


Spring 5-15-2018

Fashioning Florence: Portraiture and Civic Identity in the Mid-Sixteenth Century

Stephanie Ariela Kaplan
Washington University in St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/art_sci_etds

 Part of the [European Languages and Societies Commons](#), and the [History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kaplan, Stephanie Ariela, "Fashioning Florence: Portraiture and Civic Identity in the Mid-Sixteenth Century" (2018). *Arts & Sciences Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 1545.
https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/art_sci_etds/1545

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Arts & Sciences at Washington University Open Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Arts & Sciences Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Washington University Open Scholarship. For more information, please contact digital@wumail.wustl.edu.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS

Department of Art History & Archaeology

Dissertation Examination Committee:

William E. Wallace, Chair

Daniel Bornstein

Roger Crum

John Klein

Nathaniel Jones

Fashioning Florence: Portraiture and Civic Identity in the Mid-Sixteenth Century

by

Stephanie Ariela Kaplan

A dissertation presented to
The Graduate School
of Washington University in
partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy

May 2018

St. Louis, Missouri

© 2018, Stephanie Ariela Kaplan

Table of Contents

List of Figures	iv
Acknowledgments.....	x
Abstract of the Dissertation	xii
Chapter 1: Fashioning Civic Identity in a Changing State	1
Chapter 2: Pontormo’s <i>Portrait of Alessandro de’ Medici</i> : “il Duce della Repubblica Fiorentina”	24
2.1 Introduction	24
2.2 Florence in Crisis	28
2.3 Florentine Portraiture	36
2.4 Pontormo’s Imprecise Portraits.....	42
2.5 Literature Review	52
2.6 Alessandro: An Enigmatic Portrait	56
2.7 Painting Princes: The Ruler Portrait.....	60
2.8 Alessandro: “il Duce della Repubblica Fiorentina”	68
2.9 Alessandro Draws: An Act of Engagement	70
2.10 Conclusion.....	73
Chapter 3: Bronzino’s <i>Portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatichi</i> : Between France and <i>Fiorentinità</i> ..	76
3.1 Introduction	76
3.2 <i>Portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatichi</i>	78
3.3 Bronzino and Hyper-Realistic Portraiture.....	87
3.4 Bartolomeo Panciatichi: A Foreign Florentine?.....	91
3.5 Bartolomeo Panciatichi: A Florentine.....	101
3.6 Visible <i>Fiorentinità</i>	106
3.7 A New Noble.....	119
3.8 Conclusion.....	121
Chapter 4: Baccio Bandinelli’s <i>Bust of Cosimo I</i> : How Pliny Inspired an Innovation in Florentine Sculpture	124
4.1 A Novel Portrait Bust for a New Type of Ruler	124
4.2 Literature Review	131

4.3	Pliny on Portraiture	138
4.4	Baccio Bandinelli: Sculptor-Draftsman to the Medici	143
4.5	<i>Bust of Cosimo I: Form and Material</i>	149
4.6	A Study for the Living	156
4.7	<i>Bust of Duke Cosimo I: Content and Context</i>	160
4.8	<i>All'Antica</i> Becomes All the Rage.....	167
4.9	Conclusion.....	173
	Conclusion	175
	Bibliography	180
	Figures.....	204

List of Figures

- Figure 1: Pontormo, *Portrait of Alessandro de' Medici*, 1534-35, oil on panel, 101.3 x 81.9 cm. Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia.....204
- Figure 2: Pontormo, *Alessandro de' Medici*, 1534-35, oil on panel, 35.3 x 25.8 cm. Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago.....205
- Figure 3: Andrea del Castagno, *Portrait of a Man*, c. 1450, tempera on panel, 55.5 x 41.2 cm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.....206
- Figure 4: Sandro Botticelli, *Portrait of Giuliano de' Medici*, c. 1478-80, tempera on panel, 75.5 x 52.5 cm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.....207
- Figure 5: Sandro Botticelli, *Portrait of a Man with a Medal of Cosimo the Elder*, c. 1474, tempera on panel, 57.5 x 44 cm. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.....208
- Figure 6: Leonardo da Vinci, *Portrait of Ginevra de' Benci*, c. 1474-78, tempera on panel, 38.1 x 37 cm. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.....209
- Figure 7: Raphael, *Portrait of Agnolo Doni*, c. 1506, oil on panel, 63 x 45 cm. Galleria Palatina, Florence.....210
- Figure 8: Raphael, *Portrait of Maddalena Doni*, c. 1506, oil on panel, 63 x 45 cm. Galleria Palatina, Florence.....210
- Figure 9: Ridolfo Ghirlandaio, *Portrait of a Gentleman*, c. 1505, oil, probably with some tempera, on panel, later transferred to canvas, 68.2 x 49.2 cm. Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago.....211
- Figure 10: Giuliano Bugiardini, *Portrait of Leonardo de' Ginori*, c. 1528, oil on panel, 62.9 x 47 cm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.....212
- Figure 11: Pontormo, *Portrait of a Goldsmith*, c. 1517-18, oil on panel, 70 x 53 cm. Musée du Louvre, Paris.....213
- Figure 12: Pontormo, *The Visitation*, c. 1528-29, oil on panel, 202 x 156 cm. Pieve di San Michele Arcangelo, Carmignano.....214
- Figure 13: Pontormo, *Youth in a Pink Coat*, c. 1525, oil on panel, 85 x 61 cm. Museo Nazionale di Palazzo Mansi, Lucca.....215
- Figure 14: Andrea del Sarto, *Portrait of a Woman with a Basket of Spindles*, c. 1517, oil on panel, 76 x 54 cm. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.....216

Figure 15: Andrea del Sarto, <i>Portrait of a Woman with a Petrarchino</i> , c. 1528, oil on panel, 87 x 69 cm. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.....	217
Figure 16: Pontormo, <i>Maria Salviati with Giulia de' Medici</i> , c. 1537, oil on panel, 88 x 71.3 cm. The Walters Art Museum, Baltimore.....	218
Figure 17: Pontormo, <i>Maria Salviati</i> , c. 1543, oil on panel, 87 x 71 cm. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.....	219
Figure 18: Pontormo, <i>Maria Salviati with Giulia de' Medici</i> detail, oil on panel, 88 x 71.3 cm. The Walters Art Museum, Baltimore.....	220
Figure 19: Bronzino, <i>Portrait of Bia de' Medici</i> and detail, c. 1542, oil on panel, 63 x 48 cm. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.....	221
Figure 20: Bronzino, <i>Portrait of Bia de' Medici</i> detail, c. 1542, oil on panel, 63 x 48 cm overall. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.....	221
Figure 21: Giorgio Vasari, <i>Portrait of Alessandro de' Medici</i> , 1533-34, oil on panel, 157 x 114 cm. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.....	222
Figure 22: <i>Portrait of Alessandro de' Medici</i> , sixteenth century, oil on panel. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.....	223
Figure 23: Domenico di Polo, <i>Cameo of Alessandro de' Medici</i> , 1532-47, green chalcedony and gold, 38 x 25.5 mm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London.....	224
Figure 24: Benvenuto Cellini, <i>Alessandro de' Medici</i> obverse, sixteenth century, silver testoon, 2.9 cm diameter. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.....	225
Figure 25: Pedro Berruguete and/or Justus of Ghent, <i>Portrait of Federico da Montefeltro and his Son</i> , 1480-81, oil on panel, 134 x 77cm. Galleria Nazionale delle Marche, Urbino.....	226
Figure 26: Sperandio Savelli, <i>Medal of Federico da Montefeltro</i> obverse, c. 1482, bronze, 8.7 cm diameter. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.....	227
Figure 27: Sperandio Savelli, <i>Medal of Federico da Montefeltro</i> reverse, c. 1482, bronze, 8.7 cm diameter. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.....	227
Figure 28: Titian, <i>Portrait of Charles V with a Hound</i> , c. 1533, oil on canvas, 194 x 112.7 cm. Museo del Prado, Madrid.....	228
Figure 29: Jacob Seisenegger, <i>Portrait of Charles V with a Hound</i> , 1532, oil on canvas, 204 x 123 cm. Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna.....	229

Figure 30: Pontormo, <i>Portrait of Alessandro de' Medici</i> detail, 1534-35, oil on panel, 101.3 x 81.9 cm overall. Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia.....	230
Figure 31: Copy after Pontormo, <i>Alessandro de' Medici</i> , 1530s, black chalk on paper, 23.8 x 18.7 cm. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.....	231
Figure 32: Agnolo Bronzino, <i>Portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatichi</i> , c. 1541, oil on panel, 104 x 85 cm. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.....	232
Figure 33: Agnolo Bronzino, <i>Portrait of Lucrezia Panciatichi</i> , c. 1541, oil on panel, 102 x 83.5 cm. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.....	233
Figure 34: Agnolo Bronzino, <i>Portrait of Ugolino Martelli</i> , c. 1537-40, oil on panel, 102 x 85 cm. Staatliche Museen, Berlin.....	234
Figure 35: Agnolo Bronzino, <i>Portrait of Lorenzo Lenzi</i> , c. 1532, oil on panel, 90 x 71 cm. Castello Sforzesco, Milan.....	235
Figure 36: Agnolo Bronzino, <i>Portrait of Laura Battiferri</i> , 1555-60, oil on canvas, 83 x 60 cm. Palazzo Vecchio, Florence.....	236
Figure 37: Agnolo Bronzino, <i>Portrait of Guidobaldo II della Rovere</i> , 1531-32, oil on panel, 114 x 86 cm. Galleria Palatina, Florence.....	237
Figure 38: Agnolo Bronzino <i>Portrait of Cosimo I de' Medici in Armor</i> , 1543, oil on panel, 74 x 58 cm. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.....	238
Figure 39: Jean Clouet, detail from <i>Les Trois premiers livres de Diodore Sicilien</i> , 1534, color on parchment, 29 x 20 cm. Musée Condé, Chantilly, France.....	239
Figure 40: Jean Clouet, <i>Francis I</i> , c. 1530, oil on panel, 21 x 17 cm. Musée du Louvre, Paris.....	240
Figure 41: Studio of Jean Clouet, <i>Jean de Tais</i> , c. 1535. Musée Condé, Chantilly, France.....	241
Figure 42: Studio of François Clouet, <i>Jean de Tais</i> , 1540s. Musée Condé, Chantilly, France.....	242
Figure 43: <i>Portrait of Ugolino Martelli</i> , mid-sixteenth century, oil on panel, 91 x 68 cm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.....	243
Figure 44: Lorenzo Lotto, <i>Double Portrait of a Couple</i> , 1523-24, oil on canvas, 96 x 116 cm. The Hermitage, St. Petersburg.....	244
Figure 45: Florentine School, <i>Portrait of a Man and Woman</i> , sixteenth century, oil on panel. Galleria Palatina, Florence.....	245

Figure 46: Filippo Lippi, <i>Portrait of a Woman with a Man at the Casement</i> , c. 1440, tempera on panel, 64 x 42 cm. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.....	246
Figure 47: Ercole de' Roberti, <i>Portrait of Giovanni II Bentivoglio</i> , 1474, tempera on panel, 54 x 38. cm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.....	247
Figure 48: Ercole de' Roberti, <i>Portrait of Ginevra Bentivoglio</i> , 1474, tempera on panel, 54 x 39 cm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.....	247
Figure 49: Attributed to the Maestro delle Storie del Pane, <i>Portrait of a Man, possibly Matteo di Sebastiano di Bernardino Gozzadini</i> , c. 1494, tempera on panel, 49 x 36 cm. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.....	248
Figure 50: Attributed to the Maestro delle Storie del Pane, <i>Portrait of a Woman, possibly Ginevra d'Antonio Lupari Gozzadini</i> , c. 1494, tempera on panel, 49 x 36 cm. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.....	248
Figure 51: Domenico Ghirlandaio, <i>Portrait of a Man</i> , c. 1490, tempera on panel, 20 x 16 cm. The Huntington Library and Art Collections, San Marino, California.....	249
Figure 52: Domenico Ghirlandaio, <i>Portrait of a Woman</i> , c. 1490, tempera on panel, 20 x 16 cm. The Huntington Library and Art Collections, San Marino, California.....	249
Figure 53: Pontormo, <i>Monsignor della Casa</i> , c. 1541-44, oil on panel, 102 x 79 cm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.....	250
Figure 54: Agnolo Bronzino, <i>Portrait of A Young Man</i> , c. 1534-38, oil on panel, 97 x 75 cm. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.....	251
Figure 55: After Francesco Rosselli, <i>Carta della Catena</i> , 1470s, woodcut. Staatliche Museen, Berlin.....	252
Figure 56: Filippino Lippi, <i>Nerli Altarpiece</i> , c. 1486, tempera on panel, 160 x 180 cm. Santo Spirito, Florence.....	253
Figure 57: Filippo Brunelleschi. <i>Ospedale degli Innocenti</i> , 1419-26, Museo degli Innocenti, Florence.....	254
Figure 58: Kneeling window, <i>Palazzo Medici-Riccardi</i>	255
Figure 59: Michelangelo, <i>New Sacristy</i> , c. 1520-34. San Lorenzo, Florence.....	256
Figure 60: Francesco Salviati, <i>Portrait of A Florentine Nobleman</i> , 1546-48, oil on panel, 102 x 83 cm. St. Louis Art Museum, St. Louis.....	257

Figure 61: Baccio Bandinelli, <i>Bust of Cosimo I</i> , 1545, marble, 91 cm tall. Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence.....	258
Figure 62: <i>Bust of Hadrian</i> , 2 nd century CE, marble, 68 cm tall, Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.....	259
Figure 63: Baccio Bandinelli, <i>Metropolitan Bust of Cosimo I</i> , 1539-40, marble, 80 x 78.4 cm, 95.9 cm with socle. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.....	260
Figure 64: Mino da Fiesole, <i>Piero de' Medici</i> , c. 1453, marble, 54 cm height. Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence.....	261
Figure 65: Andrea del Verrocchio, <i>Giuliano de' Medici</i> , c. 1475-78, terracotta, 61 x 66 cm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.....	262
Figure 66: Florentine sculptor probably after a model by Andrea del Verrocchio and Orsino Benintendi, <i>Lorenzo de' Medici</i> , 15 th or 16 th century, painted terracotta, 65.8 x 59.1 cm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.	263
Figure 67: Michelangelo, <i>Brutus</i> , 1540s-50s, marble, 95 cm height (including base). Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence.....	264
Figure 68: Alessandro Vittoria, <i>Bust of Tommaso Rangone</i> , c. 1571, bronze, 81 cm height. Ateneo Veneto, Venice.....	265
Figure 69: <i>Tomb of Alessandro Antinori</i> , c. 1555-57. Santi Michele e Gaetano, Florence.....	266
Figure 70: Andrea Mantegna, <i>Self-Portrait</i> , 1504-06, bronze, 47 cm height. Sant'Andrea, Mantua.....	267
Figure 71: Marco Dente after a design by Baccio Bandinelli, <i>Massacre of the Innocents</i> , c. 1520, engraving, 41 x 58.2 cm. Princeton University Art Museum, Princeton.....	268
Figure 72: Baccio Bandinelli, <i>Hercules and Cacus</i> , 1525-34, marble, height 505 cm. Piazza della Signoria, Florence.....	269
Figure 73: Agostino Veneziano after Baccio Bandinelli, <i>The Academy of Baccio Bandinelli</i> , 1531, engraving, 27.4 x 30 cm. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.....	270
Figure 74: Enea Vico after Baccio Bandinelli, <i>The Academy of Baccio Bandinelli</i> , first of two states, c. 1544, engraving, 30.6 x 43.8 cm. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.....	271
Figure 75: Baccio Bandinelli, <i>Self-Portrait</i> , c. 1530, oil on panel, 142.5 x 113.5 cm. Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston.....	272

Figure 76: Agnolo Bronzino, <i>Portrait of Cosimo I de' Medici as Orpheus</i> , c. 1537-39, oil on panel, 93.7 x 76.4 cm. Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia.....	273
Figure 77: Baccio Bandinelli, <i>Bust of Cosimo I</i> detail, 1545, marble, 91 cm tall overall. Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence.....	274
Figure 78: Sandro Botticelli, <i>Minerva and the Centaur</i> , c. 1482, tempera on canvas, 207 x 148 cm. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.....	275
Figure 79: Sandro Botticelli, <i>Minerva and the Centaur</i> detail, c. 1482, tempera on canvas, 207 x 148 cm overall. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.....	275
Figure 80: Benvenuto Cellini, <i>Bust of Bindo Altoviti</i> , 1549, bronze, 105.5 cm height. Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston.....	276
Figure 81: Giorgio Vasari, <i>Cosimo I Plans the War of Siena</i> , 1563-55, oil on panel. Palazzo Vecchio, Florence.....	277
Figure 82: Giorgio Vasari, <i>Cosimo I Plans the War of Siena</i> detail, 1563-55, oil on panel. Palazzo Vecchio, Florence.....	278
Figure 83: Baccio Bandinelli, <i>Bust of Duke Cosimo I</i> , 1544, bronze, Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence.....	279
Figure 84: Baccio Bandinelli, <i>Bust of Eleonora di Toledo</i> , 1544, bronze, Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence.....	279
Figure 85: Benvenuto Cellini, <i>Bust of Cosimo I</i> , 1545-48, bronze, 110 cm height. Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence.....	280
Figure 86: Giovanni Bandini, <i>Bust of Cosimo I</i> , c. 1572, marble, 83 cm height. Detroit Institute of Arts, Detroit.....	281
Figure 87: Leone Leoni, <i>Bust of Emperor Charles V</i> , c. 1553, bronze, 112 x 58 cm. Museo del Prado, Madrid.....	282

Acknowledgments

This project could never have been completed without the guidance of William E. Wallace. His willingness to share his time and knowledge has been invaluable. Both my teaching and scholarship were reshaped and refined under his tutelage. John Klein's expansive intelligence and pointed questions encouraged me to push myself and my research further. Nathaniel Jones modelled how to be an emerging scholar, and his bibliographic recall solved many of my problems. Daniel Bornstein lent himself and his considerable insights to my project and the discussion was richer for his participation. Roger Crum's perceptiveness helped me see broader connections, and his assistance has enriched this project. This committee, as a whole, modelled and taught as only the best scholars and professors can. I have benefitted as well from the continued guidance of Kristina Kleutghen.

Where my committee supported my intellectual curiosity, my family and friends saw to my mental and emotional needs. Through humor, my brother Benjamin and sister-in-law Kimberly supported me from afar. They also served as the delivery system for my dear nephew Dylan. In person or on the phone, that light and laughter – and loud dinosaur roars – reinvigorated me. Jessica Puller's natural ability for words combined with her empathy made her the best friend I could ask for. Kym Teslik and Elizabeth Wolfson offered both words of encouragement and gifs of absurdity, depending on my need. James Anno and Kate Harnish simultaneously provided friendship and intellectual stimulation. Many others contributed to this project in ways that may sound small or pedantic. My community of friends and family has both put up with me and propped me up. I am honored to claim them, and the ways they have shaped and supported me, as part of my own identity.

There are no words to say thank you to my parents, Anne and Robert Kaplan. They always found ways to be encouraging and compassionate. They are enablers of the best kind, for their love and support has enabled me to wander and to wonder. I dedicate this work to them.

Stephanie Ariela Kaplan

Washington University in St. Louis

May 2018

Abstract of the Dissertation

Fashioning Florence: Portraiture and Civic Identity in the Mid-Sixteenth Century

by

Stephanie Ariela Kaplan

Doctor of Philosophy in Art History and Archaeology

Washington University in St. Louis, 2018

Professor William E. Wallace, Chair

Despite intense socio-political upheaval, portraiture flourished in Florence of the 1530s-1540s. These works remain understudied, and are primarily examined in isolation from their broader context. This study evaluates a series of case studies to determine novel approaches to formulating identity through portraiture during the chaotic second quarter of the sixteenth century in Florence. Positioning the sitter as part of a collective, the artists and their patrons use assertions of civic identity to transcend a sense of otherness as they forge new identities and define new positions. Situated in the transition from republic to duchy, this project offers new insights into portraits by the foremost contemporaneous artists while outlining ways the genre reflected evolving concepts of civic identity. This focused study deepens our understanding of sixteenth-century portraiture and the nature of self-presentation and civic identity. It further offers a framework for considering portraiture and expressions of identity in times of turmoil.

Chapter 1: Fashioning Civic Identity in a Changing State

At the end of 1535, a delegation of exiled Florentines arrived in Naples to convey a series of grievances against the Florentine government. A symptom of the civil war that plagued the city, these exiles (*fuorusciti*) were vehemently opposed to the leadership of Alessandro de' Medici, the head of the government instituted by the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V. In their official complaint, they described the un-just imprisonment, hasty executions, and exile of their friends, families, and colleagues. They used both pathos and logos to portray a city in crisis: a city damaged by the loss of its pride, honor, and liberty. These objections reflected a persistent and unstable state, which by then had characterized Florence for nearly a decade. They lamented the physical and psychological transformations that had occurred in the city as the loss of an essential part of their identity. They referred to it as “Florence...the city which has already changed....”¹

The terms of civic and personal identity underwent constant revision in sixteenth-century Florence, as political loyalties were in flux in this shifting and often dangerous environment. As Florence oscillated between a republic and a Medicean regime, a surprising abundance of portraits were produced. The sheer quantity of works is particularly surprising given that it was a period of disruption, civil war, and political uncertainty. While the functions of portraits varied,

¹ “Firenze...la città la quale haveva già mutato forma...” Archivio di Stato di Firenze, Carte Stroziane Serie I, 98: 3v.

the works offered a means to establish one's identity during – and beyond – the sitter's lifetime.² To be successful at this in the sixteenth century, portraits had to do more than replicate a sitter's physiognomy.³ Portraits emphasized diverse aspects of the subject; they might establish the sitter's profession, virtue, or character. They provided the opportunity to situate the sitter among – or above – his contemporaries. Portraits could be declarative statements, claiming identity for their sitters. Thus, in this period of turmoil and change, expressions of civic identity were especially problematic. Civic identity was a means to situate the individual within the collective. It could be used to make a patriotic claim or reflect a political ideology. In a period of civil war and civic disruption, how did one visually establish this aspect of identity? Was it a characteristic that could be unambiguously claimed and represented in a changing world?

In the late fifteenth century portraiture consistently emphasized likeness above all else. Artists such as Domenico Ghirlandaio produced portraits that purported to accurately represent individuals. Detailed physiognomy collaborated with the inclusion of specific attributes to create a recognizable individual, explicitly and unambiguously.⁴ Domenico Ghirlandaio's *An Old Man*

² The Italian word *ritratto* is most commonly translated as portrait. However, the verb form, *ritrarre* is often translated more generally as portray. *Ritratto* "is defined by the *Vocabolario della Crusca* as a 'figure that is taken [*cavare*] from life.'" As quoted in Maria Loh, *Still Lives: Death, Desire, and the Portrait of the Old Master* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2015). The original Italian version is "*Ritratto: figura cavata dal natural.*" See for example *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca* (Venezia: G.G. Hertz, 1686), 777. Both the verb *ritrarre* and the noun *ritratto* operate around the idea of semblance; how things seem in life and in art. For a complete and nuanced exploration of the term *ritratto* in both the Renaissance and later scholarship, see Claudia Cieri Via, "L'immagine del ritratto: considerazioni sull'origine del genere e sulla sua evoluzione dal Quattrocento al Cinquecento," in *Il ritratto e la memoria: materili*, ed. Augusto Gentili, Philippe Morel, and Claudia Cieri Via (Rome: Bulzoni, 1989), 45-91.

³ Cieri Via, "L'immagine del ritratto," 46 points out that the term *ritratto* was applied more specifically to portraiture as we understand it today only in the seventeenth century, when it was used "*nel senso preciso di ritratto autonomo di persona somigliante al modello...*" Her definition herein of a portrait, as an autonomous image "of a person resembling a model" serves as the basis for my own. For the purposes of this study, a portrait is accepted as a representation of a unique individual based on firsthand knowledge. I do not place limits on if that knowledge has come from the artist's observation, the sitter's own view of himself, or an intermediary. I explore these portraits as both physical and conceptual representations of the sitter.

⁴ While these portraits make claims on likeness, identity is constantly being constructed. Portraiture contributed to the construction of identity not only in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, but beyond. An introduction to this topic

and his Grandson is a perfect example of this type. In the early sixteenth century, Leonardo da Vinci's *Mona Lisa* began to expand possibilities as it achieved an epitome of naturalism and a sense of the individual. The work stimulated artists to innovate within the genre. They experimented in particular with poses to enliven the figure. While some artists such as Giuliano Bugiardini created works that were conservative in character, others, like Pontormo, began to employ a more idiosyncratic style. These artists, sometimes labelled Mannerists for these idiosyncratic qualities, none the less often became sought-after portraitists. They expanded the possibilities, styles, and functions of portraiture.

The broader literature on Mannerism has tended to overlook the genre of portraiture, resulting in an unexpected lacuna. One challenge in studying works produced during this period remains the relationship between the genre and definitions of Mannerism. Early scholarship on Mannerism – whether it was defined chronologically, stylistically, or thematically – generally ignored portraiture.⁵ In more recent scholarship, portraits have been discussed as characteristic of the artists who painted them, thus bringing them into the mannerist fold without ever establishing how a portrait – with its unique concerns and goals – could be a Mannerist work.

While this project was initially inspired by a lacuna in Mannerist literature, one unexpected conclusion of this study is that there was little uniformity of style. Mannerism is not the sole way to define these portraits. Rather they are united in their Florentine-ness. Despite the political turmoil, each portrait considered in this study positions the sitter in a larger socio-

can be found in the introduction to John Klein's *Matisse Portraits* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001), 1-15. Klein outlines the ways identity is always socially constructed and performative, especially in pages 3-7.

⁵ For example, portraiture is not addressed in John K. G. Shearman, *Mannerism* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967); Walter F. Friedlaender, *Mannerism and Anti-Mannerism in Italian Painting: Two Essays* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957), among others.

political framework. This focused study adds gradations to our understanding of the genre at the time and how it was linked to political change.

This dissertation considers the particular history of the Florentine portrait. These are not only works made in Florence or depicting Florentine citizens, but portraits that claim a Florentine identity for the sitter. I consider a variety of strategies for formulating identity through portraiture during the chaotic second quarter of the sixteenth century in Florence. Progressing chronologically, each chapter investigates a key work by a leading Florentine artist. Rather than attempting to define a uniform style of portraiture, I consider individual artists, patrons, and problems. In order to address how these works communicated meaning to contemporary viewers, I employ the methods of social art history. Grounded in contextual and visual analysis, archival material, and close engagement with the works of art, I re-contextualize the portraits as part of a broader cultural context and offer new insights into the formation of the Early Modern Florentine state. Explicating the art of this transitional time further explains the cultural shifts occurring and adds nuanced knowledge to a period often oversimplified.

One question that regularly emerges is how one defines oneself in a period where what it means to be a Florentine is constantly being altered. Each object resolves this issue in a different manner, yet all three are united in using portraiture as a declaration of *fiorentinità*. The term, which translates as “Florentine-ness,” is often applied by scholars to a cultural identity related to the artistic traditions – both visual and literary – of the early modern city state of Florence.⁶ It primarily has been discussed as a means to circumvent the turbulence of the period by creating a connection with Florentine culture. If the citizen was not proud of his city, then he could find

⁶ See Chapter Three, pages 108-112 for more on the scholarship related to this term. The fundamental work is Elizabeth Cropper, “Prolegomena to a New Interpretation of Bronzino’s Florentine Portraits,” in *Renaissance Studies in Honor of Craig Hugh Smyth Volume 2*, Andrew Morrogh, ed. (Florence: Giunti-Barbera, 1985), 149-160.

solace in continued cultural predominance. Where civic structures were disrupted and civic loyalty lacking, cultural institutions were consistent and reliable. Previous scholarship has positioned *fiorentinità* as a subtly subversive expression.⁷ In constantly looking backwards, the sitters were declaring their displeasure with the contemporary Medicean rulers of Ducal Florence.

This study elucidates novel ways to express one's Florentine-ness by situating its development not just in opposition to, but within the Florentine court as well. In addition to establishing the sitter's Florentine-ness, each portrait exhibits a tendency to obscure or elide another significant aspect of the sitter's identity. Each portraitist references or adapts a pre-existing tradition, but does so in an innovative way. My dissertation identifies inventive and influential ways civic identity was portrayed, thereby addressing a gap in the scholarship.

In my first case study, I consider Pontormo's *Portrait of Alessandro de' Medici* in relation to the contemporary socio-political milieu. I argue that it is a public portrait that presents the sitter as a Florentine citizen rather than a powerful ruler. I do so by identifying the way it diverges formally and in content from other ruler portraits. This was an intentional choice that reflected Alessandro's ambiguous position in the Florentine constitution of 1532. The artwork counteracts claims of tyranny leveled at Alessandro by positioning him as a Florentine citizen. It ignores distinguishing characteristics that made him unique from his fellows, from his uncertain power over the city to his distinctive hair. Although Pontormo's overall portraiture production often presented sitters in enigmatic guises, certain aspects in his *Portrait of Alessandro de' Medici* are particularly clear to the viewer. Each of these elements positions Alessandro as a

⁷ See, for example, *ibid*; Maurice Brock, *Bronzino*, trans. David Poole Radzinowicz and Christine Schultz-Touge, (Paris: Flammarion, 2002), 8, 106.

contemporary Florentine. A much-maligned figure, Alessandro is thereby normalized rather than set apart as a singular – and autocratic – head of the city.

The following chapter focuses on Bronzino's *Portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatichi* which elides the thirty-plus years of absence of a sitter who had only recently moved to Florence. Bronzino depicts his sitter as a consummate, professional, and, above all, Florentine courtier. This chapter traces the development of *fiorentinità* – or Florentine-ness – by arguing that it is used not as a means of supplanting a civic identity with a cultural one, but rather in unifying the two. It does so by visually placing the sitter in a chronological and conceptual account of the city, implicating Bartolomeo as part of a Florentine *longue durée*. In this way, his *fiorentinità* not only looks to the past, but visibly brings the sitter – and the city – into the present moment. This new reading of the portrait establishes how a foreign-born and raised sitter presented himself as a Florentine courtier at the embryonic Medici court.

