**‘Here, in her hairs / The Painter plays the spider…’:**

**Shakespeare’s Spider Painter in European and Elizabethan Context**

The casket scene in Shakespeare’s *Merchant of Venice* (1596-8) is the supreme audio-visual manifestation of the cultic and erotic power of Elizabethan portraiture. Portia’s late father devised a test for her suitors: to marry his daughter they must select one of three caskets made, respectively, of gold, silver and lead. Bassanio, whom Portia loves, correctly chooses the lead casket which is inscribed ‘Who chooseth me must give and hazard all he hath’ (2:7:11-12). Therein he finds a portrait miniature of Portia. But it is so meticulous and sensuously alive that Bassanio is jealous of the ‘demi-god’ painter, and of his perceived tactile and visual intimacy with Portia during the sittings. Bassanio believes the painter ‘plays the spider’ in her hair.

The purpose of this essay is to explore Bassanio’s response, teasing out its rich cultural and socio-political context. Hitherto, this has only been done to a very limited degree.[[1]](#endnote-1) I will show how Shakespeare exploits prevailing notions of the spider as a symbol of touch that is both creative and destructive. Bassanio’s commentary is far more than just a witty emblematic conceit; it is imbued with Protestant and Puritan fears about image-magic. Yet there were grounds for his suspicions - in art myth and theory if not necessarily in practice. Shakespeare was most likely thinking of Nicholas Hilliard (c.1547-1619), the Queen’s miniature painter, and the principal fashioner of the royal image, both ‘in little’ and ‘in great’.[[2]](#endnote-2) Hilliard spun web-like lines and patterns in his royal portraits, intensifying trends in elite fashion - the Queen had a penchant for spider and web motifs, and a big spider is one of the animals embroidered into her dress in a Hilliard workshop portrait (fig. 12). Hilliard also envisaged the painter as necessarily in love with his English sitters, a potentially transgressive (per)version of the new fashion for authorial empathy. I will argue that Bassanio’s response to the miniature marks a key moment in the history of portraiture, implying as it does a crisis in relations between patron and artist, and between classes.

**Good Spider, Bad Spider**

During the Elizabethan period, miniature portraits were the most intimately experienced of visual artforms.[[3]](#endnote-3) They were exchanged by lovers, family members, kinsfolk and courtiers. Set in jewelled, ivory or ebony cases with lids, they were usually stored in cabinets in private chambers; from the 1570s, however, they were increasingly either pinned or hung on clothes as semi-public demonstrations of fealty and love; they could be held in the hand for close viewing and kissed; they could even be fastened to the shoe and elbow to show disfavour.[[4]](#endnote-4) (Fig. 1) Insofar as Portia’s miniature is kept in a casket, the scene is rather old-fashioned for the 1590s - but then it was her dead father’s idea.

Bassanio, in his moment of triumph, thinks less of his future intimacy with Portia (and with her portrait), than of her past intimacy with the anonymous painter. He is assailed by doubts which make their relationship seem potentially tainted:

What find I here?

Fair Portia's counterfeit! What demi-god

Hath come so near creation? Move these eyes?

Or whether, riding on the balls of mine,

Seem they in motion? Here are sever'd lips,

Parted with sugar breath: so sweet a bar

Should sunder such sweet friends. Here in her hairs

The painter plays the spider and hath woven

A golden mesh to entrap the hearts of men,

Faster than gnats in cobwebs; but her eyes,--

How could he see to do them? having made one,

Methinks it should have power to steal both his

And leave itself unfurnish’d. (3:2:109-21)[[5]](#endnote-5)

‘What demi-god / Hath come so near creation?’, Bassanio asks. By virtue of painting Portia, the painter has come far closer to this pinnacle of creation than any other man. But the phrase ‘come so near creation’ also means ‘comes so near to creating her’. The demi-god painter has rivalled the creator by creating Portia anew in this portrait - *pro*creating her. There is yet another, even more risqué meaning - that the painter has come near to procreating *with* her. The double-entendres in Bassanio’s reference to Portia’s eyes ‘riding on the balls of mine’ suggest he sees the painter as a sexual rival who may have imperilled Portia’s chastity. The portrait itself might be the offspring of their relationship: it was a cliche, originating with Plato, that the works of an artist or writer were their children, and this idea was expressed in phrases like pregnant wit.[[6]](#endnote-6) Petrarch believed the relationship between the sitter and their portrait was like a family resemblance, as between parent and child.[[7]](#endnote-7)

Bassanio’s predatory conception of the painter is elaborated and intensified when he compares him to a spider: ‘Here in her hairs / The painter plays the spider and hath woven / A golden mesh to entrap the hearts of men, / Faster than gnats in cobwebs’. Although the golden mesh alludes to a golden hair net, the fact that it is ‘in’ rather than ‘on’ her hairs suggests that her hair has become net-like thanks to the mesmerising skill of the painter. Indeed, Portia’s hair may have been worn loose, as befitting a virgin - but all the better to entrap a male admirer. Bassanio implies that in order to paint her hairs so microscopically well the painter may have examined each one up close, perhaps even touching them, like a spider extracting and touching its web or wrapping its prey. Similarly, when creating hairs and other details of web-like fineness - a ‘golden mesh to entrap the hearts of men’ - he imagines the spider painter first entrapping Portia in his own web, then her trapping men in her own web-like beauty. All elite women, including royals, practiced sewing and embroidery, so the weaving metaphor made some sense. (Fig. 2) The spider painter has created a portrait in his own image, endowing Portia with spider-like powers. A comparable mirroring occurs in a sonnet by Edmund Spencer published in 1595: he compares his beloved to Penelope, wife of Odysseus, weaving at her loom a ‘Web her wooers to deceave’, while he, in his ‘fruitlesse’ attempts to woo her, is like a spider whose web is ‘broken with least wynd’.[[8]](#endnote-8)

Shakespeare’s six other references to spiders are negative, and mostly refer to political networks and influence.[[9]](#endnote-9) In Richard III (c.1593), for example, Queen Margaret asks Queen Elizabeth about Richard: ‘Why strewst thou suger on that bottled spider, Whose deadly web ensnareth thee about?’ (1:3:240). Spiders eat sugar so Bassanio’s spider painter would feed on Portia’s ‘sugar breath’ and ‘sweet’ lips: at the very least, Bassanio imagines him breathing on her, and breathing in her sweet breath, as he scrutinises her like a modern optician or dentist. Hilliard did in fact use sugar, adding it to the pigment used in red curtain backgrounds to preserve its brightness, the earliest dated example being from 1595. Sugar and honey were also often used as plasticisers by painters.[[10]](#endnote-10)

The terms for painting in England in this period still had pejorative associations - counterfeit (which Bassanio uses) and design (have designs on someone); drawing was a ‘rude draught’; ’curious painter’ and ‘artificial painter’ signified figure painter.[[11]](#endnote-11) Even for Hilliard, perspective (perhaps because he almost never used it) was a means to express truth by falsehood.[[12]](#endnote-12) It was an era of iconoclasm, when a portrait of a father could be disapproved of because commemorative portraits marked the origins of idolatry.[[13]](#endnote-13) So Bassanio’s spider painter reflects a climate of some suspicion.

