

Roy Strong

Nicholas Hilliard's miniature of the 'Wizard Earl'

In the year 1728 the antiquarian George Vertue paid a visit to Northumberland House in the Strand. He made his usual staccato memoranda in his notebooks on the pictures, in this instance, ones of the present owner, of Henry VIII, a triple portrait by Dobson but, following a reference to the great Titian of the Cornaro family now in the National Gallery, London, comes a short description of a miniature: 'a Lord Percy a limning lying on the ground. dyd about 1585. in Syon Gardens'¹.

In this entry we have the earliest certain reference to Nicholas Hilliard's miniature of Henry Percy, ninth Earl of Northumberland (see cover). The owner of the house at that date was Charles Seymour, 6th Duke of Somerset, known as the Proud Duke, who had married the Percy heiress, Elizabeth, daughter of the eleventh Earl of Northumberland. Although the identity of the miniature had by then seemingly been lost the subject was in fact the Duchess's great-grandfather. Its appearance in Northumberland House would certainly seem to indicate that there is no need to doubt its descent within the family from the time that it was painted. That descent would have been from the ninth Earl to his son, Algernon, tenth Earl of Northumberland (1602–68) and from him to his son, Joceline, the eleventh Earl (1644–70). He left as his only child, Elizabeth, who married as her

third husband the Proud Duke. For the miniature's subsequent descent we have to turn to the Duke's second wife, Charlotte, daughter of Daniel Heneage Finch, Earl of Winchilsea and Nottingham. Their daughter, Charlotte, married Heneage, 3rd Earl of Aylesford in 1750. At the time of the marriage her step-brother, Algernon, seventh Duke of Somerset, had begun extensive changes to the old Jacobean house 'to make it less like a prison'² and it is conceivable that the miniature passed to her in the process of dismembering the earlier interior to make way for the work of Adam. From her it descended directly in the family of the Earls of Aylesford until it was sold from their collection at Christie's on 23rd July 1937 (lot 45)³. There is a second version of this miniature and before we proceed it would be as well to dispose of it. The miniature is now in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, and takes the form of a horizontal oval that includes the figure to the waist (Fig. 1)⁴. The background, however, is different for, instead of a closed book, there is an open one with pink ribbons fluttering from it and only one glove is cast onto the ground amidst a carpet of wild flowers. For a time this miniature was wrongly identified as Sir Philip Sidney⁵ with the consequence that the present Rijksmuseum miniature also took that name so that it was sold in 1940 as 'Sir Philip Sidney, dans une attitude de rêve, dans un beau paysage'. The Sidney identification is hardly surprising, for



Fig. 1. Attributed to Rowland Lockey. Henry Percy, ninth Earl of Northumberland, c. 1590-95? Vellum stuck to a playing card with three hearts showing at the reverse, 51.5 × 63.5 mm. Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge (PD 3-1953).

NICHOLAS HILLIARD AND THE CABINET MINIATURE

This miniature belongs to a series which are generally referred to as large-scale or cabinet miniatures and were the product of a particular period of Nicholas Hilliard's career stretching from the last years of the 1580's to the middle of the 1590's when they abruptly stop, even though Hilliard himself was to continue to paint for another twenty-five years⁷. The earliest one is the celebrated *Young Man among Roses*, almost certainly Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, painted about 1587 and the last, arguably the Northumberland painted about 1596, although it could be earlier in date. There are only about half-a-dozen in all and the sitters without exception were rich, grand and prodigal: Essex, to whom we have already referred, George Clifford, 3rd Earl of Cumberland, the Queen's Champion in the tiltyard, and Sir Robert Dudley, son and heir of her first favourite, Leicester. Hilliard was forty when he suddenly embarked on the miniatures and almost fifty when he as suddenly abandoned them. In sharp contrast his pupil, Isaac Oliver, was to return to the formula over the whole length of his career. Why was this? Why were Hilliard's cabinet miniatures such a short-lived phenomenon? The answer may initially come as something of a shock, for they were surely a failure both in commercial and aesthetic terms. To understand this we have to reconnoitre back in time and place them within a broader perspective. For the last thirty years Hilliard has been the subject of unending adulation, but recent examination of most of the two hundred or so miniatures that he painted, in laboratory conditions would indicate that a great deal of qualification needs now to be applied to our appreciation of his work. As an artist Hilliard was at once enormously gifted but at the same time extremely uneven in the quality of the work which he produced. His technique of limning, of painting in miniature from life in watercolour on vellum mounted onto card he probably learnt in the 1560's from Levina Teerlinc, (daughter of the famous Flemish illuminator, Sanders

the provenance of the Fitzwilliam miniature is Penshurst Place, Kent, seat of the Sidney family. This, however, presents no problems in respect of the ninth Earl, for his daughter, Dorothy Percy, married the owner of Penshurst in 1615, Robert Sidney, 2nd Earl of Leicester.

