attention towards the face. Not all the portraits have the forthright arrogance of Robert Dudley, Francis Bacon or Hilliard himself (figs. 3, 40 and 9). Portraits such as Oliver's miniature of Henry Stanley (fig. 15) suggest instead a knowing melancholy, while Holbein's Jane Small (fig. 44) looks lost in her own pensive reflections. Whatever the identity of the sitter, the powerful scale of the Tudor portrait miniature seems to demand attention, to assert that these are faces worth looking at, that their thoughts are worth guessing at. Their monumentality focuses on the face as a meaningful site of connection between surface and depth.

Returning to the miniature of Francis Bacon (fig. 40), we might be tempted to read the inscription as more open-ended. In Dürer's portrait of Erasmus the statement is unequivocal: the writings *are* a better depiction. Here, the conditional tense leaves the door open: *if* one could paint the mind… would it look like this face? As with the structure of the miniature itself, the inscription invites us to see the mind in the painted face while at the same time confronting us with the elusiveness of another's inner life. In Donne's verse letter, 'The Storm', the speaker claims that 'a hand or eye/ By Hilliard drawn, is worth an history'.[207] On the one hand, this line must refer to the greater respect traditionally given to narrative history painting according to the writings of figures like Alberti. But it could also imply that telling features like the eyes and hands can convey as much as a history painting, in terms of narrative content and meaning. There is perhaps a sense of these features as bearing witness to the 'history', or memories and experiences, of the individual.

There is a danger that this analysis of the structural effects of size and scale seems to collapse the varied techniques of Tudor miniaturists and the diverse effects of individual portrait miniatures into a single meaning. However, hopefully the varied interpretations given for the miniatures considered here show that these implications provided a springboard or a set of conditions which

[206] George Herbert, 'Man', in Payne and Hunter, eds., *Renaissance Literature*, 1043.
[207] Donne, *Selected Poetry*, 50.

encouraged the viewer to approach these portraits in terms of abstract values of interiority. The precise effect of each portrait could then be shaped, not only by the unique features of the sitter's face, but by their gaze, expression, costume and the particular technique of the painter. So, while Hilliard's style created more flawless, crystalline images, Oliver often used a more expressive technique (fig. 15), and where Horenbout and Hilliard tended towards head-and-shoulder portraits, Holbein and Oliver often gave more space to their compositions. As we have seen, although a certain combination of pictorial features dominated the Tudor miniature tradition, artists also felt able to make occasional departures from this formula for the sake of a particular effect – the flaming background of figure 12, for example, conveying the internal fire and passion which lies (literally) behind his face.

These intrinsic capacities of the miniature format were not always exploited, sometimes because the invitation to such intimacy was considered inappropriate (as in the case of most royal portraiture) [208] or because such subtle suggestions of character required virtuoso execution and sensitivity which not every portrait miniature achieved. However, the miniature is, as Lugli puts it, a 'fundamentally elastic condition',[209] always implying the full size and scope of the 'original'. This quality could be harnessed by artists in diverse ways to suggest an interiority and depth which cannot be represented in literal terms. At the same time, through a miniature format which offers intimacy while insisting on separation and distance, these portraits acknowledged that another's inner self will always, finally, evade our grasp.

[208] Frank Zöllner, "The" Motions of the Mind" in Renaissance Portraits: The Spiritual Dimension of Portraiture," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 68, no. H. 1 (2005).
[209] Lugli in Kee and Lugli, "Scale to Size: An Introduction."

CONCLUSION

We started with the proposition that size, as well as medium, is crucial to the ontology of the Tudor portrait miniature. Having outlined the dominant visual characteristics of the Tudor portrait miniature in terms of size and scale, the aim of this thesis has been to show that the significance of size goes beyond questions of definition and functionality. Instead, the miniature's particular combination of medium, miniaturisation and monumental scale offered a very different aesthetic experience compared with viewing a life-size panel portrait. Its dimensions draw the viewer in and create an unfamiliar encounter which is at once intimate and distant, immersive and exclusive. The miniature's pictorial construction creates a dynamic experience: at arm's length these compositions are powerful, restrained and monumental, but close up they become subtle, suggestive and detailed. Finally, we explored the possible meanings of miniaturisation, from the preciousness suggested by their compression, clarity and association with items of jewellery, to an implicit concern with abstract qualities and interiority, resulting from a rhetoric of discrepancy and the reduced physicality of the object and sitter.

However, there is one avenue (at least) still to explore, which is to propose that miniaturisation may have been of interest *in itself*, in addition to the added functionality, aesthetic experience and meaning which these reduced dimensions provided. That miniature portraits were produced at all is indicative: these were discretionary items, which required specialised skill and time to produce, and this was reflected in their price and the cost of setting them in a suitable locket or box. However, it is harder to uncover the kind of interest they may have stimulated in Tudor viewers.

Again, part of the answer may be transhistorical. We have already seen that the perception of scale was based partly on the capacities and norms provided by the human body. This may encourage certain universal responses to the miniature, a suspicion that lies behind John Mack's global survey of *The Art of Small Things*.[210] Though individual manifestations of the miniature vary widely and wonderfully in response to various local and historical factors, Mack identifies certain pervasive attitudes towards the small and miniature object. Such objects commonly seem to elicit affection, aesthetic enjoyment and wonder. At times, this sense of wonderment tips over into talismanic, even magical, associations stemming both from the seemingly supernatural nature of their creation and the sense that they represent a potent concentration of a particular substance or subject.[211] There also seems to be a fascination with miniaturisation that arises from the

[210] Mack, *Small Things*.
[211] Mack, *Small Things*, 72.

pushing of physical, perceptual and philosophical boundaries. Artists and craftsmen often compete at the limits of their dexterity, viewers strain their eyes to see every last detail, and in reaching the limits of physical vision perhaps encounter a quality which Kant called 'the sublime'. Kant applied this idea only with regard to objects which are so large that they transcend the apprehension of the senses. Kant proposed that such an inability to estimate the magnitude of something resulted in 'the awakening of a supersensible faculty within us.'[212] The miniature challenges us to contemplate the infinitely small rather than the infinitely large, but this involves the same stretching of apprehension and perhaps the same stimulation of the 'supersensible' or imaginative faculty.

It is hard to say whether all or any of these responses were felt by Tudor viewers of the portrait miniature, even if such reactions seem plausibly universal. Baxandall has noted that the recording of aesthetic responses is an unusual activity at the best of times, let alone in a period where the discourse about art was in its infancy.[213] Nevertheless, there is already a palpable resonance between the general tendencies above and the Tudor miniature: its role in courtly love and use of the 'amorous gaze', its jewel-like aura of value and the way it was 'worn as a kind of talisman',[214] and of course the documentary evidence of admiration for the art form. In addition, it is possible to identify specific intellectual and cultural trends in the sixteenth century that may have led to an interest in miniaturisation itself.

For a start, the very newness of art theory made it a live topic of debate, certainly in Italy, but also in humanist circles elsewhere in Europe. The appearance of the *paragone* debate in works like Castiglione's *Book of the Courtier*, translated by Thomas Hoby in 1561, promoted such topics as deserving of general interest among an educated audience.[215] Tudor elites may well have read key works of Italian art theory in Latin or Italian (Sir Thomas Tresham, for example, owned copies of treatises by Alberti, Dürer, Palladio and Vitruvius[216]), but the translation of Lomazzo's *Tract Concerning the Artes of Curious Paintinge, Carving and Building* in 1598 shows a growing interest in and availability of such literature. Lomazzo dedicates the entire first book of the treatise to proportion, emphasising the necessity of maths, geometry and perspective as 'the foundation of…

[212] Kant, *Critique of Judgement*, 81.
[213] Michael Baxandall, *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth Century Italy: A Primer in the Social History of Pictorial Style*, 2nd ed. (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 111.
[214] Pointon, "Surrounded with Brilliants", 60.
[215] Baldassare Castiglione and Thomas translated by Hoby, *The Book of the Courtier; from the Italian, done into English by Sir Thomas Hoby, anno 1561* (London: David Nutt, 1900), https://archive.org/stream/bookofcourtierfr00castuoft/bookofcourtierfr00castuoft_djvu.txt.
[216] Christy Anderson, 'Learning to Read Architecture in the English Renaissance', in Gent, ed., *Albion's Classicism*, 259.

[the painter's] arte'.[217] The first book takes care to differentiate the 'true quantity and stature' of a man from how he may appear when distorted by distance and viewing angle.[218] This kind of theorising is highly relevant to how contemporaries may have understood the effect of miniaturisation, where a person is represented at a minute scale, yet devoid of a setting which would suggest either viewing distance, or the sitter's 'true quantity and stature'.

Hilliard himself provides evidence that questions of precisely this kind were generated by Tudor miniature portraits. In his *Treatise* he reports a conversation with Sir Philip Sidney, in which the poet 'demanded… whether it weare possibl in one scantling, as in the lenght of six inches of a littel or short man, and also of a mighty bige and taulle man in the same scantling, and that one might weel and apparently see which was the taule man, and which the little, the picture being just of one lenght.'[219] In other words, given the arbitrary size of a pictorial representation, Sidney asks how the true magnitude of a man can be indicated. Hilliard goes on to explain that, because the size of a man's head is usually the same, regardless of bodily stature, the smaller man will have a larger head in proportion to his body. Academic interest in this exchange has sometimes focused on the social significance of a courtier speaking with an artist as an intellectual equal, while Clarke Hulse argued that the conversation represented a more fundamental question about the extent to which art could represent the truth of nature.[220] However, I think it is more persuasive and interesting to take this exchange at face value. Sidney's question implies a specific interest in the effect of miniaturisation on the perceived size of the sitter, in how a viewer could infer the stature of a man without a frame of reference. Hilliard's answer, too, suggests that he understood this as a technical question about the representation of size and scale.