But there is a fascinating ambivalence, for Bassanio is clearly jealous of the ‘demi-god’ artist who is both marvellous and enviable, dangerous and immoral. The painter simultaneously enables and blocks his access to Portia. The insistent prior presence of the artist and his artistry prevents Bassanio taking exclusive possession of the beloved. There is, as it were, a *menage-à-trois*. Bassanio is denied what has been termed ‘intimate vision’, a private view of the miniature that shelters both viewer and subject from the world - or in this case, from the artist’s studio.[[14]](#endnote-14) The Venetian setting makes this empowerment of the portrait painter all the more plausible: Sir Philip Sidney, while staying in Venice in 1574, debated at length whether to be portrayed by Veronese or Tintoretto, both of whom ‘easily occupy the first rank in this art’.[[15]](#endnote-15) The permanent presence of the famous artist in the portrait had already been articulated by the Sienese poet Claudio Tolomei in a letter of 1543 to the Venetian-born Sebastiano del Piombo, who succeeded Raphael as the leading portrait painter for Rome’s elite:

‘You know how many times you yourself have said you wanted to paint my portrait. When, as I hope, this is accomplished, then I will seem to have gained a mirror, which I will always call a divine mirror, because in it I will see you and me together. You, because I will perceive in my image your singular ability and your marvellous skill; me, because I will see my image expressed vividly in your art…’[[16]](#endnote-16)

In the ‘divine mirror’ of Portia’s portrait, Bassanio sees only Portia and the demi-god ‘spider’ painter.

Apelles and Campaspe come to mind, whose story could be found in Thomas Hoby’s 1561 translation of Castiglione’s *The Courtier* (1528), where drawing is recommended as a skill for courtiers. Castiglione gave the story a different emphasis from his source in Pliny, who says that Apelles fell in love with Alexander the Great’s favourite mistress Campaspe after painting her nude, whereupon Alexander gifted her as a perquisite.[[17]](#endnote-17) Castiglione says painters have a greater appreciation of female beauty than anyone else, and this is why Alexander handed her over:

Those loves that arise onelye of the beauty which we dyscerne superficially in bodyes, without doubt will bring a farre greater delite to him that hath a more skill therein then to him that hath but a little. Therefore retourning to our pourpouse, I believe Appelles conceived a far greater joy in behoulding the beawtye of Campaspes then did Alexander, for a man maye easilye beleeve that the love of them both proceeded of the beawtye, & perhaps also for this respect Alexander determined to bestowe her upon him, that (in his minde) could knowe her more perfectlye then he did.[[18]](#endnote-18)

Bassanio, in his role as Alexander the Not-So-Great, may fear that the spider painter could love and appreciate Portia more profoundly than he ever can. He is, after all, marrying her for money, and he has just spouted a misogynist soliloquy, decrying the ornaments women use to ‘entrap the wisest’, even wearing wigs of ‘crisped snaky golden locks’ (3:2:92 & 101). Last but not least, he has probably not taken Castiglione’s advice and learned how to draw…

Having unravelled Bassanio’s response to Portia’s miniature, I will now explore the wider context of the spider painter in relation to aesthetics, physiology, politics, sex and gender.

**Spider Lines**

The most obvious way in which a visual artist might be compared to a spider is through the refined deployment of line. In this respect Hilliard, who trained to be a goldsmith, had no rivals amongst contemporary European portrait painters (Bronzino died in 1572). When Bassanio observes that ‘*in* her hairs / The painter plays the spider’, this applies particularly well to Hilliard, who developed several techniques never previously used in manuscript or miniature painting, and worked with astonishing linear precision, using rhythmical hatching and cross-hatching.[[19]](#endnote-19) Working with a brush made from squirrel or ermine hair, he not only articulates individual hairs and eye-lashes (as in the *Self-Portrait* of 1577, Fig. 3), he actually seems to get inside the hair of sitters.[[20]](#endnote-20) This has been deftly noted in a comparison with the work of his star pupil Isaac Oliver: ‘In the Hilliards we can see deeper into the mass of hair: the shadows are darker versions of the lights; in the Olivers the highlight glistens as on a velvety opaque cushion’.[[21]](#endnote-21)

Hilliard admired Dürer above all artists, and knew his prints and treatises. In his own treatise on miniature painting, now known as *The Art of Limning* (c1600), Hilliard frequently invokes Dürer’s ‘rules’, and praises him as ‘exquisite and perfect’, the most ‘exquisite man that ever use lines to view, for true delineation’.[[22]](#endnote-22) Dürer was the only painter and engraver to be associated with spiders and webs. He was said by a contemporary Christopher Scheurl to have painted spiders’ webs around his house to fool his servants, which they then tried to brush off.[[23]](#endnote-23) This was a tribute to his ability to draw the finest and most controlled of lines. Dürer, in his *Painter’s Manual* (Unterweysung der Messung, 1525/38), would coin the term ‘spider lines’ (spinnen lini) for conchoid and epicycloid shapes because ‘when fully drawn it resembles a spider’, as well as looking like a web (Fig. 4). Hilliard had learnt Latin at school, and may have had access to this treatise in the latin translation.[[24]](#endnote-24)

There is another crucial aspect of the symbolism of the spider that both Shakespeare and Hilliard would have known.[[25]](#endnote-25) According to Ovid, Arachne was a supreme weaver, who challenged her divine teacher Minerva to a weaving competition, which she won with a tapestry depicting the erotic entanglements of the Gods - a subject which was, of course, predicated on the sense of touch. Minerva, enraged by her impious arrogance, struck her with a weaving shuttle, whereupon Arachne hanged herself, before being turned into a spider.[[26]](#endnote-26) Like Arachne, heretics were often thought to be like spiders, spinning webs of impious words drawn from their own bodies, rather than being guided by God. In Shakespeare’s *Henry VIII* (1613), the vanity, pride and ambition of the Cardinal of York is due to his being a self-made man:

spider-like,

Out of his self-drawing web, he gives us note,

The force of his own merit makes his way

A gift that heaven gives for him, which buys

A place next to the king. (1:1:62-6)

An exception could sometimes be made for poets, however. In antiquity poets were often said to weave a web or tapestry, enchanting their audience, and this trope waspopularised in the sixteenth century by one of Erasmus’ adages: ‘Ex se fingit velut araneus’ - the spider forms/creates as if from itself. Erasmus cites Plutarch: ‘Poets and orators are like… “the spiders who create material that is their very own”, and is not supplied by others, and start to weave their webs and then expand them’.[[27]](#endnote-27) Spencer, in *Virgil’s Gnat* (1591), and Philip Sidney, in the preface to *Arcadia* (1590), would compare their poems to webs that they weave.[[28]](#endnote-28) Hilliard was friendly with Sidney,[[29]](#endnote-29) and praised him in his treatise;[[30]](#endnote-30) when living in France (1576-8), he knew and portrayed Ronsard, who also used the motif of the poet as spider.[[31]](#endnote-31)

The association of painting, drawing and engraving with Arachne’s web was made explicitly by Hilliard’s close friend Richard Haydocke (c1570-c.1642), a student of medicine at Oxford University and self-taught artist. Haydocke published the first art theoretical text in England, *A tracte containing the artes of curious paintinge, caruinge & buildinge* (1598).This was an edited and interpolated translation of the first five books of Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo’s *Trattato dell’arte de la pittura, scoltura, et architettura* (1584).[[32]](#endnote-32) In the preface, Haydocke declared that he had asked Hilliard to write a history of limning.