Up until now the Fitzwilliam miniature has been accepted as by Hilliard himself but although it makes use of all the miniaturist's techniques as they would have been learnt in the studio, the painting has none of the incisive quality of Hilliard himself. This miniature belongs to a group which we can now associate with a pupil, Rowland Lockey (c. 1565-1616), who was active as an artist in his own right from the start of the 1590's⁶. We know that he worked particularly as a copyist, and his most fully documented miniature, the *More Family Group*, painted about 1593-94, is just such an object, a copy in little of Holbein's famous lost group but with the addition of subsequent generations of the family. Lockey's manner is a weak and muddled version of his master's work as it was in the 1580's. It would be more difficult to establish when exactly this second version of the miniature was painted. There is some evidence to indicate that Lockey in the 1590's executed duplicate versions of Hilliard miniatures but it could be later in date. What is certain is that the miniature now in the Rijksprentenkabinet is the prime original by Nicholas Hilliard himself.

Benninck), who was picture-maker to four Tudor monarchs, Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary I and the young Elizabeth I. Even as late as 1576, when Hilliard had already established his workshop, she was still painting miniatures of the Queen. Although she died in that year, Hilliard was not appointed as her successor and indeed his career from the opening of the 1570's was to be that of court painter *manqué*, a victim of the huge financial cut-backs – shades of our own age – that the Elizabethan government embarked upon in the 1560's. His earliest work in the 1570's is easily his most brilliant, portraits from life painted with vigour in a linear style that far exceeded the work of all his predecessors except Holbein. But he was always financially in deep water. The indications are that he was also unreliable and from time to time it is clear that he felt threatened by competitors. In 1576 Hilliard went to France for a twin purpose, he stated, money and knowledge. For almost three years the Queen was left without her portrait painter. She was not pleased, so, when the lucrative post of Serjeant Painter fell vacant in 1581, she gave it, not to the impoverished Hilliard, who by then had returned, but to the reliable George Gower. That Hilliard had gone to France for knowledge reveals that he felt inadequate. The year before he left England his major patron, Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, had brought over Federigo Zuccaro. The presence, even if only for a few months, of an Italian artist of international standing and sophistication must have made Hilliard all too aware of his limitations. Although his miniatures were superb, his oil paintings from the 1570's can only be described at the most as archaic, at the worst as primitive. Hilliard, however, was fortunate for he was to enjoy an aesthetic heyday in the isolationist England of the pre-Armada years. There were to be no challenges from visiting artists and a new generation had not begun to undermine him, nor had educated Elizabethan society awoken to the idea of painting in the terms of Renaissance Italy. Softened by French court art, his essentially medieval aesthetic of outline, colour and frontal, even light remained triumphant until the close of

the 1580's when innovation was, for the first time, apparent. On the whole Hilliard stuck to a set format throughout his career, in his case the head and shoulders portrait posed against a blue background within an oval shape. This he began to experiment with. He was first of all prevailed upon by his sitters to introduce emblems. He next embarked on a series of small full length miniatures but gave them up almost at once as unsatisfactory. Then about 1587 he embarked on the cabinet miniatures and, finally, in 1594, he evolved a new format for the backgrounds to his sitters, the folded crimson velvet curtain. What prompted this? Without a doubt the answer is: competition. By the 1590's his pupil Rowland Lockey was working. More significantly Isaac Oliver's earliest miniature is dated 1587 coinciding precisely with Hilliard's sudden urge to explore new possibilities. Oliver from the start was the greater genius, for even his first miniature owes nothing to Hilliard beyond its technique and looks directly to the engraved portraiture of Hendrik Goltzius. Oliver was the opposite of Hilliard. His own career is a monument to constant experimentation with both scale and format. I have said that Hilliard abandoned the large-scale miniatures because they were not a success. The truth of the matter is that they showed up the essential limitations of the man. As long as he stuck to head and shoulders close-ups the fact that he had no grasp of scientific or aerial perspective never became apparent. In the case of the full length miniatures his complete ignorance of the norms of renaissance pictorial convention were rapidly revealed. Lines never converge to a single vanishing point but to several. In Hilliard's case they could even go in two totally opposite angles and there is no understanding of the fading of the intensity of colour in relation to distance. On the whole his most successful large-scale miniatures are those, like the Northumberland, with naturalistic backgrounds. His abandonment of this format also coincided with the advent of the aesthetic revolution which was to render him obsolete. Oliver was an exponent of the new wave of 'curious painting' which catered for a new generation