Such an interest on the part of a courtier is fascinating, but perhaps less surprising in an age which celebrated human discovery, knowledge and achievement. The importance of 'curiosity' in the early modern period, in the sense of a spirit of interest and enquiry, is attracting growing scholarly attention,[221] and although there has been an increased emphasis on continuity and conservatism in the sixteenth century, this period is still recognised as one which expanded the scope of and interest in 'natural philosophy'.[222] The place of the portrait miniature in this intellectual culture is indicated by the artform's early association with the adjective 'curious'. Haydocke describes

[217] Lomazzo and Haydock, *A Tracte*, 8.
[218] Lomazzo and Haydock, *A Tracte*, 16, 22-25.
[219] Hilliard et al., *A Treatise*, 82.
[220] Hulse, *Rule of Art*, 122-123.
[221] Rorbert J.W. Evans and Alexander Marr, *Curiosity and Wonder from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2006).
[222] David Colclough, 'Scientific Writing', in Hattaway, ed., *English Renaissance*, 150-159; Evans and Marr, *Curiosity and Wonder*.

limning as one of the 'curiouser kindes of painting' in 1598,[223] and by the mid seventeenth-century Norgate (or a later interpolator) can assert that 'there is no Art wherein Curiosity can be more expressed then in the Art of Limning'.[224]

The exact connotations of 'curiosity' in the sixteenth century deserve further research, but the OED entry for 'curious' suggests at least two avenues of meaning.[225] The first relates to intriguing intellectual qualities, reflected in questions such as Philip Sidney's. The second avenue of meaning is less familiar, becoming obsolete in the seventeenth century, and emphasises the manual skills of art and craftsmanship, connoting elaboration, delicacy, accuracy, intricacy, ingenuity. Baxandall has argued for the increased value of skill in Renaissance Italy, pointing to Alberti's comment that 'to represent the glitter of gold with plain colours brings the craftsman more admiration and praise [than using gold itself]'.[226] Although England is often seen as lagging behind Italy's artistic culture, an English preference for elaborate ornamentation (as noted in Chapter 1), the recruitment of foreign craftsmen by Henry VIII, and the use of adjectives such as 'curious' in relation to specialised artistic techniques suggest a similar regard for great skill and refined execution.

Indeed, Hilliard's own *Treatise* is evidence of an interest, not just in the finished object, but the mysterious and wonderful process of creating the portrait miniature. Hilliard's work does not seem to be written for his fellow craftsmen, or even for an amateur. While *seeming* to explain his working methods, he actually increases the aura surrounding his paintings, emphasising the fineness of his materials, the purity of his colours and the skill, discipline and judgement of the painter. The greatest detail is dedicated to the fastidious conditions required for limning: water 'distilled most pure', gum arabic 'of the whitest and briclest', clothes 'such as sheadeth lest dust or haires', clean air, good light, nice smells.[227] The extreme size of the miniature is evoked by the similarly extreme efforts and conditions required in its execution. In describing the aesthetics of his painting process, Hilliard seems to have sensed something that academics such as Sheila Kohring have only recently articulated: that sometimes a particularly unusual or skilful means of production becomes embedded in the aesthetic of the finished object, that the creative process itself 'characterises [the object] as special, enchanted or ritually charged'.[228]

---

[223] Haydock's preface, in Lomazzo and Haydock, *A Tracte.*
[224] Norgate, *Miniatura*, Introduction xxi.
[225] Oxford English Dictionary, *"curious, adj."* (Oxford University Press). http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/46040?rskey=Tz0nJB&.
[226] Leon Battista Alberti in Baxandall, *Painting and Experience*, 16.
[227] Hilliard et al., *A Treatise,* 72.
[228] Sheila Kohring, "Bodily Skill and the Aesthetics of Miniaturisation," *Pallas.* 86, no. 86 (2011): 34, https://www.jstor.org/stable/43606684?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents.

It seems plausible, then, that Tudor audiences might have been interested in the phenomenon of miniaturisation itself, the skill required to achieve it and the questions it raised about proportion and representation. Indeed, having explored the multifaceted effects and meanings of miniaturisation, it seems less surprising that the portrait miniature proved so popular and appealing to Tudor audiences: these portraits were visually powerful, intellectually stimulating, aesthetically pleasing, inherently meaningful and yet tantalisingly secretive. However, as we have seen, these qualities were dependent upon a complex interaction between size, scale and other pictorial qualities such as colour, line, shadowing and detail. From portrait to portrait the exact impression also varies due to the idiosyncrasy of each sitter, their particular posture and subtleties of expression. It would therefore be fascinating and informative to see how the effects and meanings of miniaturisation shift and develop beyond the sixteenth century: how the monumentality of the Tudor miniature was affected by the more *sfumato* techniques of John Hoskins and Peter Oliver, how the meanings implied by miniaturisation might have changed when portrait miniatures started to look more like the large oil portraits of Van Dyck, how the aesthetics of the portrait miniature were altered by the use of enamel and ivory, and how the experience of viewing a miniature changed as miniatures came to be worn uncovered.

In an era when so much imposes upon and competes for our attention, it is perhaps unsurprising that the diminutive size of the portrait miniature has escaped scholarly scrutiny. However, the aim of this research has been to contest definitions of the portrait miniature which focus only on medium and technique, and expose the substantial and multifaceted role played by size and scale in the appeal of these tiny works of art. The word 'appeal' lies at the heart of this research and the paintings it has focused upon. The Tudor portrait miniature called the viewer away from the noise and theatre of life at court, it attracted attention rather than imposing upon it, it silently asked for contemplation rather than making public statements about the sitter. The portrait miniature asserts the values of invitation, understatement, introspection and relationship. Like a sudden *pianissimo* in the middle of a grand orchestral symphony, these subtle qualities require our attention and captivate the audience with a quiet drama of their own. In a loud and uncertain world, these portraits continue to captivate and 'appeal', in large part thanks to their manipulation of size and scale.

ILLUSTRATIONS

1. Nicholas Hilliard, *Young Man Among Roses*, c.1587. Watercolour and bodycolour, with gold and silver, on vellum laid on card, 135 x 73mm. [life size]

2. Hans Holbein the Younger, *Hans of Antwerp*, c.1532. Oil on panel, 131 x 131mm. [life size]

3. Nicholas Hilliard, *Robert Dudley, 1st Earl of Leicester*, 1576. Watercolour on vellum, 44 x 44mm. [life size on left]

4. Nicholas Hilliard, *Leonard Darr*, 1591. Watercolour and body colour on vellum, laid on card, 70 x 55mm. [life size]

5. Hans Holbein the Younger, *Georg Giese*, 1532. Oil on wood, 960 x 860mm. [not to scale]

6. Steven Cornelisz van Herwijck, *Richard Martin (obverse)*, 1562. Cast and chased silver, 57mm diameter. [life size]

7. Hans Holbein the Younger, *Anne of Cleves*, 1539. Watercolour on vellum, laid on a playing card, 44mm diameter. Box: ivory base and lid, 61mm diameter. [life size on left]

8. Nicholas Hilliard, *Portrait of a Lady, perhaps Penelope, Lady Rich (1563-1607)*, c.1589. Watercolour on vellum, laid on card, 57 x 46 mm. [life size on left]

9. Nicholas Hilliard, *Self-Portrait, Aged 30*, 1577. Watercolour on vellum, laid on card, 41mm diameter. [life size on left]

10. Anon, *Cameo of Elizabeth I*, 16th century, English. Onyx in gold collet frame, 24 x 20mm. [life size on left]

11. Nicholas Hilliard, *The Heneage Jewel*, c.1595. Watercolour on vellum, set in enamelled gold locket with table-cut diamonds, Burmese rubies and rock crystal, 70 x 51mm.
[both life size]

12. Nicholas Hilliard, *An Unknown Man*, c.1600. Watercolour on vellum laid on card, 69 x 54mm. [life size]

13. Isaac Oliver, *A Young Man Seated Under a Tree*, c1590-1595. Watercolour on vellum laid on card, 124 x 89mm. [life size]

14. Isaac Oliver, *Isaac Oliver*, c.1590. Watercolour on vellum, 64 x 51mm. [life size on left]

15. Isaac Oliver, *Henry Stanley, 4th Early of Derby*, c.1590. Watercolour on vellum, 51 x 42mm. [life size on left]

16. Nicholas Hilliard, *An Unknown Young Man*, 1590-1593. Watercolour on vellum laid on a playing card and contained in a box of turned ivory, 50 x 42mm. [life size on left]

17. Nicholas Hilliard, *An Unknown Man, aged 24*, 1572. Watercolour on vellum laid on a playing card, 60 x 48mm. [life size on left]

