

‘God is in the details’: visual culture of closeness in the circle of Cardinal Reginald Pole

Lorraine de la Verpillière

When Reginald Pole first came to Rome in November 1536 to take up his new position as a cardinal, in exile from England and his now schismatic cousin, King Henry VIII, he must have been struck by the splendour of the papal city, the centre of Christendom. Pole was an important figure at the Curia: his quasi-royal status and his appointment to serve on a papal reform commission allowed him to mingle with the ecclesiastical elite.¹ He should therefore have been familiar with the profusion of decorations and paintings in Italian churches and with the magnificent palaces in which most great cardinals lived.² In spite of being a prolific writer, Pole never commented on art, seeming completely oblivious to the painted works and to the brilliant architectural feats that surrounded him on a daily basis in the papal city. The lack of information about the relationship between Pole and the artists who gravitated to his circle and on the artworks he commissioned, along with Thomas Mayer’s claim that ‘Pole, by most definitions a Renaissance patron, was a failure’,³ seems to have discouraged further research on the cardinal’s artistic patronage. In fact, the apparent absence of evidence about Pole’s interest in the visual arts is misleading. Pole has yet to receive the attention he deserves in the History of Art, as he did engage with the visual arts, even though he was highly selective about them and demanded they conform with his spiritual and social practices, similarly to other reformist-minded Roman Catholics. This article focuses on new ways of apprehending Pole’s relation to the visual arts. However difficult it may be to interpret absences in written sources when trying to understand a patron’s taste, it will be shown that Pole and the circle of reformers to which he belonged – the *spirituali*⁴ – tried to

develop a very specific and well-defined visual culture, the keyword of which was ‘closeness’.

AN ‘ALTERNATIVE REALM’⁵ OF PATRONAGE

First, it is important to explain the unconventional and contradictory aspects of Cardinal Pole’s patronage, as described in the existing literature, as well as to expose the difficulties that can be encountered in its study. Types of patronage were varied and complex at the time, but a ‘traditional’ Renaissance patron may be broadly defined as a figure of prestige, granting protection as well as intellectual and financial support to a client looking for advancement and offering his services (an artist for instance), usually as a means to display the patron’s wealth and power. Patrons sometimes had their views and tastes implemented in their protégé’s achievements.⁶ As Thomas Mayer demonstrated, Pole’s patronage did not exactly meet that definition. The historian successfully identified the different phases of Pole’s patronage, showing that they mainly depended on the cardinal’s financial situation.⁷ Although it appears that Pole was never interested in art, we have to bear in mind that he had few resources during his ‘Italian period’ (1536-1554). Henry VIII, who had given him stipends for the purpose of his studies since 1521, immediately stopped sending him money in 1536, when Pole condemned the king’s divorce in his epistolary treatise defending Church unity, *De unitate*.⁸ Even once Pole had become a cardinal, he only received a modest pension from the papacy.⁹ Also preventing the prelate from undertaking a ‘traditional’ patronage were his own religious convictions: Pole cherished an ideal of apostolic poverty and wished, like many other partisans of reform, to purify the church of its abuses.¹⁰ But as Mayer highlighted, despite Pole’s ‘unworldly attitude’ a great number of intellectuals, poets and artists revolved around his circle, benefiting from its humanist culture and from its religious reflections.¹¹ This led Mayer to qualify Pole’s patronage as ‘spiritual’.¹² But most importantly, the author

showed that Pole's patronage was, to a large extent, that of his circle: it was the product of a collaborative effort between him and his private sphere.¹³ Thanks to Alexander Nagel's study of Michelangelo's presentation drawings to Vittoria Colonna, the *Pietà* of Boston (Fig. 1) and the *Crucifixion* of the British Museum (Fig. 2), we know that the *spirituali* preferred offerings without obligation, thereby making an analogy between the notion of 'gift-giving' and divine grace.¹⁴ This may explain why Pole seemed to refuse the logic of reciprocity of the patron-client relationship and why artworks circulated between members of the *spirituali* with such an exceptional facility.¹⁵ Constance Furey shares Nagel's views, but also rightly brought attention to the fact that Pole himself experienced 'the conflict between the ideals and reality of patronage' during his brutal break with his own patron, Henry VIII.¹⁶ According to Furey, the combination of these factors led to the creation of a new community where members were bound by friendship, an 'alternative realm that was both shaped and distinct from the world of patronage'.¹⁷

Unfortunately, these studies remain mostly focused on literary patronage, and deal only lightly with the question of visual creations in the circle of Pole – Michelangelo's drawings being an exception. However, in his recent biography on the cardinal, Mayer dedicated valuable pages to the construction of a new wing in Lambeth Palace – the Archbishop's official residence in London¹⁸ – that was commissioned by Pole, and to Dominique Lampson's *inventio* for the decorative wall painting overlooking the cardinal's tomb in Canterbury Cathedral.¹⁹ He also compiled a catalogue of the different painted and engraved portraits of Pole.²⁰ But the subject is far from exhausted. Building on Mayer's foundation, this paper aims at revising the tendency of this author to balkanize Pole's artistic patronage into an 'Italian' and an 'English' period, and at revealing instead a more consistent view of his patronage.

The artistic aspect of Pole's patronage is more difficult to apprehend than the literary one: although it is quite clear that Pole was the nodal point linking the threads of a complex network of artists and humanists, the evidence is scarce. Thanks to scattered sources, we know that the cardinal must have had contacts with famous artists working in Rome, such as Michelangelo, his pupil Marcello Venusti – who might have followed Pole when he returned to England²¹ – and Sebastiano del Piombo.²² The Flemish painter Lambert Lombard was also a member of his household from 1537 to 1538, although he remained under the patronage of the Prince-Bishop of Liège, Erard de la Marck.²³ After Lombard left, it has been suggested that Anthonis Mor may have been a protégé of Pole in Rome during the early 1540.²⁴ Again, in 1554, when the Spanish court painter was commissioned a portrait of Mary Tudor, he probably travelled in England with the cardinal²⁵ and stayed in his entourage in Lambeth Palace. There, he started a strong friendship with the cardinal's secretary, Dominique Lampson, a young humanist from Liège who later attended Lombard's art lectures in this city. But surprisingly, Pole never mentions the names of any of these artists in his correspondence, nor does Ludovico Beccadelli, a member of Pole's household and author of the first biography on the cardinal (1563). Additionally, most works of art from that period belonging to Pole and his circle have now disappeared. For instance the grisaille work representing the *Table of Cebes* that Lombard made for the English prelate as he was staying in his house in Rome, is lost.²⁶ This lack of surviving artworks is particularly striking when it comes to Pole's 'English Period' (1554-1558). Lampson's mural painting in Canterbury faded, due to the poor staying power of the oil painting on the wall.²⁷ The new brick wing built by Pole on the north front of Lambeth Palace around 1556 and 1557, the most remarkable and also the most expensive achievement of Pole's patronage, was destroyed in 1829 by the architect Edward Blore. Nothing remains of the Italianate *loggia* – one of the first of this type in England – above which was a 'long gallery' leading to a series of private chambers and

probably used to display artworks.²⁸ Testimonies, literary descriptions, and – when lucky – engravings are the only sources left to understand the complexity of Pole's patronage.

It is clear, then, that the study of Pole's patronage has been blinded by this shortage of sources and existing artworks. Yet could the absence of such material instead be a precious indicator of the type of visual culture emphasized in Pole's circle?

