Introduction
Images as Norms in Europe and Beyond: A Research Program

Chiara Franceschini

Two famous stories concerning crucifixes, featured in the 1550 and 1568 editions of Vasari's *Vite*, demonstrate how contested the relationship between artistic renderings and sacred images could be in Florentine visual culture. The witty, maybe fictional, and certainly obscure pupil of Verrocchio, Nanni Grosso, was lying on his deathbed in the hospital of Santa Maria Nuova. When a very clumsy and ugly wooden crucifix ('un crucifisso di legno assai mal fatto e goffo') was brought and shown to him, he begged them to take it out of his sight and to replace it with one by the hand of Donatello. If they 'did not take it away he would die in desperation ('si morrebbe disperato'), so greatly did he love his art'.[1] A mirror image of this story is the more famous anecdote concerning Donatello and Filippo Brunelleschi. According to the latter, who later in the story demonstrated how to sculpt a proper Christ, the former would have 'put on the cross a peasant and not Jesus Christ'.[2] The first anecdote, circulating widely in Europe in various iterations, expresses the always shifting but ever-persistent tension between devotional objects and works of art — a tension that lies at the heart of artistic production, not only in the Renaissance.[3] The second story exemplifies the same tension in a subtler way, revolving instead around the problem of conflicting aesthetics. Both concern the potential clashes between art, aesthetics, and religion — a topic that provoked many discussions not only during the early modern period, but is still an extremely controversial issue today. The majority of the works of art produced between 1450 and 1650 in Europe still refer to religious subjects. Does this mean that, in that period, religion dominated art or that art dominated religion?

This question concerns early modern art well beyond the small world of the Florentine Renaissance. Global sacred images, the power of images, and the manifold relations between powers and images in early modern cultures as well as in other periods have been at the centre of intense art-historical investigations since the last decades of the twentieth century.[4] Art historians have recognized topics at the border of traditional art history, visual and material culture, and anthropology as important research fields (e.g. ex-voto, relics, pilgrimages etc.).[5] They have especially worked on image censorship and iconoclasm, or *Bildersturm*, the 'controversy' and the 'reform' of art, as well as on the relations between art and emotions.[6] Important scientific experiments, at the intersection between art and neuroscience, have explored the physiological basis of emotional responses to images.[7] At the same time, historians of religion, theology, and culture, starting with Hubert Jedin and Paolo Prodi and continuing with Carlo Ginzburg and Adriano Prosperi, have incorporated the realm of the visual into research on the function and scope of the Christian inquisitions, and the mechanisms of power and social control throughout Europe.[8] Above all, recent developments in global and non-European art histories have looked at the variegating landscape of European art from a wider perspective, discovering new materials and shaping new concepts, among which artistic mediation, artistic *metissage*, contact zones, interconnected or 'convergent' cultures.[9] These new waves of studies have created the foundation on which to question the status and functions of the sacred image in relation to institutional and individual artistic agendas and affiliations, as well as in encounters and clashes of cultures, which allows us to comprehend the functions of images at varying distances.[10]

In dialogue with this rich and diverse production, both this new series and this first edited volume suggest to focus in particular on a series of three interconnected questions, which, as such, have not yet been at the centre of previous investigations: In the production and reception of art objects, which are the norms produced and perpetuated by the images themselves (by their forms, techniques, iconography, organization of space, placement, etc.)? How do these norms relate with norms imposed on images by external agents (for instance, in the process of production, use, and placement)? How does artistic transfer enable or activate a fluid geography of visual norms?

Visual Normativity

The question of visual normativity, that is what standards and regulations (visual and moral) are produced by images, has hardly been addressed in current scholarship on early modern art. There have been important attempts at studying the specific rules of visual communication and image normativity, especially in ancient cultures.[11] In addition, an established tradition has investigated the relations between law and visual culture.[12] In this field, a relevant line of enquiry has concerned the study of the juridical efficacy of medieval effigies of shame in public contexts.[13] This recent discussion has helpfully revolved around the question of 'how did the *pittura infamante* work?'.[14] It has became clear that, to fully investigate the legal power of images, it is necessary to analyse the differences between textual and visual communication with sharper tools. Nevertheless, in this cross-disciplinary discussion, art historians, historians, and theorists of law have only very recently begun to isolate the possibility of a visual or iconic norm, as opposed to a written norm.[15]

In conversation with these neighbouring fields and themes, which are mainly concerned with medieval and contemporary materials, one open question concerns which devotional and theological 'norms' were specifically imposed by art and images themselves, rather than by written texts, in early modern cultures. One starting point for this investigation is the idea that artists were actually entrusted with the task of giving religious notions a definite, and sometimes definitive, form. For example, the final choice about how to represent Christ's suffering or his triumph was left, ultimately, to them.[16] The limits of the 'power of images' in establishing normative visions of sacred things, and, ultimately, in conditioning social behaviours, poses therefore an open question. In order to analyse this perceived power and its limits, the strategy followed in the present volume is twofold. On the one hand, some of the case studies included in this volume (in particular by Yoshie Kojima, Chiara Franceschini, Cloe Cavero, and Mattia Biffis) regard how images and their aesthetics are effective in very different legal and inquisitorial practices. On the other hand, several contributions focus on the textual and visual reactions to images, which were perceived as excessive (Franceschini), unlawful (Kojima), not canonically acceptable (Escardiel González Estévez), or, even, too mild and clean, as in the case of the variations of the depiction of the suffering of Christ in the series of paintings studied by Piers Baker-Bates.

A connected question concerns the relation between the set of constraints for sacred images imposed by religious or political powers and the visual normativity produced by the images themselves, often by breaking existing religious, ideological, or even artistic standards. For several reasons, this issue has also been hardly addressed by early modernists. First, disciplinary boundaries between history and art history have tended to separate studies on images and religion from studies on style, art, and iconography. Several recent interventions have encouraged a closer dialogue between historians of theology, of art, and of literature.[17] Nonetheless, disciplinary boundaries still tend to separate acknowledgment of institutional normativity from studies on the capacity of art to produce not only its own rules, but also normative visions of sacred things.