18. Nicholas Hilliard, *Sir Francis Drake*, 1581. Watercolour on vellum, 28mm diameter.

19. Attributed to George Gower, *Portrait of Lettice Knollys*, c.1585. Oil on panel, dimensions unknown. [not to scale]

20. Jacopo Tintoretto (Robusti), *Crucifixion*, 1565. Oil on canvas, 5180 x 1220mm [not to scale]

21. Hans Holbein the Younger, *Drawing: Design for a Chimney Piece*, c.1537-43. Black and brown ink with grey, blue and red wash on paper, 539 x 427mm. [not to scale]

22. Flemish, *The Triumphs of Petrarch*, 1500-1523. Woven silk and wool tapestry, 4030 x 8230mm. [not to scale]

23. John Jones, *Communion Cup and Paten Cover*, 1571-1574. Engraved silver with gilded interiors, 198mm high. [not to scale]

24. Unknown, *Wanli Ewer with English Mounts*, 1560-1586. Painted porcelain with silver-gilt mounts, 256 x 175mm. [not to scale]

25. Agostino dei Musi, *Ewer,* London 1583-1584. Silver gilt, embossed and chased with cast details, 330 x 170mm. [not to scale]

26. Agostino Veneziano, *Engraving of a Ewer*, 1531. Engraving, 253 x 169mm. [not to scale]

27. Nicholas Hilliard, detail of *Robert Dudley, 1st Earl of Leicester*, 1576. Watercolour on vellum, 44 x 44mm. [not to scale]

28. Michelangelo di Lodovico Buonarroti Simoni, *Madonna of the Stairs*, c.1491. Marble relief sculpture, 567 x 401mm. [not to scale]

29. Hans Holbein the Younger and workshop, *Design for a Cup for Jane Seymour*, 1536-1537. Pen and brush drawing in black ink on paper, 375 x 143mm. [not to scale]

30. Hans Holbein the Younger, detail from *King Henry VIII; King Henry VII*, 1536-1537. Cartoon in ink and watercolour on paper, 2578 x 1372mm. [not to scale]

31. Lucas Horenbout, *Portrait miniature of a gentleman, possibly Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk*, c.1532. Watercolour on vellum, laid on card, 40mm diameter. [life size on left]

32. Anglo-Netherlandish School, *Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester*, 1564. Oil on panel, 1070 x 80mm. [not to scale, fig. 3 given below for comparison]

33. Raphael da Urbino, *Madonna della Sedia*, 1513-1514. Oil on panel, 710mm diameter. [not to scale]

34. Hans Holbein the Younger, *Hermann Hillebrandt von Wedigh*, 1533. Oil and tempera on panel, 390 x 300mm. [not to scale]

35. Hans Holbein the Younger, *Jean de Dinteville and Georges de Selve ('The Ambassadors')*, 1533. Oil on oak, 2070 x 2095mm. [not to scale]

36. Attributed to William Scrots, *Edward VI*, 1546-1547. Oil on panel, 1072 x 820mm. [not to scale]

37. Steven van der Meulen, *The Hampden Portrait*, 1563. Oil on canvas, 1960 x 1400mm. [not to scale]

38. Unknown Netherlandish artist, *Sir Thomas Gresham*, c.1565. Oil on panel, 1003 x 724mm. [not to scale]

39. Hans Holbein the Younger, *Anne of Cleves*, c.1539. Oil on parchment, mounted on canvas, 650 x 480 mm. [not to scale, fig. 7 given below as comparison]

40. Nicholas Hilliard, *Francis Bacon, 1st Viscount St Alban*, 1578. Watercolour and bodycolour on vellum laid on card, 60 x 47 mm. [life size on the left]

41. Nicholas Hilliard, *An Unknown Woman, Aged 26*, 1593. Watercolour on vellum laid on playing card, 58 x 48mm. [life size on the left]

42. Albrecht Dürer, *Erasmus of Rotterdam*, 1526. Engraving, 248 x 191mm. [not to scale]

43. Jean Fouquet, *Carrying the Cross* in the Hours of Etienne Chevalier, c.1452-c.1460. Illumination on parchment, 165 x 120mm. [life size]

44. Hans Holbein the Younger, *Mrs Jane Small, formerly Mrs Pemberton*, c.1536. Watercolour on vellum in a decorated case, 52mm diameter. [life size on left]

45. Hans Holbein the Younger, *Henry Brandon, 2nd Duke of Suffolk (1535-1551)*, c.1541. Watercolour on vellum laid on playing card, 56mm diameter. [life size on left]

46. Hans Holbein the Younger, *Thomas Cromwell, Earl of Essex*, c.1532-1533. Watercolour and bodycolour on vellum, 44mm diameter. [life size on left]

47. Nicholas Hilliard, *Man Clasping a Hand from a Cloud*, 1588. Watercolour on vellum, 60 x 49.5mm. [life size on left]

48. Isaac Oliver, *Elizabeth I [unfinished]*, 1590-1592. Watercolour on vellum stuck to a playing card, 82 x 52mm. [life size]

APPENDIX I – CORPUS DATA

Corpus Conditions:

This corpus includes paintings from the collections of the Victoria and Albert Museum, the National Portrait Gallery (London) and the Royal Collection Trust which satisfy the following criteria:

- Completed in the years up to and including 1600
- Painted in England or by an English-based artist
- Painted in watercolour
- Excluding cabinet miniatures (larger limned paintings, usually rectangular and with landscape or interior settings)

These conditions resulted in a corpus of 80 miniatures of which 2 are unfinished and 1 had no available images (highlighted in blue). Where relevant, these miniatures are excluded from the calculation of percentages.

Where a single date was required (e.g. to order the corpus by date) but a date range is given, an average date was used, rounded up to the next year. E.g. 1560-1565 gives an average date of 1562.5, which is rounded up to 1563.

The corpus is presented in 4 separate extracts according to theme, but the order of the records is kept constant and the museum number and short title is given on every page for ease of comparison.

Fields highlighted in yellow ( ) indicate where I have had to make informed guesses or assumptions.

The fields in light green ( ) in Corpus Extract C indicate where certain colours have not been counted as 'main colours' because they are insignificant details. White cuffs and ruffs have also been discounted where they do not greatly contribute to the colour palette.

A table of key statistics can be found in Appendix II.

Abbreviations used in the Corpus

- V&A – Victoria and Albert Museum
- NPG – National Portrait Gallery
- RCT – Royal Collection Trust
- PM – Portrait Miniature
- H&S – Head and Shoulders
- Y/N/? – Yes/No/Unable to tell
- D – Detail only

Corpus Extract A – Historical Data

Number	Title	Collection	Artist	Date
NPG 6453	Queen Mary I	NPG	Horenbout, L	1525
RCIN 420042	Portrait of a man, trad identified as Sir Henry Guildford	RCT	Unknown	1530-5
NPG 4682	Katherine of Aragon	NPG	Horenbout, L	1525
P.40&A-1935	Mrs Jane Small, formerly Mrs Pemberton	V&A	Holbein, H	1536
NPG L244	Katherine of Aragon	NPG	Horenbout, L	1525-6
P.8-1947	An unknown woman	V&A	Hilliard, N	1575-80
RCIN 420010	Henry VIII [teal tunic]	RCT	Horenbout, L	1526-7
NPG 6761	Francis Bacon, 1st Viscount St Alban	NPG	Hilliard, N	1578
P.2-1942	Alice Brandon, Mrs Hilliard	V&A	Hilliard, N	1578
RCIN420641	Mary Queen of Scots	RCT	Hilliard, N	1578-9
RCIN 420640	Henry VIII [green tunic]	RCT	Horenbout, L	1526-7
P.22-1942	The Emperor Charles V	V&A	Horenbout, L	1525-30
E.401-2013	Portrait miniature of a gentleman, possibly Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk	V&A	Horenbout, L	1532
P.24-1975	Portrait Miniature [Mary Queen of Scots)	V&A	Hilliard, N	1578-9
RCIN 422026	Elizabeth I	RCT	Hilliard, N	1580-5
E.1178-1988	Portrait of an unknown man	V&A	Hilliard, N	1580-5
NPG 6310	Thomas Cromwell, Earl of Essex	NPG	Holbein, H	1532-3
RCIN 420019	Henry Fitzroy, Duke of Richmond and Somerset	RCT	Horenbout, L	1533-4
NPG 4106	Sir Walter Raleigh	NPG	Hilliard, N	1585
RCIN 422292	Elizabeth, Lady Audley	RCT	Holbein, H	1538
P.23-1975	Portrait of Queen Elizabeth I	V&A	Hilliard, N	1586-7
P.2-1974	Portrait of an unknown woman	V&A	Hilliard, N	1585-90
NPG 6311	Thomas Cromwell, Earl of Essex	NPG	Studio of Holbein	1537
P.163-1910	Young man among roses	V&A	Hilliard, N	1587
RCIN 422293	Portrait of a lady, perhaps Katherine Howard	RCT	Holbein, H	1540
P.153:1,2-1910	Portrait miniature of Anne of Cleves	V&A	Holbein, H	1539
NPG 5549	Sir Christopher Hatton	NPG	Hilliard, N	1588
P.15-1977	Portrait miniature of an unknown young man	V&A	Hilliard, N	1588
RCIN 422294	Henry Brandon, 2nd Duke of Suffolk	RCT	Holbein, H	1541
P.21-1942	Man clasping a hand from a cloud	V&A	Hilliard, N	1588
RCIN 422295	Charles Brandon, 3rd Duke of Suffolk	RCT	Holbein, H	1541
P.21-1954	A girl, formerly thought to be Queen Elizabeth I as princess	V&A	Teerlinc, L	1549
P.10&A-1979	Portrait miniature of Katherine Grey, Countess of Herford	V&A	Teerlinc, L	1555-1560
RCIN 420011	Henry VIII	RCT	British school	1540-70
P.4&A-1974	Portrait miniature of an unknown youth in yellow	V&A	Hilliard, N	1585-90
RCIN 420944+[@Number]	Elizabeth I	RCT	Hilliard? (Disputed)	1560-5
RCIN 420020	Portrait of a Lady, perhaps Penelope, Lady Rich	RCT	Hilliard, N	1589
P.48-1984	Portrait of an unknown woman	V&A	Teerlinc, L	1560
NPG 6273	Unknown man, possibly George Clifford, 3rd Earl of Cumberland	NPG	Hilliard, N	1590