AN ERASMIAN CONCEPTION OF ART

Among the new batch of cardinals nominated by the new pope Paul III between 1535-1536 were Gasparo Contarini, Giovanni Morone and Jacopo Sadoletto – figures who, just like Pole, were closely associated with the movement of Italian reform – and the famous *literati*, Erasmus. The latter was offered a cardinal's hat in 1535, an honour he of course declined. Pole, like many of the *spirituali*, owed much to the spirit and writings of Erasmus. He owned copies of eight of Erasmus's works and praised his knowledge, defending him against his detractors.²⁹ Thanks to his numerous travels in England, Pole and the Dutch humanist had many mutual friends: the jurist Thomas More, the bishop John Fisher, the Oxford theologian John Colet and the three grammarians and Hellenic scholars, Thomas Linacre, William Latimer and Cuthbert Tunstall are a few examples.³⁰ Although Pole and Erasmus probably never met, they intermittently carried on a correspondence.³¹ Like Pole, despite his voluminous correspondence and his many other writings, Erasmus has left few detailed verbal descriptions of individual works of art.³² This is even more surprising considering the fact that, like Pole, Erasmus visited Rome between 1506 and 1509. His total silence about Italian Renaissance art and artists might be explained by the fact that his stay in the city was largely a disappointment: the humanist easily admits that he was shocked by the scandalous luxury of the papal court, the dissolute life of some roman prelates, and above all by the prevailing paganism in artworks.³³

Erasmus's indignant reaction to the excesses of Rome is interestingly similar to an anecdote that was told in 1539 by Richard Morison, King Henry's propagandist against Pole, concerning the cardinal's visit to Rome in 1525 for the papal jubilee: '[he] recalled Pole saying that he had been so disgusted on that occasion by "the abomination of the cardinals, bishops and other their [sic] officers, with the detestable vices of that city", that he left Rome after about three or four days'.³⁴ Morison's story is of course exaggerated. Pole was not an iconoclast, but he certainly held views quite similar to those of Erasmus on the matter of the 'magnificence' displayed in Rome – that is, the large sums of money spent by the elite for exceptional material splendour aimed at showing their wealth and power.³⁵ As noted above, Pole was a partisan of Church reform. The ideal of simplicity he adopted must have affected his life on a daily basis. Indeed it can be seen in the detailed inventory of Lambeth Palace, carried out after Pole's death by Elizabeth's commissioners, the Earl of Rutland, Sir Gawen Carew, and Sir Nicholas Throckmorton on 20 November 1558.³⁶ This document indicates that Pole and his household had a rather distant relationship with objects: the description of the numerous rooms of the palace is more a list of mattresses, sheets, cushions and carpets. A few historiated tapestries and embroidered bedspreads are the only artworks mentioned, without any indication however on what they depicted (fol. 23r for instance: 'peeeces of hanginges with pictures' or fol. 22v: 'A coverlet with Images'). Even the inventory of Pole's wardrobe, dated the same day, appears more sumptuous in comparison.³⁷ However, it would be an oversimplification to assume on this basis that Pole was disinterested in art. Pole's silence, his apparent lack of interest in art, together with the modest environs of Lambeth, should instead be interpreted in the light of the simplicity he cherished, and his revulsion – like Erasmus – towards ostentatious art. To Pole, art was subordinated to moral and religious feelings, and to humanism. Its function was to help the viewer rising towards higher realities, placing *docere* and *movere* above *delectare*.

In this respect, Lombard's 1538 grisaille constitutes a perfect example of Pole's patronage, and of how the cardinal's views and tastes were implemented in a work of art. As Godlieve Denhaene argued, its theme was highly erudite and moral, in line with Pole's ideals.³⁸ It is likely that Pole himself asked Lombard to work on this subject, taken from an ancient philosophical text entitled *The Table of Cebes*. Pole had probably been familiar with the *Tabula* long before: it was a popular school text, used during the Renaissance to teach Greek, a language that Pole studied in Padua.³⁹ Emphasising virtues such as 'Continence', 'Patience', 'Moderation' and 'Modesty', it recommended an austere way of life, corresponding to Pole's ideal of ecclesiastical life.⁴⁰ It was also particularly well suited to religious interpretation, another aspect that may have pleased Pole: during the Renaissance, the *Tabula* was frequently transformed into an image of man's progress towards salvation. For example, an anonymous Venetian engraving published in 1549, interpreted the text from that angle, presenting a suffering Christ with his cross at the climax of its composition.⁴¹ Knowing Pole's interest in salvation and the centrality of Christ's figure in his spirituality, it is likely that Lombard's grisaille was comparable.

Also characteristic of the artistic production in Pole's circle is the taste for Christocentric, 'dolorist' representations of the Passion. This is particularly striking in Michelangelo's *Pietà* and *Crucifixion*, in which Christ's tormented body occupies a central position. As Nagel and many others have noted, this can be explained by the fact that the *spirituali* nourished a faith centred on Christ. Contrary to the main school of thought in the Roman Church, which emphasized the primacy of good works in man's justification before God, the *spirituali* believed that faith in Christ's sacrifice was the only true path to salvation.⁴² Other artists seem to have been inspired by the Christocentric doctrine of the *spirituali*, adopting at the same time the motifs Michelangelo created for this group. Denhaene claimed that Lombard was profoundly influenced by Pole's spirituality: he depicted

for instance a *Christ on the Cross* (Fig. 3), sharing many characteristics with Michelangelo's *Crucifixion*, including the same "Y"-shaped form of the cross and the same supplicating gaze of the Saviour towards the heavens.⁴³ However, care must be taken to assess the influence of Pole's religious thoughts on art, since it is not known to what extent he informed artists of his ideas on doctrine-related matters – indeed, the evidence rather indicates that even his closest friends did not grasp clearly his opinions.⁴⁴ It will now be argued that in addition to his predilection for religious and moral themes, Pole's circle favoured subtle artworks, combining specific visual characteristics in phase with the cardinal's 'ideal of simplicity' and which were designed for the purpose of meditation.

THE *SPIRITUALI*'S 'VISUAL NICODEMISM'

The creation by Pole and the *spirituali* of an 'alternative realm' of patronage suited their desire for secrecy. The ambiguity of their position in the Roman Church and the similarity of their ideas to those of the Lutherans, especially on the doctrine of justification, called for discretion: the circle of the *spirituali* remained until its end a highly private and exclusive circle.⁴⁵ Pole himself always seemed reluctant to present publicly his own theological views and carefully avoided direct confrontations.⁴⁶ He was more at home with his friends, in his private sphere, or in his position as spiritual adviser to noble women, like Giulia Gonzaga, the poet Vittoria Colonna, and Queen Mary Tudor.⁴⁷ Pole's circle encouraged the cultivation of a certain form of secrecy and interiority when it came to spiritual life: this tendency is likely to have influenced the visual style of the artworks circulating among the members of this circle. From this perspective, the study of Michelangelo's presentation drawings is essential. Before being widely disseminated as engravings, they were, at the beginning, only intended for the contemplation of a select audience. They circulated freely between the members of the *spirituali* circle, whether in the form of originals, drawn copies, or painted panels,⁴⁸ but were

jealously kept within this circle.⁴⁹ This seems to confirm the hypothesis that Michelangelo's works were specifically adjusted to the tastes of his friends. Based on the two drawings he made for Colonna and the *spirituali*⁵⁰ it is possible to establish a visual 'profile' of the kind of works Pole and his friends might have favoured.