Second, there is an enduring tendency (already noted by David Freedberg in 1989 and again by Gerhard Wolf in 2010) to impose a three-phase chronological succession of visual cultures, on the basis of an over-simplified reading of Hans Belting's *Bild und Kult*.[18] Such interpretations articulate a succession from 'the age of the image' in the Middle Ages, to 'the age of art' (the Renaissance), into the beginning of the so-called 'art of the Counter-Reformation', with a conventional turning point fixed on the year 1563 — the promulgation of the Council of Trent's decree on images and the cult of saints. However, as argued in this volume especially in the essay by Antonia Putzger, the boundaries between art and image in early modern times are much more ambiguous. Additionaly, such a supposed clean succession of eras clashes with the different temporalities we observe when we adopt a multicentric global perspective.

Finally, research on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century European art (that is, the art of the centuries of state formation) still suffers from fragmentation among various national schools, which have often proposed distinct and not always compatible approaches to the study of images and art. Many of the available stylistic studies and cultural investigations of image production, politics, and interconnections with religious history have inevitably focused, apart from a few seminal exceptions,[19] on single areas or countries. In this field, there have been extremely important contributions on the relations between art, social behaviour, and religion, which, even if they focus on specific regions, provide a background for wider-scope and comparative studies.[20] Studies on early modern iconoclasm and censorship have thus far focused mainly on the boundaries between different confessions within a country, while the variations characterizing the apparently uniform Catholic landscape have remained less explored, notwithstanding the richness of visual, textual, and archival materials available for such a project. Several essays in this collection aim to overcome national boundaries by mapping the European and extra-European diffusion of certain objects, styles, and modes. Particularly promising for the study of the normativity of images is, in fact, a focus on copies, reproductions, and adaptations of influential models as forces to establish visual norms (as explained here through different examples in the essays of Kojima, Franceschini, Baker-Bates, Putzger, and Erin Giffin).[21]

A Landscape of Competing Norms

The present collection aims to go beyond the limits imposed by these three old historiographic paradigms delimiting the ages of the image, art, and the Counter-Reformation, as well as to confront traditional top-down methods of analysis. As already noted above, beginning with the works of Hubert Jedin (1935) and Paolo Prodi (1962), historians and historians of theology have incorporated the realm of the visual into research on the function and scope of the Christian inquisitorial investigations and instruments of social control utilized throughout Catholic Europe.[22] Whether discussing the origins of the 1563 Tridentine decree, or focusing on the activity of single bishops (in particular, Gabriele Paleotti and Carlo Borromeo), these authors have underlined the centrality of images and image regulation in theological thinking and in the practical actions undertaken by Catholic authorities and institutions in response to the crisis of the Reformation.[23] This focus produced extremely important results in the editing and commenting of key sources (including Paleotti, Johannes Molanus, Francisco Pacheco, Louis Richeôme etc.), which complemented, from a different disciplinary perspective, the fundamental work undertaken on art theory and artistic literature from Julius von Schlosser to Paola Barocchi.[24] Especially in the late 1990s and the early 2000s, modern mechanisms of social and cultural control were described in terms of 'social discipline' following an approach mainly deriving from Gerhard Oestreich's notion of *Sozialdisziplinierung*. This notion was adopted and developed by various European historical schools, particularly in Germany and in Italy (by historians such as Wolfgang Reinhardt and Paolo Prodi himself, among others).[25] While this approach responded vigorously to sharper Weberian oppositions between Protestant and Catholic early modern societies, the notion of 'social discipline' promoted a top-down vision of social control. This focus on mechanisms of control was more recently complemented by extensive research on the positive forces behind the production of political and religious imagery in the early modern era, which have been studied under the period notion of *propaganda*, which, however, still evokes a top-down perspective for the study of the use and diffusion of images.[26] Focusing more on the constraints from above than on responses and actions undertaken from below, the aforementioned contributions have not fully taken into account artistic responses, adaptations, and reinterpretations of institutional standards.

Recent contributions suggest a more nuanced vision focusing on bottom-up actions and local adaptations and negotiations of social and cultural facts. Proposing a comparative study of the relations between religious and artistic normativity, this series and volume adopt and further develop this perspective for the production and fruition of sacred images in different European centres and peripheries.

In this framework, the desired research outcomes include an attentive investigation of the specific role of early modern artists and images in orienting the debate about religious subjects and hierarchies, as well as the study of the competition between the regulations of religions and the rules of art. Within the *Sozialdisziplinierung* paradigm, the relations between rival agencies in charge of image production and control in early modern Catholic

countries have remained unexplored. As is well known, after the Council of Trent, the degree of intervention of the various European inquisitions in the matter of images was exceptional. According to the Tridentine decree on the veneration of relics, saints, and images (1563), local bishops were in charge of controling religious imagery.[27] In particular, bishops had to watch over three categories of images: those representing 'false dogma', 'provocatively beautiful' representations, and 'unusual' depictions (*insolitae imagines*). However, these three image categories were vague, and the decree specified that, in case of doubt, bishops should refer to higher authorities. This delegation to the local bishops already created a differentiated geography of norms, since every bishop should theoretically watch over his own local territory; and every geographical area or town in the very extensive Catholic world had its own visual and iconographic traditions.[28] On the one hand, it would be useful to extend the research concerning image production and control promoted by single local bishops in Europe and beyond;[29] on the other, it is necessary to complete, in a comparative framework, the survey of all image-related materials kept in the archives of the various European inquisitions.[30] One partial and short survey in the archive of the Roman Inquisition has confirmed that, by virtue of their exceptionality, key inquisitorial interventions in the matter of sacred images can shed unexpected new light on the life and efficacy of those images.[31] Such an investigation would greatly help a comparative European survey of the different norms in place for images in the face of radical criticism of sacred iconography conducted by the Reformation and by other denominations and non-Christian religious minorities in Europe.

Several of these documentary sources reveal that practices of denunciation spread effectively through Catholic territories, to the point that we encounter cases in which a sacred image was contested or denounced not by the competent authorities (the bishops), but by common devotees, groups of observers, or even political enemies of the patrons involved.[32] Sacred images became therefore the target of individual attacks as well as the agents of religious and political struggle, exactly because they had the power to establish the celebrity of a cult, the fame of an individual (maybe an aspirant saint, a political leader), or the political strength of social groups (nations, allegiances, or cities).