The final chapter examines Baccio Bandinelli's *Cosimo I in Armor*, one of the earliest *all'antica* portrait busts of a living individual. This work disguises the lack of a Florentine precedence – politically and artistically – for ruler portraits by adapting the Roman practice of the sculpted portrait bust. When the artist carved an honorific sculpture of his duke – a position that Cosimo I, at the time, was still defining – Bandinelli was careful to do so in a way that incorporated antique precedent as a means of legitimacy. The sculpture conflates the image of an *all'antica* Roman Emperor and a modern ruler by outfitting him in antique-inspired fantastic armor. To create a new type of sculpture for a nascent ruler of an emerging state, Bandinelli modernized a well-known ancient genre and established a uniquely Florentine convention that informed portrait sculptures in the decades that followed.

The proliferation of portraiture in the 1530s, a politically chaotic and socially unstable period, is surprising. Where one might expect the production of the genre to significantly diminish in a period of disruption – due to economic constraints or the danger of making strong claims with one’s portrait – it instead flourished.⁸ This was not the first time that when identity and politics became unstable, the commissioning of portraits increased. In the year 69, the Roman Empire was subject to four emperors. In this confusing time of competing interests, there were a plethora of portraits, especially numismatic ones. The need to construct and claim an identity often increases when that identity itself is uncertain.

During the Florentine transition from Republic to Principate, the leading citizens of the city continued to commission life-size representations of themselves from the foremost painters of the city. Yet the art created was as complex and varied as the politics of the period. Each case study that follows reveals carefully calculated individual stylistic and iconographical choices. The examples are united by their links to broader cultural and political contexts. As these shift, so too do the portraits of Florentines as they attempt to stay at the vanguard of the city’s political and cultural transmutations.

This study frames the development of a particularly Florentine language of portraiture, during an especially turbulent period, in terms of contexts and audiences, rather than as a stylistic development. This approach is largely absent from the field of portraiture studies. The following literature review identifies the works essential to this study. The scholarship on Renaissance portraiture is rich and varied, and this introduction is intended principally to review works most

⁸ Between Pontormo and Bronzino alone, there are at least 25 surviving Florentine portraits within a fifteen year period, from approximately 1530 to 1545. This figure does not include Bronzino’s growing workshop that produced many portraits of the ducal family.

influential to this study.⁹ These books and essays are primarily broad studies on portraiture and Florentine art. Studies with narrower parameters are included in each chapter as part of a relevant literature review wherein the key work, artist, and cultural milieu are explored in detail.

There are several overviews of the genre in addition to a variety of studies organized around single artists and individual themes, many of which are foundational to examinations of Italian Renaissance portraiture. From the seventeenth through nineteenth centuries, portraiture, which was low in the hierarchy of genres, was considered a subject matter of secondary importance.¹⁰ It was ranked behind history painting and religious works. Early studies of Renaissance art emphasized large-scale frescoes decorating chapels and altarpieces. Thus, while Jacob Burckhardt's seminal work established the importance of the individual in the Renaissance, he de-emphasized the role of the portrait.¹¹ Scholarship reflected the concerns of the day, and early scholarship was not as concerned with a minor genre such as portraiture.

One early source, especially relevant to this dissertation, is Emil Schaeffer's *Das florentiner Bildnis*.¹² Schaeffer created an early catalog of Florentine portraits. In his

⁹ In doing so, I omit other areas of study, most notably the expansive literature devoted to the theoretical underpinnings of portraiture. For more on definitions and theories of portraiture, see for example Eduard Pommier, *Théories du portrait: De la Renaissance aux Lumières* (Paris: Gallimard, 1998); Shearer West, *Portraiture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), especially "What is a Portrait?" pages 21-41; Frank Zöllner, "The Motions of the Mind in Renaissance Portraits: The Spiritual Dimension of Portraiture," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 68 (2005): 23-40; Pascale Dubus, *Qu'est ce qu'un portrait?* (Paris: Insolite, 2006).

¹⁰ For more on the historiography of portraiture, including specific explorations of how contemporary concerns influenced scholars, see Norbert Schneider, *The Art of the Portrait: Masterpieces of European Portrait Painting, 1420-1670* (Köln: Benedikt Taschen, 1999); Catherine M. Soussloff, *The Subject in Art: Portraiture and the Birth of the Modern* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006); Maria Loh, "Renaissance Faciality," *Oxford Art Journal* 32 (2009): 341-363.

¹¹ Jacob Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, trans. S. G. C. Middlemore (London: Phaidon, 1965). Originally published as *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien* in 1860. He addressed the genre in a later essay, discussed below. Conversely, the altarpiece was lauded, and Burckhardt himself wrote a survey of the genre in the Renaissance. Jacob Burckhardt, *The Altarpiece in Renaissance Italy*, ed. and trans. Peter Humfrey (Oxford: Phaidon, 1988).

¹² Emil Schaeffer, *Das florentiner Bildnis* (München: Verlagsanstalt F. Bruchmann, 1904).

chronological survey, he focused on portraits as defined by a particular aspect: these topics ranged from fresco to the court portrait. Schaeffer did not limit himself to isolated portraits, but explored the role of the likeness of an individual in larger narrative and religious scenes. The portraits were then used to draw broader conclusions about contemporary Florence. Schaeffer identified developments across decades, demonstrating how portraiture mirrored changes in Florentine values. For example, he observed that portraits reflect the merit of the age including, at diverse times, spiritual faith, youth and beauty, and humanist knowledge.¹³ While later scholarship has re-attributed several of the paintings and offered more nuanced insights into individual works, the portraits discussed by Schaeffer have remained primary to discussions of Florentine portraiture. However, few scholars have followed him in perceiving an obvious parallel between portraiture and politics. As such, Schaeffer is central to this study.

While Schaeffer offered a wide-ranging exploration of portraits produced in Florence, Jean Alazard's *The Florentine Portrait* focused on those painted between 1470 and 1570.¹⁴ He was interested not in the persona or identity of the sitter, but rather in the artistic advancements evident in portraiture. He sought to identify the methods, techniques, and even intentions of the artist through the portraits they produced. Alazard delved into the work of Leonardo da Vinci and Andrea del Sarto, looking at their artistic output and identifying their influences on later artists. Alazard was particularly focused on establishing a linear, formal development of Florentine portraiture.

John Pope-Hennessy's *The Portrait in the Renaissance* is of primary interest for modern studies of Renaissance portraiture as it offers an introduction of wide chronological and

¹³ Ibid, 165.

¹⁴ Jean Alazard, *The Florentine Portrait*, trans. Barbara Whelpton (New York: Schocken Books, 1968). While his book addresses works over a century, most of his study is devoted to the 1480s – 1530s.

geographic breadth.¹⁵ This overview of the genre's development in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries is organized into six essays, each exploring a central theme. While the subject was broad in scope, the organizing principle, which relied on the circumstances of the work's creation, has been influential for modern scholars. Pope-Hennessy's interest in patronage studies, contexts, and audiences is especially relevant to this study. Although its tenets are still debated, this work remains a fundamental contribution to any exploration of the genre.¹⁶

Lorne Campbell's *Renaissance Portraits: European Portrait-Painting in the 14th, 15th, and 16th Centuries* is another enduring work of Anglo-Saxon scholarship on portraiture.¹⁷ A broad survey, Campbell's work is especially useful in defining types and functions. Throughout the book, Campbell constantly identified and explained artistic techniques and what they accomplished. Campbell's work explored the formal qualities and material considerations that informed the work of Renaissance portraitists.

A broad-ranging study, Richard Brilliant's *Portraiture* considered meanings and functions of the genre from the classical period to the twentieth century.¹⁸ He used these general parameters to explore, for example, why and how the demand for the genre varied. His central question revolved around the changing nature of the individual in society. While other studies focused on either the identity of the sitter or artist, Brilliant was especially sensitive to how the two parties collaborated in the creation of a portrait. Brilliant addressed many theoretical and conceptual issues in portraiture studies, including how to define a portrait. He proposed that the

¹⁵ John Pope-Hennessy, *The Portrait in the Renaissance* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979).

¹⁶ Pope-Hennessy's work emphasized the centrality of the face to discussions of portraiture. Maria Loh, "Renaissance Faciality," offers a critical analysis of this tendency.

¹⁷ Lorne Campbell, *Renaissance Portraits: European Portrait-Painting in the 14th, 15th, and 16th Centuries* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990).

¹⁸ Richard Brilliant, *Portraiture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991).

portrait has a unique relationship with its referent, as he explained that it depicts a single individual who exists in the world.¹⁹

It is rare in the history of scholarship when one journal article makes a seismic impact on the field. This is certainly the case with Elizabeth Cropper's "On Beautiful Women, Parmigianino, Petrarchismo, and the Vernacular Style."²⁰ Cropper conclusively established a connection between Firenzuola's treatise on the beauty of women and changing conceptions of ideal feminine beauty, but her article made an impact far beyond the specific argument. It focused our attention on the literature of art and the literature of the court; it offered a lens to look not just at Parmigianino portraits but portraits of women and even portraits in general; and, it helped to open the entire field that we now call 'word and image,' in which we realize that neither poem nor portrait may be a 'likeness' but that both serve to celebrate the beauty and *virtù* of the sitter. She set a model for explicating what portraiture could and should do.

Scholars have engaged critically with the foundational studies already discussed. In doing so, novel avenues of exploration have been identified and new questions that can be asked of the genre have been posed. One example is the scholarship of Maria Loh. Loh insightfully queried the primacy of the face in discussions of portraiture in her essay "Renaissance Faciality."²¹ She located the origins of this point of emphasis in the nineteenth century, and traced its popularization through Pope-Hennessy's work. Her scholarship has upended basic assumptions in studies of Renaissance portraiture, especially associations between naturalism, identity, and the face. In *Still Lives: Death, Desire, and the Portrait of the Old Master* she focused on artist

¹⁹ Like others, Brilliant's definition does not emphasize likeness or mimetic qualities, but that it is based on, even if loosely, an individual person who exists.

²⁰ Elizabeth Cropper, "On Beautiful Women, Parmigianino, Petrarchismo, and the Vernacular Style," *Art Bulletin* 58.3 (Sept., 1976): 374-394.

²¹ Maria Loh, "Renaissance Faciality."

portraits.²² As with much of her work, Loh’s analysis provided insight into functions of portraiture beyond likeness.²³ Loh crafted a narrative that moved from the artist’s lifetime, when he is actively engaged in self-fashioning, through to posthumous representations. She established the exterior agents acting upon a portrait – which she labelled a “representational avatar” – and the ways the portrait tried to maintain an identity.²⁴ She was consistently attentive to the tension between the time-bound sitter – who ages, whose body decays – and the portrait that lives on.

Exhibition catalogs have served as the vehicle for significant discussions of Renaissance portraiture.²⁵ A focused exhibition, *Pontormo, Bronzino, and the Medici: The Transformation of the Renaissance Portrait in Florence*, edited by Carl Brandon Strehlke, is of particular interest to the current study.²⁶ This work provided essential grounding for understanding portraiture during the second quarter of the sixteenth century in Florence as well as its role in the formation of a Florentine court. Strehlke explored both Pontormo and Bronzino in their roles as portraitists, focusing on the relationship between these two artists and their Medici patrons. The catalogue offered commentary on the changing and diversifying uses of court portraiture. Elizabeth Cropper’s essay in that same important catalog examined relationships between both the portraits

²² Loh, *Still Lives*.

²³ In the preface, Loh unequivocally explained that, “Instead of likeness and resemblance, the emphasis in *Still Lives* is placed upon the psychodynamics between the artist’s laboring body and the representational avatar.” Ibid, xvii.

²⁴ See, for example, ibid, 71, 173. Loh, who opened her first chapter with a review of the Italian vocabulary for portrait, was careful in her own vocabulary as well. Terms such as avatar and icon are intelligently deployed.

²⁵ Generally, wider surveys of Renaissance art and social histories have often discussed the genre only in passing. Exhibition catalogs have been the catalyst for much insightful and innovative research into the genre, which this literature review reflects.

²⁶ Carl Brandon Strehlke, ed., *Pontormo, Bronzino, and the Medici: The Transformation of the Renaissance Portrait in Florence* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004).

and their artists.²⁷ While most scholarship has used portraiture to establish the identity of the sitter, Cropper remained attentive to the artist. She recounted both the personal and artistic education of both artists, situating them in the literary, cultural, and political world of contemporary Florence. She also considered their relationships with a wider cultural – and particularly literary – sphere.

The broadly framed *Renaissance Faces: Van Eyck to Titian* includes several insightful essays.²⁸ Luke Syson’s “Witnessing Faces: Remembering Souls” reviewed two key concepts of Early Modern portraiture: the commemorative function and the role of likeness.²⁹ Syson expertly introduced many of the potential factors influencing an individual portrait. In particular, he explored ways portraits could reflect religious tenets and the importance of classical thought. Syson reviewed different ways identity could be claimed by the sitter, including in the choice of the artist to execute the work.

Jennifer Fletcher’s “The Renaissance Portrait: Function, Uses and Display” summarized the variety of contexts in which Renaissance portraits were viewed.³⁰ Although a simplified introduction, the identification of diverse functions and displays is an important reminder that the genre embraced many types of works beyond the life-size painted panel. These categories often ignored in larger studies of Renaissance portraiture include the *album amicorum* and votive

²⁷ Elizabeth Cropper, “Pontormo and Bronzino in Philadelphia: A Double Portrait,” in *Pontormo, Bronzino, and the Medici*, 1-33.

²⁸ Lorne Campbell et al., eds., *Renaissance Faces: Van Eyck to Titian* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008). The exhibition and accompanying catalog featured a broad consideration of portraiture beyond the geographic bounds of this study. While this exhibition and its accompanying catalog were broad in scope, Keith Christiansen et al., eds., *The Renaissance Portrait: From Donatello to Bellini* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011) focused on Italian portraiture. It too opens with an insightful essay in Patricia Rubin, “Understanding Renaissance Portraiture,” 2-25. Focused on fifteenth-century Florentine portraiture, Rubin provides a strong historiographic summary and reviews many of the key issues within the field.

²⁹ Luke Syson, “Witnessing Faces: Remembering Souls,” in *Renaissance Faces*, 14-31.

³⁰ Jennifer Fletcher, “The Renaissance Portrait: Function, Uses and Display,” in *Renaissance Faces*, 46-65.

images of which few examples survive. Both Syson and Fletcher drew attention to the importance of artistry in Renaissance portraits. Syson focused on the aesthetic values at the time of creation while Fletcher reminded her readers that portraits changed function over time, both in the lifetime of the sitter and the lifetime of the object.³¹ The latter became collectors' objects, in which their aesthetic considerations could be – and often were – more important than the mimetic quality.

While these two essays – along with Loren Campbell's exploration of the physical process of making a portrait – were broad in scope, Miguel Falomir's "The Court Portrait" considered one specific aspect of the genre.³² His essay was limited to depictions of royal families and rulers. Falomir traced the court portrait back to medieval traditions such as cycles of famous men before considering various methods used to illustrate princely power. He identified themes within the category of court portraiture and explored its role within the larger evolution of Renaissance portraiture. He was especially interested in ideas of virtue in princely portraiture and explicated the tension between verisimilitude and majesty – and likeness and idealization – in portraits of rulers. Falomir's work was essential to this study as it traced the development of the codification of the painted ruler portrait. While this development post-dates my study, the careful balancing of a network of references to ancient and contemporary rulers was an approach I adapted and expanded in Chapter Four. Of further use, each essay in the catalog also provided an extensive bibliography.

While basic surveys of Florentine portraiture have been discussed above, more specific studies deserve mention. Aby Warburg's "The Art of Portraiture and the Florentine Bourgeoisie"

³¹ Syson, "Witnessing Faces," 29-30; Fletcher, "The Renaissance Portrait," 63.

³² Lorne Campbell, "The Making of Portraits," in *Renaissance Faces*, 32-45; Miguel Falomir, "The Court Portrait," in *Renaissance Faces*, 66-79.

focused on fifteenth-century Florentine portraiture.³³ Originally published in 1901, Warburg looked not at stand-alone examples of the genre, but at works that were part of larger narrative cycles. He used archival research and these visual references to reconstruct Florentine social networks of the late fifteenth century. Warburg's work explored artist-patron relationships as part of the larger societal milieu.³⁴

Warburg's influence on scholars has been profound. His work, along with that by Julius von Schlosser, brought attention to less studied forms of portraiture, most notably the wax image.³⁵ His essay also inspired many to pursue identification of still-unknown sitters. Others have turned an analytical eye to Warburg's legacy. For example, Georges Didi-Huberman suggested that scholars, inspired by Warburg's work, have put too much emphasis on the identity of sitters. For Didi-Huberman, it was more important to explore other avenues of investigation, many of which are in evidence in Warburg's scholarship. He asked instead what function was fulfilled by naturalistic depiction.

The evolution of portraiture in early modern Florence appeared in surveys of Renaissance Florentine art, although generally it was not discussed as a coherent development.³⁶ For example,

³³ Aby Warburg, *The Renewal of Pagan Antiquity: Contributions to the Cultural History of the European Renaissance*, trans. David Britt, (Los Angeles, CA: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1999). Warburg himself was responding to Jacob Burckhardt's thoughts on portraiture published posthumously in Jacob Burckhardt, *Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte von Italien: das Altarbild Das Portrat in der Malerei die Sammler* (Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing, 2010).

³⁴ Georges Didi-Huberman, "The Portrait, The Individual and the Singular: Remarks on the Legacy of Aby Warburg," in *The Image of the Individual: Portraits in the Renaissance*, eds. Nicholas Mann and Luke Syson (London: British Museum, 1998), 156-188, 231-235.

³⁵ Julius von Schlosser, "History of Portraiture in Wax," trans. James Michael Loughridge, in *Ephemeral Bodies: Wax Sculpture and the Human Figure*, ed. Roberta Panzanelli (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2008), 171-314 was originally published as *Geschichte der Porträtbilde in Wachs* in 1911. Combined with the 1999 publication of Warburg's work in English, this has brought renewed interest in particular to wax votive sculptures. More recent scholarship includes Alison Luchs, "Lorenzo from Life? Renaissance portrait busts of Lorenzo de' Medici," *The Sculpture Journal* 4 (2000): 6-23, whose footnotes include an extensive bibliography on the subject.

³⁶ Similarly, discussions of Florentine portraiture are often found in monographic studies. These often prove to be insightful in regards to the artist under consideration, but can be isolated from larger trends. Many of these are

it was noted in separate chapters within *Florence*, a comprehensive survey edited by Francis Ames-Lewis.³⁷ While each author traced their own narratives within the chronologically-organized chapters, portraiture made several – but spotty – appearances. Major changes within the genre were noted for each generation. Caroline Elam outlined the alterations of formats in tandem with a shift from external to internal likeness in the last third of the fifteenth century while Jill Burke focused on innovations in female portraiture in the early sixteenth century.³⁸ These astute observations, however, were subsumed into larger – and seemingly more important – narratives.

Arranged in roughly chronological order, *Storia delle Arti in Toscana: Il Cinquecento* is arranged as a series of explorations of essential features of sixteenth-century Tuscan art.³⁹ The individual essays addressed the relationship between artworks and their environs. While the collection was not restricted to Florence, many of the contributions focused on the city-state. Florentine art was situated in relationship to art of its provinces and of Rome. Many of the essays presented the sixteenth-century material as a natural outgrowth of their fifteenth-century precedents. Portraiture was discussed not as a unique development, but as part of a wider cultural production. As each essay emphasized the particular context, in both geography and chronology, the discussion of portraiture implied a connection to the socio-political circumstances. Most

discussed in the individual chapters that follow. Among these are Philippe Costamagna, *Pontormo* (Milano: Electa, 1994); Carlo Falciani et al., eds., *Pontormo and Rosso Fiorentino: Diverging Paths of Mannerism* (Firenze: Mandragora, 2014); Maurice Brock, *Bronzino*, trans. David Poole Radzinowicz and Christine Schultz-Touge, (Paris: Flammarion, 2002); Carlo Falciani, and Antonio Natali, eds., *Bronzino: Artist and Poet at the Court of the Medici* (Firenze: Mandragora, 2010); Detlef Heikamp, and Beatrice Paolozzi Strozzi, eds., *Baccio Bandinelli: Scultore E Maestro (1493-1560)* (Firenze: Giunti Editore: 2014); Nicole Hegener, *Divi Iacobi Eqves: Selbstdarstellung im Werk des florentiner bildhauers Baccio Bandinelli*, (München: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2008).

³⁷ Francis Ames-Lewis, ed., *Florence* (Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

³⁸ Caroline Elam, “Art and Cultural Identity in Lorenzo de Medici’s Florence,” especially pages 235-237; Jill Burke, “Republican Florence and the Arts, 1494-1513,” especially pages 267-268; both in *Florence*.

³⁹ Roberto Paolo Ciardi and Antonio Natali, eds., *Storia delle Arti in Toscana: Il Cinquecento*

significant for this study is Elizabeth Cropper's essay, which posited that at the nascent Florentine court, artworks forced a stronger and more direct connection between the work and the viewer.⁴⁰ Cropper considered how the formation of a courtly society, mediated by Baldassare Castiglione's treatise *The Courtier*, made new demands on the functions and legibility of art. She employed a range of portraits as evidence for the changing character of the interaction between the individual and state. She discussed portraits as part of a broader artistic shift, as art moved from a period of experimentation to one that was more academic. This dissertation takes her proposal that art responded to the formation of the court and augments it with a more nuanced discussion of portraits of leading Florentine figures. Where Cropper placed emphasis on the beholder's share at interpretation, my study considers how the artists and patrons created their works to achieve the desired impact.

Similarly, David Franklin's examination of portraiture was embedded in his larger study of *Painting in Renaissance Florence 1500-1550*.⁴¹ Franklin's discussion was dispersed throughout the book, often in relation to individual artists. While it was not directly traced as a development within the city-state, Franklin's keen insights into Florentine painting production can be applied to portraiture. Of particular relevance for this study is Franklin's attempt to isolate and explain what was uniquely Florentine about Florentine art during this period. He relied heavily on formal analysis of works by a select group of artists. Franklin established that the development of Florentine painting represented a self-conscious artistic heritage, wherein painters referenced the earlier tradition even as formal qualities were changing. He was successful in identifying how this was perpetuated by individual workshops and artistic familial

⁴⁰ Elizabeth Cropper, "L'arte cortigiana a Firenze: Della Repubblica dissimulata allo Stato paterno," in *Storia delle Arti in Toscana: Il Cinquecento*, 85-115.

⁴¹ David Franklin, *Painting in Renaissance Florence, 1500-1550* (New Haven, CT.: Yale University Press, 2001).

lineages.⁴² Franklin's work provided new avenues for considering the latent meaning of style and portraiture, particularly in early sixteenth-century Florence.

Renaissance Florence: A Social History, a collection of essays edited by Roger Crum and John T. Paoletti, applied social art historical methodologies to a wide variety of topics, all related to early modern Florence.⁴³ As such, it is a key reference as the present study is closely concerned with the larger socio-political context of Florence and uses a similar methodology. Within the individual essays, there was a uniform attention to the display of art and establishing those who had access to it in various locales. The authors were concerned with who saw what visual material and in what setting. Although none addressed portraits in particular, their insights can help to situate Florentine portraiture in a broader context and provide a more nuanced awareness of contemporaneous viewership.⁴⁴ My work addresses this gap by re-situating the portraits within their original contexts, and therefore within this larger literature.

There are several dominant threads in portraiture literature to which this study is indebted, most particularly those addressing how portraits established and reflected the sitter's identity. From Burckhardt to Stephen Greenblatt, the importance of self-fashioning one's identity has been central to Renaissance studies.⁴⁵ From Lorenzo Ghiberti to Giorgio Vasari, there are ample primary documents that explore and explain the importance of fashioning one's artistic

⁴² Ibid, 16.

⁴³ Roger Crum and John T. Paoletti, eds., *Renaissance Florence: A Social History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

⁴⁴ Many of them build off of the seminal work done by Richard C. Trexler in *Public Life in Renaissance Florence*, Studies in Social Discontinuity (New York: Academic Press, 1980). Trexler is especially attentive to how people lived and moved in Renaissance Florence. His work is an early example of the importance of social networks.

⁴⁵ Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, see note 9 above; Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).

identity.⁴⁶ Of particular interest to this study are works that chart the development of identity formation in Florence. A classic study of social and artistic response to turmoil is Frederik Hartt's "Art and Freedom in Quattrocento Florence."⁴⁷ Establishing a clear correlation between artistic invention and societal conditions, Hartt used Donatello's *St. George* for Orsanmichele to exemplify a corporate assertion of identity. As the guilds decline in power in the middle- and late- fifteenth century, corporate identity is supplanted by familial identity. Assertions of familial identity abound in the commissioning of large scale projects such as palazzi and private chapels, as well as individual works of art for both public and private audiences.⁴⁸ This study focuses on the third phase of identity formation in Florence: that of the entrepreneurial individual. As the social and political realities of life in the city-state shift, outsiders arrive, seeking a Florentine identity as a means to establish themselves in the new structures of the city.

The broader topic of identity formation spans both historical and art historical scholarship, with Peter Burke's books and essays providing an important foundation. A cultural historian, Burke is concerned with establishing clear connections between visual culture and the societal context for which it was produced. This methodology is adapted in this study. Most significant for this dissertation is his essay "The Presentation of the Self in the Renaissance

⁴⁶ Lorenzo Ghiberti, *I commentarii: Biblioteca nazionale centrale di Firenze, II, I, 333*, ed. Lorenzo Bartoli (Firenze: Giunti, 1998); Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori e architettori: nelle redazioni del 1550 e 1568*, eds. Rosanna Bettarini and Paola Barocchi, (Firenze: Sansoni, 1966-1987). For scholarship on artistic self-fashioning, especially through the lens of the self-portrait, see Joanna Woods-Marsden, *Renaissance Self-Portraiture: The Visual Construction of Identity and the Social Status of the Artist* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998); Loh, *Still Lives*.

⁴⁷ Frederick Hartt, "Art and Freedom in Quattrocento Florence," in *Essays in Memory of Karl Lehmann*, ed. Lucy Freeman Sandler (Locust Valley, NY: J.J. Augustin Publisher, 1964), 114-131.

⁴⁸ See for example F.W. Kent, *Household and Lineage in Renaissance Florence: The Family Life of the Capponi, Ginori, and Ruccellai* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1977); Eve Borsook and Johannes Offerhaus, *Francesco Sassetti and Ghirlandaio at Santa Trinità, Florence: History and Legend in a Renaissance Chapel* (Doomspijk, Holland: Davaco, 1981); Dale Kent, *Cosimo de' Medici and the Florentine Renaissance: the Patron's Oeuvre* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000); Dale Kent, *Friendship, Love, & Trust in Renaissance Florence* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009).

Portrait,” as it focused on Italian sixteenth-century portraiture.⁴⁹ In this essay Burke explored diverse ways individuals presented themselves, explicating and reconstructing many of the social codes that structured the performance of identity. He placed the genre within a larger system of signs. Interested in the communicative power of portraits, Burke considered not only how the sitter crafted an identity, but how viewers encountered and interpreted the visual information. To do so, he established the assumptions those viewers possessed.

Burke’s insights have manifested themselves in continued research into the communicative power of portraits, including an interest in the beholder’s share of interpretation.⁵⁰ Viewer reception was the subject of John Shearman’s *Only Connect. . . : Art and the Spectator in the Italian Renaissance*, a study devoted to establishing communicative strategies of art.⁵¹ Shearman explored artworks as objects that create a conversation – a connection through dialogue – by identifying ways in which artworks were adapted to their intended viewers. Shearman proposed that the viewer was mentally present from the work’s inception. A successful Renaissance artwork, he argued, required a beholder to complete it. Unlike other studies in reception history, Shearman remained focused on the aesthetic qualities of the artwork. His work moved from the general to the particular, increasingly defining the spectator: first as a Renaissance individual and later as, for example, an individual experiencing a

⁴⁹ Peter Burke, *The Historical Anthropology of Early Modern Italy: Essays on Perception and Communication* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987). Peter Burke, *The Italian Renaissance: Culture and Society in Italy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987) provides a broader overview of Italian art and society. Other works by Peter Burke that impacted this study include *The Fabrication of Louis XIV* (New Haven, CT.: Yale University Press, 1992); *The Fortunes of the Courtier: The European Reception of Castiglione’s Cortegiano* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996).

⁵⁰ There is a considerable and growing literature on portraiture and identity. Greenblatt’s *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, a broad exploration of self-conscious identity in Early Modern England, is foundational for this strand of inquiry. Many of the thematic questions he explores are applied to Renaissance Italy in Mary Rogers, ed., *Fashioning Identities in Renaissance Art* (Brookfield, VT: Ashgate, 2000).

⁵¹ John Shearman, *Only Connect--: Art and the Spectator in the Italian Renaissance* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992).

domed space. In his chapter “Portraits and Poets,” Shearman applied the question of engagement between object and spectator to portraiture. He identified the performative aspect of the portrait as part of the paragone between artists and authors to enliven a figure. The beholder became integral to the portrait, which cannot function as a presence if there is not a second party to view it. Shearman identified unique ways portraits encouraged the viewer to react and respond to the image.

The idea of an engaged audience was explored in a more nuanced and theoretical mode by Jodi Cranston in *The Poetics of Portraiture in the Italian Renaissance*.⁵² Cranston brought an interdisciplinary approach to the question, inserting the viewer’s subjectivity into interpretations of sixteenth-century Italian portraits. Cranston was especially attentive to ways in which portraits elicited a viewer’s response. She also isolated methods used to help the viewer perceive the sitter’s inner self. Cranston considered individual relationships between sitter and viewer – between object and audience – to explore how the portrait addressed the spectator. The idea of an active viewer that both Shearman and Cranston discussed is especially pertinent to the current study.

Turning from art history to history, much of the secondary literature on this transitional period has been written in recent decades. Eric Cochrane’s *Florence in the Forgotten Centuries, 1527-1800: A History of Florence and the Florentines in the Age of the Grand Dukes* was primarily responsible for focusing attention on the period.⁵³ Whereas previous scholars considered Italy – and Florence in particular – economically and intellectually insignificant following the 1527 Sack of Rome, his work established that the period was one of production,

⁵² Jodi Cranston, *The Poetics of Portraiture in the Italian Renaissance* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

⁵³ Eric Cochrane, *Florence in the Forgotten Centuries, 1527-1800: A History of Florence and the Florentines in the Age of the Grand Dukes* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973).

stimulation, and importance. This book further introduced achievements of Cosimo's administrative organization. It inspired the following generations of scholars to study this once-forgotten period, and this research follows in their footsteps.⁵⁴

This dissertation has grown out of the rich research on Renaissance portraiture while addressing particular omissions. While studies have explored Florentine portraiture during the republican era and the ducal period, few examine the turbulent second quarter of the sixteenth century. Where these portraits have previously been discussed in connoisseurial terms or as isolated expressions of individuality, this dissertation reframes them as part of a collective and civic identity. When questions of civic and national identity were addressed, they tended to be more cursory and as part of a wide-ranging study. This project contributes to the broader field with a concentrated exploration of the role of civic identity in portraiture. I offer new insights into the works considered as case studies, but these insights are valuable beyond the individual artworks. They add gradations to our understanding of both the aesthetic and political climate of the period. This study elucidates an area of artistic confusion just as the artists and their patrons struggled to navigate the political chaos that surrounded them.