The first noteworthy characteristic is sobriety. Close to an *Andachtsbild*, Michelangelo's *Pietà* represents a moment 'out of time'. It acts as a visual abstract⁵¹ in the whole mystery of Incarnation, death and Redemption, suggested by the combination of opposing ascending and descending dynamics – formed by the rising arms of the Virgin, the dropping ones of Christ and the ground shifting under his feet – and by the complex interaction between the mother and her son: placed between the legs of the Co-redemptrix Virgin, the Saviour seems to return to the womb of his mother which now acts as his sepulchre.⁵² The *Crucifixion*, on the contrary, corresponds to a precise biblical episode, that is the moment when the crucified Christ implores his father, crying 'Heli, Heli' (Marc, 15:34).⁵³ But there is a similar trend towards visual *simplificatio* and austerity in both drawings: apart from a few hardly sketched details (the weeping angels at either side of the cross, the skull and the Golgotha at the bottom), the *Crucifixion*'s background remains plain, almost blank. Christ's body, which is on the contrary very elaborately worked, seems to stand out in relief, as if sculpted at the black chalk's point. This visual sobriety or *despejo* (from the verb *despejar*, 'to empty' in Portuguese) was already identified by Francisco de Hollanda – another important figure in Pole's circle⁵⁴ – as key to Michelangelo's art.⁵⁵ It helped the viewer concentrate on the divine body of Christ, which took a predominant role in the piety of the *spirituali*. A drawing by the hand of Giulio Clovio (Fig. 4) – copied after a lost original by Michelangelo⁵⁶ – shows that the master carried this solution to its paroxysm: it displays Christ's body, without even the cross, as crucified on the space of the sheet, suspended in the air. Lombard also seemed to

acknowledge this notion of *despejo* in his *Christ on the Cross*, where the absence of setting is particularly striking.⁵⁷

Notably, all of the works discussed here were depicted with a reduced range of colours. The very peculiar chromatic world formed by the use of only one colour was already at work in Lombard's grisaille of the *Tabula Cebetis*. Mathilde Bert interestingly suggested that in Lombard's case, the use of monochromy was intended as a play of emulation with ancient painting, that the painter knew through his reading of book XXXV of Pliny the Elder's *Naturalis historia*.⁵⁸ Linking humanism and the notion of erudition with a taste for monochrome works, Bert also highlighted Erasmus's interest for *austeristas* in figurative means. In his praise of Dürer (1528) – probably the longest incursion of the Dutch humanist into art criticism – Erasmus places the artist above Apelles thanks to his use of monochrome: 'Dürer, however, though admirable also in other respects, what does he not express in monochromes (*monochromata*), that is, by black lines?'.⁵⁹ Pole's apparent preference for monochrome is once more a common taste with Erasmus. The only two 'colours', black and white, that Michelangelo used in his drawings, therefore seemed to fulfil the cardinal's requirement for sobriety. They probably allowed the viewer to elevate his mind towards the moral and spiritual message, inviting him to go beyond the wall of appearances to reach the heart of the subject.⁶⁰

Another important characteristic of Michelangelo's *disegno* for the *spirituali*, and the related works that followed, is their highly 'private' nature. Their relatively small format – drawings, small-size painted panels, or miniatures – confirms that they were conceived to be viewed in the intimacy of meditation, by one person at a time. The works in question were then easily transportable: Pole for instance brought his *Pietà* by Michelangelo with him to Trent in 1545-46.⁶¹

The small size of these works also served a devotional purpose⁶²: it encouraged the viewer to examine carefully each hidden recess of their design. In that respect, several letters suggest that the *spirituali* used magnifying glasses in order to observe better each detail of the representation. In one of her letters to Michelangelo, dated between 1538-1541, Vittoria Colonna claimed she observed the *Crucifixion* using a lamp, a magnifying glass and a mirror (*al lume e col vetro e specchio*).⁶³ Later, in 1543, the Marchesa wrote to Alvise Priuli, Pole's faithful friend, asking him to send her rapidly a green-coloured glass from Venice (*quell vetro verde che venne da Venezia*),⁶⁴ similar to the one possessed by Pole and also used by Marcantonio Flaminio. Apparently this object was a convex lens that Colonna wanted to lend to Michelangelo, whose eyesight was falling, to help him paint more comfortably (*per la vista nel dipingere*). Admiring works of art through such devices was not uncommon at the time and is rather well documented for several artists and patrons.⁶⁵

In Pole's circle, however, magnifying glasses seem not to have been used as a true aid to vision but rather as a tool for a very specific philosophy of the image. Colonna's letter mentioning a lamp, a magnifying glass and a mirror, suggests that the poetess managed to project an enlarged version of the drawing in the mirror. As Hugo Chapman rightly suggested, 'The reversal of the design, and the resulting image's disassociation from the drawing, was perhaps a means to move her attention away from aesthetic admiration of its merits as a work of art, to a devotional contemplation of its subject'.⁶⁶ This way of looking therefore allowed Colonna to enhance her intimacy with Christ, being able to see every detail of his suffering body, and to free herself from the materiality of the drawing, transforming it into a mental image for the purpose of meditation. This 'negative method', recognising that God cannot be apprehended by visual contemplation and renouncing meditation based on a material image in

a superior state of prayer, can be traced back to the writings of Dionysius the Areopagite.⁶⁷ It is also very close to the Jesuit theory of images that would later be developed in devotional books towards the end of the century and the beginning of the seventeenth century.⁶⁸

The fact that the Company – one of the names chosen by the Jesuits to designate their organisation⁶⁹ – bore the same contradiction as the *spirituali* about visual representations, that is being great promoters of images but at the same time tempted to reject them,⁷⁰ is actually not so surprising. Several members of the *spirituali* circle, such as Bishop Matteo Giberti, Gasparo Contarini, Vittoria Colonna, were close to the nascent Society of Jesus in the 1530s and 1540s. It is likely that Pole himself met the founder of the Society, St Ignatius Loyola, through his friends.⁷¹ As their correspondence shows, Pole was involved with the Company and regularly assisted Loyola. It has frequently been highlighted that the spirituality of the Jesuits was in line with the movement of the *devotio moderna*, started in the fifteenth century, which cultivated the ideal of a more personal and interiorised faith. But due to the exceptional modernity and ‘adaptability’ of the Society of Jesus, it might be interesting to consider instead that Loyola and the early Jesuits drew lessons from shared spiritual practices with the *spirituali*.⁷² Pole and his friends may even have influenced one of the founding texts of the Jesuits, the *Spiritual Exercises*, ‘a guide through a set of inner experiences that every Jesuit underwent’.⁷³ Although the first edition of this manual was printed in 1548, several of its manuscripts circulated long before in learned circles. The English priest John Heylard, a close friend of Pole,⁷⁴ even copied the *Exercises* into his notebook and is said to have made them in Paris or Venice under the direction of either Ignatius himself or Pierre Favre.⁷⁵ The *Exercises* highlighted the importance of the ‘composition of place’, a mental and sensory projection of the devout within the image of the meditation subject.⁷⁶ The *spirituali* were not unfamiliar with such practices, using images for meditation, as demonstrated by a text composed by Vittoria Colonna between 1539 and 1542, *Pianto sopra la Passione di Cristo* (Plaint on the