NPG 6302	Henry Stanley, 4th Earl of Derby	NPG	Oliver, I	1590
RCIN 420987	Elizabeth I	RCT	British school	1565
NPG 108	Queen Elizabeth I	NPG	Hilliard, N	1572
RCIN 420028	Portrait of an unknown man	RCT	British school	1590
RCIN 420112	Portrait of a lady, possibly Frances Walsingham	RCT	Hilliard, N	1590
E.1170-1988	Portrait of Mary Dudley, Lady Sidney	V&A	Teerlinc, L	1575
NPG 4852	Isaac Oliver	NPG	Oliver, I	1590
P.5-1947	Peregrine Bertie, Lord Willoughby D'Eresby	V&A	Oliver, I	1590
887:1-1894	An unknown man, presumably a member of the Barbor Family	V&A	Hilliard, N	1590
E.1174-1988	Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester	V&A	Hilliard, N	1571-4
E.1171-1988	Portrait of Robert Sidney, Viscount Lisle	V&A	Hilliard, N	1590
RCIN 420034	A self-portrait	RCT	Oliver, I	1590
NPG 4197	Robert Dudley, 1st Earl of Leicester	NPG	Hilliard, N	1576
P.11-1947	Portrait of an unknown man, formerly called Sir Francis Drake	V&A	Oliver, I	1590
P.139-1910	John Croker of Barton, Oxfordshire	V&A	Hilliard, N	Late 16th C
P.139-1910	Wife of John Croker, Frances	V&A	Hilliard, N	Late 16th C
P.27-1977	An unknown woman	V&A	Hilliard, N	1576
P.8-1945	An unknown woman	V&A	Hilliard, N	1590
P.37-1941	An unknown man aged 27	V&A	Oliver, I	1590
P.145-1910	An unknown girl, aged four	V&A	Oliver, I	1590
P.154-1910	Richard Hilliard	V&A	Hilliard, N	1576-77
P.146-1910	An unknown girl, aged five	V&A	Oliver, I	1590
P.138-1910	Sir Christopher Hatton	V&A	Hilliard, N	1588-91
P.5:1-1974	Portrait miniature of an unknown man	V&A	Hilliard, N	1590
P.8-1940	Elizabeth I	V&A	Oliver, I	1590-2
P.155-1910	Self-portrait, aged 30	V&A	Hilliard, N	1577
P.3-1974	An unknown young man	V&A	Hilliard, N	1590-3
P.9-1947	An unknown woman	V&A	Hilliard, N	1590-3
NPG 4851	Sir Francis Drake	NPG	Hilliard, N	1581
P.1-1942	An unknown man, aged 24	V&A	Hilliard, N	1572
P.134-1910	An unknown woman, aged 26	V&A	Hilliard, N	1593
M.81-1935	The Heneage Jewel	V&A	Hilliard, N	1595
RCIN 420021	Elizabeth I	RCT	Hilliard, N	1583-7
NPG 4966	Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex	NPG	Oliver, I	1596
P.4-1917	A man, called Sir Arundel Talbot	V&A	Oliver, I	1596
RCIN 420933	Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex	RCT	Oliver, I	1596-8
P.5-1944	An unknown man	V&A	Hilliard, N	1597
RCIN 421029	Queen Elizabeth I	RCT	Hilliard, N	1595-1600
NPG 5994	Mary Herbert, Countess of Pembroke	NPG	Hilliard, N	1590
RCIN 420063	Portrait of an unknown woman	RCT	Oliver, I	1600
P.5 1917	An unknown man (against flames)	V&A	Hilliard, N	1600

Corpus Extract B – Format and Dimensions

Number	Short Title	Width	Height	Length	Shape of Picture	Aspect	Gaze
NPG 6453	Queen Mary I	35	35	H&S	Circle	Three-quarter	Left
RCIN 420042	Man, trad Sir Henry Guildford	67	79	Half	Oval	Three-quarter	Right
NPG 4682	Katherine of Aragon	38	38	H&S	Circle	Three-quarter	Left
P.40&A-1935	Mrs Jane Small	52	52	Half	Circle	Three-quarter	Right
NPG L244	Katherine of Aragon	39	39	H&S	Circle	Three-quarter	Left
P.8-1947	An Unknown Woman	32.5	39	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
RCIN 420010	Henry VIII [teal tunic]	40	40	H&S	Circle	Three-quarter	Right
NPG 6761	Francis Bacon	47	60	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
P.2-1942	Alice Brandon	57.5	59	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
RCIN420641	Mary Queen of Scots	37	45	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Left
RCIN 420640	Henry VIII [green tunic]	47	47	H&S	Circle	Three-quarter	Right
P.22-1942	The Emperor Charles V	42	42	H&S	Circle	Three-quarter	Right
E.401-2013	Gentleman, possibly Charles Brandon	40	40	H&S	Circle	Three-quarter	Right
P.24-1975	Mary Queen of Scots	25	40	H&S	Oval on later mount	Three-quarter	Left
RCIN 422026	Elizabeth I	33	38	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
E.1178-1988	Portrait of an unknown man	41	48	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
NPG 6310	Thomas Cromwell	44	44	H&S	Circle	Three-quarter	Left
RCIN 420019	Henry Fitzroy	44	44	H&S	Circle	Three-quarter	Unclear
NPG 4106	Sir Walter Raleigh	41	48	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
RCIN 422292	Elizabeth, Lady Audley	56	56	Half	Circle	Three-quarter	Right
P.23-1975	Portrait of Queen Elizabeth I	37	45	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Left
P.2-1974	Portrait of an unknown woman	39	46	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
NPG 6311	Thomas Cromwell	44	44	H&S	Circle	Three-quarter	Left
P.163-1910	Young Man among Roses	73	135	Full	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
RCIN 422293	Lady, perhaps Katherine Howard	63	63	Half	Circle	Three-quarter	Direct
P.153:1,2-1910	Anne of Cleves	44.5	44.5	H&S	Circle	Full-face	Direct
NPG 5549	Sir Christopher Hatton	35	47	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
P.15-1977	Unknown young man	44	55	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
RCIN 422294	Henry Brandon	54	54	Half	Circle	Three-quarter	Right
P.21-1942	Man Clasping a Hand	49.5	60	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
RCIN 422295	Charles Brandon	55	55	Half	Circle	Full-face	Direct
P.21-1954	A Girl, formerly Queen Elizabeth I	48	48	Half	Circle	Three-quarter	Left
P.10&A-1979	Portrait miniature of Katherine Grey	?	?	Half	Circle	Three-quarter	Left
RCIN 420011	Henry VIII	36	36	H&S	Circle	Full-face	Direct
P.4&A-1974	Unknown youth in yellow	66	66	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
RCIN 420944	Elizabeth I	52	52	Half	Circle	Almost full	Left
RCIN 420020	Lady, perhaps Penelope, Lady Rich	46	57	Full	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
P.48-1984	Portrait of an unknown woman	25	25	Head + ruff	Circle	Three-quarter	Left
NPG 6273	Possibly George Clifford	38	48	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
NPG 6302	Henry Stanley, 4th Earl of Derby	42	51	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Unclear
RCIN 420987	Elizabeth I	45	45	Half	Circle	Almost full	Direct