This project re-inserts the portraits into larger discussions of art and persona in this self-conscious period. It deepens our understanding of sixteenth-century portraiture and the nature of self-presentation, in particular in terms of civic identity. Broadening the definition of *fiorentinità*,

⁵⁴ Cecil Roth, *The Last Florentine Republic* (London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1925), predates this interest, as does Rudolf von Albertini, *Firenze dalla Repubblica al Principato: Storia e Coscienza Politica* (Torino: Einaudi, 1995), originally published as *Das florentinische Staatsbewusstsein im Übergang von der Republik zum Prinzipat* (Bern: Franke, 1955). A strong introduction to the history and politics of Florence in the later sixteenth century is R. Burr Litchfield, *Emergence of a Bureaucracy: the Florentine Patricians, 1530-1790* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986). Several publications include John M. Najemy, *A History of Florence, 1200-1575* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006); Nicholas Scott Baker, *The Fruit of Liberty: Political Culture in the Florentine Renaissance, 1480-1550* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013); Gregory Murry, *The Medicean Succession: Monarchy and Sacral Politics in Duke Cosimo dei Medici's Florence* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014).

this dissertation suggests new ways of envisioning social and political identity. It addresses the question: how does the individual reshape his own identity while the city around him changes? The answers provided by this dissertation project will benefit the complex field of early modern portraiture studies.

Chapter 2: Pontormo's *Portrait of Alessandro de' Medici: "il Duce della Repubblica Fiorentina"*

2.1 Introduction

There is nothing to distinguish the sitter in Pontormo's *Portrait of Alessandro de' Medici* as the recently-appointed ruler of Florence. Cloaked in black and his head topped by a soft black cap, Alessandro looks up, out of the picture plane, as though he has been interrupted while drawing a woman's profile (fig. 1). Alessandro looks not at the drawing he is creating. Rather, he gazes beyond the picture frame, level and a little to his left. His right hand holds the thin stylus, pressing it to the paper, which Pontormo has tilted downward and out toward the viewer. Seated in a rich, wood paneled room with a *pietra serena* framed door, Alessandro's figure fills much of the picture space. His corporeal frame is exaggerated by the inconsistent perspective. It is an unusual portrait with its unresolved spatial construction, unflattering body proportions, enigmatic iconography, and spare attributes. Not only is there something unnerving about the sitter, but altogether the picture is an unconventional portrait of a ruler.

Previous scholarship on this portrait has reconstructed its complex history.¹ According to Vasari, Duke Alessandro de' Medici commissioned the work from Pontormo after seeing a

¹ In addition to monographs and exhibition catalogs, the portrait has been the subject of several articles, most notably: Leo Steinberg, "Pontormo's Alessandro de' Medici, or, I only have eyes for you," *Art in America* 63.1 (January-February 1975): 62-65; Carl Brandon Strehlke, "*Pontormo, Alessandro de' Medici, and the Palazzo Pazzi*," *Philadelphia Museum of Art Bulletin* 81 (Autumn, 1985): 3-15; Vanessa Walker-Oakes, "Representing the Perfect Prince: Pontormo's Alessandro de' Medici," *Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 32 (2001): 127-146; Patricia Simons, "Disegno and Desire in Pontormo's Alessandro de' Medici," *Renaissance Studies* 22.5 (2008): 650-668. The work and the relationship between the painter and patron is explored in detail in Elizabeth Pilliod, *Pontormo, Bronzino, Allori: A Genealogy of Florentine Art* (New Haven, CT.: Yale University Press, 2001), especially 11-42. As with many topics related to Pontormo and his production, Philippe Costamagna, *Pontormo* (Milano: Electa, 1994), 222-25 provides a solid foundation and bibliography. Further bibliography and a

portrait of Amerigo Antinori, which had met with critical acclaim.² Pontormo first produced a small panel, which at the time Vasari wrote his *Lives* was still in the Medici collections in the *guardaroba* of Cosimo I and today can be found in the Art Institute of Chicago (fig. 2). The painted study served as a model for Alessandro's life size portrait. Vasari recounts how Pontormo asked, as compensation, only for the funds necessary to retrieve a pawned cloak. Alessandro, who was pleased with the work, instead paid him fifty gold *scudi*. This episode is significant as it points to the initial reception history of the portrait, which the patron valued enough to increase the painter's salary and even offer a subsequent reward.³ According to Vasari, the finished product did not remain in the Medici family collections for long.

In Vasari's account, Alessandro gave the portrait to Taddea Malaspina, his preferred paramour, sometime before his death in 1537. When she left Florence for Massa following Alessandro's assassination, she took the panel with her. Initially unaware of the portrait's existence, Duke Cosimo I likely first learnt of it only from Vasari's *Lives of the Artists*.⁴ In 1568, although uncertain of its location, Cosimo issued a request for the return of the painting. Three years later, on 23 November 1571, Constantino Ansoldi wrote a letter to Francesco de' Medici,

discussion of the history of the panel can be found in Carl Brandon Strehlke, ed., *Pontormo, Bronzino and the Medici: The Transformation of the Renaissance Portrait in Florence* (Philadelphia: Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art in association with the Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004), 112-115.

² Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori e architettori: nelle redazioni del 1550 e 1568*, eds. Rosanna Bettarini and Paola Barocchi, (Firenze: Sansoni, 1966-1987) vol. V, 327.

³ Pilliod, *Pontormo, Bronzino, Allori*, 14 further notes that in Vasari's account the duke offered Pontormo a stipend that the artist initially rejected. The archival work in her book goes on to prove that Pontormo was a court artist at the first ducal court. It should be noted that by 1534, Pontormo had established a prime place within the Florentine artistic world, and Alessandro may have been as interested in connecting his name to the artist who by the mid-1530s had already decorated the Capponi Chapel and twice collaborated with Michelangelo.

⁴ Steinberg, "Pontormo's Alessandro de' Medici," 64 suggests that the Duke may have learnt of the existence of the larger portrait only with the 1568 publication of the second edition of Vasari's *Lives*. This proposal has been subsequently adopted in more recent scholarship. Costamagna, *Pontormo*, 224 states that Cosimo was also inspired by Paolo Giovio's collection to acquire representations of illustrious members of the Medici family. It implies that Cosimo I, in his interest in Medici genealogy, was carefully controlling Medicean imagery. An attempt to locate this portrait fits his wider cultural and artistic policies.

then ruling in his father's stead.⁵ Ansoldi, a former tutor to Alessandro's illegitimate son Giulio, claimed knowledge of the painting and its location in Massa. He declared that he had discovered it in the holdings of Alberico Malaspina Cibo, the Marquis of Massa and nephew to Taddea Malaspina. From there, the story takes a dramatic turn. Ansoldi recruited his former charge, Giulio, to help him obtain the picture and thereby return it to the ducal collections. However, two artists, identified only as Vincenzo and Salvio, made a copy in an effort to avoid relinquishing the original. Giulio gave the copy to Ansoldi and kept the original for himself.⁶ Unable to secure the original painting, Ansoldi wrote to Francesco de' Medici. The fate of the work in the late sixteenth century remains a mystery. No documentary evidence has been discovered to corroborate or contradict the saga. The original painting reappeared only in 1911, in a letter from Bernard Berenson to John G. Johnson regarding the work.⁷

Scholars have considered the portrait as an unconventional presentation of a ruler, and offered several significant insights into its purpose and audience. Early interpretations suggested it was a private work.⁸ With the speculation that it was commissioned as a gift from Alessandro to his paramour, the audience was at most two: Alessandro and Taddea. This hypothesis served to explain the strange representation of a prince. By deeming it a private work with a limited

⁵ The letter is reproduced in Frederick Mortimer Clapp, *Jacopo Carucci da Pontorno, his Life and Work* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1916), 280-82.

⁶ A copy of the work by an unknown painter exists in Lisbon at the Museu Nacional de Arte Antiga. Costamagna, *Pontorno*, 224, believes it could be the copy described in Ansoldi's letter. Strehlke, "Pontorno, Alessandro de' Medici, and the Palazzo Pazzi," 9 believes that the Lisbon painting is of higher quality than the copy cited by Ansoldi. Strehlke proposes that the Lisbon portrait could instead *be a copy made by Battista Franco c. 1536-37*.

⁷ Steinberg, "Pontorno's Alessandro de' Medici," 65. Berenson commented that it was a portrait of an artist, and when it first went on display as part of the Johnson Collection at the Philadelphia Museum, it was of an unknown sitter. It was only in 1913 when Frederick Mortimer Clapp saw a photograph of it connected it to Vasari's accounts that it was identified as Pontorno's portrait of Alessandro de' Medici.

⁸ See, for example, Steinberg, "Pontorno's Alessandro de' Medici" and Costamagna, *Pontorno*. This view is discussed more fully in the literature review below.

audience, its enigmatic qualities were readily excused. More recent scholarship has argued that this work was not intended for a single viewer but a broad, public audience.⁹ One lacuna in the scholarship is a detailed exploration of the larger context of the portrait. This chapter situates Pontormo's *Portrait of Alessandro de' Medici* in its broader Florentine socio-political context. To do so, I review developments in portraits of Florentines and princes.

The enigmatic and complex portrayal of Alessandro de' Medici, known to history as the first Duke of the Florentine Republic, exemplifies one of the developments in portraiture in reaction to the turmoil and uncertainty of the 1520s and 1530s in Florence. In light of both visual and archival documents, the portrait is re-inserted into the unstable political situation and Pontormo's portraiture production.¹⁰ Considering Alessandro's role, as specified in the 1532 constitution as the "leader of the Florentine Republic," this chapter posits that the unconventional portrait purposefully reflects an unconventional – and uncertain – prince.¹¹ I argue that rather than situate Alessandro amidst the codified visual language of public or private ruler portraiture, this portrait posits Alessandro more ambiguously - perhaps as a Florentine citizen – thereby eliding the markers of rule. It actively conceals his position, presenting Alessandro as a member of the educated public. This was a purposeful strategy of visual presentation for a personage of highly ambiguous and tenuous social and political position.

Scholarly discussion of portraiture produced by two of the most prominent artists of the mid-sixteenth century – Pontormo and Bronzino (1503-1572) – has often been limited to issues

⁹ As espoused by Walker-Oakes, "Representing the Perfect Prince," and Simons, "Disegno and Desire in Pontormo's Alessandro de' Medici," as discussed below in the literature review.

¹⁰ Pontormo's successful career as a portraitist may in part have been the happenstance of the context. The artist who at times presented his sitters in a perplexing or enigmatic way was not necessarily responding to the socio-political context, but rather found an audience well-disposed to his work due to the enigmatic situation.

¹¹ Archivio di Stato di Firenze, Senato dei 48, Provvissioni, I:3V. See footnote 29 below. Translation mine.

of connoisseurship. Rather than isolating the output of the artist by emphasizing the idiosyncratic style of the individual artist, this dissertation considers the portraits as part of a more cohesive development. By questioning what characteristics of their works appealed to contemporaneous portraits, it is possible to achieve a more complete understanding of the political, social, and artistic worlds of sixteenth-century Florence.

2.2 Florence in Crisis

The first decades of the sixteenth century were a tumultuous time in Florence. A period of intense political turmoil and social upheaval, political institutions were in constant flux if not actual crisis. As the following discussion establishes, a new government was being invented, and during a period of maximum tension and disruption. Individual citizens had to contend with shifting powers, deciding how to align themselves and if those allegiances should and could safely be maintained.¹²

Alessandro de' Medici was born into this shifting world in Urbino in 1511 or 1512. His exact birthdate is unknown and his early life is poorly documented. He was presented as the illegitimate son of Lorenzo II de' Medici, called Lorenzino, who was the de facto ruler of Florence from 1513 to 1519.¹³ However, doubt has been raised as to Alessandro's claimed parentage. Some historians favor the theory that he was fathered by Pope Clement VII, who later chose Alessandro as the first Duke of Florence over the pope's other nephew, Ippolito.¹⁴ This

¹² Nicholas Scott Baker, *The Fruit of Liberty: Political Culture in the Florentine Renaissance, 1480-1550* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013), 103-4. For example, Baker discusses the experiences of Francesco Guicciardini and Filippo Strozzi, who "provide the best-documented examples of the delicate line walked by men with close ties to the Medici, and the conflicting loyalties that drew upon them." 104

¹³ The election of Leo X, the first Medici pope, precipitated Lorenzo's rise to power. He was also appointed Duke of Urbino in 1516.

¹⁴ Ippolito, the illegitimate son of Giuliano de' Medici, Duke of Nemours, ruled as Lord of Florence from November 19, 1523 to May 16, 1527. He died August 10, 1535 at the age of 24. For a more nuanced discussion of Alessandro's parentage, see John Brackett, "Race and Rulership: Alessandro de' Medici, first Medici Duke of Florence, 1529-

theory was first espoused in Alessandro's own lifetime, primarily by Florentine exiles who were attempting to undermine Pope Clement's authority by highlighting his nepotism.¹⁵

Following his election as pope in 1523, Clement VII insisted that Alessandro and Ippolito reside in Florence. Alessandro was tutored by Silvio Passerini, Cardinal of Cortona, as per his uncle's wishes. Although both of Clement's nephews lived in the city by 1524, it was Ippolito who Pope Clement initially favored. Elected to the *Balìa* – the ruling committee – on 24 July 1524, Ippolito was a logical choice over Alessandro for his age and his purer lineage. He was the elder nephew. His father was decidedly less hated by the Florentines than was Lorenzo. While Ippolito was technically part of the *Balìa* and *Settanta* (the seventy), his young age suggests the honorifics were in name only, and he exercised little power.¹⁶

As under the papacy of Leo X, the city under the papal stewardship of Clement VII was forced to align with papal policy and ambition. Although the city remained an independent republic, the pope was instrumental in choosing the key players in Florentine governance as well as setting policies at home and abroad. Clement VII therefore operated as a de facto ruler of Florence. During this period, Clement favored French policies. With papal support, the French appeared to be expanding their influence across the peninsula.

1537,” in *Black Africans in Renaissance Europe*, eds. by T.F. Earle and K.J.P. Lowe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 303-325. Brackett argues that Alessandro's father was Lorenzino while his mother was Simonetta, a Moorish slave.

¹⁵ For a complete accounting of sixteenth-century authors and their claims on Alessandro's parentage, see Catherine Fletcher, *The Black Prince of Florence: The Spectacular Life and Treacherous World of Alessandro de' Medici* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), fn. 6 pages 281-82. Fletcher concludes that he was likely the son of Lorenzo and an African slave, as the majority of contemporaneous accounts support this lineage. She makes the point that either way, the lack of known documentation of his early life reflect that he was not expected to take a leading role within the family, and it was only with the deaths of many male members that he had the opportunity for prominence.

¹⁶ Baker, *The Fruit of Liberty*, 91-92.

French ambitions in Italy were abruptly curtailed when the imperial army of Charles V defeated the French at the Battle of Pavia on 24 February 1525. The pope made overtures of friendship to the victor, but on 22 May 1526 he joined with his former ally, Francis I, to form the Holy League of Cognac. This alliance was bolstered by several other Italian powers, including Milan, Venice, and Genoa. The proposed mission of the League was to protect against the Ottoman Turks, but in effect it was an anti-imperialist alliance. Clement VII signed Florence on, leading to a military confrontation with the imperial army. In April 1527, the leaders of the imperial forces brought their army south, arriving outside of Florence. They were opposed by the army of the League of Cognac, led by the Duke of Urbino, Francesco Maria della Rovere.

With the imperial army threatening the city, Cardinal Passerini and Ippolito de' Medici left Florence on April 26. Though they ostensibly went to confer with the Duke of Urbino, their abrupt departure gave rise to rumors that they had abandoned the city. In their absence, the local populace rose in rebellion, rallying in the Piazza della Signoria.¹⁷ They forced their way into Palazzo della Signoria, and demanded, among other things, the exile of the Medici. Members of the Signoria, although initially nominated and supported by the Medici, voted without dissent to banish the family. Imprisonments were overturned, prisoners in the Bargello were freed, and the state constitution of 1512 was re-adopted.¹⁸ The great bell atop the seat of government was sounded, calling citizens to the piazza. Rumors arose that the Medici had retreated.¹⁹ Cries of

¹⁷ The initial issue is believed to have been permission to carry arms within the city, a prohibition that upset the young elite men of Florence. For this reason they had planned a revolt for the following day, but used the absence of Ippolito to launch it early.

¹⁸ Cecil Roth, *The Last Florentine Republic* (London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1925), 26-27.

¹⁹ Rumors were ripe this evening, as others states that the *Gonfaloniere* had been assassinated. This falsity spurred some to action, viewing it as a provocation and event that required vengeance.

libertà and *popolo* echoed through the city. For one evening, the Florentine Republic was restored.

Today, the *tumulto del venerdì* is barely a footnote to history, as Cardinal Passerini quickly returned and re-established order.²⁰ It is perhaps better remembered for the unfortunate damage done to Michelangelo's *David*, when a bench thrown from the Palazzo della Signoria struck the statue's arm, breaking it into pieces. That was the most visible mark left by the frenzied one-afternoon revolt. Passerini, arriving with artillery, was prepared to fire on the city to reclaim it. His opponents, however, surrendered without incident in return for a general amnesty. A case of rapid and unexpected political instability, the one-day revolt reveals the chaotic Florentine environment, where the government could unexpectedly change drastically in a matter of hours. Though a mostly bloodless episode, the short-lived *tumulto del venerdì* revealed a citizenry simultaneously apprehensive and opportunistic.

The imperial army, facing the forces of the League of Cognac, continued southward. While this show of support furthered the Medici cause in Florence, the *tumulto del venerdì* should have warned the Medicean faction how quickly the political situation could change. Two weeks later, on 11 May 1527, word arrived of the Sack of Rome. The news reached Florence only a few days after the events of 6 May that made Pope Clement VII a virtual prisoner in the city he had ruled. Reports of the Medici pope's political and military defeat in Rome put the Florentine Medici in a precarious position.²¹ It signaled that Pope Clement VII, and therefore the

²⁰ The classic account of the *tumulto del venerdì* remains *ibid*, 23-31. A recent addition to secondary literature on the subject is Catherine Fletcher, *The Black Prince of Florence*, 37-39. Fletcher's biography, supported by archival research, constructs the experience of the night with excerpts from first-hand accounts. A detailed discussion of the event is recounted in Benedetto Varchi, *Storie fiorentine*, ed. Lelio Arbib (Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2003), vol. I, 130-178. Baker, *The Fruit of Liberty* provides a further list of Renaissance accounts of the *tumulto del venerdì* in fn. 169, page 314.

²¹ Baker proposes that the Medici had increasingly lost touch with other elite Florentines when their interests began to diverge from their peers. In particular, he notes that the Papacy turned their focus to the world exterior to the city

Medici family, had lost his grip on power. Without papal support, the Medici relinquished control of Florence, this time in response to a bloodless coup. Within ten days, Florence had re-adopted the 1494 constitution and returned to a popular government.²² This was the beginning of the Last Florentine Republic, as the period from 1527 to 1530 has come to be known.²³

Catherine de' Medici, the future Queen of France, remained behind, while Alessandro was forced to flee with the majority of his family when the Republic was once again restored in May 1527.²⁴ At the time, Alessandro and Ippolito represented the only two heirs of the senior branch of the Medici family, those who could trace their lineage to Cosimo il Vecchio. As an anonymous chronicler noted, on 16 May, "The government was changed peacefully, by an agreement, and Ippolito de' Medici and the Cardinal of Cortona went away together."²⁵ The unknown diarist who continued the diary of Luca Landucci presents the event as one void of drama and easily executed. In his spare style, he observes but does not comment on the change of government. However, the short-lived republican period saw factionalism grow in the vacuum of power.

Clement VII returned to Rome in October of 1528, and set about to simultaneously reclaim and reform the power of the papacy. He entered into the Treaty of Barcelona on 29 June 1529, which established peace with Charles V. The treaty included a clause in which the emperor

state, as "Florence became a source of finance to further Medici dynastic ambitions and pontifical military adventures." *The Fruit of Liberty*, 97.

²² Stephens, *The Fall of the Florentine Republic*. Stephens reconstructs the tumultuous years between the death of Lorenzo il Magnifico and the appointment of Alessandro primarily through archival documents.

²³ An increasingly rich literature covers the Last Florentine Republic and the siege. For a more complete accounting of the period from 1527-1530, see Roth, *The Last Florentine Republic*; J.N. Stephens, *The Fall of the Florentine Republic, 1512-1530* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983); Baker, *The Fruit of Liberty*.

²⁴ Alessandro had remained outside the city limits, at the familial villa of Poggio a Caiano.

²⁵ Luca Landucci, *A Florentine Diary from 1450 to 1516*, trans. Alice de Rosen Jervis (New York: Arno Press, 1969), 291-92.

agreed to assist in the family's return to their home town, returning the family in Florence.²⁶ Hoping to pre-empt the situation, a Florentine embassy departed for Genoa in mid-August of 1529 to meet with Charles V, but garnered no reassurances or guarantees. Fulfilling the terms of the treaty, imperial forces marched on Florence. Although they arrived all but unhindered, the first two months of the siege were ineffective. With the army only occupying the south bank of the Arno, the city was not fully isolated until a second imperial army arrived, commanded by Ferrante Gonzaga and Alfonso d'Avalos.²⁷ Then the Siege of Florence began in earnest.

In March 1530, the imperial army completed its investment of the city. Within the walls of Florence, food soon ran low while plague began to spread among the populace.²⁸ In early August of 1530, a detachment of soldiers en route to assist the Florentines was soundly defeated. This military setback and the lack of relief from abroad led to the surrender of the city, which officially capitulated on 12 August 1530. Among the terms of the treaty that ended the siege was the significant stipulation that Charles V had control over the new form of Florentine government. Meanwhile, all political exiles since 1527 were welcomed back.

It is estimated that 36,000 people died in the city during the siege, a number equivalent to approximately one third of the population.²⁹ The siege was concurrent with a five-year plague

²⁶ Shortly thereafter, Charles V and Francis I also end their feud, signing the Peace of Cambrai on 5 August 1529. For more on this treaty, see Roth, *The Last Florentine Republic*, 142-144.

²⁷ In fact, by early December the situation favors the Florentines over their besiegers, as the city had prepared for the siege not only by reinforcing its walls, but also by burning crops that the imperial army might otherwise have consumed. Baker, *The Fruit of Liberty*, 118 details Florentine preparations for the siege.

²⁸ For a more complete picture of the siege of Florence, see Roth, *The Last Florentine Republic*, 184-224. Sixteenth-century accounts can be found in Varchi, *Storia fiorentina* vol. 2, 132-536; Jacopo Nardi, *Istorie della citta di Firenze*, ed. Agenore Gelli (Firenze: Felice le Monnier, 1858), vol. 2: 170-218.

²⁹ Roth, *The Last Florentine Republic*, 320. It should be noted that the deaths were due directly to the siege, as well as a plague outbreak, discussed below.

outbreak.³⁰ From 110,000 residents in 1527, there were only 54,000 inhabitants at the end of the siege.³¹ In the span of just a few years, the city's population had been decimated.

The subsequent period was one of serious disruption and even disaster for many of the city's elite who had not allied themselves with the Medici. Many were murdered in the chaotic aftermath of the Last Republic. Many more suffered exile. The city's constitution was again subject to reform, this time by the distant overlord, Charles V. While awaiting a more concrete system of government, Bartolomeo di Filippo Valori, a supporter and representative of the Medici, took charge.³² Clement VII chose Nikolaus von Schönburg, then archbishop of Capua, to replace Valori in the closing weeks of 1530. An untested youth, Alessandro de' Medici remained absent from the city. Instability and uncertainty continued in Florence, with nominal governments lasting only short periods of time. Despite the conclusion of the Siege of Florence, it remained an uncertain and volatile state with an ill-defined system of governance.

The situation was not stabilized even when Alessandro de' Medici was pronounced fit for all public offices on 17 February 1531. At this time, he had already gained the title of Duke of Penne from Charles V. It was essentially an honorary title, as Alessandro did not reside in Penne, a small town in Abruzzo. When he officially reentered Florence on 5 July, Alessandro bore an imperial bull that declared him head of the Florentine government. It was not until April 1532,

³⁰ Alan S. Morrison, Julius Kirshner, and Anthony Molho, "Epidemics in Renaissance Florence," *American Journal of Public Health* 75:5 (May 1985): 530. This plague occurred only a few years after the 1522-25 outbreak, during which Pontormo retreated to the Certosa del Galluzzo, where he executed five frescoes with scenes from the Passion of Christ.

³¹ Roth, *The Last Florentine Republic*, 320. The population was likely further reduced by those who went into exile, either by choice or by decree.

³² "As papal commissioner in the besieging army, and in the absence of any representative of the Medici family, Bartolomeo di Filippo Valori assumed control of the city and lodged in the Palazzo Medici." Baker, *The Fruit of Liberty*, 144. Baker goes on to discuss concern, expressed by elite Florentine citizens, "about the arbitrary and temporary nature of Valori's authority in the city." Valori's brief stewardship represents the continued uncertainty regarding the socio-political structures of the city during this period.

however, that a new constitution was imposed on Florence. Despite its importance in Florentine history, the *Signoria* – the central organ of democratic government – was eliminated and replaced with a series of councils. Alessandro was made the head of the government, as “...*Alessandro de’ Medici, el quale in future si habbi a chiamare il Duce della repubblica fiorentina come si chiama el Duge di Venetia.*”³³

The particular language of the constitution is here significant, as the concept of a duke fronting a republican government for a life-time term is by definition impossible. It is initially unclear how *il Duce della repubblica fiorentina* should be understood. It has commonly been translated as “the Duke of the Florentine Republic.” However, there are two difficulties with this formulation. The first is that Alessandro already nominally held the rank of duke. Having been granted the position as Duke of Penne, it was a general title Alessandro already possessed. The second is the particular word choice: *duce* as opposed to *duca*. *Duce* translates to a more general term for a leader as opposed to a particular title. How then should the language of the new constitution be understood?

The declaration continues, equating Alessandro’s position with that of the Doge of the Venetian Republic. This position was not hereditary. It was an institutional and elected role. By comparing Florentine governance with Venetian, it suggests that the title was honorific. It also avoids the question of a hereditary ruler, a notion implied by the position of a duke, but not by

³³ “...Alessandro de’ Medici, who in the future will be called the leader of the Florentine Republic as one calls the Doge of Venice.” Translation author’s own. Archivio di Stato di Firenze, Senato dei 48, Provvissioni, I:3V, as quoted in Baker, *The Fruit of Liberty*, fn 32, 331. See also pages 152-53 for a discussion of the title “as a prince in name alone.”

the role of the Venetian Doge. The 1532 constitution, written by a committee of twelve men of the patrician class, instituted not a duchy but an oligarchy.³⁴

The constitution and formation of a new state, with a novel administrative function, sought in design and linguistic reference to satisfy both the citizens and the Medici, particularly in accordance with the treaty of August 1530.³⁵ The Florentine Republic officially ended on 27 April 1532 with the revised constitution quoted above. It implied that Alessandro was the head of the Florentine government, but did not explicitly establish his power or authority. Given the variety of previous short-term solutions and short-lived governments, stability was not yet established or expected. After a chaotic decade, it seems Florentines did not assume that Duke Alessandro would be a permanent fix or fixture.

2.3 Florentine Portraiture

Before turning to Pontormo's *Alessandro de' Medici*, a brief overview of Florentine portraiture in the preceding century is essential in establishing how the genre had developed in the city state. This review serves not only this chapter, but as background for my entire study. In addition to the general overview, I highlight various trends in Florentine portraiture in the 1530s to establish that patrons had significant options in the manner of representation and self-presentation. The choice of an artist was one way sitters were able to construct their identity.

Independent, secular painted portraits developed in the middle of the fifteenth century out of the tradition of portraying famous men.³⁶ Portraits from the mid-fifteenth century are

³⁴ Baker, *The Fruit of Liberty*, 150. It should be noted, however, that the same document abolished the Signoria, a key institution of the Florentine Republic for centuries.

³⁵ For the text of this document see Varchi, *Storia fiorentina*, vol. 2: 514-518.

³⁶ Previous to this period, portraits of saints were more common and the secular sitter rare. Rather, the contemporary secular portrait would be found not as a stand-alone work but as part of a cycle of famous men that could include both ancient and modern examples.

primarily under-life size depictions that are bust- or half-length while focusing on the visage of the sitter.³⁷ Likeness and naturalism were primary goals during the second half of the Quattrocento. One prevalent emphasis was that of virtue, using the serious and thoughtful countenance as well as attributes to reflect the upstanding moral character and honorable qualities of a sitter. These works were often intended to provide a clear and explicit message about the sitter. The *Portrait of a Man* in Washington, D.C. (fig. 3) by Andrea del Castagno (1419-1457) exemplifies this type of portrait, with its emphasis on likeness and specific style of dress. Set against a sky of variegated blues, the unidentified sitter in Castagno's portrait is depicted with his left shoulder turned toward the viewer. Although the three-quarter view was already popular in Northern Europe, this work was created at a time when the vast majority of portraits in Italy presented the sitter in profile. His distinctive nose, cleft chin, rounded cheeks, and full lips all provide descriptive details of physiognomy. The precise folds of his *lucco* (a traditional Florentine tunic) create volume. The red *lucco* placed him among the elite citizens and office-holders of contemporary Florence. The isolation of the figure against a landscape, popular in the 1450s, would slowly give way to an expansion of the frame that came to include more attributes.

By the 1480s, sitters were consistently highlighted against a neutral ground, set in an open space, or depicted inside with a view out of a picture window.³⁸ In the works of the leading painters of the period, namely Sandro Botticelli (1446-1510) and Domenico Ghirlandaio (1449-1494), the naturalism of the subject was extended to its setting. Whether the interior setting of

³⁷ See, for example, works by Paolo Uccello including *Five Famous Men*.