While, as I have argued so far, historians and cultural historians have tended to focus on the constraints imposed on art by external agencies, the 'rules of art' have been central to art history. The period of European culture conventionally labelled 'the Renaissance' is generally understood to be a moment of artistic freedom compared to previous and later periods. However, art historians know that the so-called 'Renaissance' was instead a highly 'normative' period. According to Ernst Gombrich, most rules of art and style in this period are formulated negatively as a catalogue of 'sins to be avoided': 'the artist's freedom was progressively limited and confined by these multiplications of norms'.[33] It might be fruitful to depart from this notion of 'normative criticism' in order to investigate the consequences of the competing normativities of art, art theory, and religion in early modern Europe: when, how, where, and why does a formal artistic language become normative? Rethinking Gombrich's definition of style as a 'principle of exclusion', the aim therefore would be to study the relation between aesthetic norm and

religious images and models in the period between Leon Battista Alberti and Antonio Palomino.

Recent debates have ranged from positions considering art development in Europe between the fifteenth and the seventeenth centuries as mainly inspired by the religious ideals of Reform and/or Counter-Reform, to positions which argue that art became more and more autonomous from external constraints during this period.[34] Two different approaches to the study of stylistic change and pictorial modes have been particularly important. A series of studies have underlined the contrast and co-presence of 'archaism' and 'modernity' in Renaissance and early modern religious painting, stressing in particular the active role and impact of Byzantine icons, schemes, and styles.[35] Another strand of research, aimed at revising the previous schemes of interpretation regarding 'Counter-Reformation art' as a controlled art 'out of time' (as proposed by Federico Zeri), emphasizes the progressively stronger emotional and sensuous appeal of sacred images in this era.[36] Beyond Hans Belting and David Freedberg's pioneering studies, the early modern religious image increasingly emerges today as a field of tensions between tradition and innovation: sacred objects were highly influenced by the moods of the period, but simultaneously acted as autonomous and valid representations; they were *senza tempo*, and yet they remained dependent on the perception of a specific observer at a single point in time. To be able to understand these complex and often extremely attractive nodes of contraries which encapsulate Renaissance and early modern religious images, a study of the documented reactions (not only forensic, but also aesthetic, or emotional) can help us understand their powers, but also their limits as agents of persuasion, conversion, disapproval, or reassurance.

One of the most important challenges for art historians is to frame this study of competing norms and forces outside and inside the image within a multicentric geographic dimension. Apparently, the notion of the 'norm' evokes the idea of a normative center; but how did image normativity function in the increasingly multicentric and interconnected early modern world? In their 1979 seminal essay on *Centro e periferia*, Enrico Castelnuovo and Carlo Ginzburg started to investigate the relationship between normative centres, peripheries, and cultural transfer in Europe.[37] According to them, when a strong system of forms and schemes, supported by a powerful group of patrons, takes over, it determines public demand and expectations. Artists who do not conform have to either give way or leave for less important cultural centres. Subsequent research projects, and especially the studies of non-European art which have developed in the last twenty years, have challenged this binary centre/periphery paradigm, by deepening our understanding of the dynamics between *centres* and *peripheries*, considering their variable intersections with local and global relations.[38] The present study intends to contribute to this discussion, by focusing not only on a deeper understanding of how 'a system of forms and schemes' becomes normative, but also on the development of the geographic dimension of art in a multicentric direction. One strategy, which several essays in this volume employ from different angles (Kojima, Franceschini, Baker-Bates, and Giffin), is to map the transfer of stylistic modes and register local reactions, recreations, and re-appropriations on a global scale. Hopefully, a reflection on the notion of the

geographies of image normativity will significantly contribute to shedding new light, from a distinctively fresh perspective, on previously explored notions such as those of 'image censorship', the 'power of images', the 'authority of images', and the 'performance of images'.[39] The overall aim would be to reformulate the question of the efficacy of images, contributing to a geographically differentiated and historically contextualized study of the ways in which art is able to impose new normative visions of sacred subjects as well as to produce normative reactions, which tend to vary from place to place, always creating new clusters of standards.

The Role of the Artist: Freedom, Sovereignty, Responsibility

At the core of the problem lies the question of the degree of freedom of the artist, in relation to a series of conflicting norms of aesthetic, political, and religious nature, which changed from place to place. Since the second half of the twentieth century, the theme of the 'freedom' of the artist has been central to the debate on the relations between modern art and politics, especially in Germany.[40] However, the complexities and the constraints of art production in pre-modern times have led scholars to work with a more nuanced definition of 'freedom' and with a range of different notions, which can describe more appropriately the status of the artist and his work, as well as what an artist could and could not do in this period. The question of image normativity in sacred contexts has to do with a tension between the norm (which can be understood also as 'tradition') and the change or innovation in artwork created for religious contexts and uses. Artists asked to produce religious art had to conform to a series of instructions and traditions, but they could also exploit their commissions to introduce degrees of innovation, which could have differing levels of impact on the public. In other instances, artists who worked in, or for, foreign contexts could produce art that was perceived as 'normal' in their place of origin, but was received as new, or even shocking, in the location where they were transposed. To evaluate the degree of 'freedom' of the pre-modern artist, it would be therefore necessary to observe and study the landscape of rules and regulations in which their work was immersed, as well as the extent to which their own work contributed to create or perpetuate this set of rules and norms.

Two concepts originating in medieval legal contexts are helpful to define the degrees of 'freedom' and agency of pre-modern artists. In his essay on *The Sovereignty of the Artist*, Ernst H. Kantorowicz analysed the theological and legal roots of the idea of a *creatio ex nihilo* that later emerges in Dürer's writings, and of a *plenitudo potestas* as a privilege of the poet and the artist.[41] Echoing Kantorowicz, Horst Bredekamp has more recently analysed the *Souveränität* of the artist, and in particular of Michelangelo, in relation to that of the ruler and patron.[42] In a *motu proprio* from 1549, Paul III established Michelangelo's unrestricted position as architect of the *fabbrica di San Pietro* and his independence from the building commission; providing Michelangelo with the status of leading architect and with the necessary means to enforce the form against the fierce resistance of the commission,

'led to a microcosmic focus of power of disposal, which can be defined macrocosmically as sovereignty'.[43] This jurisdictional faculty *granted* from the pope to the artist to be *free from* other building authorities gave him 'plenam, liberam, et omnimodam potestatem et facultatem' to freely destroy previous structures and create not only new forms and buildings, but also new building laws and dispositions.[44] A different, but equally important notion, which proves helpful in defining the status of the early modern, is that of 'responsibility'. As Olivier Christin pointed out, the mere fact of being able to put an artist on trial for questions concerning his or her work (and not their behaviour), as happened to Paolo Veronese, is a step forward, if not towards the artist's *freedom*, then at least in the way the artist's status and responsibility were perceived. If artists can be put on trial (either by religious or lay authorities) for their work, it means that they are held responsible for both the form and the content of their work — a completely new fact that first began to emerge in Europe in cases such as the charges against Veronese (1573) or Innocenzo da Petralia (1628-1629).[45]