Haydocke engraved the ambitious frontispiece, rather crudely, almost certainly in collaboration with Hilliard who was a printmaker. He placed a profile portrait of Lomazzo at the top, and a bust length framed oval portrait of himself at the bottom, undoubtedly based on a lost miniature by Hilliard (Fig. 5). In the four corners he placed classical figures symbolising the visual arts. Juno is at top left, with a peacock, standing for painting and colour; Prometheus, at bottom left, makes a sculpture; Daedalus, at bottom right, is architecture; while at top right Minerva, goddess of wisdom and the arts, holds a patterned cloth or tapestry. She is flanked by webs made by her rival, Arachne. Near her right hand, two spiders are suspended from a web over a dragon - depicting a fable about a spider killing an evil dragon with its bite. The spider and its web can signify a number of things - weaving, engraving, and - even more importantly here - *disegno*, or design and drawing.[[33]](#endnote-33) The webs on both sides of Minerva, flanking her like a sun and moon, are very similar to the geometrical diagrams in Dürer’s *Painter’s Manual*. The suspended web seems to be attached to Minerva’s elongated finger, as though she too has become a spider. Her long courtly finger becomes a surrogate spider’s leg. Haydocke considers the artist to be a ‘Demi-god’, crediting the idea to Leonardo, and this hybrid spider-goddess is the visible manifestation.[[34]](#endnote-34)

Many of Hilliard’s miniature portraits are partially enveloped and haloed by a gold inscription curving round the upper edge of the circular or oval ground. It usually includes the date of the portrait, and the sitter’s age; or a motto. The letters are exquisitely wiry, the capitals done with a calligraphic flourish. This could be the script of a spider painter-poet, the flourishes perhaps even webs ‘broken with least wynd’. (Fig. 3) No other miniaturist turns the inscription into such a flamboyant *dramatis persona:* his predecessors confined themselves to horizontal, capitalised latin inscriptions flanking the sitter’s neck.[[35]](#endnote-35) This flaunting of line also puts Hilliard in direct competition with Apelles, who was famed as a painter of lines of web-like fineness: having visited Protogenes’ studio and not finding him there, he painted a line on a panel, then left; when Protogenes returned, recognised Apelles’ line, and painted a finer line next to it; Apelles returned and drew a still finer line, whereupon Protogenes conceded defeat.[[36]](#endnote-36) Thomas Lodge opened his defense of poetry, *Protogenes can know Apelles* (1579): ‘PROTOGENES can know Apelles by his line though he se him not, and wise men can consider by the Penn of aucthoritie of the writer thoughe they know him not.’[[37]](#endnote-37) We know Hilliard by his line alone.

**The Feeling Power**

When Shakespeare compares the painter to a spider, he is not simply making a formal point about the finesse and precision of the painter’s line. He is drawing on a rich emblematic tradition, in which one of the key aspects of spiders is their mastery of touch - both sensitive (in their legs, which feel movement in the web) and brutal (in their poisonous bite).[[38]](#endnote-38) Hence the grotesque shock-value of Bassanio’s metaphor. From around the twelfth century, when animals were first used to symbolise the five senses, the spider and its web was often the symbol of touch.[[39]](#endnote-39) A spider in a circular web features in a medieval wall painting depicting *The Five Senses* (c1340) in Longthorpe Tower, Peterborough, where the five sensory animals are distributed around a wheel.[[40]](#endnote-40) The spider again signifies the sense of touch in Sir John Davies’ encyclopediac *Nosce Teipsum* (1599), which includes a sequence of five poems dealing with the senses.

Lastly, the feeling power, which is Life's root,

Through euery liuing part it selfe doth shed ;

By sinewes, which extend from head to foot,

And like a net, all ore the body spred.

Much like a subtill spider, which doth sit

In middle of her web, which spreadeth wide ;

If ought doe touch the vtmost thred of it,

Shee feeles it instantly on euery side.

By Touch, the first pure qualities we learne… (1057-65)

When Davies compares the ‘feeling power’ to ‘a net, all ore the body spred’, and calls it the primordial sense by which ‘we do the first pure qualities learn’, he is endorsing the epicurean doctrine, expressed in Lucretius’ *De Rerum Naturae*, that touch is the fundamental sense ‘of the whole body’.[[41]](#endnote-41) He may also be influenced by the depictions of the nervous system in Vesalius’ *De humana corporis fabrica* (1543) and *Epitome* (1543).[[42]](#endnote-42) (Fig. 6) Vesalius compared the skin-like internal coat of the arteries, intestines and stomach to ‘a wide, unbroken spider’s web’; while the spreading of the optical nerve when it meets the back of the eye is like a net.[[43]](#endnote-43) Davies conceives the nervous system to be like a web that passes over and through the whole body. So a spider analogy prevails for both the interior and exterior of the human body; the spider is architect and exemplar of the feeling body. Hence, perhaps, the spider painter’s demi-god status in Bassanio’s eyes.

The all-pervasiveness of the sense of touch throughout the human body, and its erotic implications, is deftly illustrated in a print by Dutch artist Hendrick Goltzius depicting *Tactus* (c. 1578), one of a series on the five senses.[[44]](#endnote-44) (Fig. 7) Goltzius’s prints were freely available in London, and he was the only living artist singled out for praise by Hilliard.[[45]](#endnote-45) A scantily clad female figure, derived from an earlier print image of Cleopatra, is bitten by a snake on her hand, and rained on. The rain shower suggests the diffusion of the sense of touch through the whole body. The caption reads ‘Take care not to be moved by the illicit sense of Venus,/ And let the lawful couch be your remedy’. So the rain is also an erotic fertility symbol, akin to the shower of gold with which Zeus raped Danae. She glances up at a spider lurking in the middle of a web placed in the branches of a neighbouring tree. The snake bite shows she is being punished for her susceptibility to the feeling power. The point is reinforced by Goltzius’ technique: the parallel curved lines and crosshatching emulate the effect of the spider’s web, literally becoming ‘like a net, all o’er the body spread’. Here ‘spinnen lini’ are eroticised and universalised: every depicted thing becomes a vibrating erogenous zone.

The lasciviousness of spiders (and snails and urchins) leads to mob violence and gang rape in an allegory of the senses in Spencer’s *Faerie Queene* (1590). The human body, represented by a large castle in which the pure soul, Alma, resides, comes under attack from monstrous hordes, which assault all of the five senses in turn, each located in its own perimeter fort. The last to be attacked, or tempted, is the sense of touch:

But the fift troupe most horrible of hew,

And fierce of force, was dreadfull to report:

For some like Snailes, some did like Spyders shew,

And some like ugly Urchins thicke and short:

Cruelly they assayled that fift Fort,

Armed with darts of sensuall delight,

With stings of carnall lust, and strong effort

Of feeling pleasures, with which day and night

Against that same fift bulwarke they continued fight. (2.11.13)

Bassanio seems to imagine the spider painter ‘assailing’ Fort Portia in a comparably carnal manner, penetrating her hair and who knows where. The basic idea goes back to a comparison made by Socrates in Xenophon’s *Memorabilia* between a lover’s kiss and the bite of a poisonous spider, both of which inflict excruciating and maddening pain: a hot-headed man has dared to kiss the handsome son of Alcibiades.[[46]](#endnote-46)

**A Spider Queen**

Bassanio does not just compare the painter to a spider; he also sees arachnid qualities in Portia. The spider painter remakes her in his own image, endowing her with a ‘golden mesh’ that entraps the hearts of men ‘Faster than gnats in cobwebs’; in the end, the spider painter has merely highlighted and intensified what was already obvious - that Portia is a man-trap.