Passion of Christ). According to Susan Haskins, it is the result of a meditation inspired by Michelangelo's *Pietà* drawing and the account of a vision that may have been prompted by this image.⁷⁷

Accordingly, at least one visual practice specific to the *spirituali* can be identified: during meditation, they used a visual support, 'parsed' it,⁷⁸ and – when its mental duplicate was sufficiently anchored and reconstituted in memory – finally abandoned it to see its image with the 'eyes of the spirit' instead of the 'eyes of the body'. This process may have been one of the sources of inspiration that later informed the Jesuit conception of the image. Expressing her admiration for his *Crucifixion* drawing to Michelangelo, Vittoria Colonna told the master that its image had 'crucified itself in her memory' (*ha crucifixe nella memoria mia*). Ercole Gonzaga, in a letter to Pietro Bertano, Bishop of Fano, having written that Pole was ready to let him have his *Pietà* by Michelangelo, concludes that it is best the drawing remains in the possession of Pole 'who carries it by faith sculpted on his heart' (*per fede sculpito nel cuore*).⁷⁹ This verbal metaphor also recalls one of the favourite motifs of Jesuit devotional manuals, that is Christ's image sculpted or painted in the meditant's heart as an echo to the Aristotelian theory, according to which images could leave their mark on this organ in the same way as a seal can be imprinted on wax.⁸⁰ Christocentricity, sobriety, and privacy are therefore the essential characteristics of the visual style advocated by the *spirituali*: contemplation of images had to be able to further a direct religious experience between God and the meditant.⁸¹ It seems that Pole long kept this artistic ideal with him, even when he came back to England for the Restoration of Catholicism.

A TASTE FOR MINIATURE WORKS: POLE'S ARTISTIC BAGGAGE IN ENGLAND

Among the rare artistic works that were commissioned by Pole himself are several miniatures.⁸² Between 1548 and 1549, he commissioned one for the frontispiece of the

account book of the English Hospice in Rome, the *Liber Rationarius Hospitalis*, when he directed this institution: it represented the Holy Trinity, to whom the place was dedicated since its foundation in the fourteenth century, together with Saint Thomas of Canterbury and Saint Edmund.⁸³ In England, Pole commissioned John Mulcaster to illuminate his Archbishop's Register in Lambeth: it consisted in the depiction of his heraldry in lieu of a frontispiece, and, on the first page, of an ornate letter 'R' for *Registrum*, as a frame for a small sketch representing the death of Pyramus and Thisbe.⁸⁴

Thomas Mayer also noticed this apparent taste of Pole for the miniature genre and uses it as an argument to justify that Venusti, praised by Vasari for his qualities as a miniaturist, might have been the mysterious painter 'Marcello' who accompanied Pole to England. The author also suggested that Pole's predilection for miniatures could emanate from his desire to save money.⁸⁵ It must be mentioned however that miniatures have never proved to be less expensive than larger works, quite the contrary: the elite character of the miniature was greatly prized in European courts at that time. Moreover, even if Pole was indeed preoccupied by his poor finances during most of his life, I argue that the miniature genre pleased him for completely different reasons, and namely because of its adaptability to the '*spirituali* visual culture' as defined above: a preference for small-sized works, easily transportable and manipulable, the contemplation of which could promote personal – and preferably spiritual – experiences. The fact that miniatures were easily concealed might even have suited Pole's preference for discretion. It may be argued that the acquisition of miniatures was already part of a well-established tradition in England, sometimes for the exact same reasons that I attributed to Pole⁸⁶, and that even King Henry VIII – Pole's most noteworthy enemy – owned several miniature works. However, I argue that Pole still breaks with previous instances of acquisition of miniatures in England, in that his interest did not lie only in the miniature genre

itself, but instead in the combination of the miniature's convenient format with very specific subjects and forms – which were created by Michelangelo in Italy for the *spirituali* circle.

We know that miniatures on religious subjects circulated in Pole's circle. The inventory of the personal belongings that Gianfrancesco Stella⁸⁷ left in Rome to join Pole in England, dated 25 November 1555,⁸⁸ mentions a miniature of Christ on the Cross by 'Marcello' (Venusti?), presented in an ebony frame.⁸⁹ Unlike Stella, however, other members of the circle seem to have taken their miniatures in England, sometimes offering them as gifts to newcomers. The Flemish humanist Dominique Lampson, Pole's new secretary in Lambeth, in a letter dated 9 December 1570, told the artist Giulio Clovio how he came into possession of one of his miniatures representing the *Holy Family* – a gift offered to him by George Lily – , describing it as one of his most precious objects.⁹⁰

Clovio's figure has not been sufficiently examined in the light of his relationship with Pole's circle.⁹¹ Yet the facts seem to show he was very close to the *spirituali*, and especially Colonna and Michelangelo. As noted by M. Pelc,⁹² the third dialogue of Francisco de Hollanda takes place in Giulio Clovio's workshop. Hollanda reported that the miniaturist asked him to be introduced to the intellectual and spiritual circle of the Marchesa of Pescara and Michelangelo – with whom the Portuguese was on good terms.⁹³ Hollanda's favour must have helped since Clovio would later draw a *Pietà* for Colonna. The poetess even did everything she could to stop the miniaturist from leaving Rome when he was tempted to quit the service of his patron, Alessandro Farnese, and go to Florence.⁹⁴ Although no documents suggesting any real contacts between Michelangelo and Clovio have thus far come to light, the nature of their relationship is clear from an artistic point of view:⁹⁵ Clovio was probably the 'most diligent and exact copyist of Michelangelo'.⁹⁶ He had access to many drawings by the master as early as the 1530s, long before Venusti: some of them can even be found in the inventories of the belongings he left at his death.⁹⁷ Clovio also made miniatures after

Michelangelo's *invenzioni*, drawing inspiration from the Colonna *Pietà* or the *Crucifixion*.⁹⁸ If several miniatures by Clovio were indeed brought back in England by the *spirituali*, they could have introduced Michelangelo's compositions to local artists. It could explain for instance the origin of Christ's position in a miniature drawing by the famous English artist Isaac Oliver, *The Lamentation* (Fig. 5): the 'yokelike posture'⁹⁹ of his arms, placed over the knees of the figure behind him, the rest of his body resting on the ground, inevitably recalls the graphic world of Michelangelo, and especially the Colonna *Pietà*. But it reminds us even more of a drawing by Clovio¹⁰⁰ (Fig. 6), probably made after a lost original by Michelangelo, and also very close to the *Pietà*, but in this case with Nicodemus¹⁰¹ holding Christ instead of the Virgin, like in the *Lamentation*. It is certainly not a coincidence that Oliver's name was associated early on with the same praiseful epithet attributed by Vasari to Clovio – 'Michelangelo in little' – so that the first English historians of art tended to confuse the two.¹⁰²

Several signs suggest that the *spirituali* circle owed much to Clovio when it came to the reproduction of Michelangelo's drawings as miniatures and as devotional works. If Clovio had not remained in Florence in the 1550s at the Medici's court, it would be tempting to think that he might have come to England with Pole instead of Venusti. In a more general way, Clovio seems to have built close ties to England since he undertook a correspondence with the noted female miniaturist painter, Lievine Teerlinc, then in Elizabeth I's service.¹⁰³ Much work remains to be done, however, with regards to the identification of the miniatures which circulated in Pole's circle: English collections may still contain works by Clovio,¹⁰⁴ hitherto wrongly attributed.