NPG 108	Queen Elizabeth I	48	51	Half	Oval	Three-quarter	Right
RCIN 420028	Portrait of an unknown man	44	52	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
RCIN 420112	Lady, possibly Frances Walsingham	47	57	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
E.1170-1988	Mary Dudley, Lady Sidney	36	36	Half	Circle	Three-quarter	Direct
NPG 4852	Isaac Oliver	51	65	Half	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
P.5-1947	Peregrine Bertie	26	36	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
887:1-1894	Man, presumably of Barbor Family	29	37	H&S	Oval	Profile	Left
E.1174-1988	Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester	44	44	H&S	Circle	Three-quarter	Direct
E.1171-1988	Portrait of Robert Sidney	32	37	?	Oval	?	?
RCIN 420034	A Self-portrait	37	45	Half	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
NPG 4197	Robert Dudley, 1st Earl of Leicester	44	44	H&S	Circle	Three-quarter	Direct
P.11-1947	Man formerly called Francis Drake	35	41	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
P.139-1910	John Croker of Barton	41	55	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
P.139-1910	Wife of John Croker, Frances	41	55	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
P.27-1977	An Unknown Woman	37	37	H&S	Circle	Three-quarter	Direct
P.8-1945	An Unknown Woman	43	51.5	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
P.37-1941	An Unknown Man Aged 27	43.5	54	Half	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
P.145-1910	An Unknown Girl, aged four	44	54	Half	Oval	Full-face	Direct
P.154-1910	Richard Hilliard	41	41	H&S	Circle	Three-quarter	Direct
P.146-1910	An Unknown Girl, aged five	44	54	Half	Oval	Full-face	Direct
P.138-1910	Sir Christopher Hatton	44	56	Full	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
P.5:1-1974	An Unknown Man	?	?	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Left
P.8-1940	Elizabeth I	52	82	Half	Oval	Three-quarter	Right
P.155-1910	Self-portrait, aged 30	41	41	H&S	Circle	Three-quarter	Direct
P.3-1974	An Unknown Young Man	42	50	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
P.9-1947	An Unknown Woman	47	59	Half	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
NPG 4851	Sir Francis Drake	28	28	H&S	Circle	Three-quarter	Direct
P.1-1942	An Unknown Man, aged 24	48	60	H&S	Rectangle	Three-quarter	Direct
P.134-1910	An Unknown Woman, aged 26	48	58	Half	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
M.81-1935	The Heneage Jewel	45	60	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
RCIN 420021	Elizabeth I	18	18	Head	Circle	Three-quarter	Unclear
NPG 4966	Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex	41	51	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
P.4-1917	A Man, called Sir Arundel Talbot	54	69	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
RCIN 420933	Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex	42	50	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
P.5-1944	An Unknown Man	40	50	Half	Oval	Three-quarter	Left
RCIN 421029	Queen Elizabeth I	45	54	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
NPG 5994	Mary Herbert, Countess of Pembroke	54	54	H&S	Circle	Three-quarter	Direct
RCIN 420063	Portrait of an Unknown Woman	59	78	H&S	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct
P.5 1917	An Unknown Man (against flames)	54	69	Half	Oval	Three-quarter	Direct

Corpus Extract C – Background and Colour

Number	Short Title	Background colour	Costume Colour 1	Costume Colour 2	Costume Colour 3	3 or fewer colours
NPG 6453	Queen Mary I	Blue	Black	White	Gold & red detail	Y
RCIN 420042	Portrait of a Man	Blue	Light blue	White	Gold/buff/black details	Y
NPG 4682	Katherine of Aragon	Blue	Red	White	Gold & silver detail	Y
P.40&A-1935	Mrs Jane Small	Blue	Black	White cap and shawl	Red, gold and green detail	Y
NPG L244	Katherine of Aragon	Blue	Black	White	Copper detail	Y
P.8-1947	An unknown Woman	Blue	Unfinished	White		Unfinished
RCIN 420010	Henry VIII [teal tunic]	Blue	Teal	Brown fur	Orange, black	N
NPG 6761	Francis Bacon	Blue	Black	White		Y
P.2-1942	Alice Brandon, Mrs Hilliard	Blue	Black	White	Gold, green detail	Y
RCIN420641	Mary Queen of Scots	Blue	White	Black		Y
RCIN 420640	Henry VIII [green tunic]	Blue	Sage	Brown fur	Black, White and Gold	N
P.22-1942	The Emperor Charles V	Blue	Black	Green	White & gold detail	Y
E.401-2013	Possibly Charles Brandon	Blue	Black	Beige/brown		Y
P.24-1975	Mary Queen of Scots	Blue	Black	White		Y
RCIN 422026	Elizabeth I	Blue	Black	White	Elaborate jewel detail	N
E.1178-1988	An unknown man	Blue	Black	White		Y
NPG 6310	Thomas Cromwell	Blue	Black	Brown fur		Y
RCIN 420019	Henry Fitzroy	Blue	White	Black detail		Y
NPG 4106	Sir Walter Raleigh	Blue	White ruff	Black		Y
RCIN 422292	Elizabeth, Lady Audley	Blue	Red	Gold	Black & white detail	Y
P.23-1975	Portrait of Queen Elizabeth	Blue	Black	White		Y
P.2-1974	An unknown woman	Blue	Black	White ruff		Y
NPG 6311	Thomas Cromwell	Blue	Black	Brown fur	Gold detail	Y
P.163-1910	Young Man among Roses	Garden - multi	White	Black		N
RCIN 422293	Portrait of a Lady	Blue	Gold	Brown/black	Aqua/white detail	Y
P.153:1,2-1910	Anne of Cleves	Blue	Gold	Red/pink	White pearl detail	Y
NPG 5549	Sir Christopher Hatton	Blue	Black	White ruff	Gold & blue details	Y
P.15-1977	An unknown young man	Blue	Black	White collar		Y
RCIN 422294	Henry Brandon	Blue	Black	Green/red sleeves	White details	Y
P.21-1942	Man Clasping a Hand	Blue	Black	Grey	White & gold detail	Y
RCIN 422295	Charles Brandon	Blue	Light blue	Red stripes	Black & white detail	Y
P.21-1954	A Girl, formerly Elizabeth I	Blue	Black	White fur	Gold detail	Y
P.10&A-1979	Katherine Grey	Blue	Black	Grey fur	Gold detail	Y
RCIN 420011	Henry VIII	Blue	Black	White	Gold & red details	Y
P.4&A-1974	Unknown youth in yellow	Blue	Yellow	White		Y
RCIN 420944	Elizabeth I	Blue	Black	Gold	White detail	Y
RCIN 420020	Perhaps Lady Rich	Interior	White/grey	Black	Red detail	N
P.48-1984	An unknown woman	Blue	Black	White	Gold detail	Y

NPG 6273	Possibly George Clifford	Blue	Ivory	Black and pink details		Y
NPG 6302	Henry Stanley, 4th Earl of Derby	Blue	Black	White ruff		Y
RCIN 420987	Elizabeth I	Blue	Black	Gold sleeves	White detail	Y
NPG 108	Queen Elizabeth I	Blue	Black	White	Flowers, ribbons, gems -multi	N
RCIN 420028	An unknown man	Blue	Black	White		Y
RCIN 420112	Poss. Frances Walsingham	Blue	Ivory/white	Orange	Gold & black detail	Y
E.1170-1988	Mary Dudley, Lady Sidney	Blue	Black	White		Y
NPG 4852	Isaac Oliver	Blue	Black	White ruff	Red detail	Y
P.5-1947	Peregrine Bertie	Blue	Gold	Black detail	White detail	Y
887:1-1894	Man, presumably of the Barbor Family	Grey like stone	Gold	Blue	Red, beige, white	N
E.1174-1988	Robert Dudley	Grey damask	Black	White	Gold, red, green detail	Y
E.1171-1988	Portrait of Robert Sidney	?	?	?		?
RCIN 420034	A Self-portrait	Blue	Black	White ruff		Y
NPG 4197	Robert Dudley	Blue	Black	White ruff	Gold detail	Y
P.11-1947	Man (formerly Drake)	Blue	Black	White ruff	Red detail	Y
P.139-1910	John Croker of Barton	Blue	Ivory	White ruff		Y
P.139-1910	Wife of John Croker	Blue	Black	White	Gold detail	Y
P.27-1977	An Unknown Woman	Blue	Black	White	Gold detail	Y
P.8-1945	An Unknown Woman	Blue	White	Gold	Black detail	Y
P.37-1941	An Unknown Man Aged 27	Blue	Black	White ruff		Y
P.145-1910	An Unknown Girl, aged four	Blue	Black/grey	Red bonnet	White detail	Y
P.154-1910	Richard Hilliard	Blue	Black	Brown fur	White detail	Y
P.146-1910	An Unknown Girl, aged five	Blue	Black/grey	Red bonnet	White detail	Y
P.138-1910	Sir Christopher Hatton	Interior - multi	Black	Gold detail	Brown fur	N
P.5:1-1974	An unknown man	Red	Black	White		Y
P.8-1940	Elizabeth I	Blue	Unfinished			Unfinished
P.155-1910	Self-portrait, aged 30	Blue	Black	White ruff	Gold, green detail	Y
P.3-1974	An Unknown Young Man	Black	Grey	White	Pink detail	Y
P.9-1947	An Unknown Woman	Blue	Black	White ruff	Jewel detail	Y
NPG 4851	Sir Francis Drake	Blue	Ivory/white	Gold detail		Y
P.1-1942	Unknown Man, aged 24	Blue	Black	White	Green detail	Y
P.134-1910	Unknown Woman, aged 26	Blue	Black	White	Embroidery detail	Y
M.81-1935	The Heneage Jewel	Blue	White ruff	Gold detail	Colour ornaments	N
RCIN 420021	Elizabeth I	Gold, pink	White ruff	Jewel detail		Y
NPG 4966	Robert Devereux	Grey-blue	Black	White	Blue ribbon	Y
P.4-1917	Man, called Arundel Talbot	Blue	Black	White collar		Y
RCIN 420933	Robert Devereux	Grey-blue	Black	Blue ribbon	White detail	Y
P.5-1944	An Unknown Man	Blue	Yellow	White	Pink detail	Y
RCIN 421029	Queen Elizabeth I	Blue	White	Gold	Red detail	Y
NPG 5994	Mary Herbert	Blue	White ruff	Black	Floral detail	Y
RCIN 420063	Unknown Woman	Blue	Black	White	Jewel detail	Y
P.5 1917	Unknown Man (flames)	Flames	White	Jewel detail		Y