Bassanio’s assessment of Portia is not simply or even primarily provoked by her physical attributes; it is a response to contemporary female fashions, where net worked fabrics and spider motifs were all the rage. No-one did more to promote the fashion than the Queen; and nowhere did this power-dressing become more sublimely irresistible than in Hilliard’s royal portraits, ‘in large’ as well as ‘in little’.

Hilliard’s first miniature of the Queen was painted in 1571. He would become the most influential shaper of the Queen’s image, producing life size oil paintings in his workshop as well.[[47]](#endnote-47) In 1584, Hilliard was commissioned to design the second great seal of the realm, and a draft patent gave him the exclusive right to produce miniature portraits of the Queen. Although this was never ratified, it attests to his pre-eminence, and he would never lose favour throughout her reign. There was an explosion in the production of reginal portraits from that time, and especially after the Armada (1588), when she was promoted as the ever youthful Virgin Queen and as Astraea, an Imperial Ruler.[[48]](#endnote-48) As a virgin she was sometimes shown with her hair loose, especially on coins.[[49]](#endnote-49) Hilliard was a jeweller and goldsmith by training, and he clearly developed a stronger feel for pattern and line than continental European painters trained to value naturalism, shading, foreshortening and perspective.

The *Phoenix portrait* (1570s) used a face pattern similar to that in Hilliard’s first surviving miniature of the Queen (1572).[[50]](#endnote-50) (Fig. 8) This, and the *Pelican portrait* (made by reversing the pattern, and with adjustments to the costume, hand, props and background), established the standard format for reginal portraiture, and we are struck by the insistent heraldic flatness and iconic frontality of the pattern making.[[51]](#endnote-51) Both pictures are named after a pendant jewel that hangs in the middle of her chest. The phoenix and pelican are (like the ‘self-drawing’ spider) autonomous and self-reliant in important respects - the phoenix is reborn when burnt, and the pelican feeds its young from its own blood. They refer to Elizabeth’s ability to revive herself and her nation continually without the need for a husband and his sperm.

Despite being the most forceful advocate for Elizabethan portraiture, Roy Strong criticised these portraits for being ‘certainly a retrogression when compared with the elegant sophistication of that attributed to Steven van der Muelen…Hilliard looks at her face on, a wooden stylized icon of clothes and jewellery’.[[52]](#endnote-52) Yet the ‘correctly’ perspectival and proportioned portraits by van der Meulen and Federico Zuccaro make her less imposing, both withdrawn in space and more conventionally ‘feminine’. The intensity and excess of the Hilliard portraits is highly innovative, with no obvious precursors in medieval or renaissance painting. One would need to go to medieval goldsmiths’ work, such as the bejewelled *Pala d’Oro* in San Marco, Venice - though even this seems diffuse by comparison.

The costume in the *Phoenix Portrait* is a deluxe exoskeleton. The abundance, opulence and frontality verges on the hallucinogenic. There is a tantalising sense that the Queen’s riches might burst their bounds and that we might touch them. Her long-fingered yet ringless hand (she was proud of her hands) holds a red Tudor rose over her heart, and is artfully displayed. In *The Allegory of the Tudor Succession* (c1572), Elizabeth appears with Peace and Plenty, the latter a bare breasted woman who carries a cornucopia overflowing with fruits, telling of the abundance and prosperity that Elizabeth brings.[[53]](#endnote-53) The Phoenix portrait tells of the riches that might flow from her, as from an open-cast mine. In Shakespeare’s *Henry VIII*, the richly dressed French nobles make ‘Britain India: every man that stood / Show’d like a mine’ (1:1:25-6); in Hilliard’s portrait, Henry’s daughter has made ‘Britain India’. For sheer sublime excess, the only comparable royal portrait is Arcimboldo’s *Emperor Rudolf II as Vertumnus* (1591), a Roman fertility god. (Fig. 9) The Emperor is a cornucopia, entirely fashioned from flowers and fruits of all seasons. But Arcimboldo’s portrait was an amusing ‘one-off’, destined for a cabinet of curiosities, rather than mass-produced for public and semi-public settings.[[54]](#endnote-54)

The flatness of the *Phoenix Portrait* makes the web association more compelling. There seems to be an allusion to a spider’s web in the pleats in the otherwise invisible veil, and in the gold network that decorates and structures the clothes. Pearls of implausible size, and the protruding clumps of white fabric, are caught in the net like gnats. European fashions of the time may have made these metaphors possible, but Hilliard realises them emphatically, exaggerating lateral proportions, padding, patterns and the size of jewels: in January 1582, a full-length portrait of the Queen painted for Catherine de’ Medici was displayed at the Valois court and the women present marvelled at the size of the pearls.[[55]](#endnote-55) This all-encompassing pattern-making is strikingly different to Holbein’s superficially similar portraits of *Henry VIII*, where we are impressed by the King’s pneumatic, muscular bulk; and to the more demure female portraits by the French court miniaturist François Clouet (c1510-72), which Hilliard saw during his stay in France in 1576-8. He evidently admired textile art: in his treatise he credits foreigners with bringing to England the arts of ‘Carving, Painting, Gouldsmiths, Imbroderors’.[[56]](#endnote-56)One wonders if he designed any of the Queen’s bejewelled clothes.

In portrayals of the Queen, her own (e)motionless demeanour is indeed comparable to that of a spider in a web. This interpretation may seem far-fetched, but it is unlikely to have troubled her, for the Queen actively promoted arachnid images and associations; and so did her enemies. Political figures - like Shakespeare’s Richard III - were often referred to as spiders at the centre of a web of power and intrigue, usually but not always by their enemies. In John Heywood’s illustrated poem *The Spider and the Fly* (1556), protestants are evil spiders, and catholics innocent flies and butterflies. The webs are eventually brushed away, and the spiders stamped on by a maid, who stands for the catholic Queen Mary.[[57]](#endnote-57) (Figs. 10, 11) Mary died two years later, in 1558, and her half-sister Elizabeth was crowned Queen. In 1592, the Scottish catholic William Crichton tried to persuade Philip II of Spain to have Elizabeth assassinated: he wrote that like a spider, the Queen spun her web in different parts of Philip’s house. He could clean away the cobwebs in the various rooms, but as long as the spider remained, the webs returned. The King should concentrate on the destruction of the spider.[[58]](#endnote-58) Crighton may not only have been thinking of her international network of spies and agents; her mass-produced portraits ‘in little’ and ‘in large’ were sent far and wide, usually as diplomatic gifts, to places like Edinburgh, Paris, Florence, Vienna and the Spanish Netherlands.[[59]](#endnote-59)

The Queen played up to this powerful, indefatigable image, for in March 1595 - shortly before Shakespeare began *The Merchant of Venice* - Duke Frederick of Wurttemberg’s ambassador reported that the sixty-one year old Queen was wearing a red robe interwoven with gold thread, studded with large diamonds and precious stones: “Over her breast, which was bare, she wore a long filigree lace shawl, on which sat a hideous black spider that looked as if it were natural and alive. Many might have been deceived by it.’[[60]](#endnote-60) The spider was a piece of raised embroidery on a network scarf probably designed to look like a web. To simulate the effect, I have overlaid an embroidered spider from a satin petticoat panel onto a portrait of the Queen by an unknown artist. (Figs. 11 & 12) This daring coup-de-theatre no doubt inspired discussions as to whether the spider symbolised a poisonous enemy lurking on the body politic; an enemy that had been tamed and neutralised; or a powerful ally and a ‘self-drawing’ alter-ego. It could have been comparable to a Medusa’s head on a breast-plate; or the ears and eyes that decorate her dress in the *Rainbow Portrait* (c.1600) to show her omniscience.[[61]](#endnote-61) A spider queen was someone to be reckoned with.