³⁸ Many of these compositional changes have been attributed to exposure to portraiture from Northern Europe. Lorne Campbell, *Renaissance Portraits: European Portrait-Painting in the 14th, 15th and 16th Centuries* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990), 232-232.

Botticelli's *Portrait of Giuliano de' Medici* or the landscape behind his *Portrait of a Man with a Medal of Cosimo il Vecchio* (figs. 4-5), the sitter exists in a fully three-dimensional space. The portrait continues the viewer's space in a perspectively-consistent manner that extends back from the picture plane. In his *Portrait of a Man with a Medal of Cosimo il Vecchio*, Botticelli's sitter holds a medal which overtly declares his socio-political loyalty to the Medici. Despite the anonymity of the sitter today, we are certain of his allegiance.

It is Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519) whose work is often considered to mark a significant interest in expressing personality in portraiture. He expresses both the inner and exterior character of his sitters, which reflects his stated goal of depicting 'the motions of the mind.'³⁹ In addition, he provides clues to identity, including emblematic attributes, such as the near-halo effect of the juniper bush behind Ginevra de' Benci's head (fig. 6). The bright highlights of her hair and headdress – only the rim of which is visible behind her tight coiffure – serve to set her off from the spiky protrusions of the juniper bush. She is more volumetric than many of her predecessors. The botanical backdrop served multiple purposes. The juniper was a common symbol for feminine virtue. The Italian *ginepro* also can refer to her given name, Ginevra. This unusual botanic inclusion announces her name and her inner, abstract qualities. The use of symbolic attributes became one popular development in Florentine portraiture at the turn of the century.

Leonardo's sitters had a strong presence – more volumetric, more corporeal, and therefore more arresting – in part through innovations in pose and lighting. He rotated the shoulders and turned the figure toward the viewer. This pose enlivened the figure and added visual interest. Raphael of Urbino (1483-1520) assimilated these lessons, in particular endowing

³⁹ For the origins and use of this phrase see Frank Zöllner, "The 'Motions of the Mind' in Renaissance Portraits: The Spiritual Dimension of Portraiture," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 68.1 (2005): 23-40.

his sitters with greater presence. The adaptation of the pose in *La Gioconda* is seen for example in his portraits of Agnolo and Maddalena Doni (figs. 7-8). Both sitters crowd the frame, occupying a significant portion of the painted space. However, they are also situated in a clearly-delineated three-dimensional space, as one elbow is pulled away from the viewer. The close cropping of the figure pushes him or her into the viewer's space, further focusing our attention on the sitter. Both husband and wife turn their faces toward the viewer, meeting our gaze. This innovation spread rapidly, and was especially popular in the early sixteenth century throughout central Italy.

While Leonardo and Raphael were experimenting with innovative portraiture, some contemporary artists pursued a more conservative manner. One of the leading painters – and most popular portraitists – in the city was Ridolfo Ghirlandaio (1483-1561), the scion of Domenico Ghirlandaio who ran the family workshop to much acclaim. Ridolfo received commissions from the leading families of the period and for major civic projects such as the chapel of the Palazzo Vecchio. His *Portrait of a Gentleman* (fig. 9) at the Art Institute of Chicago exemplifies his mature style. Ridolfo's style remained consistent throughout his career. Steeped in his father's workshop, Ridolfo visually exemplified his connection to the previous generation, maintaining a conservative style well into the sixteenth century. Here, Ridolfo combines a late-fifteenth century type with the pyramidal sitter inspired by Leonardo and Raphael. He employs the dramatic lighting that was increasingly popular. The unknown sitter, who gestures over a parapet to communicate with his audience, wears an elegant *cappuccio*, dark red *ciopino*, and cape, thus signaling his status as an active and wealthy member of the commune. The *ciopino* was the long-sleeved version of a *lucco*, associated with the well-to-do and civically engaged members of the city's elite.

The bust-length presentation of the sitter, close-cropped framing, and view out the window are all conventions continued from the last quarter of the fifteenth century. As David Franklin observed in his discussion of the artist's portraiture, "the combination of cautious naturalism and docile ideality is perhaps what most distinguishes Ridolfo's essentially retroactive style..."⁴⁰ Although the *Portrait of a Gentleman* incorporated contemporary innovations, it was essentially conservative, dependent upon the work of the preceding generation. Ridolfo's style may have lacked in innovation, but it was immensely popular during his lifetime.⁴¹ Demand for Ridolfo's work illustrates the continued relevance of conservative styles during the early decades of the sixteenth century.

Guiliano Bugiardini (1476-1555) is another artist whose reputation has suffered, despite his success as a portraitist.⁴² Bugiardini's critical fortunes declined largely because of Vasari's predominantly negative assessment of his paintings as the work of an imitator.⁴³ Although he worked into the mid-sixteenth century, he has been labelled a "retrograde Florentine painter."⁴⁴ Despite these criticisms, Bugiardini was patronized by Pope Clement VII, among others, and his portraits were well received in his lifetime. Bugiardini's portrait production continued the fifteenth-century Florentine tradition. Like Ridolfo, Bugiardini trained under Domenico Ghirlandaio, whose influence is clearly evident in his earliest works. An example of his mature style, his *Leonardo de' Ginori* (fig. 10) looks back to the mid-fifteenth century with the body

⁴⁰ David Franklin, *Painting in Renaissance Florence 1500-1550* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001), 108.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 103.

⁴² Bugiardini's portrait production is today perhaps best known for his portrait of Michelangelo, which was merely one of many portraits he produced.

⁴³ Vasari, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori e architettori*, vol. V, 279-283.

⁴⁴ Bastian Eclercy, ed., *Maniera: Pontorno, Bronzino and Medici Florence* (New York: Prestel, 2016), 116.

posed in strict profile.⁴⁵ However, the face has been turned toward the viewer. There are no attributes included or hints of a setting around Leonardo de' Ginori. The focal-point of the bust-length portrait is the physiognomic likeness of the sitter's face. Bugiardini has erased any wrinkles or imperfections, presenting Ginori as a smooth-faced middle-aged man with straight red hair of a burnt sienna hue and a wide forked beard with a coarse, curly texture.

Like his contemporaries, Bugiardini avoids the full frontal rendering, keeping the head turned slightly from the picture plane. The 1520s and onward saw a proliferation of a double-twist to the body, with the torso turning in a direction distinct from the head. This implied motion enlivened the figure and added visual interest to an isolated and otherwise static subject. Many of Bugiardini's other portraits, including the so-called *La Monaca*, present the sitter in this popular pose, suggesting that the absolute profile view of Leonardo de Ginori's body is purposeful.⁴⁶ This latter portrait was painted during the so-called Last Republic, the few years between the Sack of Rome and the Siege of Florence. Leonardo de' Ginori presents himself as a member of the ruling class of Florence – a civilian leader, continuing the tradition from the last quarter of the fifteenth century. It illustrates the continued prominence of older models. It further provided an option for political engagement in an ostensibly retroactive portrait format.

While portraits could suggest Republican connotations, ambiguity became another popular option. As power shifted quickly in Florence of the 1520s and 1530s, the uncertainty of one's political position stimulated innovative portraits that disguised as well as revealed. Even

⁴⁵ The portrait, today at the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C., is identified as Leonardo de Ginori based on an inscription on the reverse reading "Lionardo G[inori]." Leonardo de Ginori, 1475-1554, would have been approximately 53 at the time this portrait was made. Significantly, he married Caterina di Tommaso Soderini in 1528.

⁴⁶ One suggestion is that it was commissioned on the occasion of Ginori's wedding to Caterina Soderini in 1528. Thus, the profile view of the body would be justified by a paired painting of his wife. However, paired portraits, even marital portraits, often presented the sitters in a three-quarter pose. Raphael's portraits of Agnolo and Maddalena Doni serve as exemplar here.

with the establishment of Alessandro de' Medici as the new ruler, Florentine identity remained fluid. The position of an individual in government or wider society fluctuated, and portraiture evolved to provide a visual parallel to this fluidity. The portraits of Florentine elites - and the identities they espoused – did not have to express a clear loyalty. As the following discussion elucidates, Pontormo's portraits appealed to Florentine patrons precisely because of the absence of strong assertions of identity. The lack of clear attributes or civic connections was one response to the political turmoil.⁴⁷ Rather than the explicit expression of loyalty found, for example, in Botticelli's *Man with a Medal*, some Florentines gravitated toward purposeful ambiguity.

2.4 Pontormo's Imprecise Portraits

Born 24 May 1494, Jacopo Carucci is more commonly known as Jacopo Pontormo or simply Pontormo, after the town in which he was born. The son of Bartolomeo di Jacopo di Martino and Alessandra di Pasquale di Zanobi, he began his training in the workshop of Leonardo da Vinci at the age of thirteen. In short time he was also apprenticed to Mariotto Albertinelli and Piero di Cosimo. In 1512, at the age of eighteen, he entered the workshop of Andrea del Sarto. Many of his early works recall this latter master, such as the *Portrait of a Goldsmith* (fig. 11). Painted in 1518, this work is stylistically and formally dependent on his training, with the pose of the sitter recalling Sarto's *Portrait of a Sculptor*.⁴⁸ Unlike many of Pontormo's forays in the genre, this portrait presents the subject with a detailed and specific costume, the tools of his trade, and a distinctive physiognomy. Pontormo delineated the various elements of his dress, differentiating between the coarse outer material and the soft fur of his collar. Whereas many of Pontormo's portraits from later in his career feature geometrically-

⁴⁷ The lack of clear political connotations may also have led to their continued survival. Following the Siege of Florence, many prominent citizens were imprisoned, exiled, or fled.

⁴⁸ Costamagna, *Pontormo*, 138 suggests that both artists may have been influenced by Raphael's *Portrait of Bindo Altoviti*.

simplified heads like those found in his narrative and religious works, the unnamed sitter has a distinctively-shaped head, with plump lips, a wide nose, and a broad chin.

The historiography on Pontormo as a “Mannerist” artist and Pontormo as a portraitist differ significantly.⁴⁹ While his portraits are praised for their naturalism and for revealing the inner life of his sitters, his works in other genres often employ the stylistic language and terminology of Mannerism: affectation, stylization, non-naturalistic representations executed in an idiosyncratic manner.⁵⁰ For example, in painting *The Visitation* (fig. 12), Pontormo departed from his Tuscan contemporaries and predecessors in creating non-naturalistic figures and unrealistic spaces. The figures are elongated, anatomically ill-proportioned, and monumental, especially when compared to the surrounding space, from which they appear disconnected.⁵¹ Pontormo achieved an unsettling effect by foregrounding the figures and compressing the spatial recession. Buildings that optically appear to be only a few feet away must be several blocks removed, when compared to the size of the figures in the foreground. In this way, Pontormo’s work is perplexing. The viewer is unable to easily understand the space and composition. Rather than integrating the figures within the landscape as Leonardo famously did, Pontormo consciously separates them. The relationship of the figures to their surroundings is jarring, as the

⁴⁹ Elizabeth Cropper points out that this scholarly tradition began in the nineteenth century, when authors separated the portrait production as worthy of praise whereas the larger oeuvre of the artist, executed in a mannered style, was condemned. Cropper, “On Portraits by Rosso Fiorentino and Jacopo Pontormo,” 119.

⁵⁰ Elizabeth Cropper observes this distinction in his preparatory studies for religious works as well. For example, she notes of the two monks in the *Supper at Emmaus* that “The arresting naturalism of the two anxious figures of monks in Pontormo’s preparatory drawing was not transformed in the painting.... In these religious scenes Pontormo placed naturalism in drawing inherited from the Florentine tradition in the service of modernity....” Ibid, 123.

⁵¹ An informed and concise discussion of this work can be found in Marcia Hall, *After Raphael: Painting in Central Italy in the Sixteenth Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 61-2. Especially pertinent here is Hall’s observation that in *The Visitation* Pontormo “tries again to get beyond a mere believable rendering of the event in our space and time, to imply the spiritual dimension.”

space recedes at an alarming rate. The iconography of the scene is also unclear, as Pontormo added two figures to the foreground.⁵²

Thus, this painting has often been cited as an exemplar of “Mannerist style.” It is artificial, affected, and even bizarre. Pontormo did not use the background to create a sense of space, atmosphere, or provide additional information. Rather, the relationship between figures and background complicates the narrative. Throughout his career, Pontormo did not depict the harmonious, symmetrical, naturalistic world associated with the High Renaissance in Tuscany.

But, while his religious and narrative works have been identified as Mannerist – with the implied distancing from the natural and visible world – his portraits have been lauded primarily for their naturalism. The portraits are generally interpreted as life-like, psychological depictions that make visible the inner life of his sitters.⁵³ Whereas his narrative and biblical scenes represented an innovative break from his predecessors, Pontormo’s portraits are understood to continue traditional strategies and styles of representation. I argue that there is more continuity than disjunction between these genres. Although often overlooked, the artist’s tendency toward experimentation and enigmatic representation was also present in his portraiture.

Pontormo’s works evidence stylistic elements from artists he trained with – most notably Andrea del Sarto. While adapting certain elements he also disregarded the consistency of perspective and pictorial harmony of his predecessors. His portraits tend to eliminate the

⁵² Traditionally, the Visitation is a scene that requires two women, Mary and her cousin Elizabeth. When additional figures such as the two maidservants are depicted, there is often a clear differentiation, whether in scale or placement. However, Pontormo’s arrangement of the women, with their interviewing limbs, is innovative. Having the two maidservants stand frontally and look outside the space of the artwork to the viewer gives them more agency than the central figures.

⁵³ John Pope-Hennessy, *The Portrait in the Renaissance* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1979), especially 109-10, 235. This seminal study of Renaissance portraiture presents Pontormo as a neurotic figure who paints his own uncertainties and introspection into the face and psychology of his portraits and has likely been a significant reason that Pontormo’s reputation as a portraitist who paints the interior of his sitter has continued, despite later scholarship that has problematized Pope-Hennessy’s evaluation.

background, replacing an interior or landscape setting with a single-colored, flat, dark background.⁵⁴ The result is an enigmatic space with little depth or naturalistic recession of space. The soft illumination employed by Pontormo brightens only the foreground figure. By not reaching beyond the sitter, the illumination tends to leave the background space indistinct.

The dislocating of a sitter from a definite setting, which could indicate time and space, is significant in context and in meaning. In *The Controversy of Renaissance Art*, Alexander Nagel considered the collapse of naturalistic space in sixteenth-century Italian altarpieces.⁵⁵ The purposeful denial of a naturalistic and ordered space, he suggested, was a “means of articulating and recapitulating the ground of painting, a figured acknowledgement that painting carries out its work in a two-dimensional field.”⁵⁶ Applied to portraiture of the period, an ambiguous space and unclear relationship between figure and his surroundings draws attention to the two-dimensional painted surface. Rather than portrait-as-window, this type of representation emphasizes the constructed nature of the work.

Another common strategy Pontormo employed was to eschew attributes.⁵⁷ Unlike his contemporaries, who employed attributes to fill out the identity of their sitters, Pontormo generally minimized or occluded such accessories.⁵⁸ Two examples, spanning Republican and

⁵⁴ The landscape-background was falling out of favor from the 1520s onward, but in Italy lasted into the 1550s. For more on the chronological history of settings, see Campbell, *Renaissance Portraits*, especially 112-124.

⁵⁵ Alexander Nagel, *The Controversy of Renaissance Art* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 83-106.

⁵⁶ *Ibid*, 86.

⁵⁷ I suspect that this is part of the impetus behind searching for a psychological component to these portraits. The standard scholarly view suggests that Pontormo depicted the inner life of the sitter, but the minimal information depicted may be what has inspired the viewer – at least the modern viewer – search for a deeper, hidden meaning.

⁵⁸ Some artists displayed the accoutrements as objects to be viewed and admired, others posed their sitters interacting with the items. This common strategy was used to impart additional information about the sitter’s identity, wealth, interests or occupation to the viewer. This was especially common for half-length portraits or larger, a category to which the majority of Pontormo’s works belong.

Ducal eras, will serve to elucidate these pictorial strategies and the way they obscure rather than describe the subject.

Pontormo's *Youth in a Pink Coat* (fig. 13) has variably been identified as Amerigo Antinori and Alessandro de' Medici, among others.⁵⁹ The sitter, cropped at the thighs, and the space are truncated, such that the subject emerges from a dark, nearly-black background.⁶⁰ No additional visual evidence which could impart information about the sitter or his location is included. Given the size and scale of this portrait, the bare surroundings and lack of identifying indicators are unusual. The only object accompanying the figure is a table on which his right hand rests.⁶¹ Yet this single item provides no information on the identity or character of the sitter, nor does it clearly situate the figure in space.⁶² Nor can we turn to the sitter's visage to learn about him.

The face is surprisingly generalized, reduced primarily to simple geometric shapes. The long, oval face is softly modeled. His physiognomy, which exhibits minimal tonal variation, is framed by dense hair that extends approximately to the figure's chin. The hair, without definition and modeling, lacks the suggestion of individual locks.⁶³ Like the *Portrait of Alessandro de'*

⁵⁹ Costamagna, *Pontormo*, 213-15, suggests it is Amerigo Antinori. The association with a youthful portrait of Alessandro is based on a passage in Vasari, in which he states that Pontormo produced two portraits of the Medici cousins, one of Ippolito and another of Alessandro. Gabrielle Langdon suggests it is Giulio, Alessandro's illegitimate son born in 1533, which would require a dating of the mid-1540s. Gabrielle Langdon, "Pontormo and Medici Lineages: Maria Salviati, Alessandro, Giulia and Giulio de' Medici," *RACAR* 19.1-2 (1992): 20-40.

⁶⁰ This was not an unusual choice, as artists before and after Pontormo often depicted their sitters in half or three-quarters length portraits. However, the lack of a depicted space combined with a three-quarters length standing figure created an impression that he could be anywhere.

⁶¹ The catalog entry in Strehlke, *Pontormo, Bronzino and the Medici*, 82 calls the object a "parapet." The confusion over the type of object represented reinforces the ambiguity of this portrait.

⁶² The spatial relationship between the figure and the table remains uncertain, particularly due to the fact that Pontormo has cast its top in darkness.

⁶³ This is not unique to *Youth in a Pink Coat*, but is evident in other portraits by Pontormo, including *Portrait of Two Men*. However, it is unusual for the period, when artists used highlight strokes to suggest individual hairs or darker outlines to define locks and curls.

Medici, the head is diminutive relative to the rest of the figure. The voluminous drapery here exaggerates this effect. While elongated bodies populated Pontormo's narrative and religious compositions by the 1530s, it is especially significant in the genre of portraiture, where the expectation is for a detailed and individualized physiognomy. A comparison with portraits by Pontormo's one-time teacher, Andrea del Sarto, is here instructive.

Where Pontormo's lacks details, the unknown sitter in Sarto's *Woman with a Basket of Spindles* (fig. 14) offers much greater physiognomic specificity. Distinguishing features such as a dimpled chin and rounded tip to her nose contrast with the smooth, blank face of Pontormo's figure. The shading and modelling of her face results not only in endearing rosy cheeks, but also a lifelikeness, as she emerges from the background in a gentle, slanting light. The planes of her face reveal a distinct bone structure and a pleasing visage. Where Andrea's woman invites us into the conversation, Pontormo's young man arrests us. The painting simultaneously brings the figure to life by pushing him into the viewer's space while drawing attention to its artificiality with the undefined space and the evidence of loose, visible brushstrokes.

For the *Youth in a Pink Coat*, the sitter's outerwear is more distinct than his face. The contrast between face and torso is facilitated by the smooth contours of the head and the sharp treatment of the drapery. It is likely this disconnection between the two parts that contributed to the feeling of "shyness or discomfort" for some modern viewers.⁶⁴ This may also be a result of the internal lighting. Unlike portraits by Raphael and Leonardo da Vinci, Pontormo's *Youth in a Pink Coat* presents the sitter in a limited, diffuse light that does not illuminate the setting. The

⁶⁴ Strehlke, *Pontormo, Bronzino, and the Medici*, 82.

spatial relationship between figure and surroundings is made more enigmatic by the omission of outlines on much of the pink coat, coupled with the artist's visible brushstrokes.⁶⁵

Florence was a city of cloth merchants. Middle- and upper-class citizens were meticulously attuned to material and style of clothing as a means to indicate status and establish identity. Given a long tradition of careful sartorial representation, the generalized dress of Pontormo's portrait comes as a surprise. The bulky pink overcoat is the outermost of four layers of clothing. The layers however can be differentiated only through brushstroke and color, not by sartorial facture. This contradicts Florentine portrait tradition. Pontormo's brushwork is looser on the teal and pink layers, but especially refined elsewhere such as the black hat.⁶⁶ The materiality of the cloth is unarticulated. Unlike portraits by Pontormo's predecessors or contemporaries, there are few indications of individual identity in the clothing.

The dress of the figure has been connected specifically to a page's costume.⁶⁷ This astute observation is based on a comparison with the medallion insert in Pontormo's *St. Anne Altarpiece*, where two youths with oversize mantles carry swords at the front of the procession. The one significant variation is the cap, which here looks more like the *cappuccio della civile* (citizen's hat) worn by Alessandro than the four-cornered hats worn by the pages in the altarpiece.

⁶⁵ "Pontormo painted the background first, leaving a reserve for the figure. During the course of execution he changed some of the contours, going over parts of the already painted background." Ibid, 85

⁶⁶ This is not entirely dissimilar from Andrea del Sarto's work. The master Florentine painter used soft brushwork, giving the impression that his figures were just being glimpsed, as though seen through a thin haze. Franklin, *Painting in Renaissance Florence 1500-1550*, 135. Franklin discusses how features are "out of focus" and his finished works were "influential in inspiring local painters to attempt this destabilizing, seemingly momentary impression of their finished work."

⁶⁷ Strehlke, *Pontormo, Bronzino and the Medici*, 82.

In a portrait of this size, showing the sitter in three-quarter length, without detailed attributes was atypical. The wide panel was not exploited to make a specific claim about the identity of the figure by providing additional information related to the sitter. Andrea del Sarto also simplified the background of many of his portraits. However, he subtly embedded marks of identity into his compositions. Sarto's *Portrait of a Woman with a Petrarchino* (fig. 15) and *Portrait of a Woman with a Basket of Spindles*, painted three years apart, both include clear and specific attributes. In each, the woman is seated, painted at approximately half-length, against a dark background. Unlike Pontormo's pink-coated youth, each is slightly rotated. The diagonal twist of the body creates a perception of depth and movement despite the flat backdrop. Although each woman holds only a single attribute, it reflects on the character of the sitter. In the works by Andrea, the sitter is alone and specific, a formal composition popularized in the works of Leonardo da Vinci. Pontormo's isolated sitter offers the viewer only a table – with nothing on it – and an eye-catching costume. The sitter does not engage with the object. This single item provides no information on the identity or character of the sitter, nor does it clearly situate the figure in space.⁶⁸ Overall, this is a portrait that lacks specificity.

Although some authors have suggested that Pontormo was anti-Medicean, he maintained a successful career throughout the Medicean regime.⁶⁹ Indeed, much of his success depended upon their patronage. Vasari recorded that Alessandro de' Medici employed him beginning in 1534, and he worked under Cosimo I from 1537 onward.⁷⁰ Pontormo was especially esteemed by Maria Salviati, the mother of Duke Cosimo I. He painted two portraits of the Medici matron:

⁶⁸ The spatial relationship between the figure and the table remains uncertain, particularly due to the fact that Pontormo has cast its top in darkness.

⁶⁹ Pilliod, *Pontormo, Bronzino, Allori*, 11-14. Pilliod traced the scholarly tradition of the artist's disapproval of the Medici dukedom back to Giorgio Vasari.

⁷⁰ *Ibid*, 22.

Maria Salviati with Giulia de' Medici and *Maria Salviati* (figs. 16-17). In both portraits, Pontormo depicted Maria Salviati in similar costumes and similar poses. In each, she wears a black dress and a widow's veil, depicted with crisp, architectonic folds. In each depiction, Maria turns one shoulder toward the viewer. This pose, adapted from Leonardo da Vinci, was used by Pontormo in many of his portraits. It served to subtly animate the figure, suggesting an enlivened figure capable of motion.⁷¹

The earlier *Portrait of Maria Salviati with Giulia* reveals and disguises in its framing and composition. Like the *Youth in a Pink Coat*, Pontormo crowded his panel, cutting off Maria Salviati's right elbow and presenting Giulia de' Medici simply in bust-length format. The cropping gives the figures a monumental appearance, as they block access to any information that could be included in the setting. They are illuminated by softer lighting than many of Pontormo's portraits, making visible the shadows cast by Maria Salviati against the backdrop. The diffuse light is brightest on Giulia's features. Yet what naturally-occurring light source would so clearly light the faces of the figures without illuminating Maria Salviati's clothing? Rather her dress, with minimal tonal variation, acts as a background against which Giulia de' Medici is highlighted. Pontormo did not maintain the naturalistic effects of illumination. Like attributes or backgrounds, lighting did not necessarily illuminate and reveal. It could also distance and disguise.

More unusual is Pontormo's employment of attributes – or more precisely, their inclusion but occlusion. Although in each portrait Maria Salviati holds an object, she is not shown interacting with it. Unlike his contemporaries, even when Pontormo included a specific accessory, it was rarely displayed for the viewer. In *Maria Salviati with Giulia* she holds what is

⁷¹ *Youth in a Pink Coat* is the clear exception here.

thought to be a portrait medal (detail, fig. 18).⁷² Her delicate fingers encase the rim, with the obverse fully displayed for the viewer, yet there is no discernible image or lettering. It appears as a blank; a disc-shaped piece of metal prepared for striking. The flat face of the medal is foregrounded, clearly visible, and even tilted toward the viewer. Where his predecessors – such as Botticelli’s *Portrait of a Man with a Medal of Cosimo* (fig. 5) – and his contemporaries – Bronzino’s portrait of Cosimo I’s illegitimate daughter *Bia* (figs. 19-20) – presented figures with identifiable and detailed portrait medals, Pontormo offered only the object, leaving it to the viewer to guess at what is depicted.

This selective overview of Pontormo’s portrait production suggests several strategies employed by patrons and artist. There is an obvious departure from the naturalistic depiction privileged by the preceding generation. While there are elements of physiognomic likeness, the general impression is one of a mask-like, simplified face and clothing that lacks marks of individual identity. The settings are equally non-naturalistic, as they tend to confuse and distort. The attributes included are uninformative and sometimes occluded. The overall impression is one of a sitter not-quite-represented by the canvas; a sitter that is on display but in disguise. It is a vagueness that matched an uncertain and unstable socio-political situation. Part of Pontormo’s success as a portraitist in this time of turmoil is likely due to the mysterious air of many of his works. Patrons, complicit in the desire for ambiguity while still wishing to commission portraits, chose Pontormo for his distinct abilities as a portraitist.

Pontormo’s portrait of Alessandro shares many of these strategies, such as the creation of a non-naturalistic space. In other ways it is anomalous to Pontormo’s larger production. As the discussion below elucidates, Alessandro’s facial features are more distinct and his action clearly

⁷² Strehlke, *Pontormo, Bronzino and the Medici*, 120.

depicted. The viewer shares Alessandro's activity, as his drawing implicates those outside the frame. Having identified what is similar and different about the *Portrait of Alessandro de' Medici*, we can begin to consider why these decisions were made and what they achieved.

2.5 Literature Review

Scholarship on Pontormo's *Alessandro de' Medici* has been especially attentive to its unusual portrayal of a ruler, but has not satisfactorily explained why Alessandro does not look or act the princely part. Leo Steinberg's 1975 article "Pontormo's Alessandro de' Medici, or, I only have eyes for you" explored the act of drawing and its role in the portrait, which he identified as a private gift from Alessandro to his paramour.⁷³ Steinberg discussed the role of sketching in contemporaneous society, using ancient exemplars and sixteenth-century courtesy literature to illustrate that drawing was understood as a refined pursuit for a nobleman. He attempted to reconstruct the portrait's function. Steinberg concluded that it was commissioned by Alessandro for a small and private audience, primarily himself and Taddea Malaspina, to whom Alessandro gifted the work.

In his 1985 article "Pontormo, Alessandro de' Medici, and the Palazzo Pazzi," Carl Brandon Strehlke proposed that the work was intended as an informal portrayal of a princely subject.⁷⁴ Strehlke explored the context, expanding on Alessandro's often casual court held at the Palazzo Pitti, to understand the portrait's unusual private and intimate presentation of a duke. He further introduced discoveries made during conservation. These include a figure painted in

⁷³ Steinberg, "Pontormo's Alessandro de' Medici," 62-65.

⁷⁴ Strehlke, "Pontormo, Alessandro de' Medici, and the Palazzo Pazzi," 3-15.

profile seen through the opening behind Alessandro that was subsequently painted out, as revealed by infrared reflectography.⁷⁵

Vanessa Walker-Oakes argued for a public character and audience for the portrait in her 2001 article “Representing the Perfect Prince: Pontormo’s Alessandro de’ Medici.”⁷⁶ Pairing it with Vasari’s portrait of the duke, which is more martial in character, Walker-Oakes explored the settings, costume, and actions of both to conclude that the two were meant to be understood as a pair. She concluded that Vasari’s exhibits the military virtues of the first Florentine duke, while Pontormo’s features his princely merits.

The question of intended audience stimulated an article by Patricia Simons, wherein she argued that the portrait was meant to present the duke as a courtly lover.⁷⁷ She built on the work of Walker-Oakes, suggesting a viewership beyond Alessandro’s informal court at Palazzo Pitti. She argued that the work did not depict a private and intimate moment. In fact, she suggested that the intended viewer was Charles V or his emissaries.⁷⁸ Simons proposed that the *Portrait of Alessandro de’ Medici* was related to his subsequent marriage to Margaret of Austria, the illegitimate daughter of Charles V. Simons also foregrounded the role of drawing and its relation to previous exemplars of artists, poets, and rulers.

⁷⁵ The over-painted profile head remains an unresolved characteristic, though Strehlke suggests that “The profile may have been a rumination of the artist, not planned ahead or intended to be seen in the finished painting. Since the setting is a private room, which in a Renaissance palazzo would always have been located on one of the upper floors and would not have had a balcony, a head could not have been seen through the open window.” He further points out that a later copy, today in Lisbon, bears no trace of the figure, suggesting that it was never extant once the portrait left the artist’s studio. *Ibid*, 7-8.

⁷⁶ Walker-Oakes, “Representing the Perfect Prince,” 127-146.

⁷⁷ Simons, “Disegno and Desire in Pontormo’s Alessandro de’ Medici.”