CONCLUSION

According to Thomas Mayer, major cultural consequences should have followed Pole's return to his country, 'enough to start an Italian Renaissance cell in England'.¹⁰⁵ But as many historians of art still emphasize, art was not the priority during the troubled times of the Marian restoration of Catholicism. However, if Pole's coming to England seems not to have the expected impact, this is due less to the context than to the private nature of the works of art circulating in his circle. Seen in that perspective, Clovio's miniatures are a perfect example, and as Mark Evans points out: 'it is certain that the works of men such as Don Giulio are not public, nor in places where they can be seen by everyone'.¹⁰⁶ Artistic exchanges took a great significance within the *spirituali* circle, but were often restricted to a confidential level, escaping the traditional system of patronage and commissions. The attitude of both Pole and his friends towards art can be summed up by the word 'closeness'. First in a sense of emotional 'closeness' between the creator and the receiver: the artworks circulating among the *spirituali* were often made by artists who shared the same spiritual sensibilities and who were bound to this circle by friendship. The meditational practices of the *spirituali* influenced the theme (moral and religious), the style and the form (small size, *despejo*, and sometimes monochrome) of the works circulating among them. 'Closeness', then, is also to be understood in the spatial sense of the term: in a sort of 'archaeology of gaze' we may see that intimacy and proximity were an essential part in the *spirituali* 'visual experience', which explains the predilection of this circle for miniatures, along with their 'secret' aspect.

Because of the singular place of small-scale artworks in Pole's circle, I suggest to make the miniature a privileged observatory of the artistic impact that the cardinal's entourage had in England. Such an approach should be, however, further exploited in the broader analysis of artistic exchanges between England and the continent. The miniature was an art that was not bound by the shores of England, and the rare European artists who were

able to practice that art were closely tied to each other, either by kinship or friendship: the ‘microcosmic nature’ of this community would then allow to observe complex artistic exchanges at a smaller scale. For that purpose, Oliver’s artistic formation and hypothetical travels abroad should be re-examined: his *Lamentation*, while likely inspired by the Michelangesque forms of the *Colonna Pietà*, also played with local English, Flemish, and French forms, preferring composite artworks to direct artistic citations.

University of Cambridge

This article grew out of my ‘Master 2’ dissertation ‘*Lost in Translation? De l’Italie à l’Angleterre, le mécénat du cardinal Reginald Pole et son cercle*’, Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne, Paris, 2013. I would like to thank my former supervisor, Colette Nativel, for her support and advice during the writing of this dissertation. I am also very grateful to Jean-Marie Le Gall for his useful suggestions on Erasmus and the visual arts. Special thanks go to Alexander Marr for his careful reading of my manuscript and for encouraging me to publish.

¹ On Pole’s biography, Thomas Mayer, *Reginald Pole: Prince and Prophet* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000) is an essential reading. For a short version, see also ‘Pole, Reginald (1500-1558)’, in Lawrence Goldman (ed.), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* [online]: <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22456>> (accessed October 2013). See also Mayer, *Cardinal Pole in European Context: a Via Media in the Reformation* (Aldershot and Burlington: Ashgate, 2000). Also worth mentioning is the recent biography by John Edwards, *Archbishop Pole* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), although I did not take its conclusions into account as it was still unpublished when the present paper was written.

² For a good overview of the Rome of the cardinals in the sixteenth century see Pierre Hurtubise, *Tous les chemins mènent à Rome: arts de vivre et de réussir à la cour pontificale au XVI^e siècle* (Ottawa: Presses de l’Université d’Ottawa, 2009).

³ Thomas Mayer, 'When Maecenas Was Broke: Cardinal Pole's "Spiritual" Patronage', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 27 (1996), 419-435, 419.

⁴ The term '*spirituali*' is said to derive from the Paulinian distinction between 'carnal' and 'spiritual' men. The use of this label is problematic in the sense that it gives consistency to a group which was actually never really organised, as pointed out by Anne Overell, *Italian Reform and English Reformations, c. 1535-c. 1585* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 30. But we have to agree with Mayer, *Prince*, 8: 'Pole and his allies must still be called something'. On the movement of *evangelismo* and on the *spirituali*, see Elisabeth Gleason, 'On the Nature of Sixteenth-Century Italian Evangelism: Scholarship, 1953-1978', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 9 (1978), 3-26.

⁵ I quote this phrase from Constance Furey, *Erasmus, Contarini, and the Religious Republic of Letters* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 84.

⁶ See Paul Binski and Christopher F. Black, 'Patronage', in Hugh Brigstocke (ed.), *The Oxford Companion to Western Art* [online] <<http://www.oxfordartonline.com/subscriber/article/opr/t118/e1998>> (accessed April 2015).

⁷ Mayer, 'Maecenas'.

⁸ Furey, *Erasmus*, 55.

⁹ Mayer, 'Maecenas', 426.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 424.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 435: 'Prepared to shun material rewards, or at least put them in a distant second, Pole's clients came to him as a religious, political, and cultural icon'.

¹² *Ibid.*, 423.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 423.

¹⁴ Alexander Nagel, 'Gifts for Michelangelo and Vittoria Colonna', *The Art Bulletin*, 79 (1997), 647-668, esp. 661-4, and *Michelangelo and the Reform of Art* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 169-187.

¹⁵ The brother and sister, Antonio and Maria Forcellino, made an important contribution to research on the circulation of Michelangelo's *invenzioni* among Pole's circle. See esp. Maria Forcellino, 'Le opere di Michelangelo nel circolo degli "spirituali"', in *Michelangelo, Vittoria Colonna e gli 'spirituali', religiosità e vita artistica a Roma negli anni Quaranta* (Rome: Viella, 2009), 86-97.

¹⁶ Furey, *Erasmus*, 55-6.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 84.

¹⁸ Mayer, *Prince*, 320-330.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 348-354.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 400-438.

²¹ Thomas Mayer, 'Marcello Who?: An Italian Painter in Cardinal Pole's Entourage', *Source*, 15 (1996), 22-6.

²² Pole might have posed for a portrait by Sebastiano del Piombo around the mid-1540s (*Portrait of Reginald Pole*, c. 1540, oil on canvas, 112x94.5 cm, St Petersburg, The Hermitage). See Mayer, *Prince*, 400, cat. 1.

²³ On Lombard's stay in Pole's household, see Godlieve Denhaene, *Lambert Lombard: Renaissance et humanisme à Liège* (Antwerp: Fonds Mercator, 1990), 15-19. At the death of Erard de la Marck in 1538, the pension Lombard received from him was suppressed and the painter went back to Liège, seeking patronage from Erard's successor, Corneille de Berghes.

²⁴ See Joanna Woodall, *Anthonis Mor: Art and Authority* (Zwolle: Waanders Publishers, 2007), 103.

²⁵ See Joanna Woodall, 'An Exemplary Consort: Anthonis Mor's Portrait of Mary Tudor', *Art*

History, 14 (1991), 192-224, 203 and Mayer, 'Maecenas', 432.