Ultimately, while the early modern era is certainly not the moment of the advent of the *freedom of the artist*, it is the moment in which a fundamental question concerning the *norm* starts to be asked from different perspectives: who establishes or who is responsible for the visual norms? The artists? The new emerging figure of the art critic? Or the institutions, within which the early modern artistic work took place, such as the Church and the palaces of political power? The period we call the Renaissance is very important in the context of this discourse because it is in this period that the first conflicts arise around who has the right to judge art.[46] The aesthetic dimension of this problem is huge, as has been demonstrated by recent investigations and studies of the status of sacred images in the early modern period, discussed in several essays in this volume, and period sources reporting about image perceptions and reactions: they all reveal the impossibility of disentangling the contents of an image from its form and style.[47]

Outline of this book

The fourteen chapters forming the four interconnected sections of this book explore from diverse angles and perspectives some of the issues discussed above through a series of case studies. The first section (*Images and Trials*) focuses on the normative roles and values of images for trials of various types. The opening essay, by Yoshie Kojima, intentionally departs from the European context, providing a look from afar on the use of images in processes of abjuration of the Christian faith in Japan. The complexities and range of issues stemming from this first essay help us to understand the intrinsic ambiguity of images in the context of trials. The 'trial' in question corresponds to the specific procedure of the rejection of Christianity, which was imposed by Japanese authorities on Christians starting in 1628 or 1629. After the prohibition of Christianity in Japan, a tribunal of officials, either in Nagasaki or travelling from village to village, would compel suspect Christians to trample on a small metal image from a limited and controlled

set of objects bearing crucial Christian iconography (*Ecce Homo*, *Immaculate Conception*, *The Madonna of the Rosary*, *Pietà*, *Calvary*). The form, materiality, and iconography of the images, of which — as Kojima reconstructs — a first set in bronze came from Europe, while a second set in brass was reproduced in Japan around 1669, refer to European standards for sacred images in metal, such as *placchette* and paxes. The first set of images includes, in fact, objects produced in Europe (in Italy or perhaps in Spain) after influential models created by artists of the second half of the sixteenth century, such as Jacopo Sansovino and Guglielmo della Porta. The bronze plaquettes probably formed part of a larger set of objects, which were originally imported by European missionaries in order to be used for their work of conversion. In the *Fumi-e* practice, the function of these same images is reversed, as they became agents of condemnation (as those who refused to destroy them faced dire consequences) or abjuration. Pointing to the precise Italian models for such objects, Kojima explores the possibility that the 'aesthetic qualities of the *Fumi-e* were eloquent and powerful in the eyes of Japanese Christians'. Indeed, these truly appealing works of art, either brought by Christians from distant places or replicated in loco adapting the same foreign standards, significantly enhanced the threatening power of *Fumi-e* as agents of renunciation. The ambivalent power of these images is confirmed by the fact that their reproduction was strictly controlled and even forbidden, and simultaneously by the existence of few cases in which *Fumi-e* objects (or objects which were similar to *Fumi-e*) were subsequently venerated by hidden Christians.[48] The chapter also hints at the hypothesis that a European apostate might have been behind the orchestration of the *Fumi-e* practice. Indeed, the idea of a legal performance of abjuration of faith based on the powerful gesture of walking over its more essential images (a gesture that, to Christian eyes, might recall the many images of Christ crushing the Devil), attests to a deep knowledge of Christian image normativity and theory.

The interrelations between aesthetics and normativity are also at the centre of the second chapter. Here, I focus on a series of hyperralistic crucifixes made in 1637–38 by a Sicilian lay Franciscan friar, Innocenzo da Petralia. This little known artist, who was sculpting objects following a very established tradition of Sicilian woodcarving and painting, was exceptionally active in Central Italy. For their extreme visual power, which was also at the origin of the artist's success in Rome, Umbria, and the Marche, the crucifixes and their maker underwent an inquisitorial procedure in Rome, which, as the chapter will show, offers an extraordinary case study for an investigation of the normativity and varying geography of sacred images from Sicily, to Malta, and into early modern Peru. By using this example, the chapter also proposes one possible formulation of what is an extreme example of a 'normative image' in the framework of this project: an image that is able to 'destroy' all previous images, becoming the standard. In the third chapter, Cloe Cavero de Carondelet moves into the visual culture of an alleged practice of ritual murder attributed to Jewish communities through aggressive Christian propaganda in Europe. By focusing in particular on the cases of Simon of Trent and Michael of Sappenfeld, Cavero clearly demonstrates how the constructed visual evidence — namely, one previously little known fifteenth-century miniature reproducing the alleged state of the corpse of Simon, and one

seventeenth-century engraving after an equally forensic visualization of the body of Michael, both visualizing the precise map of their purported wounds — were used to shape the arguments in favour of the canonization of child martyrs. Finally, in the fourth chapter of this section, Escardiel González Estévez explores the complexities of one of the image types that was most successful in the era, but also most subject to contestation and censorship in the Roman Catholic world: the image and the names of the Seven Archangels. The chapter discusses previously unknown censored materials and reconstructs several lost visual connections in Rome. Furthermore, it draws links to the question of the different geographies of visual norms, as González Estévez concludes with the observation that the sharp censorship conducted in Rome contrasts with the large success of the Seven Archangels imagery in New World contexts, from America to the Philippines.

The second section (*Contested Portraits*) focuses on portraits as case studies for image normativity. Although not technically concerned with a sacred image, the opening chapter by Mattia Biffis connects with the previous section on trials, insofar as it offers a study of a virtually unknown judicial episode concerning the legal identification of a person who in 1634 claimed to be an individual who had gone missing from Bologna thirty years prior. A portrait of the returning person was commissioned from the obscure Neapolitan painter Francesco Antonio in Rome, where the trial was taking place, to be sent to Bologna not as evidence but rather as a proxy or substitute for the claimant, in order for him to be recognized (or not) through the portrait in his native city. The painter and friend of the original missing person, Guido Reni, was involved. Although the forensic portrait has yet to come to light, the analysis of the legal documentation allows Biffis to develop a cogent argument concerning the use of portraits in legal contexts and to discuss this genre in relation to the establishment of personal identities in early modern Europe — a reflection that revitalizes, from the point of view of the history of art, the research questions and historiographic methods deployed in Natalie Zemon Davis's classic work *The Return of Martin Guerre* (1983).