⁷⁸ Simons relates the portrait to Alessandro’s marriage to the illegitimate daughter of Charles V in 1536. In her reading, the work functioned as a means to position Alessandro as a refined and respectful lover, and reassure his future imperial father-in-law of the promised care Alessandro would place on both his state and wife.

Accepting the public character of the work, I will continue to consider the audience for and function of Pontormo's *Portrait of Alessandro de' Medici* by identifying it as part of a larger development in Florentine portraiture and re-situating it within a tumultuous moment. My analysis begins with the question of how and if exterior likeness can be connected to the sitter's individual identity; a question Joanna Woodall raised in her introduction to *Portraiture: Facing the Subject*, a volume addressing major issues in the genre.⁷⁹ She pointed out that in recent centuries portraiture has come to emphasize personality over likeness or virtue and located the point of differentiation in approximately the seventeenth century as a response to the Protestant Reformation. There is a tension or even division between the individual as a living body – and, in the case of portraiture, the representation of this identity – and his true self. In later centuries, dualism meant that physiognomic likeness could not accurately represent the sitter, as bodily resemblance – or the external representation of the sitter – did not necessarily reflect the interior. A dualistic approach therefore admitted to the distinction between the exterior and the internal characteristics that more precisely define one's identity. However, during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in Italy, there was still a belief in a correlation between the external characteristics of the body and the internal qualities of the individual. This was expressed for example in Baldassare Castiglione's highly influential treatise *The Book of the Courtier*.

The significant impact of *The Courtier* has long been recognized, in particular at Renaissance court cities throughout sixteenth-century Italy.⁸⁰ First published in Venice in 1528, the treatise, written in the form of a dialogue taking place at the court of Urbino, offers a model

⁷⁹ Joanna Woodall, "Introduction: Facing the Subject," in *Portraiture: Facing the Subject* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), 1-25, especially pages 9-11.

⁸⁰ For more on Castiglione's work as the instigation for the creation of courtesy literature, see Robert W. Hanning and David Rosand, eds., *Castiglione: The Ideal and the Real in Renaissance Culture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983); Peter Burke, *The Fortunes of the Courtier* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996).

for the ideal court figure, including all aspects of life from martial arts to proper behavior at court and in love. The advice consistently guides the reader in how to present oneself for a desired effect. It is significant for this study that the treatise emphasized teaching the individual how to behave and perform at court. It did not necessarily advocate for any changes to the individual, but in how the individual appears to others. As a framework for how to craft a social identity, *The Courtier* offers invaluable insights into contemporary visual arts.

Although part of a larger tradition dating back at least a century, the significant impact of *The Courtier* was widespread and immediate. It codified the relationship between the individual and his role in society. Notably, it was penned and published during one of the most disruptive periods in Italian history. The presence of several foreign powers as well as political instability in several key states disrupted societal norms and civic life. The influential treatise has therefore been interpreted as a literary means to impart order in a society that was in flux and well beyond the political control of the author.⁸¹ Readers could identify and emulate an attainable and structured model despite rapidly changing circumstances.

In Florence, where the first local edition was published in 1531, *The Courtier* was widely read in the early ducal court.⁸² Although the comportment guide emphasized exterior characteristics, it also discussed a correlation between external and internal aspects of the individual. Discursing on the courtier's choice of costume, for example, one figure asserts that

⁸¹ For example, Burke *The Fortunes of the Courtier*, 35.

⁸² Elizabeth Cropper, "Pontormo and Bronzino in Philadelphia: A Double Portrait," in *Pontormo, Bronzino and the Medici: The Transformation of the Renaissance Portrait in Florence*, ed. Carl Brandon Strehlke (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art in association with the Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004), fn. 33 page 31. Heather Lynn Sale, "Defining the Florentine Mannerist Portrait: Its Origins, Development, and Cultural Environment," (PhD diss., Indiana University, 2001), 27-29 discusses the particular role of *The Courtier* as an aid in the establishment of a court under Cosimo I, suggesting that the young duke would have turned to the popular and respected treatise as his court had no local model from which to develop.

“external things often bear witness to inner things.”⁸³ The suggestion that the inner being correlated to its exterior articulation is antithetical to dualism. We can therefore expect a correlation between the internal and external characteristics suggested by Pontormo’s unusual portrait.

2.6 Alessandro: An Enigmatic Portrait

The *Portrait of Alessandro de’ Medici* presents a man with little to distinguish his title or authority. It does so through the physiognomy which, though specific, elides markers of identity that otherwise set Alessandro apart. Alessandro’s face is dominated by a straight but oversized nose, emphasized by the shadow on its left side and the darker shading of the nasojugal fold between the left eye and nose.⁸⁴ Judging from the clear view of Alessandro’s left nostril, the viewer is placed just slightly below the sitter. Lined and puffy lower eyelids frame almond-shaped eyes with brown pupils. While Alessandro’s head is turned to his right, his eyes shift left. This double turn animates the figure, creating movement in a static portrait. Plump, bulbous lips are another distinctive feature of his physiognomy. His visible ear reveals Pontormo’s careful attention to the unique shape: wide though not tall, coming to a rounded triangle at the top, with a distinct and sinuous ear lobe. His chin has an indistinct dark and fuzzy patch, with several longer hairs curving downward.

The sitter’s head, painted in three-quarter view, corresponds closely to Pontormo’s extant painted study (fig. 2). There are subtle differences between the study and finished portrait, as the latter has a smoother and lighter skin tone and a less furrowed brow. Yet the basic physiognomy matches the small painting discussed by Vasari and long thought lost, today identified as the

⁸³ Baldassare Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier – The Singleton Translation*, ed. Daniel Javitch (New York: Norton & Company, 2002), 89.

⁸⁴ This, as the rest of the face, reflects the lighting conditions of the Art Institute preparatory painting. One significant difference, that of the chainmail on the preparatory study, was a later addition.

small panel in the Art Institute of Chicago. Alessandro's features – most notably the thick lips and protruding nose – suggest the artist's effort to endow his sitter with a specificity in likeness.

For all the physiognomic details – more than in many of Pontormo's contemporaneous portraits – Alessandro's head is surprisingly small when compared to the proportions of the rest of the figure. This is a clear departure from the works of Ridolfo Ghirlandaio and Giuliano Bugiardini discussed previously in which the head was the unequivocal focus for the viewer. Pontormo reduced this important locus of external identity, making it appear as though it were further removed from the viewer.

Alessandro wears a *cappuccio della civile* (civilian's hat) with its hanging ribbons. A hat common in contemporary Florence, it appears in contemporaneous portraiture, including Pontormo's *Youth in a Pink Coat*. There, it is combined with a costume referencing Republican civic associations. Its inclusion in Alessandro's portrait positions him as one among the Florentines. It further serves to cover an outstanding feature of the duke: his tightly-curved hair. This characteristic feature is displayed in Pontormo's preparatory painted study, a portrait of Alessandro by Giorgio Vasari, and a posthumous likeness by an unknown artist for the ducal collections (figs. 2, 21-22). In small relief portraits, including a cameo by Domenico di Polo and coinage (figs. 23-24), Alessandro's hair is clearly shown. Hiding it under a cap is not a happenstance of costuming, as Pontormo's drawings and other portraits of the young duke confirm. Rather, it is a careful disguising of one of his most distinguishing features. It is a feature that not only identifies the sitter, but also points to his otherness – the possibility that he was born to a black slave, as was widely maintained by contemporaries. By covering this well-known

physical trait, the *cappuccino della civile* obscures his tightly-curved hair, the feature that most obviously points to his questionable origin.⁸⁵

Alessandro's clothing does not provide distinct clues to his position or identity. He is dressed entirely in black, excepting a few white accents. This white cloth, worn beneath the black doublet and black sleeves, is visible only at his wrists and neck. His austere clothing contrasts with much portraiture of the period, as it does not emphasize expensive and excessive amounts of materials, dyes, and accessories. Alessandro is conspicuously disguising aspects of his identity, even while participating in contemporary sartorial fashion.

By the mid-1530s, black was common fashion in Florence.⁸⁶ In Baldassare Castiglione's *The Courtier*, one of the courtiers offers his opinion that "black is more pleasing in clothing than any other colour" for "the Courtier's dress show that sobriety which the Spanish nation so much observes...."⁸⁷ This connection to Spanish dress would be particularly appropriate for Alessandro, whose position was guaranteed by Charles V. In Florentine fashion of the 1530s, black clothing was associated with dignity and gravitas. Although it was not the most expensive dye to produce, black was standard for aristocratic clothing.⁸⁸ Princes, however, had expanded and elevated clothing options that conspicuously marked them. The materials a prince wore

⁸⁵ Similarly, his skin is lighter in this portrait than other works. This change from the painted study suggests that message is being emphasized rather than likeness.

⁸⁶ Walker-Oakes, "Representing the Perfect Prince," 134. The role of black in Florentine clothing is discussed in greater detail in Chapter Three. See especially pages 100-102.

⁸⁷ Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier*, 89.

⁸⁸ For more on Florentine clothing see Carole Collier Frick, *Dressing Renaissance Florence: Families, Fortunes, and Fine Clothing* (Baltimore, Md.; London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006); Elizabeth Currie, *Fashion and Masculinity in Renaissance Florence* (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016); Cesare Vecellio, *The Clothing of the Renaissance world: Europe, Asia, Africa, the Americas: Cesare Vecellio's Habiti Antichi et Moderni*, trans. Margaret F. Rosenthal and Ann Rosalind Jones (London: Thames and Hudson, Ltd., 2008). Other resources more generally on Italian fashion include Elizabeth Birbari, *Dress in Italian Painting, 1460-1500* (London: J.Murray, 1975); Jacqueline Herald, *Renaissance Dress in Italy 1400-1500* (London: Bell and Hyman, 1981).

could overtly point to his status. These typically included the colors of red and gold, that were valued above black in the hierarchy of princely colors, and red velvet in particular often denoted a ruler. Yet Alessandro wears unornamented black. Rather than setting him apart, his clothing normalizes him, placing Alessandro among other upper class Florentines.⁸⁹

While the portrait situates Alessandro firmly amongst his fellow Florentines, his position within a larger space of the painting has been cause for confusion. The individual elements of the setting are, at first glance, apparent: an open door, a *pietra serena* frame, and wainscoted walls. The latter two were common architectural elements of contemporary architecture in Florence and its environs, a topic that will be further explored in the following chapter. While the door serves as a framing device for the sitter's head it also complicates the spatial conception. One can see, for example, the top of the door sloping down toward the sitter, as though the viewpoint was from overhead.

The raised perspective is unique only to the open door. The door recedes quickly. With a significant reduction in scale when compared to the sitter, it appears as though it must be at a distance behind Alessandro. Yet the walls do not recede at an equivalent rate, suggesting he is seated just a few feet from the opening. Even the direction of the door's aperture is unclear. As one cannot see the side of the door, it must be opening in reverse from Alessandro. However, the clear view of the lintel gives the impression of the door opening inward, as does the light that reflects off the upper section of the *pietra serena* jamb. Over Alessandro's left shoulder, one can clearly discern patches of blue sky and white clouds. The view out the door, therefore, is from a much lower position than the perspective of the room or the seated figure. The relationship

⁸⁹ Costamagna characterized the sitter's dress as "l'aspetto d'un borghese fiorentino" or as "that of a Florentine bourgeoisie" in *Pontormo*, 224. While I agree with the Florentine descriptor, the relegation to the middle-class is problematic. This is due not only to the association between black and aristocratic clothing, but the act of drawing, as discussed subsequently.

between sitter and surroundings, as well as that between viewer and portrayed, is inconsistent and unresolved. This spatial confusion is common in Pontormo's works.

The inclusion of a skyscape adds an enigmatic element: the background can be read alternatively as an open door or an open window.⁹⁰ Leo Steinberg first suggested that it represents an open door, a motif regularly associated with post-mortem portraiture since Roman antiquity. Steinberg further supposed the door as a reference to the death of Alessandro's uncle, Pope Clement VII.⁹¹ The second Medici pope died 25 September 1534, just two years after Alessandro was installed in Florence.⁹² Door or window, the backdrop behind Alessandro creates an enigmatic space that disguises more than it reveals. The conflation between types of openings, combined with the inaccurate perspective and glimpse of an exterior that provides no specific information, emphasizes the artificial construction of the panel. It creates a disjuncture between the view of the room and that of the sitter. While the door is seen from above, the viewer is placed only marginally below the figure, facilitating the sitter to meet the gaze of his audience. This connection between sitter and viewer is particularly significant as it is anomalous in portraits of rulers.

2.7 Painting Princes: The Ruler Portrait

Pontormo's portrait of Alessandro did not emphasize his authority in part because that authority was ambiguous at best, and despised by many. While it has been labelled an

⁹⁰ There is some disagreement in scholarship concerning the opening behind Alessandro, as it is identified by some as a window and others as a door. Here, I follow Steinberg and Walker-Oakes in accepting it as a door rather than window. The 2004 exhibition catalog skirts the issue by labelling it an "opening" in *ibid*, 115.

⁹¹ Steinberg, "Pontormo's Alessandro de' Medici," 64.

⁹² Steinberg dated the painting to 1534-35 based primarily on this proposition. Although the connection he proposed between black clothing and mourning has been challenged by subsequent scholars – and I agree that black served varying purposes – the dating has been generally accepted. While Steinberg's argument relating the portrait to the death of Pope Clement VII has merit, I believe it does not satisfactorily explain the presentation of the ruler of Florence or address who the audience for this unusual portrait would be.

unconventional portrait of a ruler, scholarship has not elucidated how precisely it departs from the norm. I argue that it distinctly deviates from expectations of a ruler portrait, purposefully positioning the sitter as a contemporary Florentine citizen.

Florence did not have princely rulers, and therefore lacked ruler portrait prototypes. However, we can look at examples from other Italian principalities to determine what could be accomplished and claimed in a princely portrait.⁹³ Portraits of rulers might be painted as independent portraits or as parts of cycles of famous men. They tended to be subject to wider dissemination and viewership than private commissions of the patrician class. The likeness of a ruler had to balance personal, recognizable traits with his political role. The princely portrait needed to be simultaneously individualized and universal.⁹⁴ There was an interest in – and often necessity to – displaying and justifying the prince’s authority. Serving as icons of rulership, these portrayals had to faithfully represent the sitter while reflecting status.

These interests are well represented in the *Portrait of Federico da Montefeltro and his Son* (fig. 25) variously attributed to Pedro Berruguete and/or Justus of Ghent. Federico da Montefeltro (1422-1482), a successful *condottiere* and respected ruler in Urbino from 1444 until his death, was particularly adept at controlling and disseminating his princely image.⁹⁵ In addition to stand-alone portraits by Berruguete and Piero della Francesca, his portrait is included in manuscripts, marble reliefs, the *Montefeltro Altarpiece* by Piero della Francesca, and at least

⁹³ For a general introduction to ruler portraits, see Martin Warnke, *The Court Artist: On the Ancestry of the Modern Artist*, trans. David McLintock (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Alison Cole, *Virtue and Magnificence: Art of the Italian Renaissance Courts* (New York: Harry H. Abrams, 1995); Stephen J. Campbell, ed., *Artists at Court: Image-making and Identity, 1300-1550* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004); Miguel Falomir, “The Court Portrait,” in *Renaissance Faces: Van Eyck to Titian*, eds. Loren Campbell, Miguel Falomir, Jennifer Fletcher, Luke Syson (London: Yale University Press, 2008), 66-79.

⁹⁴ Warnke, *The Court Artist*, 213.

⁹⁵ He received the title Duke of Urbino only in 1474.

eight different medals. In his portrait by Berruguette, Federico's dress and attributes set forth his multi-faceted authority.

Portrayed in profile, a seated Federico concentrates on an open book. His robe, ornamented with gold thread and a fur collar, is open to reveal the suit of armor he wears beneath. His bare hands hold the volume, while his legs and forearms are sheathed in armor with chainmail visible at his bent elbows. At first glance, he is simultaneously martial – as befits the Captain General of the Catholic Church – and scholarly. The duality of the Duke of Urbino is further emphasized by his accoutrements. Bare-headed, he is accompanied by two pieces of headgear. In the lower right foreground is his helmet, a piece of his soldierly equipment. In the upper left-hand corner, a pearl-studded mitre, canonical in shape, calls to mind his civic and diplomatic roles. Both head coverings reflect Federico's expansive power and talents. Additionally, each speaks to differing aspects of his reputation. The helmet reflects his martial fortitude. He was a respected commander, known for the loyalty he inspired in his followers. As a gift from the Ottoman Sultan, the mitre signifies his international reputation.⁹⁶

The qualities of a strong and virtuous ruler are reinforced by the symbols of chivalric orders that are part of his attire. He wears the mantle and the collar of the Order of the Ermine about his neck, which he received in 1474. This chivalric order was founded by King Ferrante of Naples in 1465.⁹⁷ Like many knightly orders, it required adherence to the principles of the church and strong, morally-upright leadership. On his left calf, he wears the Order of the Garter. The Most Noble Order of the Garter, founded in 1348 in England, was bestowed on Duke

⁹⁶ The Persian-style mitre was presented to Federico by the ambassador of Sultan Mehmed II.

⁹⁷ For more on courtly orders see D'Arcy Jonathan Dacre Boulton, *The Knights of the Crown: The Monarchical Orders of Knighthood in Later Medieval Europe, 1325-1520* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987). On the Order of the Ermine in specific consult pages 397-426.

Federico by King Edward IV in 1474. The portrait puts his multiple –and international – honors on public display. The low vantage point forces the viewer to look up at Federico, who does not acknowledge the world outside the frame. Although we can see him, we do not interact with him. Situated in a simple planar and naturalistically-rendered space, he is separated from – and visibly raised above – the viewer.

The portrait is also dynastic in character, as his young son Guidobaldo stands next to his father. Guidobaldo wears a yellow silk gown embossed by pearls, a none-too-subtle assertion of wealth. He sports a pearl belt while holding a scepter with an unequivocal message inscribed on it: *potere*, or power. The distinctly-shaped scepter was a gift from Pope Sixtus IV.⁹⁸ Federico is a church-sanctioned secular leader, equally prepared to engage in intellectual and martial pursuits, accompanied by his son and heir, to whom he will pass his authority. Further, his portrait situates him among networks of power, by exhibiting attributes that connect him to other powerful men. It is an image with both a local and international audience.

The portrait medal by Sperandio Savelli, thought to be commissioned upon Federico's death, includes two images of the duke (figs. 26-27). He is depicted in profile on the obverse, a familiar pose from his many painted and sculpted portraits.⁹⁹ The consistency of the profile pose was one way Federico controlled the dissemination of his image. Further, the profile medal harkens back to ancient Roman prototypes. He wears contemporary robes and a scholar's cap, thus emphasizing his role as a civic leader. In contrast, the reverse emphasizes his martial role:

⁹⁸ Mary Hollingsworth, "Art Patronage in Renaissance Urbino, Pesaro, and Rimini, c. 1400-1500," in *The Court Cities of Northern Italy: Milan, Parma, Piacenza, Mantua, Ferrara, Bologna, Urbino, Pesaro, and Rimini*, ed. Charles M. Rosenberg (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 335.

⁹⁹ Federico famously lost an eye and the bridge of his nose and therefore insisted on the profile pose rather than the three-quarter or frontal pose more common by the 1470s and 1480s.

Federico is mounted, armed, and larger than the warhorse he rides. The medal thus presents two sides to – and sources of power of – the ruler.

Portraits of Duke Federico da Montefeltro used an iconography of rulership to reinforce his power and position. The painted portrait in particular is a paragon of ruler portraits, stressing his martial and intellectual accomplishments, as well as his dynastic claims. This exemplar serves as contrast when examined in concert with Pontormo's *Alessandro de Medici*. While Pontormo situates the sitter in aristocratic pursuit – making a metalpoint drawing - it lacks any signifiers of authority. Given Alessandro's poor reputation in his own state, it positions the young duke as a member of the city's elite rather than as a powerful leader. While Federico da Montefeltro was given the appearance of a private moment with his son, its role in the identity formation of Federico as an exemplary ruler was clear. Alessandro's portrait, however, avoids any references to power or authority.

Titian's *Portrait of Charles V with a Hound* (fig. 28) provides a contemporaneous and instructive example of a ruler portrait. Modelled after Jacob Seisenegger's portrait of the same title (fig. 29), Titian provides a full length depiction of the emperor.¹⁰⁰ At this time, the full-length portrait was used almost exclusively for portraits of rulers. The emperor stands frontally in contrapposto with his right leg forward. His broad shoulders fill nearly the entire width of the canvas. His left hand rests on the powerful hound while his right holds a sheathed dagger.

¹⁰⁰ Titian, who first met the emperor in Bologna in 1532, likely received the commission to create a copy – or at least a work based on – Jakob Seisenegger's *Charles V with a Hound*. Seisenegger's original was owned by the brother of Charles V, while Titian's entered the imperial collections. For an introduction to this portrait, see Campbell, *Renaissance Portraits*, 234-236; Luba Freedman, *Titian's Portraits Through Aretino's Lens* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995), 115-124. Falomir, "The Court Portrait," 73-74 discusses in particular the difficulties of creating a recognizable likeness of Charles V and Titian's initial success with this portrait. P. G. Matthews, "Jakob Seisenegger's Portraits of Charles V, 1530-32," *The Burlington Magazine* vol. 143, No. 1175 (Feb., 2001): 86-90 provides a more extensive bibliography. The most complete exploration of both works is Sylvia Ferino-Pagden and Andreas Beyer, eds., *Titian versus Seisenegger: die Portraits Karls V mit Hund: Ein Holbeinstreit* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2005).

Charles gazes off to this right, with a serious and engaged look. The gaze precludes the viewer from making eye contact with the imperious personage.¹⁰¹

The straight-backed, frontal pose accentuates his rich attire. From the cut to the materials, every detail of the careful tailoring bespeaks the unique costume of the emperor. Where Alessandro's black clothing normalizes him, that of Charles V sets him apart from his contemporaries. This is a figure of authority to be admired. The pose, attributes, and costume all reflect a noble and authoritative sitter. Unlike Pontormo's portrayal of Alessandro, every aspect suggests majesty.

A more direct comparison serves to accentuate the contrast of presentations. Pontormo's Alessandro also differs radically from Giorgio Vasari's portrayal of the same sitter.¹⁰² In a letter to Ottaviano de' Medici, to whom the portrait was gifted, Vasari explained his work.¹⁰³ Vasari wrote that his portrait visually represented the power of Alessandro and his Medici lineage. It is a princely portrait: the seated ruler holds a baton of rulership, wears shining armor, and looks over his domain.¹⁰⁴ It is a portrait made for a pro-Medicean audience, an artistic manifesto of control over the city.

¹⁰¹ Titian's later *Equestrian Portrait of Charles V* exemplifies a martial portrayal of the ruler. Mounted and armored with a lance in his right hand, Charles V rides across the canvas. Based on an association between equestrian portraits and rulers that dates back to antiquity, this portrait connects Charles V with both ancient Roman and Holy Roman emperors. Freedman, *Titian's Portraits Through Aretino's Lens*, 125-130 explores it as a work that connects Charles V with the Christian soldier-saint as well.

¹⁰² A more complete and nuanced comparison between the two works can be found in Walker-Oakes, "Representing the Perfect Prince."

¹⁰³ The letter is reprinted in Malcolm Campbell, "Il Ritratto del Duca Alessandro de' Medici di Giorgio Vasari: Contesto e Significato", *Giorgio Vasari, tra decorazione ambientale e storiografia artistica*, ed. Gian Carlo Garfagnini (Florence: Olschki, 1985), 339-61.

¹⁰⁴ Vasari writes, for example that alessandro "avendo in mano il bastione del dominio tutto d'oro, per reggere e comandare da principe e capitano." Campbell, "Il Ritratto del Duca Alessandro de' Medici di Giorgio Vasari: Contesto e Significato," 360-61.

Vanessa Walker-Oakes argued that the two portraits of Alessandro commissioned at approximately the same time represent two sets of virtues possessed by the duke: Vasari's showing the martial and Pontormo's the princely.¹⁰⁵ Her work is clear in establishing a contrast between the two images. The dichotomy in which Vasari's Alessandro is an active figure and Pontormo's a contemplative one is an insightful observation. However, Pontormo's portrait of Alessandro is anything but princely. Considering them as foils also reveals that Vasari's represented Alessandro as an autocratic prince and leader while Pontormo's elided such associations.

Vasari's portrayal corresponded more closely to other portraits of rulers in content and its intended impression. Alessandro is seated on a three-legged stool that, according to Vasari's letter to Ottaviano, included representations of Florentines. He is physically supported by – and dominates – the citizens. Depicted in profile, his princely person can be gazed upon, but does not deign to meet the viewer's eye. He holds a ruler's baton, unequivocally affirming his authority to rule. Like the portrait of Federico da Montefeltro, Alessandro is depicted surrounded by objects that comment on his character and make a dynastic claim.¹⁰⁶ Similar to the *Portrait of Federico da Montefeltro and his Son*, Vasari filled the panel with emblems of power such as a helmet, placed behind Alessandro. The laurel branch at Alessandro's right elbow proclaims his lineage, connecting him to Cosimo il Vecchio, Lorenzo il Magnifico, and the senior branch of the Medici

¹⁰⁵ Walker-Oakes, "Representing the Perfect Prince." Earlier scholarship, in particular Steinberg, "Pontormo's Alessandro de' Medici," 63 considered Pontormo's portrait a critique of Vasari's. In either case, the two can be considered in concert and as foils.

¹⁰⁶ For a more exhaustive exploration of the symbols and their meanings see Campbell, "Il Ritratto del Duca Alessandro de' Medici di Giorgio Vasari: Contesto e Significato."

family.¹⁰⁷ Filled with allegorical and symbolic attributes, Vasari's portrait emphasizes the duke's position and power.

Unlike Pontormo's portrait of Alessandro, which positions the sitter in an ambiguous space, Vasari's version includes an unmistakable vista of Florence. Viewed from the north and encircled by strong walls, the key monuments of the Renaissance city are all recognizable. Central to the painted city is the Duomo, the locus of religious life.¹⁰⁸ Most of the structure of the Palazzo della Signoria is visible just to the left of the Duomo. Also to the left is the bell tower of the Bargello. These are sites of civic authority and governance. Orsanmichele rises to the right of the cathedral's dome. Positioned on the major thoroughfare linking the loci of religious and civic power, Orsanmichele was the center of guild life. Housing a church with a miracle-working icon and the city's grain storage, this key site combined sacred and secular authority. Alessandro, with his princely symbols and reminders of his dynastic inheritance, is the clear sovereign of the city, assuming the authority that had previously belonged to the citizens. The portrait is a forceful, martial, and symbolic representation of a ruler.

Pontormo's depiction positions the sitter in an ambiguous space and does not position Alessandro as a princely character. It does not provide princely trappings or definite symbols of authority. Alessandro looks out, meeting the gaze of his viewer. Pontormo's portrait offers a private side to the head of the Florentine government – but with a public viewership in mind. He is a member of the elite rather than its dominant figure.

Pontormo's presentation of Alessandro is also anomalous in its function. Ruler portraits performed functions that transcended the genre's more generalized uses as memorials and in

¹⁰⁷ Medici symbols are discussed in detail in Janet Cox-Rearick, *Dynasty and Destiny in Medici Art: Pontormo, Leo X, and the Two Cosimos* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1984).

¹⁰⁸ Santa Maria Novella and Santa Croce are also included, among other religious buildings.

marriage contracts.¹⁰⁹ They could be used to legitimize a rule. Federico da Montefeltro's dynastic portrait not only reviewed his qualifications and accomplishments, but promised stability. They further could offer diplomatic functions, as portrayals of rulers could be exchanged as gifts or bestowed as symbols of favor. Yet Alessandro's portrait responded not to dynastic or international concerns. Its audience was a Florentine one, and its message one of civic identity.

2.8 Alessandro: “il Duce della Repubblica Fiorentina”

Having discussed the portrait's place within artistic developments, we can now turn to discovering why precisely the decision was made to position Alessandro as an elite Florentine citizen engaged in humanistic pursuits. The reason for the non-ruler portrait is Alessandro's socio-political reputation and his tenuous position in Florence in the 1530s. There are no formal qualities that underscore his title or power. Contextual analysis suggests the decision is unsurprising, given the political situation in Florence. By the time of Pontormo's portrayal Alessandro had acquired the reputation of a tyrant. The vehemence of many Florentines' growing reaction against Alessandro and his rule was exemplified by the *fuorusciti*, a group of Florentine exiles. The *fuorusciti* had proclaimed their grievances with the administration of the city since the end of the siege. They continued to petition Emperor Charles V for an official audience and inquiry. In the mid-1530s, he agreed to hear their complaints. In their official delegation to Charles, which traveled to Naples in late 1535 and early 1536, they laid out their case against Alessandro. The delegation presented Alessandro as a tyrant, overstepping his rule,

¹⁰⁹ For more on the functions of ruler portraits, see Falomir, “The Court Portrait,” 66-79.

and in an increasingly despotic manner.¹¹⁰ They proclaimed that “the government, which one finds in Florence to be tyrannical, was not only established without legitimate authority, but also governs tyrannically.” (“...il governo, che si trova in Firenze esser’ tirannico, non solo per non esser fondato con legittima autorità, ma per governarsi ancora tirannicamente.”¹¹¹)

Time and again the disgruntled citizens returned to this message: that the liberty the ruler was meant to uphold and protect has been trampled by a tyrannical master.¹¹² They recounted, for example, the story of Vincenzo Martelli, who went into self-imposed exile in Rome in 1530 following the city’s capitulation.¹¹³ From Rome, he wrote a sonnet exhorting Alessandro to be kinder to his opposition. Alessandro, in return, tricked him into returning to Florence, where Martelli was arrested and sentenced to death. While his sentence was commuted to life in prison, the episode was used to illustrate Alessandro’s monstrous abuse of power: Martelli, a young nobleman, was given a death sentence for writing a sonnet. Although this meeting with Charles V took place after the completion of the portrait, the Florentine delegation was reiterating complaints about Alessandro that had been circulating for years.

The nature of the city government was itself uncertain. Prior to Alessandro’s appointment in 1531-32, Pope Clement VII consulted several leading Florentines regarding the future governance of the city. They strongly recommended that Alessandro’s power should be

¹¹⁰ “...the government, which in Florence one finds to be tyrannical, not only because it was not founded with legitimate authority, but also because it governs tyrannically.” Translation author’s own. Archivio di Stato di Firenze, Carte Stroziane Serie I, 98: 1-29.