The Stowe inventory of the Queen’s clothing, compiled in July 1600, includes a ‘Jewell of golde with a flie and a spider in it upon a Rose’, which was presumably a red Tudor rose, thus suggesting an alliance between the spider and the rose (whose nectar the spider might drink). There is another listing for a ‘foreparte of white Satten embrodered allover with spiders flies and Roundells with Cobwebbs of venice golde and tawnye sylke’. The ‘foreparte' is the visible part of a petticoat/dress worn under an overgown which is open at the front. (Fig. 13) The wearing of these kinds of dress may have prompted Crichton’s extended metaphor whereby the Queen was the author of innumerable webs. Another petticoat is embroidered with ‘Snailes wormes flies and spiders’. These are similar to the creatures - snails, spiders, urchins - that assail the allegorical body in Spencer’s *Faerie Queene.* The Folger inventory, also compiled in July 1600, includes a fan decorated with ‘spiders of ragged pearl’.[[62]](#endnote-62) At times, the spider fan may have covered the Queen’s face. None of these items is known today, and they are unlikely to have survived for long - no doubt because future owners were as disturbed by the spider motif as the ambassador.

One giant spider (with stubby legs) does survive, however. It appears alongside other creatures on the embroidered petticoat in the portrait of Elizabeth commissioned in around 1590 by Bess of Hardwick, one of the greatest collectors and makers of textiles.[[63]](#endnote-63) (Fig. 13) It is attributed to the Hilliard workshop, and epitomises - according to Strong - ‘an outmoded aesthetic’.[[64]](#endnote-64) It echoes the ‘marvels’ that might be found in a cabinet of curiosities, or adorning the grottoes and plates of Bernard Palissy. Most of these decorative animals are predatory and/or powerful (toothy crocodiles, sea monsters, whales, snakes) and the Noah’s ark mixture of beasts of the sea, land and air suggests the Queen’s imperial sway.

A comparable fragment of petticoat survives, though here the spider theme relates to erotic traps.[[65]](#endnote-65) (Fig. 11) Spiders’ webs hang from trees and spiders are carried in net-like webs by butterflies, one of their traditional enemies, seemingly hoist in their own petard.[[66]](#endnote-66) Cupid fires his arrow at them, so these are the snares of love - as in Bassanio’s reference to the Portia’s painted hair being a ‘golden mesh to entrap the hearts of men, / Faster than gnats in cobwebs’.

Elizabethan costume (like Goltzius’s engraving of *Tactus*) does not require the presence of a spider to give the sense of a radiating, all-enveloping web. The Queen’s silhouette and that of her female courtiers expanded exponentially during the course of her reign, while men's fashions slimmed down.[[67]](#endnote-67) During the 1570s and 80s the use of starch enabled white lace neck ruffs to become large radiant cartwheels, inspired by but far exceeding French and Italian court fashions.[[68]](#endnote-68) The term devised in the middle ages for this type of lace work with a network ground was Opus Araneum - spider-work; the decoration was darned in.[[69]](#endnote-69) The ruff’s haloing effect was intensified by enveloping veils cantilevered above the shoulder and round the back of the head using wire, or cartilage from the mouth of the baleen whale. A spectacular example is the portrait from around 1590 at Compton Verney, in which transparent veils rise from the Queen’s shoulders.[[70]](#endnote-70) (Fig. 12) In the Bower of Bliss scene in Spencer’s *Faerie Queen*, the veil of ‘silk and silver thin’ that covers Arcasia’s alabaster-white body is said to be finer than one of Arachne’s webs:

More subtile web Arachne cannot spin,

Nor the fine nets, which oft we woven see

Of scorched deaw, do not in th’ ayre more lightly flee. (2:12:75-7).

In the Compton Verney portrait a radiating moon, symbol of the virgin goddess Diana / Cynthia, adorns the Queen’s bodice. Here the spidery and the cosmic are almost indistinguishable in the pattern on her ruff.[[71]](#endnote-71)

**Predatory Painters**

Bassanio’s fears concerning the proximity of the spider painter to Portia are in fact rooted in a reality, for miniature painters got closer to the sitter/patron than any other artists. Shakespeare would have been well aware of this. His references to painting begin in the mid-1590s, and his actor friend Richard Burbage was a portrait painter.[[72]](#endnote-72) His plays were performed at court,[[73]](#endnote-73) so he would have been well aware of the centrality of miniatures to court culture, and to the cult of the Queen. He would have known that painters like Hilliard enjoyed more direct contact with the Queen, and other elite sitters, than he ever could, and for far longer. She gave many sittings to painters, except for the final decade of her life.[[74]](#endnote-74) Edward Norgate, in *Miniatura or the Art of Limning* (1627-8/48) recommended a first sitting of 2-4 hours, a second sitting of 3-4 hours, and a final sitting of 2-3 hours ‘according to the patience of the sitter, or skill of the Lymner’.[[75]](#endnote-75) Portrait painting could also involve selecting and adjusting poses, hairstyle, jewels and clothes. This happened notionally after the sitting as well. Painters would have had some access to the queen’s wardrobe, and a lady-in-waiting might be used to model her clothes.[[76]](#endnote-76)

The portrait painter’s proximity to a female subject is dramatised and satirised in *Hamlet* (1599-1602). When Ophelia gives an account of Hamlet’s outrageous conduct to her father Polonius, she compares him to a portrait painter:

He took me by the wrist and held me hard.

Then goes he to the length of all his arm,

And, with his other hand thus o’er his brow,

He falls to such perusal of my face

As he would draw it. Long stayed he so.

(2.1.84-8)

Intense scrutiny of an elite female face is the special preserve of the portrait painter; the reference is almost certainly to miniature portraits as Hamlet soon complains that everyone pays large sums for King Claudius’s ‘picture in little’ (2.2.360-8), and then gets his mother to compare ‘counterfeits’ of his father and Claudius (3.4.63-4). Hamlet’s arm’s length distance from Ophelia is a little less than that recommended by Hilliard in his *Treatise*: sit no closer than two yards.[[77]](#endnote-77)

Hilliard is more deeply concerned about the relationship between sitter and artist than any other art writer; and these deliberations shed light on Ophelia’s comparison and Bassanio’s concerns. He gives the only surviving account of a portrait sitting with the Queen, and the emphasis is on their intimacy and privacy. He claims she insisted on being outside in the open to avoid shadows being cast on her face: ‘Her Majesty … chose her place to sit in for that purpose in the open alley of a goodly garden, where no tree was near, nor any shadow at all, save that as the heaven was lighter than the earth, so must there be that little shadow that was from the earth.’[[78]](#endnote-78) It has been claimed that this would have taken place in the gardens at Hampton Court, but why would Hilliard - a compulsive name-dropper - not identify such an exclusive location?[[79]](#endnote-79) This outdoor scenario is in fact likely to be fanciful, not least because this period is known as the Little Ice Age, so not conducive to sitting still in the open for long periods.[[80]](#endnote-80) No other example is known to me of a sitting for a portrait conducted outdoors. Hilliard painted directly onto the prepared vellum, rather than making preparatory drawings, so dust, insects and pollen could have stuck to the wet paint. The sitting would presumably be on an overcast spring or summer day for otherwise shadows would be cast. Not that this would have mattered much because the Queen would have been heavily made up in white face powder, and her face in portraits was heavily stylised.[[81]](#endnote-81) Hilliard suppresses facial shadow in all his portraits. Elsewhere he recommends a completely different setting: indoors, with a northern light, ‘somewhat toward the east, which commonly is without sun shining in’, from a ‘free skylight’.[[82]](#endnote-82) Nonetheless, however fanciful his outdoor pastoral encounter with the Queen may be, it emphasises that a prolonged intense involvement between miniature painter and sitter is ideal.