²⁶ On Lombard's grisaille for Pole see esp. Reinhart Schleier, *Tabula Cebetis oder 'Spiegel des Menschlichen Lebens/darin Tugend und untugend abgemalet ist'.* *Studien zur Rezeption einer antiken Bildeschreibung im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Mann, 1973), 41-5; Godlieve Denhaene (ed.), *Lambert Lombard, peintre de la Renaissance, 1505/06-1566* (Brussels: Institut royal du patrimoine artistique, 2006), 352-3, cat. 15, and Mathilde Bert, 'In monochromatis [...], quid non exprimit? La réception des arts monochromes dans la critique d'art humaniste à la Renaissance', in Marion Boudon-Machuel, Maurice Brock and Pascale Charron (eds.), *Aux limites de la couleur: monochromie et polychromie dans les arts (1300-1600)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 97-113, 110-1.

²⁷ Mayer, *Prince*, 352.

²⁸ A later inventory, made in 1575 at the death of Pole's successor, Archbishop Parker, mentions that the gallery was decorated with maps, paintings representing religious *storie* and with portraits of noble Englishmen and monarchs. See William Sandys, 'Copy of the Inventory of Archbishop Parker's Goods at the Time of his Death; Communicated by William Sandys, Esq. F.S.A., in a Letter to Sir Henry Ellis, K.H., F.R.S. Secretary', *Archaeologia* 30 (1844), 1-30, esp. 10-12 for the gallery.

²⁹ Mayer, *Prince*, 30, and note 32.

³⁰ Erasmus travelled no less than six times to England. See Jean-Claude Margolin, 'Erasme et l'Angleterre, Discours prononcé à la Maison d'Erasme le 29 novembre 1994', in Alexandre Vanautgaerden (ed.), *Erasme et l'Angleterre* (Brussels: La Lettre Volée, 1998), 39-68.

³¹ It is Thomas Lupset who introduced Pole to Erasmus in a letter dated 1525. See Kenneth Bartlett, 'Reginald Pole', in Peter Bietenholz and Thomas Deutscher (eds.), *Contemporaries of Erasmus: a Biographical Register of the Renaissance and Reformation*, Vol. 3 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987), 103-5, 103.

³² On Erasmus's attitude towards visual arts, see Erwin Panofsky, 'Erasmus and the Visual Arts', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 32 (1969), 200-227 and the important contribution of André Godin, 'Humanisme et arts visuels', in André Godin et Jean-Claude Margolin, 'Humanisme', in *Encyclopædia Universalis* [online]: <<http://www.universalis-edu.com/encyclopedie/humanisme/>> (accessed July 2014).

³³ Margolin, 'Erasme', 60.

³⁴ Richard Morison, *An Exhortation to styrre all Englyshe men to the defence of theyr countrey* (1539), cited by Jonathan Woolfson, 'Reginald Pole and his Greek Manuscripts in Oxford: a Reconsideration', *Bodleian Library Record*, 17 (2000), 79-95, 88-9.

³⁵ For a broad range of examples of discussions on Renaissance 'magnificence' in the visual arts and a substantial bibliography on this notion, see Rupert Shepherd, 'Republican anxiety and Courtly Confidence: The Politics of Magnificence and fifteenth-century Italian Architecture', in Michelle O'Malley and Evelyn Welch (eds.), *The Material Renaissance* (Manchester: Manchester University press, 2007), 47-70.

³⁶ See The National Archives, Kew (hereafter TNA), SP12/1/10II, fols. 20r-29r, *Inventory of all the bedding and other moveables belonging to Cardinal Pole, in divers chamber and offices, Lambeth Palace*, 20 November 1558. Images of these documents as well as a transcription by Helen Good can be found on *University of Hull State Paper Project* [online]: <<http://www.sp12.hull.ac.uk/image/image1.htm>> (accessed March 2014).

³⁷ TNA, SP12/1/10III, fols. 30v-32v, *An inventory of the wardrobe of Cardinal Pole, Lambeth Palace*, 20 November 1558.

³⁸ Denhaene, *Lombard, peintre*, 352-3, cat. 15.

³⁹ Woolfson, 'Greek Manuscripts', 86.

⁴⁰ Denhaene, *Lombard, peintre*, 353.

⁴¹ Anon., *Tabula Cebetis (Imagine, rappresentacione, overo discorso de la vita morale et christiana)*, 1549, engraving, 44.5x65 cm, Vienna, Albertina Museum. See Schleier, *Tabula*, 42 and 89.

⁴² The same idea is expressed in the *Beneficio di Cristo*, a short treaty published anonymously in 1543, which is generally considered as a *compendium* articulating the main religious beliefs of the *spirituali*. See Dermot Fenlon, *Heresy and Obedience in Tridentine Italy: Cardinal Pole and the Counter Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 73-85. According to Mayer, *Prince*, 120, the *Beneficio* is the result of a collaborative effort between Pole, Marcantonio Flaminio and Contarini.

⁴³ Denhaene, *Lombard, peintre*, 426-8, cat. 81, esp. 428. For other comparisons between Lombard's work and Pole's spirituality, see *Ibid.*, 427 and 404-5, cat. 85.

⁴⁴ See for instance Fenlon, *Heresy*, 95: 'Prudence and caution were the keynotes of Pole's policy at Viterbo. His closest friends could only guess at his opinions'. It is then legitimate to express reservations about Joanna Woodall's argument that two panel paintings she attributes to Mor – the *Saint Sebastian* (1542, oil on panel, 155x113 cm, Rotterdam, Museum Boymans-van-Beuningen) and the *Resurrection of Christ* (c. 1556, oil on panel, 160x152 cm, Chantilly, musée Condé) – could allude to the religious convictions of the *spirituali*, and especially to the debate concerning justification by faith. See Woodall, *Anthonis Mor*, 122-8 and 295-336.

⁴⁵ As also highlighted in Nagel, 'Gifts', 655.

⁴⁶ This is what Mayer, *Prince*, 441, calls 'a preference for withdrawal'.

⁴⁷ See Mayer, *Prince*, 105: 'Pole privately cultivated the congenial members of his household and spiritual relationship with women'.

⁴⁸ See Forcellino, *Michelangelo*.

⁴⁹ As shown by the anger of Michelangelo in his letter to Luigi del Ricco in 1546 when he heard that Giulio Bonasone made an engraved plate after his *Pietà* drawing for Colonna. See

Antonio Forcellino, *The Lost Michelangelos*, trans. Lucinda Byatt (Cambridge, MA: Polity, 2011), 24-6.

⁵⁰ The relationship between Michelangelo and the *spirituali* was too often reduced to his close ties with Colonna. But the Florentine master also had connections with other prelates of that circle as showed in his correspondence: see Hugo Chapman (ed.), *Michelangelo, Drawings: Closer to the Master* (London: British Museum Press, 2005), esp. 252.

⁵¹ The ‘diagram of a doctrine’ according to Charles De Tolnay, quoted in Leo Steinberg, ‘The Metaphors of Love and Birth in Michelangelo’s *Pietàs*’, in Theodore Bowie and Cornelia Christenson (eds.), *Studies in Erotic Art* (New York: Basic Books, 1970), 231-335, 266.

⁵² On the Virgin’s womb as a grave for Christ’s body, see *Ibid.*, 268.

⁵³ As recorded by Condivi in his description of this work. See Forcellino, *Michelangelo*, 76.