Fig. 2. Nicholas Hilliard. Henry Percy, eighth Earl of Northumberland, 1585. Vellum stuck onto card, oval, 2 x 1½ inches. The Duke of Rutland, Belvoir Castle.

that collected pictures as work of art, who were acutely aware of the optical aspects of painting in terms of perspective and chiaroscuro, and who were open to new genres, such as the landscape, for which a word had to be borrowed from the Dutch. By 1603, when the old Queen died, Hilliard was the remnant of a vanished age.

THE WIZARD EARL

Henry Percy, ninth Earl of Northumberland came of a dynasty whose fortunes had been laid low in the Tudor period⁸. The Percys were part of the old Catholic aristocracy of the North. Their prosperity depended on land and they held vast estates in Yorkshire. Two of the Earl's forebears had suffered attainders arising from their part in taking leading roles in two rebellions against the government, Sir Thomas Percy, brother and heir to the sixth Earl, in 1537 and his son, Thomas, the seventh Earl, in 1572. The latter had been executed for his part in the Northern Rebellion of 1569, after which it was the Queen's wish that the title pass to his loyal brother, Henry, the eighth Earl. Such loyalty, however, was subject to wavering and he was sent to the Tower no less than three times for his intrigues with Catholics on behalf of the Queen of Scots. On the last occasion, in 1585, he was discovered dead in bed in his cell, shot through the heart in circumstances which could be categorised as mysterious, although he could equally have committed suicide.

Henry, by his wife, Catherine Neville, left eight sons and two daughters. Of these the eldest, the young man in the miniature, was twenty-one when he succeeded his father as ninth Earl. He had been brought up as a Protestant but to avert any repetition of the past it was laid down that he resided in the south, dividing his time between his principal residence at Petworth, Sussex, and various London houses. His education and early years followed a pattern common to many aristocratic youths: a foreign tour in 1582, service under Leicester in the Low Countries in 1585–86 and in the fleet sent against the Armada in 1588.



The period in which the miniature was painted was one during which it seemed that the Earl would succeed in putting back the clock and restoring the family fortunes. Royal favour began to be forthcoming. In 1591 he was made Governor of Tynemouth, in 1593 he was elected a Knight of the Garter, appointed general in the army and in 1602 went for a second time to fight in the Netherlands. The accession of James I in 1603 brought initially even more favour: privy councillor, captain of the gentlemen-pensioners and lord-lieutenant. Alas, all this was to be as nought when his kinsman, Thomas Percy, was discovered to be a leading actor in the Gunpowder Plot of 1605. James I, already disenchanted with the Earl, used this as an excuse to levy on him a vast fine and confine him to The Tower from which he did not emerge until 1621. He died at Petworth ironically on the anniversary of the Plot, November 5th 1632.

But it is the optimistic 1590s that are reflected in the miniature. Northumberland patronised Hilliard a great deal over the years. The first payment comes in the autumn of 1585: 'to Mr Hylyearde for your Lordship's picture, lx s'⁹; the second in the period from 16th June 1587 to 8th July 1588: 'for your Lordship's Picture to Hillyard lx s' and finally the third payment in the accounts covering 2nd March 1595 to 21st February 1596: 'to mr Hilliard for his Lordship's Picture lx s'¹⁰. It is conceivable that the

Fig. 3. Isaac Oliver. *Unknown Melancholy Man*, c. 1590–95. Vellum stuck onto card, rectangular, $4\frac{3}{8} \times 3\frac{1}{4}$ in. H. M. The Queen, The Royal Collection.



earliest payment relates to a miniature of his father which is now at Belvoir Castle (Fig. 2)¹¹. It bears the date 1585 and is likely to be the one which was in Charles I's collection and which he gave to the ninth Earl's son in exchange for one of the Earl of Hertford¹². The Belvoir miniature poses a problem with its date, for the eighth Earl was found dead on 21st June of that year presupposing that the miniature must have been painted between April 1st and that date, the last day of the Elizabethan year 1584 being 31st March 1584/5. It is therefore conceivable that the miniature is posthumous and commissioned by his dutiful son in memoriam. It would be tempting to associate the