Because of a portrait painter’s proximity with the sitter, they were always expected to be of good character.[[83]](#endnote-83) The obvious model was St Luke, patron saint of painters, when he painted the Virgin Mary. Female sitters were often accompanied by a chaperone/servant to prevent impropriety, as seen in a fictional Flemish evocation of van Eyck’s studio.[[84]](#endnote-84) (Fig. 14) Hilliard, in his treatise, initially takes great pains to insist on the portrait painter’s decency, and draws up a code of conduct. He needs temperance in all things, and to be possessed of ‘true gentility’ so he does ‘not offend their royal presence’ (royal presumably includes courtiers). Hilliard, son of a goldsmith, meritocratically / self-servingly points out that God does not confine gentility to the upper classes - he gives it to ‘divers persons’ (he was in fact on friendly terms with many of his patrons, notably Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and his family).[[85]](#endnote-85) Befitting a gentleman, the painter needs ‘tender senses, quiet and apt’. He must be ‘pure and cleanly’ in all his doings’. He should wear silk, ‘such as sheddeth least dust or hairs’, and not have dandruff. He should neither touch or breathe on his work, or leave the ‘least sparkling of spittle’. Hilliard recommends ‘discreet talk or reading, quiet mirth or music’ to ‘shorten the time and quicken the spirit’ of both painter and sitter. Always ‘avoid anger, shut out questioners or busy fingers’. Sit no closer than two yards.[[86]](#endnote-86) So far so good - so Italian Renaissance.

But Hilliard then changes tack, and in what has been called ‘one of the most remarkable passages in art theory’,[[87]](#endnote-87) gives good grounds for Bassanio’s suspicions concerning the spider painter. Now Hilliard insists on the need for erotic and emotional attachment with the sitter. He first claims - having concurred with Vasari’s assertion that Dürer would have been a far better artist if his models had been Italians rather than Germans with bad figures - that the English are the most beautiful race:

‘…rare beauties are, even as the diamonds are found among the savage Indians, more commonly found in this isle of England than elsewhere, such surely as art ever must give place unto. I say not for the face only, but every part; for even the hand and foot excelleth all pictures that yet I ever saw. This moved a certain Pope [Gregory the Great] to say that England was rightly called Anglia, of *angeli*, as the country of angels: God grant it’.[[88]](#endnote-88)

So English portraiture should be supreme: its artists have the best raw material. Such nationalistic faith in English beauty seems to have been widely shared: Erasmus, in *In Praise of Folly* (1511), written in England, mocks the self-love which leads the English to believe they are the most beautiful nation.[[89]](#endnote-89)

But having sitters of angelic beauty is not by itself a sufficient catalyst. The painter also needs to have a responsive temperament. If the painter wants to depict the expressions and emotions of these supremely beautiful people - the ‘grace in countenance, by which the affections appear’ - he must be

‘in heart wise, as it will hardly fail that he shall be amorous - and therefore fittest for gentlemen; for who seeth an excellent precious stone, or discerneth an excellent piece of music with skill indeed, and is not moved above others with a more amorous joy and contentment than the vulgar?’

He needs to be ‘wise’ in the affairs of the heart, and in the etiquette of loving - skills and qualities which someone with gentility is most likely to have, and which his sitters have in abundance. In other words, he has to be equally versed in the protocols of love practised at court. Adapting Castiglione’s passage about Apelles’ superior connoisseurship of Campaspe’s beauty, he says that gentlemen are most moved by beauty.

But this heightened sensibility is problematic for Hilliard: how can the painter, privileged to stare for hours at supremely beautiful sitters, not get carried away by amorous emotion?

Howbeit, gentle or vulgar, we are all generally commanded to turn away our eyes from beauty of human shape, lest it inflame the mind. How then can the curious drawer watch, and as it were catch those lovely graces, witty smilings, and those stolen glances which suddenly like lightning pass, and another countenance taketh place, except to behold and very well note and conceit to like? So that he can hardly take them truly, and express them well, without an affectionate good judgment, and without blasting his young and simple heart, although in pleasing admiration he be very serious busied, so hard a matter he hath in hand, calling those graces one by one to their due places…’[[90]](#endnote-90)

The dilemma broached here inconclusively is how the artist can apprehend the beauty of sitters while keeping hand steady, libido in check. The sitters’ gender is not specified, but here we can assume he is primarily thinking of the Queen, focal point of courtly erotics, and of Campaspe-esque female sitters.

In a related way, Bassanio wonders how the portrait painter could have depicted one of Portia’s eyes without being blinded. He concludes that Portia’s beauty did have a damaging effect on the art, for he notes ‘how far this shadow / Doth limp behind the substance’.[[91]](#endnote-91) Limp may be a reference to Petrarch’s tormented lover, ‘so weak and lame on one side where desire has twisted me, safe but still in my face bearing scars that I got in the battle of love’.[[92]](#endnote-92) Whether the facial scars blind Petrarch is left unsaid. The portrait of Portia is lame because the portrait painter was blasted and blinded by the sitter’s beauty.

Hilliard then proposes that the painter should have “affectionate good judgment” if he wants to “express them [the sitter] well”. This appears to be affection constrained by reason. And yet in the very next clause he throws this safeguard overboard, surrendering to passion. If we omit ‘without an affectionate good judgment’, the sentence runs: “he can hardly take them truly, and express them well…without blasting his young and simple heart”. We might blame it on a slip of the pen - Hilliard’s treatise survives in a scribe’s copy of 1624 - were it not that the painter is now envisaged as “young and simple” rather than mature and wise. Hilliard was then in his fifties, so he is turning himself - or rather, his sitters are turning him - into the epitome of the naive lusty boy lover. Rejuvenated yet tormented by proximity to his sitters, a young and simple Hilliard is more likely to be guided by amorous affections rather than good judgment: one thinks of *A Young Man Leaning against a Tree among Roses* (1585-95), unable to stand unsupported, hands hidden, looking away, caught in a web of rambling roses.