⁵⁴ Francisco de Hollanda was a Portuguese humanist, painter and architect who travelled in Italy between 1536 and 1541. The four ‘Dialogues on Painting in the City of Rome’ he wrote in book II of his art treaty, *Da Pintura Antigua* – completed in Lisboa in 1548 – record his friendship with Michelangelo and Vittoria Colonna. See Sylvie Deswarte-Rosa, ‘Vittoria Colonna und Michelangelo in San Silvestro al Quirinale nach den *Gesprächen* des Francisco de Holanda’, in Sylvia Ferino-Pagden (ed.), *Vittoria Colonna, Dichterin und Muse Michelangelos* (Milan and Vienna: Skira and Kunsthistorisches Museum, 1997), 349-373.

⁵⁵ See Sylvie Deswarte-Rosa, “‘*Si dipinge col cervello et non con le mani*’: Italie et Flandres’, in Nicole Dacos (ed.), *Fiamminghi a Roma, 1508-1608* (Rome: Istituto poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato and Libreria dello Stato, 1999), 277-294, 284.

⁵⁶ See Paul Joannides, *Inventaire général des dessins italiens VI, Michel-Ange, élèves et copistes* (Paris: RMN, 2003), 234-5, cat. 88.

⁵⁷ See also Deswarte-Rosa, ‘col cervello’, 290 and Denhaene, *Lombard, peintre*, 426.

⁵⁸ See Bert, ‘*In monochromatis*’, 107-112, citing Dominique Lampson’s *Lamberti Lombardi Apud Eburones, Pictoris Celeberrimi Vita*, published in Bruges in 1565.

⁵⁹ Cited by Panofsky, ‘Erasmus’, 224-5.

⁶⁰ The sixteenth century witnessed an important debate on the ‘seductiveness’ and falsity of colours: see Stuart Clark, *Vanities of the Eye: Vision in Early Modern European Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007). On the value attributed to black and white as more sober, dignified and moral colours, see Michel Pastoureau, ‘La couleur en noir et blanc (XVe-XVIIIe siècle)’, in Frédéric Barbier et al. (eds.), *Le livre et l’historien: études offertes en l’honneur du Professeur Henri-Jean Martin* (Geneva: Droz, 1997), 197- 213.

⁶¹ Forcellino, *Michelangelo*, 86.

⁶² For a recent study on the link between the miniature and spiritual devotion as part of the period’s religious experimentation, see Rebecca Zorach, ‘“Sweet in the Mouth, Bitter in the Belly”: Seeing Double in an Eccentric French Renaissance Book of Hours’, *Art History*, 36 (2013), 922-943.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 78.

⁶⁴ Thomas Mayer and Courtney Walters (eds.), *The Correspondence of Reginald Pole*, 4 vols. (Aldershot and Burlington: Ashgate, 2002-2008), Vol. 1, 311, cat. 407, also quote this letter, but its transcription and translation are confused. See instead Forcellino, *Michelangelo*, 79.

⁶⁵ On Pope Leo X and Leonardo da Vinci for instance, see Vincent Ilardi, *Renaissance Vision from Spectacles to Telescopes* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2007), 167-8 and 193.

⁶⁶ Chapman, *Michelangelo*, 256.

⁶⁷ See Christian Belin, ‘Process and Metamorphosis of the Image: Ambivalence of the Anagogic Movement in Dionysian Contemplation’, in Ralph Dekoninck, Agnès Guiderdoni

and Walter Melion (eds.), *Ut pictura meditatio, the Meditative Image in Northern Art, 1500-1700* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), 247-261.

⁶⁸ Antonius Sucquet's *Via vitae aeternae* (1620) is one of the best examples. See Walter Melion, *The Meditative Art: Studies in the Northern Devotional Print, 1550-1625* (Philadelphia: Saint Joseph's University Press, 2009), 158; Ralph Dekoninck, *Ad imaginem: statuts, fonctions et usages de l'image dans la littérature spirituelle jésuite du XVIIe siècle* (Geneva: Droz, 2005), esp. 192.

⁶⁹ The word 'Jesuits' (that is 'followers of Jesus') is actually a shorthand for the official name of their organisation: the 'Society' or 'Company' of Jesus, depending on the use of the Italian *compagnia* or its Latin equivalent *societas* to designate the notion of 'brotherhood.' On the Jesuit's different appellations at the time see John O'Malley, *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), 34 and 69.

⁷⁰ On this 'constitutive paradox' of the image in Jesuit culture, see Pierre-Antoine Fabre, 'Qu'est-ce qu'être l'auteur d'un "écrit illustré"? Sur quelques ouvrages jésuites des XVIe et XVIIe siècles', *Les Cahiers du Forell*, 9 (1998), 39-66, esp. 49.

⁷¹ On the connection between Pole, the *spirituali* and the Jesuits, see Joseph Crehan, 'Saint Ignatius and Cardinal Pole', *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, 25 (1956), 72-98; O'Malley, *First Jesuits*, 315; Thomas McCoog, 'Ignatius Loyola and Reginald Pole: a Reconsideration', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 47 (1996), 257-273 and *The Society of Jesus in Ireland, Scotland, and England, 1541-1588: 'Our Way of Proceeding?'* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 24-39; Thomas Mayer, 'A Test of Wills: Cardinal Pole, Ignatius Loyola, and the Jesuits in England', in Thomas McCoog (ed.), *The Reckoned Expense: Edmund Campion and the Early English Jesuits, Essays in Celebration of the First Centenary of Campion Hall, Oxford, 1896-1996* (2nd edn, Rome: Institutum historicum Societatis Iesu, 2007), 23-42.

⁷² This idea is also outlined by O'Malley, *First Jesuits*, 315: 'the primacy the Jesuits attributed to religious experience and interior illumination had at least generic counterparts in the teaching espoused by the *spirituali*'.

⁷³ John O'Malley, 'The Historiography of the Society of Jesus: Where Does It Stand Today?', in Bailey Gauvin et al. (eds.), *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts, 1540-1773*, Vol. 1 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), 3-37, 27.

⁷⁴ On Heylard, see McCoog, 'Our Way of Proceeding?', 25.

⁷⁵ Crehan, 'Saint Ignatius', 73-4. For a reconsideration, see McCoog, 'Our Way of Proceeding?', 25.

⁷⁶ On the *Spiritual Exercises*, see Dekoninck, 'L'image dans la spiritualité jésuite', in *Ad imaginem*, 137-186.

⁷⁷ Susan Haskins, *Who is Mary? Three Early Modern Women on the Idea of the Virgin Mary* (Chicago and Bristol: University of Chicago Press, 2008), 39. Forcellino, *Michelangelo*, 69, considers on the contrary that it is after a meditation on the Pietà that Colonna asked Michelangelo to illustrate this subject for her.

⁷⁸ We refer here to the understanding of the notion of detail as '*dettaglio*' defined by Daniel Arasse, *Le détail. Pour une histoire rapprochée de la peinture* (2nd edn, Paris: Flammarion, 2008), esp. 240, which evokes the act of viewing a visual representation, the gaze metaphorically 'partitioning' it (in French 'dé-tailler').

⁷⁹ On this passage, see also Forcellino, *Michelangelo*, 93.

⁸⁰ On metaphors referring to painting, sculpting and printing in Jesuit meditation literature see Ralph Dekoninck's research, esp. '*Ut pictura/sculptura meditatio*. La métaphore picturale et sculpturale dans la spiritualité du XVIIe siècle', *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa*, 41 (2006), 665-694.

⁸¹ See also Nagel, 'Gifts', 655: 'People with these tastes and this sort of religious orientation [...] would be interested, instead, in Christocentric works that directly addressed the movements of the viewer's conscience, works that inculcated in the viewer the experience of being personally implicated by the immensity of Christ's sacrifice'.