Rijksmuseum miniature with the 1595-6 payment but the amount is that for a small miniature. The Earl's costume belongs to the nineties, more easily to the first half than the second and as he is not shown wearing the Lesser George of the Order of the Garter, which it was mandatory for Knights to wear, it would seem that it could be dated before 1593. But it is not quite as simple as that, for in emblematic portraits the George was discarded. And with this fact we touch on the heart of the matter. The Northumberland miniature is emblematic. He reclines wearing a black doublet, trunk hose, stockings and shoes with his gloves cast behind him. His shirt is left undone as is his doublet. The initial mood and pose show that he is in the grips of *melancholia* and place this miniature firmly into a long series of Elizabethan portraits which depict young men in this manner¹³. As a fashion with its attitudes and attributes it only began to reach England at the close of the 1580s and its visual manifestation took two forms, love melancholy, in which gallants stare, heavilylidded, out at us from the shadows suffering from the pangs of unrequited love and melancholy of the intellectual kind stemming from the Ficinian revaluation of the Saturnian influence, in which case the men are also negligently dressed but depicted in poses of contemplation. Don Armado in *Love's Labour's Lost* is an example of the first, a man 'beseiged by sablecoloured melancholy' who is advised to:

'sigh a note and sing a note... with your hat penthouse-like o'er the shop of your eyes, with your arms crossed on your thin-belly doublet, like a rabbit on a spit...'¹⁴

Isaac Oliver's famous miniature of a young man sitting under a tree is just such a one with his black dress, floppy black hat and arms crossed on his chest (Fig. 3). Northumberland's melancholia is not of this variety, in spite of the fact that he married at this period, Essex's sister, Dorothy Devereux, in 1594. It is of the second type and a parallel image is Oliver's miniature of the philosopher and man-at-arms, Edward, Lord Herbert of Cherbury, painted about 1610-14

Fig. 4. Isaac Oliver. *Edwart Herbert, 1st Baron Herbert of Cherbury*, c. 1610–14. Vellum stuck onto card, rectangular, 230 × 180 mm. *The Earl of Powis, Powis Castle.*



(Fig. 4). Lord Herbert's miniature celebrates the twin aspects of the man. The *vita activa* is alluded to in the squire hanging up his armour on a tree in the distance. The *vita contemplativa* is referred to in the recumbent pose by a trickling stream of a kind sought by melancholics.

'What is more pleasant than to walk alone in some solitary grove, betwixt Wood and Water, by a Brookside, to meditate upon some delightful and pleasant subject...'¹⁵ thus Burton in his *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. The philosophical aspect is elaborated in the impresa which is on his shield with the motto, *Magica Sympathica*, depicting a winged heart ascending from flames amidst

golden sparks, an allusion to some kind of ascent of the intellect.

There is one major difference between the Herbert and the Northumberland miniature, the setting. Saturnian melancholics seek the shade of the greenwood tree and the babbling brook. They do not find inspiration for their arcane thoughts in the order of a Renaissance garden in which art is tamed by nature. The point is admirably made in the earlier Oliver miniature in which the young man sits in a 'dump' or 'muse' beneath a tree and a formal garden is seen in the distance over a wall. In contrast, Northumberland rests in some kind of garden, amidst nature which has been planted and cut into geometric shapes. He lies in an enclosure situated in a remote and

mountainous place, at first sight a rectangular enclosure bordered by a clipped green hedge on a hill-top with views of mountains beyond. Within the hedge is a gravel path, then a stretch of grass and then a gradient upon which we can see five trees growing and then an inner hedge. What does this mean? Nature never figures in Hilliard's work in any other way than a symbolic one. The clue to the meaning of the allegorical setting comes in a poem by a minor poet, George Peele, which celebrates Northumberland's election to the Order of the Garter in 1593. The passage reads as follows:

(Renowned Lord, Northumberlands fayre
flower)

The Muses love, Patrone, and favoret,
That artizans and schollers doost embrace,
And clothest Mathesis in rich ornaments,
That admirable Mathematique skill,
Familiar with the starres and Zodiack.
(To whom the heaven lyes open as her booke)
By whose directions undeceivable,
(Leaving our Schoolemens vulgar troden
pathes)