¹¹¹ Ibid, 10r.

¹¹² For example, *ibid*, 4r states explicitly that “la città nostra non sia hoggi libera ma tiranneggiata....” This particular passage goes on to accuse the “supremo magistrato” of extinguishing the liberty of the city rather than defending it.

¹¹³ Ibid, 5v. Also in ASF, CS I, 95, 87r. Further information on Vincenzo Martelli can be found in Elisabetta Sumpo, “Vincenzo Martelli,” *Dizionario Biografico* vol. 7 (2008), Accessed Sept. 20, 2016. [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/vincenzo-martelli_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/vincenzo-martelli_(Dizionario-Biografico)/)

tempered. Francesco Guicciardini spoke out against a principality, while Roberto Acciaiuoli advocated for a position similar to the kings of Sparta.¹¹⁴ Whether explicit or implicit, the citizens were consistent in pushing for a leader with a nominal title, rather than significant power. In the new constitution of April 1532, the city is presented as a republic with a token prince, whose power was to be far from absolute. This then was the figure represented by Pontormo: a young man engaged in courtly activities.

2.9 Alessandro Draws: An Act of Engagement

Thus, finally, we return to the curious representation of an ostensibly-ruling prince in the banal act of drawing. Alessandro's action of drawing serves multiple purposes. In Castiglione's treatise, one recommendation was that the courtier should learn to draw. Alessandro's activity may appear un-princely, but it corresponds to courtly society. It places him as a member of the humanistic elite. The particular materials Alessandro uses highlight the studious process of art-making. Engaged in his drawing, Alessandro holds a metal stylus pressed to the paper. Although metalpoint had gone out of fashion by the 1530s due in part to the difficulty of controlling the medium, Alessandro deftly delineates a drawing using a stylus without even the holder.¹¹⁵ A holder made the metalpoint stylus easier to manipulate and gave the artist greater control and precision. This achievement, in which Alessandro is presented as having mastered a technique too difficult for many modern masters, also draws attention to the process of making an artwork,

¹¹⁴ As summarized in Baker, *The Fruit of Liberty*, 149. For Francesco Guicciardini's statement see Francesco Guicciardini, "Discorso di Francesco Guicciardini a di 30 gennajo 1531-32," *Archivio storico italiano* I, ed. Gino Capponi, (Firenze: Gio. Pietro Vieusseux, 1842), 456; Roberto Acciaiuoli's contribution can be found in the same volume under Roberto Acciaiuoli, "Due pareri di Ruberto Acciaiuoli, anno 1531-32," 448. It is likely that they hopes to establish an oligarchy, even if Alessandro remained the nominal leader, that would allow these men to maintain and even grow their own power.

¹¹⁵ Strehlke, *Pontormo, Bronzino, and the Medici*, 114 discusses the medium. It is tempting to posit that the outmoded medium recalls an earlier period of Florentine history – artistically and politically – making this a backwards-looking portrait. However, at this time there is not enough evidence to do more than assert so.

which required careful control and specialized skills. Alessandro's hands, distinctly oversized in relation to his head and even body, emphasize his artistic prowess. Like Albrecht Dürer's 1512 *Self-Portrait*, they accentuate the hands of the creator. Is this work, therefore, meant to present Alessandro not as a ducal ruler, but as a skilled creator?¹¹⁶

Alessandro's work in progress is tilted toward the viewer, providing clear access at the expense of spatial veracity.¹¹⁷ The drawn head has been outlined on the paper in black (fig. 30). According to Vasari, Alessandro gave the portrait to Taddea Malaspina, and for this reason it has been suggested that Alessandro may be drawing his paramour. The intimate dialogue between artist and subject, between Alessandro and his mistress, is one interpretation that has been proposed for this portrait. However, as Patricia Simons has argued, there is no concrete evidence that he is drawing Taddea's profile.¹¹⁸ Rather than the duke's paramour, she proposed his artistic activity in parallel with the poetic tradition of the beloved. Interpreting drawing as a courtly art, Simons suggested the work was intended as a manifestation of courtly love. She proposed that it provided visual evidence to assure Emperor Charles V, on whom Alessandro's power was dependent, that he was a suitable duke in Florence. This reassurance was necessitated by Alessandro's unpopular position in Florence, which was reflected in Benedetto Varchi's history

¹¹⁶ Simons, "Disegno and Desire in Pontormo's Alessandro de' Medici," draws attention to the self-consciousness of the painting: a portrait of a man ostensibly creating a portrait based on a sitter external to the frame.

¹¹⁷ Alessandro is in the act of drawing, though it is doubtful if the portrait reflects biography. There is no evidence that Alessandro had been trained to or had interest in drawing. However, a later drawing identified as a copy after an original sketch by Pontormo shows Alessandro drawing (fig. 31). Pontormo's sketch, now lost, is thought to be drawn from life, and the extant copy today in the Rijksprentenkabinet at the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam shows Alessandro laboring with a stylus. This drawing is discussed, for example, in Stehlke, "*Pontormo, Alessandro de' Medici, and the Palazzo Pazzi*," 5. Interestingly, the drawing exhibits greater emphasis on and clarity of facial features and costume than the finished panel by Pontormo.

¹¹⁸ Simons, "Disegno and Desire in Pontormo's Alessandro de' Medici".

of the city.¹¹⁹ Although Simons' argument focused on drawing as an act of courtly love, her point about Alessandro's precarious positions deserves greater consideration.

There is another potential interpretation. More than an identifiable portrait drawing, the image formed by Alessandro's metalpoint recalls the tradition of the ideal female head. While the profile view was unfashionable in portraiture by the 1530s, it was common to this type of drawing. In this way, the work comes into dialogue with previous masters. Artists such as Verrocchio, Leonardo, and Michelangelo participated in the strong tradition of drawing idealized female busts, particularly in profile.¹²⁰ Such an exercise was not only part of artistic workshop practice and recommended by Leonardo as a way to continue one's artistic training, but also served as a reminder of the creative power of the artist.

Whether he is drawing from a model before him – thereby implicating the viewer as Alessandro's sitter – or creating an idealized head in the fashion of Michelangelo and using the tools of Leonardo, Alessandro's activity foregrounds the act of artistic creation. It emphasizes the necessity of the artist, of an active human agent, to translate the referent – be it ideal or grounded in a physical specimen – into a physical artistic representation. This portrait draws attention to an artistic endeavor as one of translating the physical, mundane space onto an adjusted and artificial canvas.

Yet the drawn head does not have to be either-or. It is possible that the drawing is meant to implicate Taddea Malaspina, as well as serve as a visual reference to the tradition of ideal heads. In this way, then, the portrait works for multiple audiences: for Taddea, it is a private compliment. It suggests her beauty is on par with the ideal representation of feminine beauty.

¹¹⁹ Ibid, 666-67.

¹²⁰ Cropper, "Pontormo and Bronzino in Philadelphia," 21.

Yet for a larger, public audience it emphasizes the prince as a patient, cultured individual. In any of the above interpretations, the act of drawing engages the viewer. It creates a connection between Alessandro and his audience. Further, drawing, or *disegno*, was an essential part of a Florentine artist's training. According to Vasari, it was the skill of *disegno* that set Florentine artists apart.

The combination of his activity and his gaze oriented outside the canvas serves to draw the viewer into an active role. Other artists have used mirrors to collapse space and implicate the viewer. Well-known works such as Jan van Eyck's *Arnolfini Portrait* or Diego Velazquez's *Las Meninas* use the reflective properties of a mirror to show the viewer both what is in front and what is behind them, thereby visually placing them within the pictorial frame and narrative. Here, Pontormo relies on knowledge of drawing practice to engage the viewer. While it is unsurprising that a sitter looks out of the portrait, it does implicitly implicate the viewer, much as the mirror in other examples, as though we are the object of the sitter's own observation.

Not only does Alessandro meet the viewer's gaze, but his act of drawing incorporates the viewer into the painting. In state portraiture, the prince is oblivious to his viewer, acting as both an individual and noble ideal. Alessandro's engagement in his creation forces him to look beyond the frame, thereby connecting with the viewer and the viewer's space. Such a connection is rare in portraits of rulers. This is yet another way that the work occludes a princely portrayal.

2.10 Conclusion

Over the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, portraiture expanded from a class of art restricted to rulers and great men to one accessible to a variety of classes. Amidst this democratization of the genre, nobles and rulers found ways to visually distinguish themselves from the merchants who commissioned portraits. They chose formats, such as the full-length

portrait, and included objects and backgrounds that visually proclaimed their status and authority.¹²¹ These elements do not appear nor are subtly alluded to in Pontormo's *Portrait of Alessandro de' Medici*. Rather than a manifesto of his power, it presents Alessandro as an elite citizen. From the format of the work, to the action, and through the background the portrait subverts and questions assumptions about the sitter and his world. Pontormo's presentation of this imperfect leader corresponds more closely to the upper class than the role of Florentine Duke, especially as Alessandro's successor, Cosimo I, would come to define the position. Alessandro's portrait by Pontormo is not a ruler portrait, as he was, in fact, not yet fully accepting nor fully accepted as the ruler of Florence. Although Vasari's portrait of the same sitter in armor made a visual argument for his authority – including references to strength and dynastic inheritance – Pontormo presents him in a more enigmatic position. Where Vasari's portrait amplifies Alessandro's position, Pontormo's conceals it.

It is misleading to label the work as an unconventional ruler portrait, as it makes no attempt to position Alessandro in that way. Engaged in quiet contemplation and creation, Alessandro is not a ruler. The portrait mirrors Alessandro's ambiguous position. Some elements, such as the spatial construction and figural proportions, remain enigmatic. Alessandro's distinctive hair, which Pontormo conspicuously depicted in the small painted study, is hidden by the citizen's cap he wears. While other distinguishing elements of his physiognomy are represented, his hair, which sets him apart, is disguised. Like the selective detailing of physical characteristics, other aspects of the painting are particularly well-defined. There are the distinct materials of the interior: wood paneling and *pietra serena* frames. Alessandro's clothing, although simple, corresponds to Florentine fashions. His activity is obvious: drawing, a skill for

¹²¹ Peter Burke, *The Italian Renaissance: Culture and Society in Italy* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1987), 166.

which Florentine artists were especially known and which Castiglione encouraged in his ideal courtier. All three of these elements serve to establish Alessandro's civic identity, grounded in recognizable Florentine trends.

He further positions himself among his contemporaries, thereby constructing his identity, in his selection of a portraitist. Pontormo was particularly popular with the elite of Florence. By commissioning Pontormo – a fact that Vasari elucidates in his narrative of this work, making clear that Alessandro sought out the artist – Alessandro depicted himself as one of an elite class of patrons who employed Pontormo.

In Pontormo's depiction, Alessandro's unique political identity is masked. Disregarding references to power, he is neither a tyrant nor an interloper. Few would have claimed that Alessandro was a prince of the people, but this portrait presents him as at the least of the people. It conceals individuating elements of both his physiognomy and his position, instead positioning him as an individual contributing to a collective identity.

Chapter 3: Bronzino's *Portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatici: Between France and Fiorentinità*

3.1 Introduction

In Bronzino's *Portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatici* (fig. 32), the eponymous sitter gazes calmly and dispassionately at his viewers. Positioned to the right of center, he is depicted from head to mid-thigh in the just-under-life-sized portrait. With his right shoulder retracted and left turned toward the viewer, the figure creates a strong diagonal from the right background to the dog positioned at his lower left. Elegantly-dressed in a finely-detailed costume and with distinct facial hair, a self-confident Bartolomeo stands neither rigid nor quite casually against the balustrade. The accoutrements he holds – a book and pair of gloves – suggest he is an educated aristocrat. His surroundings, which imply a Florentine setting, position Bartolomeo securely within an urban context. He is a figure at home in the city. Yet the intricacies of his presentation create a personal and civic identity that does not strictly reflect his biography.

Previous scholarship has considered this portrait a continuation of the artist's stylistic development or in tandem with its pendant portrait of Bartolomeo's wife Lucrezia (fig. 33). The work has further been used to explore aspects of the sitter's biography, in particular his later trial and condemnation as a heretic. This chapter shifts the focus to Bartolomeo's dual-nationality as a key element of his identity. It explores how his civic identity is treated in this portrait, commissioned shortly after his arrival in Florence from France. The portrait emphasizes Bartolomeo's Florentine-ness despite the fact that he was not born there and did not enter the city until his early thirties. Considering points of both divergence and similarity between his lived

experiences and the portrait reveal that the painted version serves to elide thirty-plus years of absence. The image emphasizes Bartolomeo's courtly résumé. As the Florentine court was in its infancy, these experiences were lacking for many Florentines. The work adapts the cultural *fiorentinità* previously employed in many of Bronzino's portraits to insert Bartolomeo into the history, culture, and politics of his new home. A careful description of the sitter, which opens this chapter, provides a foil against which his personal history can be measured. Establishing that the portrait emphasizes his status as a Florentine with courtly training, the discussion then turns to *fiorentinità*. By considering this aspect of identity and the selective presentation of his biography, the painting can be examined as a means by which Bartolomeo inserted himself into the Florentine socio-political world.

Several sixteenth century authors praise the depiction of Bartolomeo for its lifelike qualities. Using an already well-worn trope, Giorgio Vasari comments that the pendant portraits of Bartolomeo and Lucrezia Panciatichi are “so natural that they seem truly alive and only lacks breath” (“*tanto naturali che paiono vivi verament e che non manci loro se non lo spirito.*”)¹ This and similar phrases are used elsewhere by Vasari and others to praise a portrait's naturalism.

Raffaello Borghini offers a similar appraisal in his *Il Riposo*, first published in 1584, which was intended for a lay audience.² Following on the success of Vasari's *Lives* and Benedetto Varchi's dialogue on the *paragone* between painting and sculpture, Borghini's text not only continues the discussion begun by those two authors but also addresses Counter-

¹ Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori e architettori: nelle redazioni del 1550 e 1568*, eds. Rosanna Bettarini and Paola Barocchi, (Firenze: Sansoni, 1966-1987). Vasari praises the portraits of both Bartolomeo and Lucrezia in his life of Bronzino, which can be found in vol. IV, 232.

² Originally published in 1584 by Marescotti in Florence, the facsimile reprint is available in Raffaello Borghini, *Il Riposo. Saggio biobibliografico e indice analitico*, ed. Mario Rosci (Milano: Labor riproduzioni e documentazioni, 1967). Raffaello Borghini, *Il Riposo*, ed. and trans. and Lloyd H. Ellis (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007) provides an English translation.

Reformation concerns. Although more interested in works of a religious nature, Borghini addresses the genre of portraiture in his life of Bronzino. Specifically, Borghini draws attention to the portraits on display in the house of Carlo di Bartolomeo Panciatichi. Of the portraits of Carlo's parents, Bartolomeo and Lucrezia, Borghini comments that they are "*tanto naturali che paion vivi...*"³ The comments by both Vasari and Borghini demonstrate that the portraits of Bartolomeo and Lucrezia were well-known and well-received in the sixteenth century.

3.2 *Portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatichi*

Depicted in a subtle three-quarter view with only one ear visible, Bartolomeo meets the viewer's gaze. At first glance, the two outstanding features are his distinctive facial hair and flawless skin. Yet his face, on closer examination, has several distinguishing features. His cheeks, with a slight rosy tint, are emphatically rounded. On his right side, Bronzino has created an extended cheek beyond the basic symmetrical shape of his face, breaking simple geometric forms. On his left, the strong shadow creates a mirrored curve. The shadow rises across his forehead, tracing the outer brow of his left eye. Although Bartolomeo's eyes are depicted in the heavily-lidded style characteristic of Bronzino's work, the artist emphasizes a deep eye socket with an overhanging supraorbital notch. The small shadow beneath Bartolomeo's left brow, occupying the space between his eyebrow and upper eyelid as well as at the far corner of his eye, further creates a depth that is absent around his right eye.

The face is smooth and even. The exposed skin of Bartolomeo's hands and face is porcelain-like. Idealized and unblemished, the cold veneer, a familiar stylistic trait from Bronzino's overall production in the 1540s, suggests a self-confident individual.⁴ His nose is

³ Borghini and Rosci, *Il Riposo. Saggio biobibliografico e indice analitico*, 535.

⁴ It also reflects contemporary court culture, in which the individual was careful of the mask he presented to others.

long and aquiline, connecting his brow to the distinctive facial hair that covers much of his lips. Bartolomeo's face is subtly turned, and the viewer can distinguish the proper left side of his nose, cast in a soft shadow. These shadows on his face contribute to a sense of three-dimensionality while confirming a direct and consistent light source. The depiction of his left nostril places the viewer just below Bartolomeo, a perspective consistent throughout the painting.

The sitter's face is dominated by his distinctive hair. Short locks peek out from under his cap. The copper-colored wavy locks extend along the sides of his face. Small curls, especially visible below his left ear, are silhouetted against the architectural background. His carefully groomed beard is composed of two distinct prongs. The swallowtail beard was especially fashionable in mid-sixteenth-century Europe. Requiring the careful attention of a barber, such a display of facial hair bespoke an elevated status and manliness.⁵ Like costuming, the beard reflects Bartolomeo's physical likeness and offers a clue to his identity, as discussed below. Bronzino uses distinct lighter strands, especially towards the bottom, and darker nearly-black wisps of hair to give texture and volume to the long beard. Bartolomeo also sports a long mustache. Tapering toward the end, it falls on his right almost halfway down the length of his beard.

His hair descends in small clusters. His black cap extends over his forehead, adding visual interest to the expanse of his upper skull as it cuts across at a diagonal. Worn at an angle, the cap rises higher over his right side and is pulled lower on the left. Ringed by a narrow flap that is a consistent width around the brim, it is marked by a feather over his right temple that is attached with a gold pin.

⁵ The court culture which replaced condottiere culture resulted in what today might be termed more effeminate styles. Beards became more carefully groomed, swords became skinnier, and armor was replaced with elegant and complicated clothing. Bartolomeo's self-presentation shows a sitter fully assimilating court culture.

Bartolomeo is dressed predominantly in black. His doublet is a masterpiece of both tailoring and painting. Looking closely, one can discern patterned embroidery over the front, suggesting a complicated weave with silver thread. This is most readily apparent in the crisscrossed pattern just to the left of the center of his body. With his right shoulder turned toward the viewer, the complicated patterning around the shoulder and upper arm is clearly evident. His outfit, high-necked and with puffed sleeves, emphasizes Panciatichi's sartorial taste and prosperity.

Although his left hand hangs casually off the railing, his pose is overall upright and poised. On his oversized hands, characteristic of Bronzino's portraits, the pale skin tones stand out starkly against his black doublet. His right hand holds a pair of brown gloves. Long and slender thumb, index, and middle fingers all extend downward, each carefully delineated. The final two digits wrap around the leather gloves, keeping them in the shadow of the balustrade. He holds the gloves rather than wearing them, allowing the viewer to observe his callous-free, carefully rendered hands. Bartolomeo's elegant hands and leather gloves contribute to the overall impression of a refined gentleman.⁶

Bartolomeo's right hand, bent at the wrist, holds a small maroon book. With his middle finger inserted between the pages, this detail serves a common purpose in contemporaneous portraiture: the educated reader interrupted. Even within Bronzino's own corpus, there are several examples where the reader marks his place as he pauses to engage the viewer. His portraits of both Ugolino Martelli and Lorenzo Lenzi depict young men with open books, the

⁶ While gloves acted as a common signifier of status, there is no single accepted interpretation of the symbolic meaning of holding a pair of gloves. Lorne Campbell, *Renaissance Portraits: European Portrait-Painting in the 14th, 15th and 16th Centuries* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990), 99 suggests that gloves do not hold any particular or consistent meaning. Peter Stallybrass and Ann Rosalind Jones, "Fetishizing the Glove in Renaissance Europe," *Critical Inquiry* 28.1 (Autumn, 2001): 114-132 explore possible interpretations for sitters holding a single glove.

words visible, though the sitters have paused to engage the viewer (figs. 34-35).⁷ Laura Battiferri also holds a book and is depicted in profile, in emulation of imagery of Dante, which is the book she reads (fig. 36).⁸ Yet while Bartolomeo's middle finger marks his place, it is within a closed rather than open book. His book functions not as a specific reference, but more generally as an indicator of literacy. No words are visible, nor is the cover decorated in such a way to reveal information about its content. A long, slim book, with a mauve cover, it is most likely a secular volume.

A black dog sits below Bartolomeo's left hand.⁹ Like the human sitter, the canine companion looks to his left. The dark luster of his black fur is interrupted by a few gray strands on one ear and a highlighted area between his eyes. Like the book and expensive dress, the dog marks Bartolomeo as an aristocrat. As Philippe Costamagna observed of the muscular dog in Bronzino's earlier *Portrait of Guidobaldo II della Rovere* (fig. 37), the canine "traditionally reflected the subject's noble origins (dogs evoked hunting, the favourite pastime of aristocrats)..."¹⁰ Elizabeth Currie further observed that the dog suggests "a more public and

⁷ Elizabeth Cropper, "Reading Bronzino's Florentine portraits," in *Bronzino, Artist and Poet at the Court of the Medici*, eds. Carlo Falciani and Antonio Natali (Firenze: Mandragora, 2010), 245-255, further explores Bronzino's use of books within his portraiture.

⁸ For more on this work see Carol Plazzotta, "Bronzino's Laura," *The Burlington Magazine*, no. 1141, 140 (1998): 251-63; Deborah Parker, *Bronzino: Renaissance Painter as Poet* (Cambridge, U.K. ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 96-103; Maurice Brock, *Bronzino*, trans. David Poole Radzinowicz and Christine Schultz-Touge, (Paris: Flammarion, 2002), 93-103. Bronzino presents a portrait of her features, her literary prowess, and also her work.

⁹ Restoration work confirms that the dog was added late in the process, as per Carlo Falciani and Antonio Natali, eds., *Bronzino, Artist and Poet at the Court of the Medici* (Firenze: Mandragora, 2010), 166. In his catalog entry, Carlo Falciani further posits that the ledge on which the dog rests his paws may have been added even after the portrait was framed, as it reaches neither the bottom of the panel nor the vertical edges.

¹⁰ Philippe Costamagna, catalog entry in Falciani and Natali, *Bronzino, Artist and Poet at the Court of the Medici*, 86. Similarly, Peter Burke notes that as the middle class were increasingly able to commission portraits, the aristocratic class found ways to indicate their elevated status. "To distinguish themselves from others, nobles had to surround themselves with objects symbolizing their status, from velvet curtains and classical columns to servants and hunting dogs." Peter Burke, *The Italian Renaissance: Culture and Society in Italy*, Rev. ed (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1987), 166.

active social presence.”¹¹ Thus the inclusion of the dog, anchoring the corner of the portrait and leading the viewer’s eye back to Bartolomeo and the cityscape beyond, signals Bartolomeo’s elevated status.

The background, featuring three large buildings, is divided into three sections that function much like a triptych, with the two exterior segments occupying significantly less of the panel. The architectural background strengthens the internal order and symmetry while framing the sitter and focusing the viewer’s attention on him. The flat expanse of the wall behind him, acting as a monochromatic backdrop, encourages the eye to linger on his face. The only architectural adornment is the cluster of large quoins on the corner, which creates rhythmic vertical accents over the sitter’s right shoulder. Fully in shadow, the flank of the building contrasts with the fully-lit and engaging face of the sitter.

Behind this central building stands an open archway, through which the viewer can make out two distinct edifices. The nearer, a gray building with pilasters accentuating the corners, features a large second-story balcony. The architrave above is adorned with geometric architectural flourishes, while the doorway to the balcony is surmounted by a heavy door jamb which creates an architectural canopy. This and the more distant buildings evidently line a street extending beyond the open arch. The *pietra serena* articulations on the archway, including the horizontal bands atop the Corinthian capital, create movement in an otherwise static, silent background. They lead the viewer’s eye left to right across the panel, moving inward from the column that anchors both the left-hand side of the painting and the arch. To follow the street back in space is, curiously, to be led directly back to Bartolomeo.

¹¹ Elizabeth Currie, *Fashion and Masculinity in Renaissance Florence* (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016), 102.

Over Bartolomeo's left shoulder, a palazzo with the Panciatichi coat of arms in a recessed arch occupies the space closest to both sitter and viewer. This edifice is characterized by flat, plastered expanses articulated by *pietra serena* ornamentation. A common material throughout Florence and neighboring cities such as Pistoia that came under Florentine control, *pietra serena* was highly visible in both public and private architecture throughout Florentine territory. The recessed archway – which appears to be structurally unnecessary – parallels the open arch on the opposite side of the painting, creating a connection through the architecture that moves across the physical structure of the panel and through the perspectival space. A light shines out of the three rectangular windows in the upper right hand corner. Yet the light is not consistent: it is strongest in the rightmost window, where its source is clearly located.

The *Portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatichi* was paired with that of his wife, Lucrezia Pucci (fig. 33). Bartolomeo's wife sits framed by a niche with her hand elegantly propping open a book of prayers. Seated in a carved wooden chair, Lucrezia pauses in her reading to face the viewer. Like her husband, Lucrezia is presented in three-quarter length with her left shoulder turned toward the viewer and her face depicted nearly frontally. Her skin – flawless and porcelain-like in its treatment – glows in an otherwise dark interior. Like the pendant portrait, Lucrezia is lit frontally and from the left as is evident from the shadow cast by her aquiline nose and the shadow on her left cheek. Her bright, pale hands provide two additional focal points. A jeweled golden ring adorns her left ring finger, signifying her married state. Her right hand is positioned within the open pages of her book of hours.

The book, resting on her lap, is carefully detailed. The binding, the ornamental framing around the pages, and even individual letters are delicately rendered. The left-hand page includes the text of a psalm at the top, while the bottom and subsequent page show excerpts from the

Song of Songs.¹² The content of the book reflects the character of Lucrezia, presenting her as a devout and pious woman. Whereas Lucrezia holds a book clearly religious in content, Bartolomeo's is evidently secular.

While the two interrupted readers are similarly posed, the color of their clothing is reversed, balancing one another. Although black is the predominant color of Bartolomeo's dress, the bright accents correspond to his wife's costume. The rich crimson silk shirt beneath his doublet matches his wife's opulent dress. Lucrezia sports a voluminous, jewel-toned silk gown, which Bronzino's brush portrays in a variety of hues as the light reflects off it. The pink sleeves, puffed about her shoulder, give way to a deep purple. A rich and intense color suggests a costly cloth. Reds and purples were among the most expensive dyes to produce and therefore carried an implicit association with luxury.¹³ Additionally the slashed sleeves required multiple pieces of fabric, greater time to tailor, and a variety of dyes. Thus Lucrezia's outfit – from details of the sleeves, to the materials and dyes – all clearly proclaim the elevated status of the wearer.

The open slits of Lucrezia's attached, slashed sleeves reveal a day dress (*gamurra*) of black and gold, with matching ties extending outside the gown. Whereas Lucrezia's bright gown is offset by the delicate lace collar (*colletto*) about her neck and deep purple sleeves, Bartolomeo's somber black costume is brightened by his sleeves. The inverse relationship between the two creates an aesthetic balancing of portraits intended to be viewed together. Lucrezia's more overtly fashionable and luxurious clothing as compared to the modest but

¹² Cropper, "Reading Bronzino's Florentine portraits," 249-50. The text is also examined in detail elsewhere in Falciani and Natali, *Bronzino, Artist and Poet at the Court of the Medici*, most notably on pages 156 and 168. This includes a discussion of the specific content of the psalm on the left-hand page, which has been proposed as both Psalm 148 and Psalm 150. Brock, *Bronzino*. 72-77, also addresses the content of Lucrezia's book.

¹³ Carole Collier Frick, *Dressing Renaissance Florence: Families, Fortunes, and Fine Clothing* (Baltimore, Md.; London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), 167 and 170.

elegant outfit of her husband contributes to a complete and complementary portrait of the couple and their elevated social standing.

Prosperity is also clearly indicated by Lucrezia's jewelry. She wears a necklace of large pearls, from which dangles a medallion encased in worked gold and featuring a ruby. A larger chain of gold is draped over her shoulders and across her chest. Engraved beads, each with four flat sides, are interspersed at regular intervals. The necklace bears the inscription "*amour dure sans fin*" ("love lasts eternally"), a verbal linking of the two sitters.¹⁴

The double necklaces decorating her upper body are a convention, especially evident in other courtly portraits by Bronzino, such as the *Portrait of Eleonora of Toledo with Her Son Giovanni* and the *Portrait of Bia* (fig. 19). All three women model a bejeweled belt (*cintura*).¹⁵ The repetitive arcs of the jewelry, arrayed across the body of the woman, add a geometrically pleasing aesthetic that Maurice Brock has connected to Agnolo Firenzuola's treatise on beauty.¹⁶ Lucrezia's presentation places her among fashionable Florentines, a strong claim for a newly established Florentine couple who returned to the city only in recent months. Even the chair she occupies contributes to the image of Lucrezia – and by extension her husband.

An example of the so-called Savonarola type, the x-shaped chair with curved arms, had previously been reserved for the most powerful secular and religious figures. Its association with powerful individuals such as kings and popes was diluted over the decades, and by 1540 it was

¹⁴ An alternative interpretation was put forth by Elizabeth Cropper and Carlo Falciani in their respective essays in Falciani and Natali, *Bronzino, Artist and Poet at the Court of the Medici* focuses on a religiously-oriented reading. Cropper suggests that it is meant to tie Lucrezia not to her husband, but to God's infinite and unending love. She further connects it to Reformist circles and literature, in particular the writings of Juan de Valdés.

¹⁵ A *cintura* was a popular element of women's dress throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Goldsmiths were known to make them on spec to sell on the open market so certain were they that the objects were in demand enough to sell consistently. Jacqueline Marie Musacchio, *Art, Marriage, & Family in the Florentine Renaissance Palace* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008), 179. Although some were made of fabric, those of wealthy women were as ornamental as functional, including gold, jewels, and pearls.

¹⁶ Brock, *Bronzino*, 74-76.

used to bestow status on a wider variety of sitters, carrying with it a more general message of prestige.¹⁷ By the time Lucrezia's image was painted by Bronzino, it would have been readily recognized as a common sign of high standing. Seated in a chair that connoted elite status, Lucrezia's portrait proclaims the couple's wealth and status. As discussed below, these conspicuous elements of self-fashioning also correspond to Florentine styles.