The following two chapters in this section, by James Hall and Nina Niedermeier respectively, touch on the core of the problem of image normativity and the portrait in the early modern period: the seriously contested status of portraits of blessed or saints in a culture of procedural standardization and visual norms for sanctity. In Chapter 6, James Hall explores the background to Urban VIII's decrees around living and dead persons whose sanctity had not been established by due process. The author perceptively argues that a force behind this decision, which had great consequences on the subsequent visual culture of sanctity, brought about a wider crisis of decorum and semantics in portraiture, which caused a sort of conflation, or a blurring, between sacred and secular representations. In particular, Hall focuses on and discusses three classes of objects: 'saintly' portraits of non-saints, secular portraits furnished with what the author names 'pseudo-haloes', and portraits 'in disguise'.

Nina Niedermeier approaches a comparable overlapping of genres and visual conventions in the portraiture of new saints from a completely different angle and with diverse materials. This chapter emphasizes a particular mode of representation regarding saints, which became more and more common in

the Counter-Reformation, and which was based on the long-standing *topos* of the humility of a saint who does not wish to be portrayed. This type of portrait shows the saint in a casual or informal pose, with his gaze never encountering that of the viewer, as if it were a portrait inadvertently 'stolen' by a close friend of the saintly person, who could catch him, without being acknowledged, in the most common and pious activities — while reading, for example, or while washing the feet to the pilgrims, as in the case of the Oratorian Filippo Neri. Niedermeier discusses analytically the several variations and fortunes of this mode of portraiture, its overlapping with profane portraiture (e.g. with the profile portraits of beautiful women), as well as the moral questions posed by these *ritratti rubati*. Finally, the section ends with an articulate analysis and theoretical discussion by Steffen Zierholz of the visual innovations and conventions through which the portrayed image of Ignatius of Loyola, depicted through different media and in different contexts, became a 'normative image': that is, in this compelling understanding, an image which 'prompts the Jesuit beholder to attempt to transform himself into a living image of Ignatius'.

The third section (*The Norm and the Copy*) investigates in three chapters a relatively large spectrum of types of 'copies' as adaptations, re-creations, and agents for normativity. The theme of the 'copy', or multiple, as a source for the establishment of a visual norm is already introduced in both Chapter 1 on *Fumi-e* and Chapter 2 on Petralia's crucifixes. *The norm and the copy* more specifically articulates the modes of replication that facilitated two- and three-dimensional recreation. Antonia Putzger reconstructs the new functions and meanings of a 'substitute copy' of an altarpiece attributed to the Augsburg painter Ulrich Apt the Elder for the Augustinian monastery of Heilig Kreuz in Augsburg. By investigating the role that engravings played in this transposition, and the stylistic and iconographic changes that were introduced, this analysis maps the changing meanings attached to altarpieces when translated from a sacred location to a princely collection, and confronts the ways in which sacred objects were reframed within a secular context. Sharing Putzger's focus on the role of prints as mediators, Erin Giffin presents part of her broader research on the architectonic replicas of the Santa Casa di Loreto, by focusing on a particular type of the Holy House visible in the church of San Clemente in Venice. This local Santa Casa prioritized the cult needs of the community by altering the iconography and hallmarks of the structural exterior. The San Clemente version effectively became a sub-model of the sacred structure, and a competing source of information that was circulated through prints, encouraging structural reproductions across Europe. The resulting Venetian-style Santa Casa type would evolve again as other communities reinterpreted the San Clemente model to meet regional cult interests.

Finally, Piers Baker-Bates shifts the focus from print to painting in his study of the different versions of the *Christ Carrying the Cross* by Sebastiano del Piombo commissioned in Rome for Spanish churches and collections. These intimate paintings served as normative models for sacred images across Spain, with degrees of variation and intensification stemming from Sebastiano's precedent, especially in the representation of blood droplets conveying Christ's suffering. Details augmented or removed from copies based on Sebastiano del Piombo's multiple *Christ Carrying the Cross* paintings

attest to regional empathetic priorities in Spanish communities and patronage circles, while simultaneously marking the artist as an authoritative painter of sacred imagery.

The fourth and final section on *Pictorial and Material Depths* builds from Baker-Bates to further discuss the theme of artist 'authoriality' in the redefinition of sacred images, and the effect of material referents upon sacred subject matter. In the section's opening essay, Josephine Neil explores the theological depths of Hendrick ter Brugghen's *Crucifixion with the Virgin and Saint John*, a painting of uncertain original context now on display in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. For its subject, and specifically the analysis of the forms and the meanings of the wounds and blood of Christ in Ter Brugghen's painting, this essay reconnects with the discussion of varying normativities of the represented lacerations of Christ as analysed in Chapters 2, 3, and 11. In the section's second essay, Livia Stoenescu sets forth Alonso Cano as the brilliant inventor of a new type of sacred art, in which different temporalities, materialities, and styles are combined in novel visions. By exploring the 'indexical capabilities of seventeenth-century painting', Stoenescu reveals the archaism invested in Cano's new compositions that encapsulate generations of cult worship oriented around one of the civic sculptural iterations of the Virgin in Madrid. As the first two chapters of the final section address the effect of materiality of Christ's blood and archaic forms in cult contexts respectively, the concluding essay by Todd Olson combines the two by suggestively plunging into the depths of the 'incendiary and geological narrative' introduced by Jusepe de Ribera and Cosimo Fanzago in the monastic church of the Certosa di San Martino in Naples — a visual narrative, which, at first sight, is in striking contradiction with the Carthusian principles of a contemplative life, austerity, humility, and retreat. As Olson seductively puts it, the material tensions between Ribera's painted figures and Fanzago's excessive marble ornamentation simulating flowers and geological formations reduce the human figure 'as hostage to the lithic' in a metamorphic world, in which artists and their imagination take the lead.

The varieties of the subjects treated in this volume revolve around a cluster of common questions. The different academic provenances and individual methods employed by each of the contributors will hopefully demonstrate that the combination of a plurality of methods and cross-national academic traditions is instrumental to any fruitful attempt at scratching the surface of the still numerous open questions in the global field of the early modern visual cultures and art histories.