Hilliard climaxes this section of his treatise with a single sentence descriptive passage. This is more throbbingly sensuous and ecstatic than any other art text prior to Winckelmann (Vasari’s description of the *Mona Lisa*, which may have influenced it, is more static).[[93]](#endnote-93) Hilliard urges the painter to scrutinise the sitter’s face with fetishistic attention - an adaptation of classical head-to-toe description, the so-called *descriptio pulchritudinis*:[[94]](#endnote-94)

‘so hard a matter he hath in hand, calling those graces one by one to their due places: noting how in smiling how the eye changeth and narroweth, holding the sight just between the lids as a centre; how the mouth a little extendeth both ends of the line upwards, the cheeks raise themselves eyewards, the nostrils play and are more open, the veins in the temple appear more, and the colour by degrees increaseth, the neck commonly erecteth itself, the eyebrows make the straighter arches, and the forehead casteth itself into a plain as it were for peace and love to walk upon’. (77)

In the earlier passage, it is not clear if the portrait painter is observing the sitter seated before him alone, or seated or standing in company: ‘stolen glances’ implies there may be distractions, or musicians, to the side. But in this passage it appears to be the painter’s intense scrutiny that is the catalyst for the most enchanting transformations - extensions, erections, flushings, blushings. He seems much closer than two yards. When he says that the forehead ‘casteth itself into a plain as it were for peace and love to walk upon’, the painter’s ‘young and simple’ heart seems to triumph over ‘good judgment’. The forehead held special significance for Hilliard, as did the navel for Vitruvius. The painter should begin his portrait by making a cross in the middle of the depicted forehead, then use it to construct all other proportions, and as a guide to make sure the sitter remained in the same position.[[95]](#endnote-95) The forehead is conceived as a pictorial lodestar. The forehead-as-plain ideal embodies the smooth ‘flatness’ that Hilliard seeks in depicted faces; it also perpetuates the outdoor pastoral theme implicit in the account of painting the Queen. The sitter’s face becomes a garden of love; but by virtue of being a plain, there is nothing to impede the enraptured gaze. This was indeed the case with miniature painters: unlike the portrait painter in Van Eyck’s studio, his view restricted by a large canvas and high easel, the miniature never blocks the view.

Hilliard is not just trying to assert his equality with his sitters; he is also trying to masculinise miniature painting. His predecessor as court limner was Levina Teerlinck, the daughter of the famous Flemish illuminator Simon Benninck. She was active at court from 1545 until her death in 1576. Some scholars believe she taught Hilliard painting, though the evidence is circumstantial.[[96]](#endnote-96) Hilliard would insist that ‘none should medle with limning but gentlemen alone’, and Strong wondered whether this did not have sexist as well as class overtones.[[97]](#endnote-97)

Around the time that Hilliard was writing his treatise, the script of an anonymous art-centred romantic comedy was published, *The Wisdome of Dr. Dodypoll* (1600), in which an Earl masquerades as a portrait painter in order to seduce the daughter of a jeweller (Hilliard’s first wife Alice was daughter of the goldsmith and jeweller Robert Brandon, to whom Hilliard was apprenticed). She is unchaperoned during the sitting, and works on her embroidery, resting it on a cushion. He flatters her unreservedly, and says that God was the first painter (which would make him a demi-God). She kisses his hand. Eventually her neglectful servant comes in, and lewdly quips: ‘I pray God he /paints no pictures with her: But I hope my fellowe / hireling will not be so sawcie’. [1.1.69-71] Painting pictures with her means making babies, with a ‘paint brush’ penis.[[98]](#endnote-98) They do eventually marry.[[99]](#endnote-99)

**Empathy With Sitters**

During the course of this essay I have contextualised Bassanio’s spider painter in relation to aesthetics, politics, physiology, fashion, sex and gender. I want to conclude by briefly showing its dependence on a theoretical premiss deriving from antiquity that was then in vogue with orators, poets, artists and actors.

Shakespeare and Hilliard’s intensification of the artist’s engagement with the sitter is a (per)version of the classical stipulation that the successful poet/orator/actor needs to feel the emotions he is expressing - what we would now call empathy. The most succinct and oft quoted expression of this idea came in Horace’s the *Art of Poetry*, where two tragic actors are told: ’If you want me to cry, mourn first yourself.’[[100]](#endnote-100) This affective theory of performance and artistic practice had become fashionable in the second half of the sixteenth century, partly due to the rediscovery of Aristotle *Poetics*, which has the earliest expression of the idea; Aristotle allows that it might be akin to madness.[[101]](#endnote-101) Lodovico Dolce in his *Dialogo della Pittura, intitolato l’Aretino* (Venice, 1557), refers repeatedly to Aristotle’s *Poetics*,[[102]](#endnote-102) and quotes Horace to support his contention that “It is not possible that someone whose hand is cold should warm the person he touches.’[[103]](#endnote-103) This belief explains why Hamlet assumes he can act Hecuba better than the player: ‘What's Hecuba to him, or he to Hecuba, / That he should weep for her?’ The Prince’s own loss will, he believes, allow him to act Hecuba from the inside.

Its relevance to Hilliard stems from courtly love being a convention at court, and from portrait miniatures being key components in this game of love. During his stay in France in 1576-8,[[104]](#endnote-104) he became Valet de Chambre to François, Duc d’Anjou, who was desperately courting Queen Elizabeth, and he would have been expected to provide ‘warm’ and ‘touching’ portraits. In 1577, he entered the service of another unsuccessful suitor, the Duc d’Alençon. Both were sons of the deceased French King and Catherine de’ Medici, to whom his first portrait of Queen Elizabeth had been sent in 1571.[[105]](#endnote-105) So the painter needed to imagine himself to be in the same amorous state as the sitter and the recipient. If the painter does not feel the blast of love while making the portrait, the portrait will leave its recipient cold.

Hilliard could have learned about the necessity for amorous empathy from both Philip Sidney (the Earl of Leicester’s nephew and heir) and Haydocke. Sidney mentions it in relation to love songs and sonnets in *The Defence of Poetry* (1595). Here he imagines himself as both the male lover and as the mistress:

‘many of such writings as come under the banner of unresistable love, if I were a mistress, would never persuade me they were in love, so coldly they apply fiery speeches, as men that had rather read lovers’ writings, and so caught up certain swelling phrases […], than that in truth they feel those passions; which easily, as I think, may be betrayed by that same forcibleness or *enargeia* (as the Greeks call it) of the writer’.[[106]](#endnote-106)

Haydocke interpolates a more lubricious version of the idea into his translation of Lomazzo. Having quoted Horace, he concludes that a picture produced in this way, by the painter feeling inwardly what he is depicting, ‘will cause the beholder to wonder, when it wondereth, to desire a beautiful young woman for his wife, when he seeth her painted naked’.[[107]](#endnote-107) Haydocke had also read the Jesuit Antonio Possevino’s encyclopediac treatise the *Bibliotheca selecta* (1593). In the sections on poetry and painting, republished separately in 1594, Possevino said the artist should imagine the suffering of saints: artists should not only to depict explicitly the pains of Christian witness, but also undergo such trials in person.[[108]](#endnote-108)

So Bassanio’s spider painter, who becomes almost inseparable from the man-trapping Portia, is the demonic embodiment of this new species of empathic, parvenu artist. His engagement with Portia gets far too close for comfort: Bassanio hopes he has painted no pictures with her.