Lucrezia is presented as a Florentine woman. She encompasses feminine virtues: she is literate, but presented quietly, in association with a religious text. Placed in front of an open niche, she is lit frontally, emerging from the darkness of a Florentine interior. The niche, with the gray coloring of *pietra serena* and decorated by fluted columns, is similar to Bronzino's *Christ Crucified*, also painted for the Panciatichi in the early 1540s. Just as the dress of husband and wife are mirrored, their settings also achieve equilibrium. Lucrezia is seated in a dark but recognizably Florentine interior. Conversely, Bartolomeo lounges against an outdoor balustrade, the city stretching behind him.

The settings complement each other, depicting an interior and an exterior: a public setting for Bartolomeo and a private one for Lucrezia. In their books, Bartolomeo and Lucrezia declare their respective secular and religious pursuits. In these ways, they also reflect gendered roles and expectations for elite Florentine married couples.¹⁸ Significantly, although they enact these dichotomies, both make distinct and gender-appropriate claims of occupying Florentine spaces.

¹⁷ Eric Denker and William E. Wallace, "Michelangelo and Seats of Power," *Artibus et Historiae* 36, no. 72 (2015): 199-210. Denker and Wallace provide a background on the history of the type that connect it to seats of power and prestige in both secular and religious realms.

¹⁸ For more on gendered spaces in Renaissance Florence see F.W. Kent, *Household and Lineage in Renaissance Florence: The Family Life of the Capponi, Ginori, and Rucellai* (Princeton: University Press, 1977); as well as several essays in Roger J. Crum and John T. Paoletti, eds., *Renaissance Florence: A Social History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), most notably those by Guido Ruggiero and Natalie Thomas.

Lucrezia's interior surroundings and Bartolomeo's cityscape both exhibit a particularly-Florentine architectural vocabulary to firmly place the sitters in Florence.

3.3 Bronzino and Hyper-Realistic Portraiture

Born just outside of Florence in Monticello on 17 November 1503, Agnolo di Cosimo – more commonly known as Bronzino – grew up in the turbulent early decades of the sixteenth century.¹⁹ His earliest artistic instruction was with an unknown painter. His training with Raffaellino del Garbo, begun at the age of 11, lasted only a year, after which he began an apprenticeship with Jacopo Pontormo. Their relationship progressed from one of student-apprentice to collaborators and comrades. His close working and personal relationship with Pontormo was noted in the elder artist's diary.²⁰ Early in his career, Bronzino's brushwork and compositions were derivative of his master and Bronzino's early work exhibits a strong similarity to Pontormo's. This has resulted in a connoisseurial minefield where the authorship of several paintings remains contested.²¹

¹⁹ More information on both the life and work of Bronzino can be found in several monographs, including Arthur K. McComb, *Agnolo Bronzino; His Life and Works* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928); Charles McCorquodale, *Bronzino*, 1st U.S. ed (New York: Harper & Row, 1981); Deborah Parker, *Bronzino: Renaissance Painter as Poet* (Cambridge, U.K. ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Elizabeth Pilliod, *Pontormo, Bronzino, Allori: A Genealogy of Florentine Art* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001); Brock, *Bronzino*; Maurizia Tazartes, *Bronzino* (Milano: Rizzoli, 2003). See additionally the exhibition catalogs Carmen Bambach, ed., *The Drawings of Bronzino* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2010); Falciani and Natali, *Bronzino, Artist and Poet at the Court of the Medici*; Brock, *Bronzino*.

²⁰ Their later relationship is chronicled in Pontormo's diary, where the artist records many meals shared with Bronzino. In November 1555, for example, the artist noted, "novembre adi primo, venerdi mattina, desinai con Bro anguilla e pesci d'Arno." Just two weeks later, Pontormo recorded that "adi 17 desinai con Bro e cenai." Pontormo, *Diario* (Milano: Abscondita, 2005), 35. Bro was one of several nicknames by which Pontormo called his former student. The relationship noted in Pontormo's typically brief and sometimes cryptic style in his private diary reflects a collegial atmosphere of friendship.

²¹ For more on Bronzino's early career see Brock, *Bronzino*; Elizabeth Pilliod "The Life of Bronzino," in Bambach, *The Drawings of Bronzino*, 3-10. Antonio Natali's essay "Agnolo Bronzino's early Years: Florence, then Pesaro" in Falciani and Natali, *Bronzino, Artist and Poet at the Court of the Medici*, particularly pages 38-43, discusses difficulties in identifying the individual hands during this period

A subsequent step in Bronzino's artistic development occurred during the Siege of Florence (1529-1530), when Bronzino fled Florence.²² He resided for a period in Urbino, where he found employment at the ducal court of Duke Francesco Maria I della Rovere. While working in Urbino from 1530 to 1532, he executed the *Portrait of Guidobaldo II della Rovere* (fig. 37).²³ The painting depicts the future Duke of Urbino in armor ornamented in gold. The sumptuous dress is only one of the many suits of armor Guidobaldo II would come to commission from Filippo Negroli, the most famous armorer of the mid-sixteenth century. Visible at Guidobaldo's elbow are swaths of his doublet made of red damask silk. His right hand rests on a helmet similarly damascened and with a Greek inscription that proclaims "It will certainly be as I have decided."²⁴ With both sword and dagger visible, the portrait presents the teenage noble as an icon of masculinity. At Urbino, Bronzino experienced a well-established, highly-cultured court. This portrait not only marks a distinct divergence from his master's style, but also provides a glimpse into Bronzino's promise as a court painter.²⁵ Much as Bartolomeo Panciatichi's experiences in France primed him to take an active role in the diplomatic and literary aspects of the nascent Florentine court, Bronzino's experiences in Urbino – in particular that of creating a court portrait – may well have assisted him in gaining a place at the court of Cosimo I.

²² For an introduction to contemporary Florentine political history, see Chapter Two, especially pages 26-34.

²³ For more on this portrait see Konrad Eisenbichler, "Bronzino's Portrait of Guidobaldo II della Rovere," *Renaissance and Reformation* 12 (Winter 1988): 21-33; Patricia Simons, "Alert and Erect: Masculinity in Some Italian Renaissance Portraits of Fathers and Sons," in *Gender Rhetorics: Postures of Dominance and Submission in History*, ed. Richard C. Texler (Birmingham, N.Y.: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1994), 171-5; Carolyn Springer, *Armour and Masculinity in the Italian Renaissance* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 73-103. Springer details Guidobaldo's self-fashioning in relation to his portraits and the armor he commissioned.

²⁴ Eisenbichler, "Bronzino's Portrait of Guidobaldo II della Rovere," considers the inscription in the context of Guidobaldo's impending marriage.

²⁵ Philippe Costamagna, "De la florentinité des portraits de Pontormo et de Bronzino," *Paragone* 62 (2005): 50-75 considers this a formative experience for the young artist.

On his return to Florence, Bronzino accepted several portrait commissions in which he portrayed a series of serious and scholarly young men. His *Portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatichi* is sometimes discussed in concert with these works from the 1530s, owing in particular to the use of a generalized *fiorentinità*. This is found in the architectural background and usually associated with an anti-Medicean sentiment. However, as this chapter will elucidate, the reference to Florentine cultural history serves a very different purpose in the depiction of Bartolomeo, nearly inverting the subtle political resonance of Bronzino's earlier works.

Bronzino was first employed at the court of Cosimo as one of several artists commissioned to execute decorations for the wedding of the young duke to Eleonora of Toledo in 1539. By the mid-1540s he was firmly established in the ducal court, a favored painter who executed small private commissions and large-scale altarpieces. Although Bronzino's portraits were numerous and varied, Bronzino's style remained consistent from the 1540s through the 1560s.²⁶ These highly-finished, evenly-illumed depictions of individual sitters allowed viewers to relish the precisely-observed details of hair, clothing, and objects. A good example is his portrait of *Portrait of Cosimo I de' Medici in Armor* (fig. 38).

Bronzino directed a large workshop which assisted not only in large scale narrative and religious works, but also in the creation of portraits of the ducal family. The workshop was particularly active in making miniatures and copies after Bronzino's originals that were sent abroad as diplomatic gifts.²⁷ While Bronzino and his workshop produced at least twenty-five autograph versions of the *Portrait of Cosimo I de' Medici in Armor*, the Uffizi version is

²⁶ More comprehensive surveys of Bronzino's portraiture can be found in both Falciani and Natali, *Bronzino, Artist and Poet at the Court of the Medici* and Brock, *Bronzino*.

²⁷ For a more complete picture of Bronzino as court painter and portraitist, see especially Henk Th van Veen, *Cosimo I De' Medici and His Self-Representation in Florentine Art and Culture*, trans. Andrew P. McCormick (Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Andrea Gáldy, *Agnolo Bronzino: Medici Court Artist in Context* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2013).

generally accepted as the original. The bust-length portrait of Cosimo I, painted when the duke was approximately twenty-four years old, shows him dressed in armor and set in front of a heavily draped, dark blue curtain.²⁸ His pose is a common one, with Cosimo's right shoulder turned toward the viewer and his neck turned in the opposite direction. This pose enlivens the sitter, adding a dynamism to a genre sometimes seen as static.²⁹ However, the Duke of Florence does not meet the viewer's gaze. Rather he looks to his right. He is crisply delineated and detached from the surrounding space. Bronzino creates a sense of depth through the overt differentiation of materials, the recession of Cosimo's left shoulder, and the voluminous curtain which occupies a generous amount of space.

The portrait is illuminated evenly, thereby allowing the viewer to discern details of the figure's physiognomy and armor. Bronzino demarcates individual hairs in Cosimo I's sparse beard. He further details the duke's armor, with its carefully studied reflections of light. Among floral and geometric patterns, a depiction of the Medici coat of arms is positioned centrally on his breastplate.

Bronzino's depiction emphasizes the materiality of the items represented. This representation of Cosimo I, closely cropped to the figure, presents the Florentine Duke as an object of study. The viewer considers his stern and alert expression or his meticulously-decorated armor, but cannot interact with him as a personality. While Bronzino and others created life-size imagery of the duke, this particular series of portraits presents Cosimo as a figure removed from

²⁸ The armored princely portrait was recently in vogue, especially following Titian's now-lost portrait of *Charles V in Armor*, a clear influence on this work. On the portrait of Charles V, see Joanna Woods-Marsden, "The Sword in Titian's Portraits of Emperor Charles V," *Artibus et Historiae* 34, no. 67 (2013): 201-218.

²⁹ For more on this particular pose see Campbell, *Renaissance Portraits: European Portrait-Painting in the 14th, 15th and 16th Centuries*, 104-5. A more general discussion of poses in Renaissance portraiture can be found in Lorne Campbell et al., eds., *Renaissance Faces: Van Eyck to Titian* (London: National Gallery Company Limited, 2008). Especially pertinent to the topic are two essays within the catalog: Luke Syson, "Witnessing Faces, Remembering Souls," 14-31; Jennifer Fletcher, "The Renaissance Portrait: Functions, uses and Display," 46-65.

his audience. In contrast, Bartolomeo Panciatichi engages the viewer directly. Chronologically between the portraits of serious young men and the likenesses executed for the court, Bronzino completed the *Portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatichi*, a portrait which marks a significant shift in how Florentine-ness is depicted.

3.4 Bartolomeo Panciatichi: A Foreign Florentine?

The illegitimate child of a Florentine merchant, Bartolomeo Panciatichi was born on 21 June 1507 in Lyon, France.³⁰ He remained in the French city for most of the first three decades of his life. A city with a significant Florentine population, Lyon maintained a strong Italian mercantile community and interests. Bartolomeo's father, Bartolomeo the Elder, was the scion of a pro-Medici family who received the title *conte palatino* (Count Palatine) from Leo X, the first Medici pope.³¹ A successful merchant and banker, the elder Panciatichi secured a place for his son as a page at the court of Francis I. This courtly training was formative for the younger Bartolomeo. Bartolomeo remained in France until 1529, when he left for two years of study in

³⁰His biography is included in Luigi Passerini, *Genealogia e Storia della Famiglia Panciatichi* (Firenze: Tipi di M. Cellini ec., 1858), 68-72. Passerini focuses on his literary output. Another biography can be found in Giorgio Caravale, "PANCATICH, Bartolomeo in 'Dizionario Biografico,'" accessed October 26, 2016, [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/bartolomeo-panciatichi_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/bartolomeo-panciatichi_(Dizionario-Biografico)). For more information on the life of Bartolomeo Panciatichi see Massimo Firpo, *Gli Affreschi Di Pontormo a San Lorenzo: Eresia, Politica E Cultura Nella Firenze Di Cosimo I* (Torino: G. Einaudi, 1997), 359-70; Elena Aloia, *I Panciatichi degli Uffizi* (PhD diss., Università degli Studi di Perugia, 2008/9); Lynette M.F. Bosch, "Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy in Agnolo Bronzino's Paintings for Bartolomeo and Lucrezia Panciatichi," in *Agnolo Bronzino: The Muse of Florence*, ed. Liana De Girolami Cheney (Washington, DC: New Academia Publishing, 2014), 35-130, especially 41-50; Elana Aloia, "Culture, Faith, and Love: Bartolomeo Panciatichi," in *Agnolo Bronzino: The Muse of Florence*, ed. Liana De Girolami Cheney (Washington, DC: New Academia Publishing, 2014), 131-174. Other sources of information can be found among his own letters, many of which are preserved in the collections of the *Accademia Fiorentina* as well as in the *Carte Stroziane* house at the *Archivio di Stato di Firenze*.

³¹ The Florentine merchant Bartolomeo will hereafter be referred to as Bartolomeo the Elder to differentiate the father from the son, the latter of whom is the subject of Bronzino's portrait. These honors, according Passerini, *Genealogia e storia della famiglia Panciatichi*, 66, included "titolo e privilegio di conte palatino" and inclusion among the knights of the order of St. Peter.

Padua.³² There is no extant documentation to suggest that he visited Florence during this period, which was marked by political chaos and martial upheaval.

Returning to Lyon in 1531, Bartolomeo pursued his humanistic interests. Although legitimized on 29 March 1531 by Bishop Alessandro Campeggi, Bartolomeo showed little interest in inheriting his father's mercantile projects. After his father's death in 1533 he left the running of the company to relatives. Instead he continued to develop interests in courtly activities. His poetry, written in both Latin and Italian, and other varied cultural activities brought him into contact with French writers such as Etienne Dolet and François Rabelais, both of whom were resident in Lyon in the early 1530s.³³

In the early decades of the sixteenth century, Lyon was a thriving city and an international center of mercantile exchange. It also proved to be a hot-bed of religious thought and controversy, as Lutheran ideas spread through the middle and upper classes. Bartolomeo may have been exposed to Lutheranism as early as 1520, while still a teenager.³⁴ By the 1530s, after his return to France, he was in contact with members of French Protestant, or Huguenot, circles and actively interested in the new reformist ideas.³⁵ It was likely his friendship with Jean de Vauzelles, a poet and priest, which brought Bartolomeo into contact with the French spiritual leaders of the evangelical movement.³⁶ Further, it is thought that Vauzelles introduced him to

³² Carlo Falciani, "Bronzino and the Panciaticchi," in *Bronzino, Artist and Poet at the Court of the Medici*, eds. Carlo Falciani and Antonio Natali (Firenze: Mandragora, 2010), 153 suggests that it was during this period that he may have first met and befriended Benedetto Varchi, as both moved within Aristotelian circles in the university city.

³³ Caravale, "PANCATIACHI, Bartolomeo in 'Dizionario Biografico.'"

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Falciani, "Bronzino and the Panciaticchi," 153

³⁶ Among others, Vauzelles knew Lefevre d'Étaples, Bishop Guillaume Briçonnet, and Louis de Berquin. Like the spiritual leaders, Vauzelles could name Margaret of Navarre as his patron. For more on Vauzelles see Elsa Kammerer, *Jean de Vauzelles et le creuset Lyonnais: un humaniste catholique au service de Marguerite de Navarre entre France, Italie et Allemagne (1520 - 1550)* (Genève: Droz, 2013).

Margaret of Navarre, sister to King Francis I. An admirer of Florentine culture in general and Dante specifically, Margaret of Navarre resided in Lyon. Panciatichi later acted as the intermediary between the court of Cosimo I and Margaret of Navarre. Thus Bartolomeo's experiences in Lyon in the 1530s were instrumental in his later ambassadorial appointments as a representative of Duke Cosimo I and the Florentine government.

Sometime between 1528 and 1534, Bartolomeo married the Florentine Lucrezia di Gismondo Pucci.³⁷ Lucrezia came from a family of modest means. Through his marriage, Bartolomeo acquired a staunch Florentine connection, even though the couple remained in Lyon until the end of the decade.³⁸ Like many other Florentines living abroad, Bartolomeo and Lucrezia preferred the more stable political and economic situation of France. They remained in Lyon during the entire stewardship of Alessandro de' Medici. Nor did they return immediately upon Cosimo's succession in 1537. It was only in late 1538 or early 1539 that they finally settled in their 'native' city of Florence.

Although there are no known records of the younger Bartolomeo's presence in Florence before the late 1530s, Bartolomeo the Elder had visited the city in 1515. The elder Bartolomeo was present for the triumphant entry of Pope Leo X, the first Florentine pope, but he was not in Florence during the disruptive years of the Last Republic (1527-30). The family had traditionally been Medici supporters, and received honors and titles from Pope Leo X; nonetheless Bartolomeo the Elder proved sympathetic to the Republican cause. According to the nineteenth-century historian and genealogist Luigi Passerini, during the Siege of Florence (1529-30) the

³⁷ Three different dates have been proposed for their union: 1528, 1531, and 1534. Bosch, "Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy in Agnolo Bronzino's Paintings for Bartolomeo and Lucrezia Panciatichi," 44 summarizes the early literature. She believes 1534 the likeliest date while Aloia, "Culture, Faith, and Love: Bartolomeo Panciatichi," 133 supports 1531. The wedding likely took place outside of Florence, perhaps in Lyon.

³⁸ Bosch, "Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy in Agnolo Bronzino's Paintings for Bartolomeo and Lucrezia Panciatichi," 44.

elder Panciatichi did not heed the call issued by the Signoria on 31 December 1529 to all Florentines abroad to return home and defend their liberty.³⁹ Rather, Bartolomeo the Elder sent a large donation for his *patria*: he offered financial rather than physical and martial support to the Republican cause. There is little indication of his son's political predilections, except that he too was absent from the city during the siege and subsequent turmoil.

Following Alessandro de' Medici's assassination on 6 January 1537, Cosimo was named his successor. As will be discussed in the following chapter, Cosimo's role was ill-defined, as he was initially denied the title of duke.⁴⁰ As the provisional head of the government of Florence, the teenaged son of Giovanni dalle Bande Nere instilled little confidence, even in supporters of the Medici faction. Although Alessandro had been installed with Imperial backing, Cosimo did not initially enjoy the same support from Charles V. In the summer following Alessandro's murder, the Florentine exiles (*fuorusciti*), allied with the French, began a march toward the city. It was only with his decisive victory over the exiles at the Battle of Montemurlo in early August, 1537 that Cosimo established his position of strength. It was this triumph that convinced Charles V to formally recognize Cosimo as the legitimate ruler of Florence. Cosimo finally gained the hereditary title his predecessor had been granted: Duke of the Florentine Republic. With Cosimo's rise, Florence gradually took on the trappings of a courtly society. More than Alessandro, Cosimo I presented himself as a legitimate prince. Although early in his reign he continued Alessandro's practice of signing his name without a title, by mid-1541 he had begun

³⁹ "...soccorse generosamente di danaro la patria: per la qual cosa si meritò di essere dispensato dall'obbedire al decreto che richiamava tutti i cittadini assenti ad accorrere alla difesa della libertà, minacciandoli del bando di ribellione; di che si ha memoria in una deliberazione dei Signori de' 31 dicembre 1529." Passerini, *Genealogia e storia della famiglia Panciatichi*, 67.

⁴⁰ Archivio di Stato di Firenze, Senato dei 48, Provvisioni I, 119r.

signing his correspondences “*el Duca di Fiorenza*.”⁴¹ He additionally instituted the formation of a Florentine court. It was into this burgeoning courtly society that Bartolomeo Panciatichi, formerly a page at the French court, first arrived.

At the end of the 1530s, Bartolomeo and his wife Lucrezia relocated to Florence, though Bartolomeo occasionally returned to France of his own volition. On his arrival in Florence, Panciatichi was especially welcomed by literary circles then active in Florence.⁴² He was known primarily for his Latin poetry, although he was adept at vernacular literary pursuits as well. His acquaintance with French authors provided a conduit to French culture, as did his earlier letters with Pietro Aretino, written while in France. This correspondence included keeping Aretino apprised of French translations of his Italian works and sending the first French translations to Aretino, then in residence in Venice. Thus, by the time Panciatichi arrived in Florence he was an active intermediary between Italian and French literary circles.

Upon his arrival in Florence, Bartolomeo sought Florentine legitimacy in his cultural activities. His interests brought him to the *Accademia degli Umidi*, a literary academy devoted to the study of Italian verse, which he joined on 20 January 1541. Within weeks, he was chosen as one of four *riformatore*, or reformers, for the *Accademia Fiorentina*, and served as consul in 1545.⁴³ The *Accademia degli Umidi* has primarily been considered in scholarship as an example

⁴¹ Nicholas Scott Baker, *The Fruit of Liberty: Political Culture in the Florentine Renaissance, 1480-1550* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013), 192.

⁴² According to Caravale, “PANCATICHICI, Bartolomeo in ‘Dizionario Biografico,’” in Florence Bartolomeo “fu accolto con molta simpatia dagli ambienti letterari, desiderosi di uscire dall’isolamento culturale seguito alla fine della Repubblica e al costituirsi del Principato e felici dunque di avere un diretto canale di contatto con la cultura francese.”

⁴³ *Ibid.*

of the cultural policies and control enacted by Cosimo I.⁴⁴ Panciatichi however joined in the earlier period, when it was one of many academies that populated the Italian cultural landscape. Founded on 1 November 1540, the *Accademia degli Umidi*, or ‘Academy of Wet Ones,’ was initially made up of twelve members. The title references the *Accademia degli Infiammati* (‘Academy of Burning Ones’), a philosophical and literary society founded in Padua earlier in the same year. Although the title appears a parody, it, like the Paduan Academy, had a serious purpose and a formal constitution.⁴⁵ It included a dual mission statement: the first reflected an interest in the study of vernacular poetry and literature, and the second stressed these pursuits as a diverting pastime. It was therefore meant to be at once enlightening and entertaining for its members. Several of the most significant founding members were not professional writers or scholars but engaged in vocational trades. Giovan Battista Gelli, for example, was a shoemaker while Antonfrancesco Grazzini was an apothecary. Yet both produced popular literature despite making their living in trades. Thus, the dual nature of the *Accademia degli Umidi*, and its initial interest in both Petrarchan sonnets and burlesque poetry, reflects its diverse interests and membership.

As Inge Werner has demonstrated, the *Accademia degli Umidi* embraced freedom of expression as discussion, deliberation, and improvisation were valued.⁴⁶ There were few strictures regarding the literary pursuits of members nor were there any limits to membership. In its early instantiation, this academy offered the opportunity for freedom of speech in both style

⁴⁴ See for example essays by Margaret A. Gallucci, Mary Alexandra Watt, and Deanna Basile in Konrad Eisenbichler, ed., *The Cultural Politics of Duke Cosimo I De' Medici* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2001).

⁴⁵ Werner, “The Heritage of the Umidi: Performative Poetry in the Early Accademia Fiorentina,” 263.

⁴⁶ *Ibid*, 257-84.

and content. The three months or so in which the Umidians existed autonomously of ducal oversight was a period in which the academy sponsored several vernacular poetry contests.

What, then, was the appeal of membership to Bartolomeo Panciatichi in January 1541? It was his entrée into the cultural milieu of his newly adoptive city, providing him with literary legitimacy. Bartolomeo joined the *Accademia degli Umidi* just two months after its founding. On 11 February 1541, Cosimo decreed a set of reforms that included renaming it the *Accademia Fiorentina*. Under ducal oversight and patronage, the Florentine Academy expanded its membership and influence but was also more closely managed. The emphasis on vernacular literature continued, though the performative aspect and freedom of expression were both curtailed. It is with this latter institution that Panciatichi is often associated, and not without reason. He served as part of the governance of the Florentine Academy as it came under ducal purview and his consulship is recorded as a particularly productive time for the academy.⁴⁷ Yet he joined before these changes took place, when the Umidian ideal was poetry written in the local language, sometimes dependent on traditional modes and references but other times not.

This suggests that Bartolomeo, known for his connection to and sympathy with French culture and his output in Latin, was interested in positioning himself as a part of the Florentine cultural landscape immediately following his arrival in Florence. His involvement in the *Accademia degli Umidi* helped him become part of a local literary clique.⁴⁸ It provided a means to insert himself into the cultural life of Florence and establish himself as a Florentine author. While his subsequent involvement and leadership of the *Accademia Fiorentina* helped ingratiate

⁴⁷ Caravale, “PANCATICHCHI, Bartolomeo in ‘Dizionario Biografico.’”

⁴⁸ It is possible that Benedetto Varchi, though still in self-imposed exile at the time, was one means of introduction to the group. In residence in Padua at the beginning of the 1540s, Varchi communicated with friends in Florence often, including reports of the Paduan *Accademia degli Infiammati*, in which he participated. Additionally, it is possible Bartolomeo came into contact with Benedetto Varchi during their educational experiences in Padua.

Bartolomeo with the duke, his initial involvement is one way he presented himself as a Florentine to local Florentine authors. As will be discussed below, the portrait by Bronzino positions Bartolomeo similarly within the Florentine landscape, in both the lived and painted versions of the city.

While the *Accademia Fiorentina* was Bartolomeo's entry first into the world of Florentine literary culture and second into the court of Duke Cosimo I, it was his French connections that would gain him an official position as Florentine ambassador to the French Court.⁴⁹ In a series of letters from the mid-1540s between Cosimo I and Pierfilippo Pandolfini, the Florentine ambassador to Venice, the duke expressly laid out instructions for the behavior he expected of his official representatives.⁵⁰ In these letters, Cosimo I stressed the necessity of putting the state – and Florentine interests – first in all negotiations. He further repeated certain phrases in relation to how he expected his ambassadors to comport themselves, primarily with *prudentia*, *accortezza*, and *diligentia* (prudence, perspicacity, and diligence).⁵¹ He emphasized the need to treat others with *cortesia* (courtesy) as well. Thus Cosimo I clearly elucidated the qualities he sought in an ambassador. These virtues correspond to the sitter's presentation in the *Portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatichi*.

By the mid-1540s, Bartolomeo had become a trusted representative of the Florentine ruler, who made requests on his time and services. His most important function was to provide

⁴⁹ He was later appointed Senator and served as the Commissary to Pisa and then Pistoia, per Passerini, *Genealogia e storia della famiglia Panciatichi*, 70-72. Prior to his official appointment as ambassador, Bartolomeo undertook several trips to France, several of which are thought to have been on Cosimo's behalf. Bosch, "Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy in Agnolo Bronzino's Paintings for Bartolomeo and Lucrezia Panciatichi," 46. Further, Aloia, "Culture, Faith, and Love: Bartolomeo Panciatichi," 136 states in her discussion of Bartolomeo's leadership roles within the *Accademia Fiorentina* that "The importance of the offices held by Bartolomeo in the *Accademia Fiorentina* symbolizes the reliance the duke placed on him and confirms once again that he was an important instrument of Cosimo's policy."

⁵⁰ Archivio di Stato di Firenze, Carte Stroziane, Serie I, 68.

⁵¹ See for example Archivio di Stato di Firenze, Carte Stroziane, Serie I, 68: 11, 69.

insight into the French court. He maintained regular diplomatic correspondences with the Florentine court even when he was in Lyon on personal business. For example, in May of 1547, it was Bartolomeo who wrote to the Duke – via a letter to his majordomo Pier Francesco Riccio – of the impending coronation of Henry II. Diplomatic contact between Florence and France was officially suspended in July 1547, when, at the coronation of Henry II, the Florentine ambassador was preceded by ambassadors from Mantua and Ferrara.⁵² Although Duke Cosimo I tasked Bartolomeo with treating the issue with King Henry II and Queen Catherine de' Medici in his 1549 visit, it was not resolved. On this particular visit, Panciatichi returned to France in an official capacity, serving as Cosimo's consul. He attended the French court as an official guest, marking the occasion of the birth of the fourth royal child.

Although there were no permanent ambassadors posted between the two courts, Bartolomeo continued to serve an important function in exchanging information. His position within Florence was well-served by his upbringing in, familiarity with, and contacts in France. However, his time in France also introduced him to Reformist ideas, and exposed him to potential trouble.

His previous engagement with Reformist concepts was well known abroad and in Florence, where he engaged in the discourse on Reformist philosophies present at Cosimo's court in the 1540s. Unlike many of his contemporaries, Bartolomeo was not engaged in only intellectual or theoretical exploration. Involved with Huguenot circles in Lyons, Bartolomeo was recognized by the early 1550s to possess heretical and non-Catholic views. His Reformist ideas were eventually brought to the attention of the Inquisition. Bartolomeo was accused of heresy

⁵² The relationship was strained by wars between the French and Charles V and the Holy Roman Empire, including over land in Italy. Florentine-French diplomatic relations were not officially re-established until the reign of Ferdinando I (r. 1587-1609).

when his name was mentioned among a clique of heretics discovered on 6 December 1551, though his arrest may have taken place later in the month.⁵³ Tried in Florence, Panciatichi escaped a more severe sentence thanks to the intercession of Duke Cosimo I. With Cosimo's support, he and the other noblemen were spared from the public humiliation meted out to the so-called heretics. Instead, he was made to pay a hefty fine. Although Bartolomeo combatted debts for several years, he would encounter no further difficulties with the Inquisition or in relation to his renounced Reformist beliefs. Additionally, Cosimo continued to support Bartolomeo despite his arrest. Bartolomeo was eventually cleared of all charges.⁵⁴

Even before his complete acquittal, however, his political and humanist careers resumed. On 24 February 1552 he was again elected consul of the *Accademia Fiorentina*. In 1567 he was appointed a senator, and in 1568 selected commissar in Pisa. Ten years later he was appointed commissar in Pistoia, the city from which his family originated. He died in Pistoia in 1582.

Bartolomeo's continued value to Cosimo I as a diplomat was a key motivation for the duke's intercession on his behalf. On 9 January 1552 Cosimo I referred explicitly to Bartolomeo's role, commercially and otherwise, as a Florentine representative in France.⁵⁵ Cosimo's defense of Bartolomeo as a Florentine citizen with an important political role to play suggests that his role at both Florentine and French courts remained a key aspect of his identity and socio-political status.