Notes

I wish to thank Cloe Cavero and Erin Giffin for their suggestions, observations and input into this *Introduction*, as well as Barbara Carnevali, Emanuele Coccia, María Cruz de Carlos Varona, Pierre-Antoine Fabre, Chiara Petrolini, Ulrich Pfisterer, Sylvain Piron, Salvatore Settis and Francesco Mores for the many conversations we have had at different stages about this research program. In this introductory chapter the bibliographic references are kept to a minimum, since most of the mentioned points are treated more at length in the individual chapters. This introductory chapter has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's research and innovation programme Horizon 2020, grant agreement n° 680192/SACRIMA.

1 Giorgio Vasari, *Le Vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori e architettori nelle redazioni del 1550 e 1568*, ed. by Rosanna Bettarini and Paola Barocchi, 9 vols, Florence: Sansoni, 1967–1987, vol. 3, p. 542.

2 *Ibid*., pp. 204–6: 'che gli pareva che egli avesse messo in croce un contadino e non un corpo simile a Gesù Cristo, il quale fu delicatissimo et in tutte le parti il più perfetto uomo che nascesse mai' (p. 204).

3 Norman E. Land, "Famous Last Words: Nanni Grosso to Antoine Watteau", *Source: Notes in the History of Art*, 34:3 (2015), 25–30.

4 Paul Zanker, *Augustus und die Macht der Bilder*, Munich: C.H. Beck, 1987; David Freedberg, *The power of images. Studies in the history and theory of response*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

5 Among the most recent contributions, see *Ex Voto: Votive Giving Across Cultures*, ed. by Ittai Weinryb, New York City: Bard Graduate Center, 2016, and *Les ex-voto: objets, usages, traditions: Un regard croisé franco-allemand / Ex voto: Objekte, Praktiken, Überlieferung: Deutsch-französische Perspektiven*, ed. by Ulrike Ehmig, Pierre-Antoine Fabre and Marie-Anne Polo de Beaulieu, Gutenberg: Computus Druck 2019. On relics in the early modern period a collaborative project, based at the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid and directed by Luisa Elena Alcalá and Juan Luis González García ('*Spolia Sancta*. Fragmentos y envolturas de sacralidad entre el Viejo y el Nuevo Mundo'), is currently in progress.

6 As main references on the first three points, see Martin Warnke, *Bildersturm. Die Zerstörung des Kunstwerks*, Munich: Hanser, 1973, followed by *Bildersturm. Wahnsinn oder Gottes Wille?*, ed. by Cécile Dupeux, Peter Jezler and Jean Wirth, Munich: Fink, 2000; Alexander Nagel, *The Controversy of Art*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011 and Id., *Michelangelo and the Reform of Art*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

7 See, among other contributions by the same author, David Freedberg, "Memory in Art: History and the Neuroscience of Response", in *The Memory Process: Neuroscientific and Humanistic Perspectives*, ed. by Suzanne Nalbantian, Paul M. Matthews, and James L. McClelland, Cambridge: MIT Press, 2011, 337–58.

8 Hubert Jedin, "Enstehung und Tragweite des Trienter Decrets über die Bilderverehrung", *Tübinger Theologische Quartalschrift*, 116 (1935), 143–188 (and, in Italian, Hubert Jedin, "Genesi e portata del decreto tridentino sulla venerazione delle immagini", in *Chiesa della fede, Chiesa della storia*, Brescia: Morcelliana, 1973, 340–90); Paolo Prodi, "Ricerca sulla teorica delle arti figurative nella Riforma Cattolica", *Archivio italiano per la storia della pietà*, 4 (1962), 121–212; and Carlo Ginzburg, *Paura, reverenza, terrore: cinque saggi di iconografia politica*, Milan: Adelphi, 2015. For a short overview, with previous bibliography, of the relations between art and the Roman inquisition see Chiara Franceschini, "Arti figurative e Inquisizione. Il controllo", in *Dizionario storico dell'Inquisizione*, dir. by Adriano Prosperi and ed. by Vincenzo Lavenia and John Tedeschi, 4 vols, Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2010, I, 102–5.

9 Starting with the studies by Serge Gruzinski, *La Pensée métisse*, Paris: Fayard, 1999, and the important exhibition *Converging cultures: art & identity in Spanish America*, Brooklyn Museum, ed. by Diana Fane, New York: Abrams, 1996. For two bibliographic surveys see Gauvin A. Bailey, Carla Rahn Phillips and Lisa Voigt, "Spain and Spanish America in the early modern Atlantic World. Current trends in scholarship", *Renaissance Quarterly*, 62:1 (2009), 1–60 (and by Gauvin A. Bailey, *The Andean hybrid baroque: convergent cultures in the churches of colonial Peru*, Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010) and Luisa Elena Alcalá, "'Where do we go from here?': Themes and Comments on the Historiography of Colonial Art in Latin America", in *Art in Spain and the Hispanic World. Essays in Honor of Jonathan Brown*, ed. by Suzanne Stratton-Pruit, London: Paul Holberton Publ., 2010, 323–348. For a spectrum of current research samples see *Kunstgeschichte global: Europa, Asien, Afrika, Amerika 1300-1650*, ed. by Matteo Burioni and Ulrich Pfisterer, Darmstadt: WBG, 2020.

10 On the latter point, see the interesting argument developed by Stephanie Porras, "Going Viral? Maerten de Vos's St. Michael the Archangel", *Nederlands kunsthistorisch jaarboek*, 66:1 (2016), 54–79.

11 Maria Luisa Catoni, *La comunicazione non verbale nella Grecia antica*, Turin: Bollati Boringhieri, 2005.

12 Cornelia Vismann, *Akten. Medientechnik und Recht*, Frankfurt/Main: Fischer, 2000, mainly focusing on the modern era and *Bildregime des Rechts*, ed. by Jean-Baptiste Joly, Cornelia Vismann, and Thomas Weitin, Stuttgart: Merz & Solitude, 2007; Peter Goodrich, *Legal emblems and the art of law: obiter depicta as the vision of governance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. A project on 'images of law', directed by Carolin Behrmann is currently developed at the Kunsthistorisches Institute in Florence ('Nomos der Bilder: Manifestation und Ikonologie des Rechts': see https://nomoi.hypotheses.org/). Also important, on the representation of early modern punishment: Samuel Y. Edgerton, *Pictures and Punishment: Art and Criminal Prosecution during the Florentine Renaissance*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.