1. Marguerite Tassi, *The Scandal of Images: Iconoclasm, Criticism, and Painting in Early Modern English Drama* (Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 2005), pp. 185-8, is one of the few to explore the ‘spider painter’. She only refers to the myth of Arachne, however. See also Camilla Caporicci, “‘Wear this jewel for me, ’tis my picture’. The Miniature in Shakespeare’s Work’, in *Shakespeare and the Visual Arts: The Italian Influence*, Michele Marrapodi (ed.) (London: Routledge 2017), pp. 159-177. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. Elizabeth Goldring, *Nicholas Hilliard: Life of an Artist* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019). [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
3. Patricia Fumerton, *Cultural Aesthetics: Renaissance Literature and the Practice of Social Ornament* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1991), 67-110; Katharine Coombs, *The Portrait Miniature in England* (London: V & A Publications, 1998); Roy Strong, *Artists of the Tudor court : the portrait miniature rediscovered 1520-1620* (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 1983); Marianne Koos, ‘Wandering things: agency and embodiment in late sixteenth-century English miniature portraits’, *Art History*, vol. 37, 2014, 836-859. [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
4. The Queen snatched a portrait miniature of Robert Cecil from his niece, and fastened it to her shoe and elbow. Catherine MacLeod, *Elizabethan Treasures: Miniatures by Hilliard and Oliver* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 2019), 17-18. [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
5. William Shakespeare, *The Merchant of Venice*, John Drakakis (ed.) (London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2010), pp. 301-2. [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
6. Plato, *Symposium*, 208b-209a. [↑](#endnote-ref-6)
7. Francesco Petrarca, *Letters on Familial Matters: Rerum familiarum libri XVII-XXIV*, Aldo S. Bernardo (trans.) (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1985), 33:19, pp. 301-2. [↑](#endnote-ref-7)
8. Edmund Spencer, *Amoretti and Epithalamion* (London: William Ponsonby, 1595), no. 23. See also no. 71, for spider and bee metaphor. [↑](#endnote-ref-8)
9. *Winter’s Tale*, 2:1:46 & 51; *Richard II*, 3:2:22; *Henry VI pt. 2*, 3:1:1; *Richard III*, 1:3:20 & 4:4:7; *Henry VIII*, 1:1:14. [↑](#endnote-ref-9)
10. Katherine Coombs and Alan Derbyshire, ‘Nicholas Hilliard’s Workshop Practice Reconsidered’, in *Painting in Britain 1500-1630: Production, Influences and Patronage*, ed. Tarnya Cooper, Aviva Burnstock, Maurice Howard and Edward Town (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), p. 243. Caporicci, ‘Wear this jewel’, p. 69. [↑](#endnote-ref-10)
11. Lucy Gent, *Picture and Poetry 1560-1620* (Leamington Spa: James Hall, 1981), pp. 7-13, 25, and passim. [↑](#endnote-ref-11)
12. Nicholas Hilliard, *A treatise concerning the arte of limning. Together with A more compendious discourse concerning ye art of liming [sic] by Edward Norgate,* R.K.R. Thornton and T.G.S. Cain(eds)(Ashington: Mid Northumberland Arts Group in association with Carcanet New Press, 1981), p. 20. [↑](#endnote-ref-12)
13. Gent, *Picture*, 35; J. R. Phillips, *The Reformation of Images: Destruction of Art in England, 1535-1660* (Berkeley: University of California, 1973). [↑](#endnote-ref-13)
14. Hanneke Grootenboer, *Treasuring the Gaze: Intimate Vision in Late Eighteenth-Century Eye Miniatures* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012), p. 5 and passim. [↑](#endnote-ref-14)
15. *Young Philip Sidney 1572-77,*  James M. Osborn (ed.) (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), p. 143. [↑](#endnote-ref-15)
16. Cited by Lorne Campbell, *Renaissance Portraits*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 195–6 and 268, n. 20. [↑](#endnote-ref-16)
17. Pliny, *Natural History*, 35:86-7. [↑](#endnote-ref-17)
18. Count Baldassare Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier*, Thomas Hoby (trans. 1561), Virginia Cox (ed.) (London: Dent, 1994), 1:52. [↑](#endnote-ref-18)
19. Jim Murrell, ‘The Craft of the Miniaturist’, in *The English Miniature*, ed. John Murdoch (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), pp. 1-14. [↑](#endnote-ref-19)
20. Goldring, *Nicholas Hilliard*, p. 146, fig. 111. [↑](#endnote-ref-20)
21. Graham Reynolds, *Nicholas Hilliard & Isaac Oliver* (London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1971), p. 22. For detail of hair, Baylisss, ‘Hilliard’s Portraits’, fig. 14, p. 722. Shakespeare may have seen miniatures by Oliver, but Bassanio’s response is more relevant to Hilliard, the most celebrated painter of his time. In Francis Meres’s *Palladis Tamia* (London: P. Short, 1598), 287, Hilliard is first in the list of English limners, his christian name omitted: ‘*Hiliard, Isaac Oliver*, and *John Creetes*, very famous for their painting’. [↑](#endnote-ref-21)
22. Hilliard, *treatise,* pp. 48, 69-71, 80. [↑](#endnote-ref-22)
23. Christoph Scheurl, *Libellus de laudibus Germaniae* (Leipzig, 1508) fol. 5; *Dürer schriftlicher Nachlass* 3 vols, Hans Rupprich (ed.) (Berlin : Deutscher Verein für Kunstwissenschaft, 1956) 1:291. Jan Bialostocki, *Dürer and his Critics* (Baden-Baden: Valentin Koerner, 1986), p. 18. [↑](#endnote-ref-23)
24. Albrecht Dürer, *The Painter’s Manual,* Walter L. Strauss (trans.) (New York: Abaris, 1977), 111. Bk. 1 fig. 40. The latin edition, *Institutiones Geometricarum*, was published in 1532, 1534, 1535, 1538. The diagram appears p. 37: ‘Nunc per lineamenta quaedam, pedibus aranei similia, lineam describere volo, quam propterea aranei vocabo’ [Now I wish to describe the line whose lineaments are similar to spiders’ feet, and which I will therefore call spider-like]. Goldring, *Nicholas Hilliard*, 23. [↑](#endnote-ref-24)
25. Judith Dundas, ‘Arachne’s Web: Emblem into Art’, *Emblemata,* vol*.* 2,1987, pp. 109-21. Tassi,  *Scandal*, p. 187. [↑](#endnote-ref-25)
26. Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 6:1-145. [↑](#endnote-ref-26)
27. John N. Grant and Betty I. Knott (trans. and eds), *Collected Works by Erasmus, vol 36* (Toronto: University of Toronto press, 2006), p. 90; for Erasmus’ less positive adages about spiders, Ballestra-Puech, *Métamorphoses d’Arachné*, pp. 109-16. [↑](#endnote-ref-27)
28. Dundas, *Spider*, pp. 3-6; Sylvie Ballestra-Puech, *Métamorphoses d'Arachné: l'artiste en araignée dans la littérature occidentale* (Paris: Droz, 2006); Pamela Royston McFie, ‘Text and Textura: Spencer’s Arachnean Art’, in David G. Allen and Robert A. White (eds), *Traditions and Innovations: Essays on British Literature of the Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1990), pp. 88-96. [↑](#endnote-ref-28)
29. Clark Hulse, *The Rule of Art: Literature and Painting in the Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), pp. 115-56. [↑](#endnote-ref-29)
30. Hilliard, *treatise*, p. 83. [↑](#endnote-ref-30)
31. Anne-Pascale Pouey-Mounou, ‘Ronsard en fileuse’, in M.-D.Legrand (ed.), *Les Figures du poète. Pierre de Ronsard*, *Littérales,* Vol. 26, 2000, pp. 119-134. [↑](#endnote-ref-31)
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