Corpus Extract D – Inscription, Symbolism and Jewellery Techniques

Number	Short Title	Inscription	Symbol	Notable inscription or symbol	Jewel techniques
NPG 6453	Queen Mary I	The Emperor	N	Possibly	N
RCIN 420042	Man, trad Sir Henry Guildford	N	N	N	N
NPG 4682	Katherine of Aragon	Katherine, his wife'	Cross necklace and brooch with HIS	N	N
P.40&A-1935	Mrs Jane Small	Anno Etatis Suae 23	Leaf, carnation, ears of wheat	Possibly	N
NPG L244	Katherine of Aragon	N	N	N	N
P.8-1947	An unknown Woman	Unfinished	Unfinished	Unfinished	Unfinished
RCIN 420010	Henry VIII [teal tunic]	Rex - Henricus - octavvs	N	N	N
NPG 6761	Francis Bacon	*1578 Si tabula daretur digna - Animum mallem - Es S 18	N	Y	N
P.2-1942	Alice Brandon	Ano Dni / * AEsS. 22, plus NH monogram above shoulders	N	N	N
RCIN 420641	Mary Queen of Scots	N	N	N	N
RCIN 420640	Henry VIII [green tunic]	HR VIII, An Etatis XXXV	N	N	N
P.22-1942	The Emperor Charles V	N	N	N	N
E.401-2013	Gentleman, possibly Charles Brandon	Ano XLVIII	N	N	N
P.24-1975	Mary Queen of Scots	Maria Regina Scotia on rectangular mount	N	N	N
RCIN 422026	Elizabeth I	N	N	N	Y
E.1178-1988	Portrait of an unknown man	*Directa reflexis firmius haerent. / AEtatis suae. 37	N	Y	N
NPG 6310	Thomas Cromwell	N	N	N	N
RCIN 420019	Henry Fitzroy	Henry Dvvk off Richemod - aetatis sva XV	N	N	N
NPG 4106	Sir Walter Raleigh	N	Black star on hat	Possibly	N
RCIN 422292	Elizabeth, Lady Audley	N	N	N	N
P.23-1975	Portrait of Queen Elizabeth I	Inscription on rectangle card mount	N	N	Y
P.2-1974	Portrait of an unknown woman	N	N	N	Y
NPG 6311	Thomas Cromwell	N	N	N	N
P.163-1910	Young Man among Roses	'Dat / poenas laudata fides'	Eglantine roses	Y	N
RCIN 422293	Lady, perhaps Katherine Howard	N	N	N	N
P.153:1,2-1910	Anne of Cleves	N	N	N	N
NPG 5549	Sir Christopher Hatton	N	Order of the garter chain	N	N
P.15-1977	Unknown young man	N	N	N	N
RCIN 422294	Henry Brandon	Statis suae 5.6. sepdem Anno 1535	N	N	N
P.21-1942	Man Clasping a Hand	*'Attici amoris ergo. / Ano. Dni. 1588'	Y	Y	N
RCIN 422295	Charles Brandon	Ann 1541 Etatis sva 3 - 10 Marci	N	N	N
P.21-1954	A Girl, formerly Queen Elizabeth I	AD 1549	N	N	N

P.10&A-1979	Portrait miniature of Katherine Grey	N	N	N	N
RCIN 420011	Henry VIII	N	N	N	N
P.4&A-1974	Unknown youth in yellow	N	N	N	D
RCIN 420944	Elizabeth I	Ano	Red and white roses in hair	N	N
RCIN 420020	Lady, perhaps Penelope, Lady Rich	N	Star shapped jewel in hair	Possibly	Y
P.48-1984	Portrait of an unknown woman	N	N	N	N
NPG 6273	Possibly George Clifford	Ano D [damaged] - Aetatis suae 30	Three pearl earring?	Possibly	D
NPG 6302	Henry Stanley, 4th Earl of Derby	N	N	N	N
RCIN 420987	Elizabeth I	N	N	N	N
NPG 108	Queen Elizabeth I	Monogram, 'Ano Dm 1572' to left and 'Aetatis fua 38' on right	Black circle pendant, roses	Possibly	Y
RCIN 420028	Portrait of an unknown man	N	N	N	N
RCIN 420112	Lady, possibly Frances Walsingham	N	N	N	Y
E.1170-1988	Mary Dudley, Lady Sidney	N	N	N	N
NPG 4852	Isaac Oliver	N	N	N	N
P.5-1947	Peregrine Bertie	N	N	N	N
887:1-1894	Man, presumably of Barbor Family	N	N	N	N
E.1174-1988	Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester	N	N	N	D
E.1171-1988	Portrait of Robert Sidney	?	?		?
RCIN 420034	A Self-portrait	Monogram of IO	N	N	N
NPG 4197	Robert Dudley, 1st Earl of Leicester	Ano Dm 1576 - Etatis Sue 44	N	N	D
P.11-1947	Man formerly called Francis Drake	N	N	N	N
P.139-1910	John Croker of Barton	N	N	N	N
P.139-1910	Wife of John Croker, Frances	N	Wearing a jewel	N	Y
P.27-1977	An Unknown Woman	'Ano Ani 1576 . AEtatis Suae. 31'	N	N	D
P.8-1945	An Unknown Woman	N	N	N	Y
P.37-1941	Unknown Man Aged 27	Ano Dni 1590 / AEtatis Suae 27.	N	N	N
P.145-1910	Unknown Girl aged four	'Ano Dni. 1590 / AEtatis Suae. 4.	Holding apple	Possibly	N
P.154-1910	Richard Hilliard	Aetatis suae 58 / Anno Dni. 157[?]	N	N	N
P.146-1910	Unknown Girl, aged five	Ano Dni. 1590. / AEtatis Suae. 5.'	Red carnation	Possibly	N
P.138-1910	Sir Christopher Hatton	N	Dog, mace and seal bag	N	N
P.5:1-1974	An unknown man	N	N	N	N
P.8-1940	Elizabeth I	Unfinished	Unfinished	Unfinished	Unfinished
P.155-1910	Self-portrait, aged 30	Ano Dmi. / 1577 ; AEtatis Suae / 30' plus monograph	N	N	D
P.3-1974	Unknown Young Man	N	Hand inside shirt	N	N
P.9-1947	An Unknown Woman	N	N	N	Y
NPG 4851	Sir Francis Drake	Aetatis Suae 42 Ano Dni 1581	N	N	N

P.1-1942	An Unknown Man, aged 24	Aetatis Sue XXIIII/Ano 1572	N	N	N
P.134-1910	An Unknown Woman, aged 26	'Ano Dni. 1593. AEtatis suae. 26'	Fleur de lys and embroidery of bees and deer	Possibly	D
M.81-1935	The Heneage Jewel	Anno 1580	Possibly two carnations on ruff	Possibly	Y
RCIN 420021	Elizabeth I	N	Rose background	Y	D
NPG 4966	Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex	N	Ribbon would carry 'Lesser George'	N	N
P.4-1917	A Man, called Sir Arundel Talbot	N	N	N	N
RCIN 420933	Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex	N	N	N	N
P.5-1944	An Unknown Man	'W Ano Ani. 1597. / W AEtatis 22.'	N	N	D
RCIN 421029	Queen Elizabeth I	N	N	N	Y
NPG 5994	Mary Herbert	N	Rose and honeysuckle details	Possibly	Y
RCIN 420063	Portrait of an Unknown Woman	N	N	N	N
P.5 1917	An Unknown Man (against flames)	N	Fire, and pendant, possibly miniature	Possibly	Y

APPENDIX II – TABLE OF STATISTICS

Statistic	Number	Percentage	Notes
PM with plain blue background	70 (79*)	89%	
PM with head and shoulder composition	52 (79)	66%	
PM with half-length composition	22 (79)	28%	
PM with full-length composition	3 (79)	4%	
PM with half or H&S composition	74 (79)	94%	
PM in circle format	31 (80)	39%	
PM in oval format	48 (80)	60%	
PM in circle or oval	79 (80)	99%	
PM with 'impresa' style symbol and/or inscription	5 Yes (77) 12 Possibly	6% 16%	
PM with no notable symbolism/inscription (overall)	60 (77)	78%	
PM by Hilliard with no overt symbolism	28 (42)	66%	Out of 42 undisputed Hilliard PM in corpus.
PM by Hilliard with no inscription	22 (42)	52%	
PM by Hilliard with no jewellery techniques	18 (42)	43%	
PM with no jewellery techniques	55 (77)	71%	
PM by Hilliard with overt jewellery techniques	13 (42)	31%	
PM with overt jewellery techniques	13 (77)	17%	
PM by Hilliard with overt or minor jewellery techniques	22 (42)	52%	
PM with 3 or fewer main colours	68 (77)	88%	Includes background colour(s) but not flesh/hair tones and details, especially white collars and cuffs.
PM in which sitter's costume is black, white and gold	39 (77)	51%	
'Typical' portrait miniatures, according to formula in Chapter 1	58 (77)	75%	PM= blue/grey-blue background, round or oval, H&S or half length, no unusual inscription/symbolism, full or three-quarter profile and limited colour palette.
'Typical' miniatures produced after 1580 (according to averaged date)	30 (58)	52%	Out of 58 typical miniatures in corpus.
Direct gaze	51 (79)	65%	

*Numbers in brackets indicated the number of corpus records used to calculate the percentage. 79 shows where the Robert Sidney miniature has been excluded, due not having a digital image for this painting. 77 shows that, in addition to the Robert Sidney miniature, the two unfinished miniatures have been excluded. They have been excluded where the final look of the painting was necessary to make a judgement, for example, regarding the including of inscriptions, jewellery and final colour palette.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alberti, Leon Battista, and Cecil Grayson (trans.). *On Painting.* Edited by Martin Kemp. London: Penguin Books Limited, 1991/2005.