13 See *Images of Shame. Infamy, Defamation and the Ethics of 'oeconomia'*, ed. by Carolin Behrmann, Berlin/ Boston: De Gruyter, 2016. This line of enquiry was opened by Gherardo Ortalli, *Pingatur in Palatio: La pittura infamante nei secoli XIII-XVI*, Rome: Jouvance 1979 (revised French edition: Paris, 1994) and has been recently revitalized by Giuliano Milani, *L'uomo con la borsa al collo: genealogia e uso di un'immagine medievale*, Rome: Viella, 2017, and Matteo Ferrari, "La propaganda per immagini nei cicli pittorici dei palazzi comunali lombardi (1200-1337): temi, funzioni, committenza", PhD diss., Scuola Normale Superiore, 2010-2011 and Id., "Prime pitture d'infamia nei comuni italiani: immagini come documenti, immagini come fatti", in *Images of Shame*, 49–74.

14 Giuliano Milani, "The Ban and the Bag. How Defamatory Paintings Worked in Medieval Italy", in *Images of Shame*, 119–40 (see pp. 121 and 127–28 on the differences of commemorative and performative functions of images), making use of Ortalli, *Pingatur in Palatio* and Jean Wirth, "Performativité de l'image?", in *La performance des images*, ed. by Alain Dierkens, Gil Bartholeyns and Thomas Golsenne, Brussels: Éditions de l'Université, 2010, 125–35.

15 This question is at the center of the innovative research on contemporary advertising as 'iconic norm' by Emanuele Coccia, "La norma iconica", *Politica e Società*, 1 (2015), 61–80. Images are only marginally taken into account in *La fabrique de la norme. Lieux et modes de*

production de normes au Moyen Âge et à l'époque moderne, ed. by Véronique Beaulande-Barraud, Julie Calustre and Elsa Marmursztejn, Rennes: Presses Universitaires, 2012.

16 For some consideration on this point see Chiara Franceschini, *Storia del limbo*, Milan: Feltrinelli, 2017, pp. 25-33.

17 For an example of a refined analysis of these intersections see Ralph Dekoninck, *Ad imaginem: Statuts, fonctions et usages de l'image dans la littérature spirituelle jésuite du XVII siècle*, Genève: Droz, 2005.

18 Hans Belting, *Bild und Kult: Eine Geschichte des Bildes vor dem Zeitalter der Kunst*, Munich: C.H. Beck, 1990. See Freedberg, *The Power of Images*; Gerhard Wolf, "Miraculous images between art and devotion in medieval and early modern Europe", in *Miraculous images in Christian and Buddhist culture*, ed. by Akira Akiyama and Kana Tomizawa, Tokyo: University of Tokyo, 2010, 99–115.

19 Including Freedberg, *The Power of Images*; Andreas Tacke, *Der katholische Cranach. Zu zwei Großaufträgen von Lucas Cranach d. Ä., Simon Franck und der Cranach-Werkstatt (1520-1540)*, Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1992; Christine Göttler, *Die Kunst des Fegefeuers nach der Reformation. Kirchliche Schenkungen, Ablass und Almosen in Antwerpen und Bologna um 1600*, Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1996.

20 Important works were, in particular, the study of the politics and poetics of sacred images in special relation with confessional conflict in 15th-century Spain: Felipe Pereda, *Las imágenes de la discordia. Política y poética de la imagen sagrada en la España del cuatrocientos*, Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2007 (now translated into English as *Images of Discord: Poetics and Politics of the Sacred Image in Fifteenth-Century Spain*, London: Harvey Miller, 2018); and the pioneristic work on Huguenot censorship, iconoclasm and reconstruction in 16th-century France by Olivier Christin, *Une révolution symbolique. L'iconoclasme huguenot et la reconstruction catholique*, Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 1991. A more recent contribution on the Netherlands is Koenraad Jonckheere, *Antwerp art after iconoclasm: experiments in decorum, 1566–1585*, Brussels: Mercatorfonds, 2012.

21 An important project on copies ('Copimonarch: La copia pictórica en la monarquía hispánica'), especially in Spain but within a larger visual network, was directed by David García Cueto between 2015 and 2017 and has since yielded a series of edited volumes.

22 Jedin, "Enstehung und Tragweite des Trienter Decrets über die Bilderverehrung", and Jedin, "Genesi e portata del decreto tridentino sulla venerazione delle immagini"; Prodi, "Ricerca sulla teorica delle arti figurative".

23 See the texts quoted in the note above, and Pierre-Antoine Fabre, *Décréter l'image? La XXVe Session du Concile de Trente*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2013. On the influence of the 1563 decree it was also important the short article by David Freedberg, "Johannes Molanus on Provocative Paintings", *The Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 24 (1971), 128–38.

24 Prodi, "Ricerca sulla teorica delle arti figurative" is contemporary to the fundamental *Trattati d'arte del Cinquecento: fra manierismo e Controriforma*, ed. by Paola Barocchi, Bari: Laterza, 3 vols,1960–1962.

25 See, for example, Paolo Prodi and Wolfgang Reinhardt (eds), "Il concilio di Trento e il moderno", *Annali dell'Istituto Storico Italo-Germanico*, 45, Bologna: Il Mulino 1996.

26 Most importantly by Evonne Anita Levy, *Propaganda and the Jesuit Baroque*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.

27 Steffan Kummer, "Doceant Episcopi. Auswirkungen des Trienter Bilderdekrets im römischen Kirchenraum", *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 56 (1993), 508–33.

28 This geographical differentiation has been studied in particular for ecclesiastical historiography and liturgy (in particular by Simon Ditchfield, *Liturgy, Sanctity and History in Tridentine Italy: Pietro Maria Campi and the Preservation of the Particular*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); less so for art and images.

29 Going beyond the already (partially) known cases of Paleotti and Carlo Borromeo. On Borromeo, cf. in particular Wietse de Boer, *The Conquest of the Soul: Confession, Discipline, and Public Order in Counter-Reformation Milan*, Leiden: Brill, 2001; Grace Harpster, "Carlo Borromeo's Itineraries: The Sacred Image in Post-Tridentine Italy", PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2018.