And following the auncient reverend steps
Of Trismegistus and Pythagoras,
Through uncouth waies and unaccessible,
Doost passe into the spacious pleasant fieldes
Of divine science and Phylosophie...¹⁶

I have no doubt that what we are looking at in Hilliard's miniature is precisely what this poem describes 'Northumberlands fayre flower' reclining in the 'spacious pleasant fieldes/Of divine science and Phylosophie' to which the route has been, as we can see by the terrain, by means of 'uncouth waies and unaccessible'. Is it heaven's book that lies close to his head? That such a suggestion is not too fanciful can be proved by placing the miniature within its intellectual setting. We can begin with Peele's description of the method of ascent. It is through a study of mathematics and astronomy as epitomised by the two figures of Hermes Trismegistus and Pythagoras. The key reference is to 'Mathesis', a word which can mean either mathematics or astrology¹⁷. It is a word which occurs in the writings of Giordano Bruno and for him Mathesis is one of the four guides in religion,

the others being Love, Art and Magic. In the Northumberland miniature the geometric enclosures are meant to be read in terms of Hermetic geometry which enlarged and elaborated upon the Pythagorean and numerological approach to the diagram traditional in the Middle Ages. In its crudest sense it is the mathematical diagram used not in order to demonstrate an argument as a mathematician would but as a hieroglyph resting on the macrocosm-microcosm analogy and therefore heavy with mystical and occult meaning. Hilliard is obviously painting a highly symbolic programme. The solution to what that programme means it is perhaps too early to unravel. It may also be hindered by the artist's limitations, for Hilliard's skill at perspective was so limited that it may well be that what he was attempting to place the Earl into was not two rectangles but two squares. The square is the symbol of secret wisdom, the attribute of the god Hermes, in one aspect the Trismegistus whom Peele celebrates¹⁸. And what the miniature depicts is, like the Lord Herbert miniature, an ascent of the mind, although the emblematic language is different. In the context of Northumberland such esoteric allusions are correct for he was the Wizard Earl. He was one of a group of late Elizabethan thinkers who pursued philosophical and mathematical studies. The Earl is mentioned in that poetic vehicle for arcane thought, George Chapman's *Shadow of Night*. Published in 1594, its theme is the 'revalued' Saturn of Renaissance thought as epitomised by Northumberland and his friends in their pursuit of arcane studies¹⁹. Raleigh was a key figure and a great friend, but a second person may be even more relevant, Thomas Hariot (1560-1621), mathematician and astronomer²⁰. Hariot had been introduced to Northumberland by Raleigh and became a member of his household and resided at the Earl's house at Syon, which came to him through his wife. He is most remembered today for his account of Virginia, the result of his voyage with Sir Richard Grenville in 1585. Together with Walter Warner and Thomas Hughes, they were known as the 'three magi' of the Wizard

Earl. Hariot's range of studies place him as a typical late Renaissance magus within the tradition of John Dee, whose work centered on the practical investigation of the nature of the physical world but still set within an hermetic concept of a universe pervaded by occult influences and forces. Research on Hariot and his circle within the context of late sixteenth century thought is still at its initial stages but the geometric diagrams in his papers may indicate that his approach was not only experimental and scientific in our sense but also mystical and symbolic. Hariot may well have been the man who compiled or suggested the esoteric programme for Hilliard to follow.

The *impresa* is equally as obscure. At first glance it would seem to relate to the innumerable emblems that include balances. One in a Jacobean source, that draws on earlier material, depicts a wreath of bay and a quill pen outweighing a canon, representing the triumph of the followers of Pallas over those of Mars²¹. But the *impresa* of Northumberland is not exactly a balance but a rod tied at one end by an eye to the branch of a tree. From it hangs a globe and a feather. There is no doubt that this is an essential part of the symbolic programme devised by or for the sitter. The structure emphasises that something very light, such as a feather, can in special circumstances, outweigh something larger and by implication heavier. The allusion is both personal and cryptic and no doubt meant to be read on a variety of levels. The crux is what the feather means. Are we to read it as somehow a personal allegory of the revived fortunes of his house? That something as insubstantial and ephemeral as royal favour can balance the weight of the rest of the world against him? Or is it more complex and profound as the secret contemplative garden of philosophy in which he reclines would suggest? His and Raleigh's protégé, Thomas Hariot, throughout the fifteen nineties was attacked as a man who believed in the eternity of matter, in the Copernican system and in the plurality of worlds. Could it be an allusion to the latter in which case earth as it was then known would have been as but a feather? I cannot pretend

to offer a satisfactory explanation but as serious research advances into the scientific and philosophical ideas that centred on the Northumberland circle advances the *impresa* should fall into place.