Arnheim, Rudolf. *Art and Visual Perception: A Psychology of the Creative Eye.* Expanded and revised ed. ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.

Auble, Cassandra. "The Cultural Significance of Precious Stones in Early Modern England." *Dissertations, Theses, & Student Research, Department of History.* 39. (2011). http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/historydiss/39.

Bachelard, Gaston. *The Poetics of Space.* New York: Orion Press, 1964.

Barkan, Leonard. *Nature's Work of Art: The Human Body as Image of the World.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975.

Barrett-Graves, Debra editor. *The Emblematic Queen: Extra-Literary Representations of Early Modern Queenship.* First edition.

Baxandall, Michael. *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth Century Italy: A Primer in the Social History of Pictorial Style.* 2nd ed. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Billinge, Rachel, Lorne Campbell, Jill Dunkerton, Susan Foister, Jo Kirby, Jennie Pilc, Ashok Roy, Marika Spring, and Raymond White. "Methods and Materials of Northern European Painting in the National Gallery, 1400–1550." *National Gallery Technical Bulletin* 18 (1997): 6-55.

———. "The Materials and Techniques of Five Paintings by Rogier Van Der Weyden and His Workshop." *National Gallery Technical Bulletin* 18 (1997): 68-86.

Borman, Tracy. *The Private Lives of the Tudors: Uncovering the Hidden Secrets of Britain's Greatest Dynasty.* London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2017.

"Box in the Form of a Rose, with a Minuture Portrait of Anne of Cleves (1515-1557)." Victoria and Albert Museum, 2017, accessed 5th June, 2018, http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O18966/box-in-the-form-of-portrait-miniature-holbein-hans/.

Bruce, Vicki, and Andrew W. Young. *In the Eye of the Beholder: The Science of Face Perception.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Butler, Stephen. *Portrait Miniatures.* London: Studio Editions, 1994.

Campbell, Lorne. *Renaissance Portraits: European Portrait Painting in the 14th, 15th, and 16th Centuries.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

Carbon, Claus-Christian. "Art Perception in the Museum: How We Spend Time and Space in Art Exhibitions." *i-Perception* 8, no. 1 (2017): 2041669517694184.

Christiansen, Keith, Stefan Weppelmann, and Patricia Lee Rubin. *The Renaissance Portrait: From Donatello to Bellini.* New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2011.

Churma, Michael E. "Blue Shadows: Physical, Physiological, and Psychological Causes." *Applied Optics* 33, no. 21 (1994): 4719-22.

Collection, Arts Council. *Size Matters: Exploring Scale in the Arts Council Collection.* London: Arts Council Collection, Hayward Gallery, 2005.

Collection Online, "M.6903 Curator's Comments." The British Museum, 1997, accessed 5th July, 2018,

http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=948458&partId=1.

Coombs, Katherine. "'a Kind of Gentle Painting': Limning in 16th-Century England." European Visions: American Voices, London, British Museum, 2009.

———. *The Portrait Miniature in England.* London: V&A Publications, 1998.

Cooper, Tarnya. *Citizen Portrait: Portrait Painting and the Urban Elite of Tudor and Jacobean England and Wales.* New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2012.

Crary, Jonathan. *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1990.

Dictionary, Oxford English. ""Curious, Adj."." Oxford University Press, 2019, accessed 24.07.19, http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/46040?rskey=Tz0nJB&.

———*"Gentle, Adj. And N.".* Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/77666?rskey=TEWOwm&.

———. *"Jewel, N.".* OED Online: Oxford University Press, June 2019. https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/101213?rskey=jk2hzG&.

———. *"Miniature, N. And Adj.".* OED Online: Oxford University Press, 2019. https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/118826?rskey=vW8NLh.

Donne, John. *John Donne : Selected Poetry.* Edited by John Carey. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Doran, Susan, and Norman L. Jones. *The Elizabethan World.* The Routledge Worlds. 1st ed. Abingdon; New York: Routledge, 2011.

Elam, Keir. *Shakespeare's Pictures: Visual Objects in the Drama.* http://www.bloomsbury.com/9781408179772.

Evans, Robert J.W., and Alexander Marr. *Curiosity and Wonder from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment.* Farnham: Ashgate, 2006.

Foister, Susan. *Holbein in England.* London: Tate Publishing, 2006.

Foister, Susan, Martin Wyld, and Ashok Roy. "Hans Holbein's a Lady with a Squirrel and a Starling'." *National Gallery Technical Bulletin* 15 (1994): 6-19.

Friedman, Alice T. "Did England Have a Renaissance? Classical and Anticlassical Themes in Elizabethan Culture." *Studies in the History of Art* 27 (1989): 94-111. http://www.jstor.org/stable/42620245.

Fumerton, Patricia. *Cultural Aesthetics: Renaissance Literature and the Practice of Social Ornament.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

———. ""Secret" Acts: Elizabethan Miniatures and Sonnets." *Representations* 15, no. Summer (1986): 57-97.

"The Phoenix and the Pelican: Two Portraits of Elizabeth I, C.1575." Making Art in Tudor Britain, accessed 24th March, 2018, https://www.npg.org.uk/research/programmes/making-art-in-tudor-britain/the-phoenix-and-the-pelican-two-portraits-of-elizabeth-i-c.1575.

Gent, Lucy, ed. *Albion's Classicism: The Visual Arts in Britain, 1550-1660*, Studies in British Art, vol. 2. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995.

Girouard, Mark. *Elizabethan Architecture: Its Rise and Fall, 1540-1640.* New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2009.

Goldring, Elizabeth. *Nicholas Hilliard: The Life of an Elizabethan Artist.* London: Yale University Press, 2019.

———. *Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester and the World of Elizabethan Art: Painting and Patronage at the Court of Elizabeth I.* London, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Grootenboer, Hanneke. *Treasuring the Gaze: Intimate Vision in Late Eighteenth-Century Eye Miniatures.* Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2013.

Hackenbroch, Yvonne. "Some Portraits of Charles V." *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 27, no. 6 (1969): 323-32.

Hanson, Elizabeth. *Discovering the Subject in Renaissance England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Harbison, Craig. *The Art of the Northern Renaissance.* The Everyman Art Library. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1995.

Harthan, John. *An Introduction to Illuminated Manuscripts.* London: H.M.S.O., 1983.

Hattaway, Michael, ed. *A New Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*. 2 vols., Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture, vol. 68. Chichester; Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Hayward, Maria. *The 1542 Inventory of Whitehall: The Palace and Its Keeper.* London: Illuminata Publishers, 2004.

Hearn, Karen, and Tate Gallery. *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England, 1530-1630.* London: Tate Pub., 1995.

Hendrix, John Shannon, and Charles H. Carman. *Renaissance Theories of Vision.* Farnham: Ashgate, 2010.

Hilliard, Nicholas, R. K. R. Thornton, Thomas Grant Steven Cain, and Edward Norgate. *A Treatise Concerning the Arte of Limning.* Ashington, Northumberland: Mid Northumberland Arts Group in association with Carcanet New Press, 1981.

Holbein, Hans, and Paul Ganz. *The Paintings of Hans Holbein.* 1st complete ed. London: Phaidon, 1950.

"Holy Bible." edited by The Go-Anywhere Thinline Bible with the Apocrypha. NRSV, Harper Collins.

Hopkins, Lisa. "Beautiful Scars: Jewels in English Renaissance Drama." *Versita* 2012, no. 1. (12/02/2013 2012): 9-26. Accessed 25/05/2018. https://www.degruyter.com/downloadpdf/j/lincu.2012.2012.issue-1/v10318-012-0015-5/v10318-012-0015-5.pdf.

Hughes, Stephen W. "What Colour Is a Shadow?". *Physics Education* 44, no. 3 (2009): 292.

Hulse, Clark. *The Rule of Art: Literature and Painting in the Renaissance.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Hurley, Ann. *John Donne's Poetry and Early Modern Visual Culture.* Cranbury: Susquehanna University Press, 2005. Table of contents http://www.loc.gov/catdir/toc/ecip051/2004023303.html.

Ilardi, Vincent. *Renaissance Vision from Spectacles to Telescopes.* Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2007.

Jones, Mark. "Medal-Making in France 1400-1650: The Italian Dimension." *Studies in the History of*

Art 21 (1987): 57-71.

Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Judgement* (Trans. By Walker, Nicholas). Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2007.

Kee, Joan, and Emanuele Lugli. "Scale to Size: An Introduction." *Art History* 38, no. 2 (2015): 250-66.

Kerrigan, Michael. *Illuminated Manuscripts: Masterpieces of Art.* London: Flame Tree Publishing, 2014.

Kinney, Arthur F. *The Cambridge Companion to English Literature, 1500-1600.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Kohring, Sheila. "Bodily Skill and the Aesthetics of Miniaturisation." *Pallas.* 86, no. 86 (2011): 31-50. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43606684?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents.

Konkle, Talia, and Aude Oliva. "Canonical Visual Size for Real-World Objects." *Journal of Experimental Psychology: human perception and performance* 37, no. 1 (2011): 23.

Kren, Thomas, and Scot McKendrick. *Illuminating the Renaissance : The Triumph of Flemish Manuscript Painting in Europe.* Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2003.