30 Members of the Sacrima Project are currently preparing a review of the already available material and completing new explorations of some important Italian and Spanish archives (Vatican City, Milan, Modena, Toledo, Cuenca, Madrid…). On a small group of interesting cases of objects and prints, which were included as evidences in inquisitorial files in the archive of the Inquisition in Cuenca, see the catalogue of the exhibition organized in 1982 in Cuenca: *La Inquisición*, ed. by Miguel Avilés Fernández, Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura-Raycar, 1982. For some of the materials kept in Rome: *Rari e preziosi. Documenti dell'età moderna e contemporanea dall'archivio del Sant'Uffizio*, ed. by Alejandro Cifres and Marco Pizzo, Rome: Gangemi Editore, 2009. See, also, Agustín Bustamante García, "El Santo Oficio de Valladolid y los artistas", *Boletín del Seminario de Estudios de Arte y Arqueología*, 61 (1995), 455–66.

31 Franceschini, "Arti figurative e Inquisizione. Il controllo"; Ead., "Volti santi e Trinità triformi: ricerche in corso sullo statuto delle immagini nei procedimenti del Sant'Uffizio", in *L'Inquisizione romana e i suoi archivi: a vent'anni dall'apertura dell'ACDF*, ed. by Alejandro Cifres, Rome: Gangemi Editore: 2019, pp. 279–301, and Chapter 2 in this volume.

32 Chiara Franceschini, "Mattia Preti's *Madonna della Lettera*: Painting, Cult, and Inquisition in Malta, Messina, and Rome", *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz*, 61:3 (2019), 335–63.

33 Ernst H. Gombrich, "Norm and Form. The Stylistic Categories of Art History and their Origins in Renaissance Ideals", in *Norm and Form. Studies in the Art of the Renaissance*, London: Phaidon, 1966, 81–98.

34 Nagel, *Michelangelo and the reform of art*; Marcia B. Hall, *The sacred image in the age of art: Titian, Tintoretto, Barocci, El Greco, Caravaggio*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.

35 Alexander Nagel and Christopher Wood, *Anachronic Renaissance*, New York: Zone Books, 2010.

36 *The sensuous in the Counter-Reformation church*, ed. by Marcia B. Hall and Tracy E. Cooper, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013; *Religion and the senses in early modern Europe*, ed. by Wietse de Boer and Christine Göttler, Leiden: Brill, 2013.

37 Enrico Castelnuovo and Carlo Ginzburg, "Centro e periferia", in *Storia dell'arte italiana*, I, Questioni e Metodi, ed. by Giovanni Previtali, Turin: Einaudi, 1979, 285–352.

38 For which see Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *Toward a geography of art*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

39 On the last two notions, also in relation with the theme of the norm, see *Das Bild als Autorität: die normierende Kraft des Bildes*, ed. by Frank Büttner and

Gabriele Wimböck, Münster: LIT, 2004 and Dierkens, Bartholeyns and Golsenne, *La performance des images*.

40 Daniel Graewe, "Die Kunstfreiheit in der deutschen Geschichte unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Künstlervereinigung 'Brücke'", *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 77:3 (2014), 407–26, discussing the genesis and historical background (the totalitarian art policy of the Third Reich with its unlawful riots against unwanted artists and against the products of art discriminated as 'degenerate') of Article 5, Paragraph 3 of the German *Grundgesetz*, granting the right of freedom to art ('Kunst und Wissenschaft, Forschung und Lehre sind frei. Die Freiheit der Lehre entbindet nicht von der Treue zur Verfassung').

41 Ernst H. Kantorowicz, "The Sovereignty of the Artist. A Note on Legal Maxims and Renaissance Theories of Art", in *De Artibus Opuscula XL: Essays in Honor of Erwin Panofsky*, ed. by Millard Meiss, New York: New York University Press, 1961, 267–79. For a different and larger perspective on the artist as *creator* and *procreator* see now Ulrich Pfisterer, *Kunst-Geburten. Kreativität, Erotik, Körper*, Berlin: Wagenbach, 2014 (translated into Italian as *L'artista procreatore. L'amore e le arti nella prima età moderna*, Rome: Campisano, 2018).

42 Horst Bredekamp, "Antipoden der Souveränität: Künstler und Herrscher", in *Vom Künstlerstaat. Ästhetische und politische Utopien*, ed. by Ulrich Raulff, Munich: Hanser, 2006, 31–41 and Id., "Der Künstler als Souverän (1549) ", in *Michelangelo: fünf Essays*, Berlin: Wagenbach, 2009, 59–68.

43 Already in 1540 Paul III had issued a *motu proprio*, which recognized the artist as the first 'inter statuarios totius terrarum orbis', 'liberum et exemptum perpetuo' from the jurisdiction of the corporation of *statuarii* and marble workers: Lucilla Bardeschi Ciulich, *I contratti di Michelangelo*, Florence: S.P.E.S., 2005, pp. 229–31, no. XCV. With the *motu proprio* of 11 October 1549, Paul III granted to him the full authority and jurisdiction on the *Fabbrica di San Pietro*, including the faculty to destroy previous structures and to appoint builders and workers: Bardeschi Ciulich, *I contratti*, pp. 278–80, 286–92 (nos. CXVIII, CXXIV and CXXV) and Bredekamp, "Der Künstler", p. 68: 'führte zu einer mikrokosmischen Fokussierung von Verfügungsmacht, die makrokosmisch als Souveränität definiert werden wird'.

44 Bredekamp, "Der Künstler", p. 67 and Bardeschi Ciulich, *I contratti*, p. 279.

45 For what concerns inquisitorial trials only, a comparison between sixteenth- and seventeenth century Italian and Spanish cases has shown that the great majority of cases of artists under inquisitorial trials in Spain were processed and sometimes convicted for their behaviours or supposed beliefs, and not for the contents of their works, for which more often the patrons were held responsible (for example, in the case of the representations of the Archangels in Spain: see Franceschini, "Arti figurative e Inquisizione", p. 105).

46 Some preliminary remarks on this theme are included in a forthcoming article: Chiara Franceschini, "Giudizi negativi e stime d'artista nel mondo di Vasari", in *Bad Reception: Negative Reactions to Italian Renaissance Art*, ed. by Diletta Gamberini, Jonathan Nelson, Alessandro Nova, and Samuel Vitali, *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* (planned publication: 2021).

47 Cf., for example, Hall, *The sacred image*.

48 See also Akira Akiyama, "Similarities between Buddhist and Christian cult images: on statue dressing and relic insertion", in *Synergies in Visual Culture – Bildkulturen im Dialog: Festschrift für Gerhard Wolf*, ed. by Manuela De Giorgi, Annette Hoffmann and Nicola Suthor, Munich: Fink, 2013, 71-81.