As we contemplate the face of the philosopher Earl his thoughts perhaps are being gathered for a Saturnian ascent of the melancholy humour as evoked by his friend, Chapman:

now let humour give
Seas to mine eyes, That I may quicklie weepe
The shipwracke of the world: or let soft sleepe
(Binding my senses) lose my working soule,
That in her highest pitch, she may controule
The court of skill, compact of misterie,
Wanting but franchisement and memorie
To reach all secrets...²²

Hilliard's Wizard Earl remains one of the most cryptic hieroglyphs of the Elizabethan age.

Notes

¹ Vertue, *Notebooks*, IV, *Walpole Society* 24 (1936), p. 152.

² London County Council, *Survey of London*, 18, *The Strand*, London 1937, p. 13.

³ See E. Auerbach, *Nicholas Hilliard*, London 1961, pp. 119–20, 303–4 (94).

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 120–21, 304 (95).

⁵ A. C. Judson, *Sidney's Appearance*, Indiana U.P. 1958, pp. 32–33.

⁶ On Lockey see Auerbach, *op. cit.* (Note 3), pp. 254–62; Otto Kurz, 'Rowland Lockey', *Burlington Magazine* 99 (1957), pp. 13–16; Roy Strong, *The English Icon*, London 1969, pp. 255–58; the same author in *The English Miniature*, Yale U.P. 1982, pp. 59–61.

⁷ This discussion of Hilliard and in particular of his cabinet miniatures is based on part of chapter IV in my forthcoming *The English Renaissance Miniature*, London 1983 and the Victoria & Albert Museum exhibition catalogue, *Artists at the Tudor Court: The Portrait Miniature Re-discovered, 1520–1620*, 1983. The standard available monograph on Hilliard remains Auerbach, *op. cit.* (Note 3), and there is a bibliography on pages 336–38.

⁸ On Henry Percy, ninth Earl of Northumberland see *Dictionary of National Biography*; G. R. Batho, *The Household Papers of Henry*

Percy, Ninth Earl of Northumberland, Camden Society, 3rd series, xciii, 1962; same author's 'The Percys at Petworth', 1574-1632', *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 95 (1958), pp. 1-27; 'Henry, ninth Earl of Northumberland and Syon House, Middlesex', *Transactions of the Ancient Monuments Society*, new series, 4 (1956), pp. 95-109; 'The Wizard Earl in The Tower', *History Today* 6 (1956), pp. 344-51.

⁹ Batho, *op. cit.* (Note 8), p. 65.

¹⁰ Auerbach, *op. cit.* (Note 3), p. 124.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 92, pl. 62 296 (57).

¹² O. Millar, 'Abraham van der Doort's Catalogue of the Collection of Charles I', *Walpole Society* 37 (1960), p. 118 (57).

¹³ Roy Strong, 'The Elizabethan Malady: Melancholy in Elizabethan and Jacobean Portraiture', *Apollo* 79 (1964), pp. 254-9.

¹⁴ Act I, sc.i; III, sc.I.

¹⁵ Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, ed. R. A. Shilleto 1926, I, p. 452.

¹⁶ David H. Horne, *The Life and Minor Works of George Peele*, Yale U.P. 1952, p. 245 11. 4-17.

¹⁷ On which see Frances A. Yates, *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition*, University of Chicago Press 1978 ed., pp. 296-98, 313-15.

¹⁸ E.g. Piero Valeriano, *Les Hieroglyphes*, trans. I. de Montyard, Lyons, p. 518.

¹⁹ Frances A. Yates, *The Occult Philosophy in the Elizabethan Age*, London 1979, pp. 135-46.

²⁰ There is no comprehensive modern work on Hariot and research on him is still at its exploratory stages. So far it is, in the main, from the navigational, mathematical and astronomical side and, rather through the eyes of modernist rational thought than those of the late Renaissance encyclopaedia. See: Henry Stevens, *Thomas Hariot*, New York, 1972 ed.; E. Seaton, 'Thomas Hariot's Secret Script', *Ambix* 5 (1956), pp. 111-14; Arthur Koestler, *The Sleepwalkers*, London 1954, pp. 363 ff; A. C. Crombie and others, 'Thomas Hariot, 1560-1621', *Times Literary Supplement*, 23.10.69, pp. 1237-8; David B. Quinn and John W. Shirley, 'A Contemporary List of Hariot References', *Renaissance Quarterly* 22, i (1969), pp. 9-25.