Leonhard, Karin. "Early Modern Color Worlds." In *Painted Gems: The Color Worlds of Portrait Miniature Painting in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Britain*, edited by Tawrin Baker and et al. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Livingstone, Margaret. *Vision and Art: The Biology of Seeing.* Reprint ed. New York: Harry N Abrams, 2008.

Lugli, Emanuele. "Measuring the Bones: On Francesco Di Giorgio Martini's Saluzzianus Skeleton." *Art History* 38, no. 2 (2015): 346-63.

Lynn, Eleri. *Tudor Fashion: Dress at Court.* London: Yale University Press, 2017.

Lévi Strauss, Claude. *The Savage Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/4823/d1c4c038add17ea57820224d0b723a4726a4.pdf

Mack, John. *The Art of Small Things.* London: British Museum, 2007.

MacLeod, Catharine. *Elizabethan Treasures: Miniatures by Hilliard and Oliver*. London: National Portrait Gallery Publications, 2019.

Mann, Nicholas, and Luke Syson. *The Image of the Individual: Portraits in the Renaissance.* London: British Museum Press, 1998.

Martin, John Jeffries. *Myths of Renaissance Individualism*. Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. http://www.library.yorku.ca/e/resolver/id/1902294.

Martin, Rebecca, and Stephanie Langin-Hooper, eds. *The Tiny and the Fragmented: Miniature, Broken, or Otherwise Incomplete Objects in the Ancient World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Maus, Katharine Eisaman. *Inwardness and Theatre in the English Renaissance.* Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

"Cusanus, Nicolaus [Nicolas of Cusa]." The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2017, accessed 29th January, 2019.

Mowl, Tim. *Elizabethan & Jacobean Style.* London: Phaidon Press, 1993.

Murrell, Jim. *The Way Howe to Lymne: Tudor Miniatures Observed.* London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 1983.

"Book of Hours, Ms 1058-1975." Illuminated: Manuscripts in the Making, Keepthinking, accessed 27/04/2018, 2018, http://www.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/illuminated/manuscript/discover/book-of-hours.

Museum, Victoria and Albert. *Princely Magnificence : Court Jewels of the Renaissance, 1500-1630.* London: Debrett's Peerage Ltd, 1980.

Nanay, Bence. "The History of Vision." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 73, no. 3 (2015): 259-71.

National Gallery (Great Britain), and Jill Dunkerton. *Giotto to Durer: Early Renaissance Painting in the National Gallery.* New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 1991.

Nuechterlein, Jeanne. *Translating Nature into Art: Holbein, the Reformation, and Renaissance Rhetoric.* University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2011.

Olson, Roberta. *The Florentine Tondo.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Payne, Michael, and John C. Hunter, eds. *Renaissance Literature: An Anthology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003.

Piper, David, and Malcolm Rogers. *The English Face.* [2nd edition] ed. London: National Portrait Gallery, 1992.

Pointon, Marcia. ""Surrounded with Brilliants": Miniature Portraits in Eighteenth-Century England." *The Art Bulletin* 83, no. 1 (2001): 48-71. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3177190.

Pointon, Marcia R. *Brilliant Effects: A Cultural History of Gem Stones and Jewellery.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Pope-Hennessy, John. "Nicholas Hilliard and Mannerist Art Theory." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 6, (1943): 89-100. http://www.jstor.org/stable/750425.

Pope-Hennessy, John Wyndham. *The Portrait in the Renaissance.* Bollingen Series. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1966.

Porter, Roy, *Rewriting the Self: Histories from the Renaissance to the Present.* London: Psychology Press, 1997

http://ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/login?url=http://www.tandfebooks.com/isbn/9780203439159.

"Portrait Medals: History and Production Processes." Renaissance Portrait Medals from the Robert Lehman Collection, 2000-2018, accessed 12th June, 2018, https://www.metmuseum.org/exhibitions/listings/2016/renaissance-portrait-medals/exhibition-themes.

Post, Jonathan F. S., ed. *Green thoughts, Green shades: Essays by Contemporary Poets on the Early Modern Lyric*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Reynolds, Anna. *In Fine Style: The Art of Tudor and Stuart Fashion.* London: Royal Collection Trust, 2013.

Reynolds, Graham. *British Portrait Miniatures.* Fitzwilliam Museum Handbooks. Cambridge; New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

———. *English Portrait Miniatures.* Rev. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Richardson, Carol M., Kim Woods, and Michael W. Franklin. *Renaissance Art Reconsidered: An Anthology of Primary Sources.* Malden: Blackwell, 2007.

Rivkin, Julie, and Michael Ryan. *Literary Theory: An Anthology.* 3rd ed. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2017.

Robb, David Metheny. *The Art of the Illuminated Manuscript.* Philadelphia: Philadelphia Art Alliance, 1973.

Rowlands, John. *Holbein: The Paintings of Hans Holbein the Younger.* Complete ed. Boston: Godine, 1985.

"The Wolsey Manuscripts." The Wolsey Manuscripts, 2017, accessed 26/04/2018, 2018, http://www.wolseymanuscripts.ac.uk/research/lectionary-and-liturgy.

Scarisbrick, Diana. *Tudor and Jacobean Jewellery.* London: Tate Publishing, 1995.

Scher, Stephen K. *Perspectives on the Renaissance Medal.* New York; London: Garland, 2000.

Scher, Stephen K., Frick Collection., and National Gallery of Art (U.S.). *The Currency of Fame: Portrait Medals of the Renaissance.* New York: H.N. Abrams in association with the Frick Collection, 1994.

Schneider, Norbert. *The Portrait.* Taschen, 2002.

Sidney, Philip. *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*. London: William Ponsonby, 1590. http://www.luminarium.org/renascence-editions/arcadia2.html.

Silver, Larry. "The Face Is Familiar: German Renaissance Portrait Multiples in Prints and Medals." *Word & Image* 19, no. 1-2 (2003): 6-21.

Silvera, David H, Robert A Josephs, and R Brian Giesler. "Bigger Is Better: The Influence of Physical Size on Aesthetic Preference Judgments." *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making* 15, no. 3 (2002): 189-202.

Smith, Paul, and Carolyn Wilde. *A Companion to Art Theory*. Oxford ; Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2002. http://www.library.yorku.ca/e/resolver/id/1836804.

Smith, Tim J. "Watching You Watch Movies: Using Eye Tracking to Inform Film Theory." In *Psychocinematics: Exploring Cognition at the Movies*, edited by A Shimamura, 165-91. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Snodin, Michael, and John Styles. *Design and the Decorative Arts: Britain, 1500-1900.* London: Victoria and Albert Publications, 2001.

Somers Cocks, Anna. *An Introduction to Courtly Jewellery.* London: Compton Press, 1980.

Stanivuković, Goran. "Portrait Miniature Painting, the Young Man of Shakespeare's Sonnets and Late Elizabethan Aesthetics." *English Studies* 95, no. 4 (2014): 367-91.

Starkey, David. *Henry VIII: A European Court in England.* London: Collins & Brown in association with the National Maritime Museum, 1991.

———, ed. *The Inventory of King Henry Viii : Society of Antiquaries Ms 129 and British Library Ms Harley 1419*, Reports of the Research Committee of the Society of Antiquaries of London,, vol. no 56. London: Harvey Miller for the Society of Antiquaries of London, 1998.

Stewart, Susan. *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection.* 1st paperback ed. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1993.

Strong, Roy C. *Gloriana: The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I.* Rev. ed. London: Thames and Hudson, 1987.

Strong, Roy, and Jim Murrell. *Artists of the Tudor Court: The Portrait Miniature Rediscovered 1520-1620.* London: Victoria & Albert Museum, 1983.

Tallian, Timea, and Alan Derbyshire. "The Reconstruction of the Materials and Techniques of Nicholas Hilliard's Portrait Miniatures." *Conservation Journal*, no. 56. (2008). http://www.vam.ac.uk/content/journals/conservation-journal/issue-56/the-

reconstruction-of-the-materials-and-techniques-of-nicholas-hilliards-portrait-miniatures/.

"The Heneage Jewel." Victoria and Albert Museum, 2017, accessed 05.06.19, 2018, http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O33883/the-heneage-jewel-locket-hilliard-nicholas/.

Trilling, Lionel. *Sincerity and Authenticity.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Troscianko, Tom, Timothy S Meese, and Stephen Hinde. "Perception While Watching Movies: Effects of Physical Screen Size and Scene Type." *i-Perception* 3, no. 7 (2012): 414-25.

Wagner, Anne. "Scale in Sculpture: The Sixties and Henry Moore." *Tate Papers* 15. (2011). Accessed 11th September 2018. https://www.tate.org.uk/research/publications/tate-papers/15/scale-in-sculpture-the-sixties-and-henry-moore.

West, Shearer. *Portraiture.* Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Woolfson, Jonathan. *Reassessing Tudor Humanism.* Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave, 2002.

Wyld, Martin. "The Restoration History of Holbein's" Ambassadors"." *National Gallery Technical Bulletin* 19 (1998): 4-25.

Yarbus, Alfred. *Eye Movements and Vision.* New York: Springer Science and Business, 1967. https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=kRf3BwAAQBAJ.

Zettl, Herbert. *Sight, Sound, Motion: Applied Media Aesthetics.* Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1990.

Zöllner, Frank. "The" Motions of the Mind" In Renaissance Portraits: The Spiritual Dimension of Portraiture." *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 68, no. H. 1 (2005): 23-40.