⁸² We here understand the term 'miniature' in the broad sense of 'visual intensity' aimed by an artist in a minimal space. As emphasised by Jim Murrell, *The Way How to Lymne: Tudor Miniature Observed* (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 1983), 4: 'Not every miniature is small enough to be held in the palm of the hand and many are larger than small oil paintings or other examples of graphic art'.

⁸³ Anon., *Trinity with Saints Thomas of Canterbury and Edmund of East Anglia*, frontispiece with the arms of Cardinal Pole, Liber 23, *Liber Rationarius Hospitalis*, 1548-59, Rome, Venerable English College Archive. On this specific iconography, see Carol Richardson, 'Durante Alberti, the Martyrs' Picture and the Venerable English College, Rome', *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 73 (2005), 223-263, esp. 234-5.

⁸⁴ *Register of Reginald Pole*, 1556-8, fol. 1r, London, Lambeth Palace Library. See Richard Palmer and Michelle Brown (eds.), *Lambeth Palace Library: Treasures From the Collection of the Archbishops of Canterbury* (London: Scala, 2010), 104-5, cat. 31.

⁸⁵ Mayer, 'Marcello', 23: 'this would have especially suited Pole's limited financial resources throughout his career'.

⁸⁶ The secret aspect of the miniature in Reformed England is also highlighted for instance by Ellen Chirelstein, 'Lady Elizabeth Pope: The Heraldic Body', in Lucy Gent and Nigel Llewellyn (eds.), *Renaissance Bodies: the Human Figure in English Culture c. 1540-1660* (London: Reaktion, 1990), 36-59, 45: 'In Nicholas Hilliard's words, the miniature was meant "to be viewed of necessity in hand near unto the eye". Thus, the intimacy and closeness of the gaze were an essential aspect of the viewer's experience'.

⁸⁷ Gianfrancesco Stella was one of Pole's agents in Rome. His uncle, Bartolomeo, was the cardinal's *majordomo* for about twenty years. When the latter died in Dillingen in 1554, Gianfrancesco took his place and accompanied Pole to England. Very few studies have so far been dedicated to the Stella family, in spite of its importance in Pole's circle. See Irma Gipponi, 'Momenti di storia religiosa e culturale del Cinquecento nell'archivio Stella', *Archivio Storico Bergamasco* 4 (1984), 259-264.

⁸⁸ This inventory is mentioned in Giuseppe Bonelli, 'Un archivio privato del Cinquecento: le carte Stella', *Archivio Storico Lombardo*, 34 (1907), 332-386, cat. 130, 352: 'Inventario delle robe, che Gian Francesco Stella lascia in custodia a "messer Angelo Maria"', alongside a second inventory, dated 22 November 1555, 352, cat. 129: 'Inventario delle robe, di Gian Francesco Stella che sta per partire per l'Inghilterra'. The latter may have allowed us to trace artworks that Stella brought with him in England in Pole's circle. Unfortunately, I was unable to examine these documents, kept in the archives of *Biblioteca Angelo Mai* in Bergamo (*Archivio Stella*).

⁸⁹ Mayer, 'Marcello', 22: 'un christo in croce di man di Marcello con la morte et demonio a pie della croce corniciato d'ebano'.

⁹⁰ Lampson's letter to Clovio, dated 9 December 1570, was reproduced and translated in French by Jean Puraye, *Dominique Lampson, humaniste, 1532-1599* (Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1950), 92-100, 93.

⁹¹ It might be because Clovio was for a time in the service of Cardinal Marino Grimani, who was known for his opposition to the *spirituali* and to their doctrine of justification by faith. See Elena Calvillo, 'Romanità e Grazia: Giulio Clovio's Pauline Frontispieces for Marino Grimani', *The Art Bulletin*, 82 (2000), 280-297. On the artist's oeuvre as a whole, see Maria Cionini-Visani, *Giorgio Clovio: Miniaturist of the Renaissance* (New-York: Alpine Fine Arts Collection, 1980): this work is lacunar but it is so far the only monograph dedicated to Clovio.

⁹² See Milan Pelc, 'The World of Giulio Clovio', in Jasminka Poklečki Stošić (ed.), *Giulio Clovio: the Greatest Miniaturist of the Renaissance* (Zagreb: Galerija Klovićevi dvori, 2012), 39-51, 48.

⁹³ See above, note 56.

⁹⁴ As told in a letter between Francesco Babbi to Pierfrancesco Ricci, dated August 1544. See Pelc, 'Clovio', 48 and Deswarte-Rosa, 'Francisco de Holanda', 371, note 74.

⁹⁵ Pelc, 'Clovio', 48-9.

⁹⁶ Joannides, *Inventaire*, 236.

⁹⁷ Pelc, 'Clovio', 48.

⁹⁸ See for instance Clovio's *Deposition* (c. 1553, oil on cardboard, 39.6x25.7 cm) and *Crucifixion with St Mary Magdalene* (1553, tempera on parchment, 24x17 cm), both preserved in Florence, Gabinetto dei Disegni e delle Stampe degli Uffizi. These miniatures were probably executed when the artist was in residence at the court of Cosmo de' Medici in Florence from 1551 onwards. See Philippe Costamagna, 'À propos du séjour Florentin de Giulio Clovio (1498-1578)', in Monika Cämmerer (ed.), *Kunst des Cinquecento in der Toskana* (Munich: Bruckmann, 1992), 168-175.

⁹⁹ Nagel, 'Gifts', 661.

¹⁰⁰ Philip Pouncey – in a manuscript note written on the back of the drawing – was the first to suggest Clovio's name. This attribution is confirmed by Cionini-Visani, *Clovio*, 98 and Catherine Monbeig-Goguel, 'Giulio Clovio, "nouveau petit Michel-Ange". À propos des dessins du Louvre', *Revue de l'Art*, 80 (1988), 37-47, 47, note 64.

¹⁰¹ The question of the problematic identification of Nicodemus's figure – especially in Michelangelo's work – has already been thoroughly examined by Jack Wasserman (ed.), *Michelangelo's Florence Pietà* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2003), esp. 156, note 75. But in this precise case, it seems clear that the figure represented is

Nicodemus, as indicated by the basket at the bottom of the drawing, containing nails, pincers and a hammer: tradition associates Nicodemus with removing the nails after Christ's death.

¹⁰² As noticed by Dominique Cordellier, 'La mise au tombeau d'Isaac Oliver au musée d'Angers', *Revue du Louvre*, 33 (1983), 178-187, 183, citing Edward Norgate's *Miniatura*.

¹⁰³ See Pelc, 'Clovio', 50 and Susan James, 'The Queen's Painter: Lievine Teerlinc', in *The Feminine Dynamic in English Art, 1485-1603: Women as Consumers, Patrons and Painters* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009), 287-333, esp. 306-8.

¹⁰⁴ Or even by Venusti. See Mayer, 'Marcello', 24.

¹⁰⁵ Mayer, 'Maecenas', 424-5.

¹⁰⁶ Mark Evans, 'The Pedigree of the Portrait Miniature: European Sources of an English Genre', in Bodo Brinkmann and Wolfgang Schmid (eds.), *Hans Holbein und der Wandel in der Kunst des frühen 16. Jahrhunderts* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), 229-252, 238.