²¹ Henry Peacham, *Minerva Britannia*, London 1612, p. 44.

²² George Peacham, *Poems*, ed. Phyllis Bartlett, New York-London 1941, p. 20.

Keuze uit de aanwinsten van het Rijksprentenkabinet

Omslag: NICHOLAS HILLIARD (Exeter 1547–1619 Londen). Portret van een liggende edelman in een begroeide hof. Miniatuur op perkament, 257 × 173 mm.
Opm.: Eén van Hilliards weinige 'grote' miniaturen, met figuren ten voeten uit. De voorgestelde jongeman is niet Sir Philip Sidney, zoals hij wel genoemd is, maar vrijwel zeker Henry Percy, 9th Earl of Northumberland (1564–1632) (Auerbach, *op. cit.*, p. 122). Deze edelman had de bijnaam The Wizard Earl (tovenaar) vanwege zijn belangstelling in alchemie en natuurkunde. Hij was verder – afgezien van zijn plaats in het politieke leven van zijn tijd – een groot boekenminnaar, bevorderaar der wetenschappen, en volgens eigen zeggen geïnteresseerd in tuinaanleg. Voor Holland heeft zijn portret aparte betekenis omdat hij hier diende als vrijwilliger van 1585 tot 1586 en in November 1600 deelnam aan een aanval op Venlo onder Prins Maurits. Een artikel over deze miniatuur van de hand van Sir Roy Strong, Directeur van het Victoria & Albert Museum in Londen een specialist voor dit onderwerp, is opgenomen in dit nummer van

het Bulletin, op blz. 54.
Litt.: George Vertue, Note Books, vol. IV, in: *The Walpole Society* 24 (1935/36), p. 152; J. Pope-Hennessy, *A Lecture on Nicholas Hilliard*, Londen 1949, pl. 32; Erna Auerbach, *Nicholas Hilliard*, Londen 1961, pp. 118 (afb.), 119–124, 303–304; J. Murdoch, J. Murrell, P. J. Noon, R. Strong, *The English miniature*, New Haven–Londen 1981, pp. 54, 69–70, col. pl. 7.
Herk.: Verz. The Earl of Aylesford (Parkington Hall, Coventry), veil. Christie, Londen 23–7–1937, nr. 45 als portret van een onbekende jongeman; Verz. Dr. N. Beets, veil. Fred. Muller, Amsterdam 9/11-4-1940, nr. 66, met afb., als portret van Sir Philip Sidney; Verz. Dr. M. E. Kronenberg, Rotterdam. Geschenk van de Rijksmuseum-Stichting, 1981 (inv. nr. 1981:2).

Afb. 1. WILLIAM HAMILTON (Chelsea 1751–1801 Londen). De toneelspeelster Sarah Siddons als Euphrasia in de *Grecian Daughter*. Zwart krijt, penseel in grijs, 455 × 343 mm.
Opm.: Sarah Siddons, afkomstig uit een familie van toneel-

spelers, vierde in de jaren 1782–1812 triomfen in de rollen van Lady Macbeth, Desdemona, Ophelia en andere thans minder bekende figuren. Zij is vaak door kunstenaars vereeuwigd, onder meer geschilderd door Reynolds, Lawrence en Gainsborough. Hamilton schilderde haar als Isabella in het gelijknamige toneelstuk van Southerne.
Herk.: Covent Garden Gallery Ltd., Londen (Cat. *Winter exhibition*, 1981/82, nr. 44, pl. 8). Aankoop 1982 (inv. nr. 1982:12).

Afb. 2. JOHN ROBERT COZENS (Londen 1752–1797 Smithfield). Italiaans berglandschap met het meer van Nemi, ten zuiden van Rome.
 Aquarel en enig potlood, 368 × 535 mm; op de oude monture i.o. gesigneerd en gedateerd: *John Cozens 1790*. Verso opschrift: *Lake of Nemi*.
Opm.: Er zijn tenminste vier versies bekend van deze aquarel, maar deze is de enige die gedateerd is. Waarschijnlijk is zij identiek met de aquarel die vermeld wordt door C. F. Bell en Th. Girtin (The drawings and sketches of John