⁵³ At the time, Panciatichi was absent from Florence, serving in official capacity in France. He was subsequently recalled to Florence while Lorenzo Pagni was sent to replace him. For more on Panciatichi's religious beliefs, arrest, and trial see Firpo, *Gli Affreschi Di Pontormo a San Lorenzo*, 359-371.

⁵⁴ For more on Bartolomeo's trial and especially his communication with Cosimo I, see Lynette M.F. Bosch, "Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy in Agnolo Bronzino's Paintings for Bartolomeo and Lucrezia Panciatichi," 35-130; Aloia, "Culture, Faith, and Love: Bartolomeo Panciatichi," 134-39; Caravale, "PANCATICH, Bartolomeo in 'Dizionario Biografico.'"

⁵⁵ See Caravale, "PANCATICH, Bartolomeo in 'Dizionario Biografico.'"

3.5 Bartolomeo Panciatichi: A Florentine

Bronzino's *Portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatichi* addresses little of this biography.

Commonly dated to 1540-1542, the portrait is sometimes associated with Bartolomeo's admission into the *Accademia degli Umidi*.⁵⁶ Significantly, Bronzino joined the academy in February of 1541, just days before the new constitution brought the association under the aegis of Duke Cosimo I.⁵⁷ If they had not previously been brought into contact, Bartolomeo and Bronzino certainly encountered each other at the *Accademia Fiorentina*, where they shared their ideas with men such as Luca Martini, Ugolino Martelli, and later Benedetto Varchi.

In the portrait, perhaps the result of their introduction and subsequent exchange of ideas at the *Accademia Fiorentina*, Bronzino depicts Bartolomeo as the consummate courtier.⁵⁸ The book he holds corresponds in dimensions and materials to a secular rather than religious type. His carefully groomed facial hair and immaculate dress lend Bartolomeo the air of an affluent aristocrat. Panciatichi's elegant costume at once communicates wealth and status. The use, for example, of metallic thread in creating the weft patterning of his doublet contributes to his air as an individual of refined sophistication. The materials and cut of his outfit place him in the upper echelons of Florentine society. His dress further connects him with local fashion and especially the sartorial preferences of both the Florentine elite and the fledgling court.

⁵⁶ Although the exact date of both commission and completion are uncertain, the work is dated to the first half of the 1540s without exception.

⁵⁷ Bronzino joined as part of a 42-member addition, substantially enlarging the institution and sponsored by the duke. This was a carefully designed move to bring the academy under the aegis of the duke's larger political and cultural control.

⁵⁸ There are no extant archival documents connected to this commission. I suspect that the final product was a joint project, between Bronzino and Bartolomeo, with the sitter supplying the overall message he wished the work to convey and the artist determining many of the means to do so. The process may have been collaborative, especially given their proximity due to the *Accademia Fiorentina*, which would have provided easy access between artist and patron and a free exchange of ideas.

There was a predilection for black in portraiture from this time. One need look no further than Bronzino's own corpus, where portraits of Ugolino Martelli and several others depict the sitter outfitted in black dress. During the decades when the Florentine court and courtly society were still nascent, black was already understood as fashionable and refined.⁵⁹ Although black was not the most expensive color to produce, it required skill on the part of the dyer as well as multiple dye baths. According to Elizabeth Currie, "high-quality black clothing," such as that worn by Bartolomeo, was a mark of "cultural prestige."⁶⁰ A staple of the dress of the Florentine elite by 1540, black clothing reflected its prevalence at well-established foreign courts, most notably the Spanish. However, French fashion of the period was significantly different, as it was famously varied.

While the cut of many items of Italian, French, and Spanish clothing may have been similar, the colors and patterns of the cloth were not. Paintings and colored prints depicting the court of Francis I reveal more bright and colorful dress (figs. 39-40). Black was present but it was not consistently a dominant color. In the sixteenth-century, French fashion was capricious. In his treatise on *Habiti Antichi et Moderni*, Cesare Vecellio observed that the French, "never maintain one style of dress but change it according to their caprice..."⁶¹ While this treatise dated from the last decades of the century, the comment is especially applicable to the rule of King Francis I. In the 1530s and early 1540s, French fashion was constantly evolving in no small measure due to the fancies of the most powerful trendsetter: the king. Francis I would dress in a

⁵⁹ See the discussion of black dress in Chapter Two, pages 56-57. Additionally, Benedetto Varchi repeatedly establishes black as the fashion of Florentine elite men in his *Storia Fiorentina*, ed. Lelio Arbib (Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2003), for example pages 123-124.

⁶⁰ Currie, *Fashion and Masculinity in Renaissance Florence*, 101.

⁶¹ Cesare Vecellio, *The Clothing of the Renaissance world: Europe, Asia, Africa, the Americas: Cesare Vecellio's Habiti Antichi et Moderni*, trans. Margaret F. Rosenthal and Ann Rosalind Jones (London: Thames and Hudson, Ltd., 2008), 326.

new style on a whim, in part as a test of loyalty. His courtiers therefore had to show their ability to change quickly and follow suit in adopting his ever-changing styles. At the court of the French king, fashion tended toward bright colors, gold, and ostentatious displays of luxury.⁶² Further, these splendid costumes were worn by both sexes, as men adopted the magnificent – and occasionally outlandish – dress of their king. The bright colors of a Frenchman’s costume would have served as an overt marker of foreignness in Florentine society, especially among the growing court and humanist circles in which Bartolomeo first found a place. Bartolomeo might have maintained French fashion as an expression of his past and his courtly experiences. Yet he self-consciously chose to adopt the dress of his new home as a means to establish himself as a Florentine rather than a foreigner.

Yet Bartolomeo, for all his assertions of Florentine identity, chose to include one overt marker of otherness. In addition to the distinguishing physiognomic features described above, the most blatant marker of individuality is his facial hair. Changes in masculine grooming fashions had been noted during the Siege of Florence, when men chose to cut their hair short and grew out their beards. However, the careful grooming of Bartolomeo’s beard suggests not a political connection but rather a social claim to identity.

Douglas Biow considered the practical advantages for the bearded man in a recent study.⁶³ In accordance to a recommendation of Castiglione, who suggests that it is sometimes necessary to mask one’s expression, Biow explored how the beard could serve as both a

⁶² François Rabelais, *Gargantua and Pantagruel*, trans. M. A. Screech (New York: Penguin Books, 2006), although telling the satirical story of two giants, offers insight and first-hand observation of noble dress at the court of Francis I. In particular, Chapter 8, “How they appareled Gargantua,” provides concise description of the embroidery and gilt that covered the velvet and silks worn at court. Rabelais additionally notes that the costume of men was as magnificent and splendid as that of women.

⁶³ Douglas Biow, *On the Importance of Being an Individual in Renaissance Italy: Men, Their Professions, and Their Beards* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015).

distinctive way to identify an individual, while simultaneously concealing his countenance.

Having established that beards were fashionable in Florence by the time this portrait was painted, Biow observed that while growing a beard was a means of conforming to local fashion, the type of beard could be a means for differentiating oneself.⁶⁴

The swallowtail beard is an adaptation of the forked beard, which first came into fashion as early as the fourteenth century. The mid-sixteenth century version, which increased in popularity across the continent, features two distinct forks that are longer than the earlier iteration. Although wildly fashionable, this particular style was the most popular in France in the 1540s, gracing the faces of many important figures of the court.⁶⁵ A case study of the evolving facial hair of Jean de Tais (1510-1553), a gentlemen of the chamber of Francis I and later grand master of the artillery (*grand maître de l'artillerie*) in the French army, in a series of portrait drawings from the Clouet workshop illustrates changes in trendy French beards.⁶⁶ In his portrait drawing from the studio of Jean Clouet dating from the mid-1530s, his beard is trimmed shorter, his mustache thinner (fig. 41). Yet in a portrait drawing from the studio of Francois Clouet from the following decade, his mustache is both thicker and longer and his beard styled into two distinct, vertically-elongated prongs (fig. 42). Jean de Tais updated his facial hair to mirror

⁶⁴ In 16th C Italy, “wearing a beard thus signaled conformity to a general fashion, but the type of beard you wore could spell out publicly, and indeed conspicuously, your own affiliation with a particular style and, at the same time, provide the opportunity to assert your unique style within that group context as a mode of performatively addressing the world through your face.” Ibid, 195. Jean-Marie Le Gall and Antoine Hotman, *Un idéal masculin?: barbes et moustaches, XVe-XVIIIe siècles* (Paris: Payot, 2011) provides a thorough introduction to the topic of early modern masculine facial hair.

⁶⁵ In England, the two forks of the beard extended more laterally than the examples in French and Italian portraiture of the same period.

⁶⁶ Alternatively referred to as Jean, seigneur de Thiais or Jean de Taix.

current trends.⁶⁷ Portrait drawings from the Clouet studio in the 1540s further provide a plethora of individuals with the distinctive swallowtail beard, confirming its popularity.

Italian texts use two different verbs to discuss the beard: *crescere* (to grow) or *portrare* (to wear).⁶⁸ In their respective treatises, both Baldassare Castiglione and Giovanni della Casa discuss facial hair as something worn (*portare*), similar to clothing. This suggests not only the ability to adapt it for a situation, but also the purposeful donning of a beard – like a doublet – as a means of asserting one’s identity. Bartolomeo’s choice to wear a beard would not have been unusual in France or Florence. Yet the particular style, with which he proclaimed his individuality, asserted a French connection. This conspicuous beard connected him with the French court and fashion. Yet the clothing – which is always worn, never grown – is distinctly Florentine.

Bartolomeo’s preference for Florentine styles extends to the cap perched atop his head at a jaunty angle. In his history of Florence, *Storia Fiorentina*, Benedetto Varchi explains that before the Siege of Florence upper-class men tended to wear the *cappuccino alla civile*, as discussed in the previous chapter.⁶⁹ However, during the siege men turned to a more austere head covering, which scholars have associated with a more martial manifestation of masculine identity.⁷⁰ That this basic type remained a popular cap in the decade following the siege is

⁶⁷ Similarly, a late 1540s portrait drawing of Antoine de Bourbon – later known as the King of Navarre and the father of Henry IV – portrays him with a swallowtail beard while a painting from just six years later by Francois Clouet in 1556 depicts the same sitter with a shorter trimmed and rounder beard.

⁶⁸ Biow observes that one could therefore “publicly and conspicuously stage the beard.” Biow, *On the Importance of Being an Individual in Renaissance Italy: Men, Their Professions, and Their Beards*, 206.

⁶⁹ Varchi, *Storia fiorentina*, vol. II, 85-86.

⁷⁰ The observation is found in Luca Landucci, *A Florentine Diary from 1450 to 1516*, trans. Alice de Rosen Jervis (New York: Arno Press, 1969), 291-92. Other scholars who have explored this shift include Cecil Roth, *The Last Florentine Republic* (London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1925); Richard C. Trexler, *Public Life in Renaissance Florence* (New York: Academic Press, 1980); Baker, *The Fruit of Liberty*. Baker, 126 expands on masculinity in response to this context, concluding that “The masculine identity of the office-holding class had been closely bound

attested to in portraiture from the time, including two representations of Ugolino Martelli by Bronzino and an unknown Florentine painter (figs. 34, 43).⁷¹ The inclusion of both a feather and a hat brooch - or *fermaglio* - was also common. The imagery on Bartolomeo's *fermaglio* is impossible to make out with certainty, but both the feather and *fermaglio* add a decorative flourish. The cap, like Bartolomeo's clothing, conforms to Italian and specifically Florentine modes of dress. The sitter's choice of fashion is reinforced by the architectural setting.

Beyond the balustrade, an eerily silent city, devoid of other residents, stretches into the distance. This city is at once both familiar and distorted. Individual parts are taken from the general vocabulary of Florentine Renaissance architecture, including the *pietra serena* ornament, the rusticated corners, and the distinctive windows over Bartolomeo's right shoulder. These individual elements form a pastiche of the contemporaneous architecture rather than reproducing any particular buildings. In this way, the portrait ties Bartolomeo to the city in general, but to no specific topographical locale. The ambiguity is a visual parallel to his ambiguous position as a newly-arrived foreigner.

3.6 Visible *Fiorentinità*

Bartolomeo's positioning out of doors prompts one to further consider the portrait's counterpart. Lucrezia is situated in a typical Florentine interior. The conventions of such paired portraits of a married couple do not lead one to expect such a contrast of settings. In several other examples from both the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the presumed husband and wife inhabit

up w/notions of virtue and the governance of the city. Altering this uniform had repercussions for the imagined community of the office-holding class and the conceptions of masculinity that underlay it: changing how men dressed in Florence changed their role and identity, 126.

⁷¹ The red *berretto* worn by the sitter in Pontorno's *Portrait of a Halberdier* is similar in style, and significant here for its use of an attached insignia. However given the continued debate over the sitter's identity, it serves only to make the point of the change toward a hat without a wider rim and ribbons, elements that were part of the *cappuccino alla civile*.

the same space.⁷² This can be seen for example in Lorenzo Lotto's *Double Portrait of a Couple* from the 1520s and the contemporaneous *Portrait of a Man and Woman* previously ascribed to Andrea del Sarto and today with an anonymous attribution (figs. 44-45). In both, the couple are depicted on a single panel and occupying a shared interior space.

Although completed approximately a century earlier, Filippo Lippi's *Portrait of a Woman with a Man at the Casement* (fig. 46) is especially instructive. This innovative portrait is often identified as the first double portrait of the Renaissance. In it, the man and woman are each depicted in profile, their gazes interlocked. The elegantly-cloaked woman is securely positioned in a carefully ordered interior, a view of a landscape visible beyond her right shoulder. Conversely, the masculine figure, whose face appears through the window, stands outside the room. This pairing of male and female with exterior and domestic interior would be continued in later double-portraits, including those of the Panciatichi.

An alternative format for a paired portrait isolates each sitter on his or her own unique panel. Often the couple share a background, thereby uniting them across space, most famously in Piero della Francesca's double portrait of Federico di Montefeltro and Battista Sforza, the Duke and Duchess of Urbino. This convention was especially popular at the end of the fifteenth century, as seen, for example, in pendant portraits of husband and wife by Ercole de' Roberti and the 1494 portraits by the Maestro delle Storie del Pane (figs. 47-50).⁷³

Conversely, the paired *Portrait of a Young Man* and *Portrait of a Young Woman* attributed to Domenico Ghirlandaio in the Huntington Library (figs. 51-52) present significant

⁷² For more on marital portraits see Andrea Bayer, ed., *Art and Love in Renaissance Italy* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008); Diane Owen Hughes, "Representing the Family: Portraits and Purposes in Early Modern Italy," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 17 (1986): 7-38.

⁷³ The potential influence of the ubiquitous northern type – exemplified in the works of Hans Memling among others – in which the two sitters, though on separate panels, are clearly represented in the same carefully detailed interior may play a part in the popularity of these works in Italy at the end the fifteenth century.

differences in the depiction of the two sitters.⁷⁴ Distinctions in the pose and setting of these figures have been discussed as a clear indication of a gendered difference in Renaissance portraits and society. In her seminal essay “Women in Frames,” Patricia Simons noted that the male sitter was depicted “in front of a landscape with a city and worldly activity, but the female was...cut off in a loggia and housebound.”⁷⁵ She suggested that while the male sitter could be depicted in an interior or exterior, the female sitter, following gendered conventions, was more often positioned indoors.

As the preceding brief survey indicates, there were multiple options for dual portraits by the 1540s. Situating Bartolomeo exterior to the palazzo was a conscious decision with more meaningful implications than conformity with gendered spaces. It allowed for a specific claim to the sitter’s *fiorentinità* despite the fact that he lacked a physical presence in the city for over three decades. This was achieved through the architectural backdrop, afforded by his position out of doors. As has been noted by several scholars, the architecture that initially seems rational becomes more uncertain the longer one engages with the painting, with changes in perspective most noticeable if one attempts to visually traverse the street behind Bartolomeo. Charles McCorquodale summarized the disorienting effect which he related to Pontormo’s ambiguous depictions of space. He observed that, “We are shown recognizable architectural features such as the three window frames at the left with their bizarre and inventive architraves, but they are presented in a repetitious, distorted way which immediately leads us to question their role in the picture; even more ambiguous is the large arch seen beyond, and the uncertain half-light coming

⁷⁴ Three versions of these portraits exist. For an introduction to the three see catalogue entries 40 a and b in Bayer, *Art and Love in Renaissance Italy*, 154-55.

⁷⁵ Patricia Simons, “Women in Frames: The Gaze, the Eye, the Profile in Renaissance Portraiture,” *History Workshop Journal* 25 (1988): 24.

from the left.”⁷⁶ While previous scholars have emphasized this sense of disjuncture, a more nuanced understanding of the architecture allows for a precise exploration of Bartolomeo’s Florentine-ness.⁷⁷

The choice of backdrop carried its own connotations and implications. In his analysis of portrait backgrounds, Lorne Campbell suggested that, “Such arrangements of canopies and curtains would have brought to mind not only the curtained structures under which princes sat on ceremonial occasions and which were considered appropriate settings for the Virgin as Queen of Heaven, but also the curtained, tent-like constructions in which princes seem to have worshipped in public....”⁷⁸ Curtains therefore served to recall a luxurious interior, often associated with the court of a prince. Members of the ruling Medici family are often represented against traditional backdrops which contribute to their identity – the princely person, his armor, and particular facial features for example.⁷⁹ Yet in his portraits of primarily young men from the 1530s, Bronzino placed the sitters against architectural backgrounds that reflected contemporary architecture in Florence and her expanding territories.

Elizabeth Cropper was the first to propose a strategy for depicting and claiming *fiorentinità* in her 1985 essay on Bronzino’s portraits of the 1530s and 1540s.⁸⁰ Focusing on Bronzino’s *Portrait of Ugolino Martelli*, Cropper considered “Bronzino’s purposeful artifice” as

⁷⁶ McCorquodale, *Bronzino*, 53.

⁷⁷ See for example Brock, *Bronzino*, 104-161.

⁷⁸ Campbell, *Renaissance Portraits: European Portrait-Painting in the 14th, 15th and 16th Centuries*, 109.

⁷⁹ One clear departure from this generalization is the *Portrait of Cosimo I as Orpheus* which places the prince, in the guise of Orpheus, in a particularized setting. However, it does reference the duke’s terrestrial seat.

⁸⁰ Elizabeth Cropper, “Prolegomena to a New Interpretation of Bronzino’s Florentine Portraits,” in *Renaissance Studies in Honor of Craig Hugh Smyth Volume 2*, Andrew Morrogh, ed. (Florence: Giunti-Barbera, 1985), 149-160.

a means to tie a sitter to Florentine culture.⁸¹ She further suggested that Bronzino was consciously developing a distinctive Florentine artistic language that allowed the cultural creations to transcend contemporaneous, chaotic politics. One means of establishing Florentine-ness was through cultural and artistic patrimony. Thus, the careful selection of books and the marble statue behind Ugolino Martelli was meant to reflect not only his individual character but his Florentine identity, which was linked with cultural achievements.

Maurice Brock answered Cropper's call for a more nuanced consideration of Bronzino's relationship with naturalism.⁸² In a discussion of Bronzino's portraiture, Brock explored the painter's relationship with Florentine cultural patrimony and tradition, concluding that the continuation and consistency of cultural and artistic traditions was a means to transcend the political upheaval. Although he did not connect it specifically to his discussion of the *Portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatichi*, Brock suggested that amidst the political turmoil, Florentine excellence was not found in socio-political structures, but in cultural traditions. The engagement with an art of reference and iconographic echoes served as a new means of asserting one's *fiorentinità*.

Scholarship on *fiorentinità* continues to move in several fruitful directions.⁸³ Claudia Lazzaro considered the implications of the unfinished New Sacristy project at San Lorenzo by Michelangelo in her article "Michelangelo's Medici Chapel and its Aftermath: Scattered Bodies and Florentine Identities under the Duchy."⁸⁴ Lazzaro explored how the unfinished state of the

⁸¹ Ibid, 151.

⁸² Brock's 2005 monograph on the artist divided Bronzino's oeuvre by type and subject. He addressed this topic in both his introduction and his chapters on portraiture. See especially Brock, *Bronzino*, 8, 104-161.

⁸³ Philippe Costamagna also addresses questions of cultural *fiorentinità* in "De la fiorentinità des Portraits de Pontormo et de Bronzino."

⁸⁴ Claudia Lazzaro, "Michelangelo's Medici Chapel and Its Aftermath: Scattered Bodies and Florentine Identities under the Duchy," *California Italian Studies* 6, no. 1 (January 1, 2016): 1-35, <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/4gv6c9b5>.

sculptures for the New Sacristy was experienced by viewers after Michelangelo's departure in 1534 and for the following three decades. She considered the importance of cultural heritage in Ducal Florence: "In the new political and social world in the decades after the imperial siege of Florence...Michelangelo's *capitani* provided models for portraits of patricians wanting to affirm and redefine their Florentine identity."⁸⁵ Of particular concern to this study, she addressed the repurposing of poses from the sculptures in portraits by Bronzino and Salviati, wherein they become a part of the cultural *fiorentinità* as they were adapted for a new context. Appropriating poses from Michelangelo's Florentine sculptures, especially the unfinished installation in the New Sacristy at San Lorenzo, became a means of asserting Florentine-ness. Lazzaro's work considered the use of cultural *fiorentinità* as a means of redefining civic identity. However, I consider its potential to contribute to Florentine identity at the ducal court, a suggestion that has not yet entered the discourse on *fiorentinità*.

The artistic adaptation could reveal information about both the artist and sitter. For the former, it revealed the artist's awareness of Florentine artistic traditions and the ability to adapt them. For the latter, it provided a way to transcend a chaotic and unstable Florence. By the time Bronzino executed Bartolomeo's portrait, he had already employed architectural *fiorentinità* in several previous paintings. Bronzino used the architectural idiom popular in Florence to create the backdrop for many of his portraits.

Maurice Brock considered Bronzino's "borrowing from Michelangelo and from local architecture so as to highlight the *fiorentinità* of both the patricians he portrayed and his own art of portraiture."⁸⁶ If the political realities of the city had shifted and been subverted, the cultural

⁸⁵ Ibid, 17

⁸⁶ Brock, *Bronzino*, 8.

continuity implied by the adaptation of a visual language of Florentine-ness could serve a renewed sense of civic identity. Brock further suggested that if one was unable to take pride in the city of one's birth, one could instead claim the cultural preeminence afforded by the state of Florence.⁸⁷ However, his discussion is largely focused on the literary and artistic echoes of Florentine achievement, rather than the architectural adaptations. Further, he emphasized the sitters' antagonistic attitude toward Florentine political policy.

One element as-yet unaddressed in the scholarly discussions of *fiorentinità* is the potential for architectural echoes of Florentine style buildings to ground Florentine-ness in a place. While cultural pre-eminence was emphasized, it is not only in the literary and philosophical spheres, but the visual as well.⁸⁸ Architectural depictions are discussed not as present representations of the city, but rather as references to achievements of the city's republican past. Yet its inclusion in the *Portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatichi* is not confined to earlier glories.

Architectural *fiorentinità*, popular in the works of Bronzino and especially those painted in the 1530s, became a common trope among many of the leading portraitists of the period. Pontormo adopts it in his *Portrait of a Monsignor della Casa* (fig. 53), which appears to place the sitter in the Florentine cathedral. It is also often employed by Pierfrancesco Foschi (1502-1567).⁸⁹ Yet even expanding the parameters, Bronzino's *Portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatichi* is

⁸⁷ Ibid, 106.

⁸⁸ See, for example, Caroline S. Hillard, "Mythic Origins, Mythic Archaeology: Etruscan Antiquities in Sixteenth-Century Narratives of the Foundation of Florence," *Renaissance Quarterly* 69, no. 2 (Summer 2016): 489-528; Andrea M. Galdy, *Cosimo I de Medici as Collector: Antiquities and Archaeology in Sixteenth-Century Florence*, Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009. Both authors consider the role of antiquity in Cosimo's larger cultural politics. This approach, taken by Cosimo and the scholars and artists working for him, created an archeological justification to legitimize the Florentine duchy.

⁸⁹ Also sometimes known as Pierfrancesco di Jacopo Foschi. See, for example, his *Portrait of Giovanni Salviati* or *Portrait of a Lady* at the Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza in Madrid.

unusual in placing the sitter in an outdoor setting. In Bronzino's portraits of primarily young men executed in the 1530s several are depicted inside orderly and austere palaces. His *Portrait of a Young Man* (fig. 54) now in the Metropolitan Museum of New York situates the sitter in an identifiably Florentine space. The *pietra serena* door frames that add visual variety to the background showcase a popular and distinctive local building material. It further serves as an accent over the sitter's right shoulder, where the stylized Corinthian capital functions as adornment and as a base for the springing of the vault.

Similarly, Bronzino's *Portrait of Ugolino Martelli*, the impetus for much of the discussion of *fiorentinità*, isolates the sitter within a private space. As Cropper demonstrated, the setting is not a direct representation of the Casa Martelli as Ugolino inhabited it, but a generalized adaptation of Florentine architecture.⁹⁰ Often referred to as an imagined interior courtyard of the family home, the space around Ugolino features many familiar aspects, most notably the *pietra serena* door and window surrounds. These severe, angular features lead the viewer's eye back to the marble sculpture of *David*, framed in an arch of the same material. The stone quoins immediately behind the sitter's head are a common feature of sixteenth-century Florentine architecture which also appear in the later portrait of Bartolomeo. In the *Portrait of Ugolino Martelli*, the Florentine architecture functions in a vague way, making a claim for cultural *fiorentinità* for a figure whose cultural and political pursuits were tied to the city.⁹¹

The inclusion of *fiorentinità* in portraiture proclaims cultural and intellectual connections if not overt political ones. Scholars have identified Bartolomeo's pose as one example of this

⁹⁰ Cropper, "Prolegomena to a New Interpretation of Bronzino's Florentine Portraits," 151-155. The setting is not a replica of the Palazzo Martelli, despite references to the family's holdings, in particular the marble *David* sculpture behind Ugolino

⁹¹ Stone quoins, especially those staggered as embellishment on a building's exterior as in the *Portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatichi* became increasingly popular in Ducal Florence.

approach as it is an adaptation of Michelangelo's sculpture of Duke Giuliano in the New Sacristy. Maurice Brock explored Bronzino's persistent adoption of this pose in his monograph on the artist, concluding that it appears in five portraits. However, he observed that it is most altered and even disguised in the *Portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatichi*.⁹² It is not the tenuous connection with Michelangelo's sculpture that is the most overt claim to cultural and artistic Florentine-ness in this portrait. That is found not in the sitter's pose but in his surroundings.

The emerging discourse on *fiorentinità* has sought and proposed explanations for Bronzino's particular type of naturalism and the impulse to include cultural touchstones – whether in iconographic references or literary allusions – as a means to assert one's civic identity. It has been applied consistently to Republican sentiments, as a subtle means of suggesting an anti-Medicean position. It has not yet, however, been considered for a transplant such as Bartolomeo Panciatichi.⁹³

Using a Florentine architectural idiom without showing particular, recognizable buildings, Panciatichi is presented as a Florentine but a resident of a Florence that is not specifically identifiable. Previous scholars have stressed the Florentine-ness of the architecture.⁹⁴ Elena Aloia has correctly observed that Bronzino's backgrounds are rarely accidental.⁹⁵ Based on her archival research on the life of Bartolomeo Panciatichi, Aloia proposed that the streetscape could replicate a view seen from the sitter's palazzo which has since been destroyed.

⁹² Brock, *Bronzino*, 110-16.

⁹³ Additionally, Bartolomeo's father and extended family were loyal Medici supporters in previous generations. An anti-Medicean sentiment would be personally and professionally disadvantageous for the sitter.

⁹⁴ Including Brock, *Bronzino*, 119-122; Tazartes, *Bronzino*, 114.

⁹⁵ Aloia, "Culture, Faith, and Love: Bartolomeo Panciatichi," 144-45.

However, as the following analysis proves, it is not a specific streetscape but rather a broader chronology of Florentine architecture that is key to interpreting its significance for the sitter.

The city around Bartolomeo Panciatichi does not exist; nonetheless it is significant. It creates not only a synecdoche of the city, but a chronology of Florentine architecture. The chronology begins in the far distance and advances through the open archway, past Bartolomeo, and arrives at the foreground; or conceptually, at the present moment. An exploration of the archway seen over Bartolomeo's right shoulder will serve to demonstrate that the architecture is imaginary rather than real. Once this is established, the individual elements that make up this synecdoche of Florence can be considered.

The open arch anchors the left-hand side of the composition. Although cut off by the frame on one side and the central building on the other, the clear reference is to the oldest city gates that punctuated the city walls from the thirteenth century onward.⁹⁶ Such an arch, with massive doors that could be locked at night – for example, *Porta Romana* and *Porta San Frediano* – were constant visible reminders of the power and protection afforded by the great circuit of walls.

The *Porta San Frediano* is represented in Francesco Rosselli's *La Veduta della Catena* and subsequent printed imagery after it and in Filippino Lippi's *Nerli Altarpiece* for the Church of Santo Spirito (figs. 55-56). In each of these examples, the massive archway is incorporated into the crenellated city wall. It is characterized by its masonry and stark brickwork with minimal architectural ornamentation. Thus the visitor entering the city is met first by a show of strength

⁹⁶ Aloia, "Culture, Faith, and Love: Bartolomeo Panciatichi," 145 suggests that it seems more Quattrocento in style, rather than the sixteenth-century references seen elsewhere in the background. The other place one might find multi-story arches was as ephemeral commemorative or triumphant works as part of a particular event after which they vanished from the inhabited city. However, the gate over Bartolomeo's shoulder is clearly intended as a solid, permanent structure.

and security.⁹⁷ The blind arch depicted by Bronzino is significantly different. The background does not mirror a contemporaneous vista, as no such architecture existed in the city.⁹⁸

Having examined the gate, we can proceed with what we might loosely consider a visual timeline of Florentine architecture, stretching from the distant civic past to Bartolomeo's ducal present.⁹⁹ As we advance from background to foreground, we in a sense pass through phases of architectural *fiorentinità*. We begin with the archway that opens up to the deeper background, which recalls the work of Filippo Brunelleschi (1377-1446). The loggia fronting the *Ospedale degli Innocenti* by Brunelleschi (1377-1446), executed in the first quarter of the fifteenth-century, featured an engaged, Corinthian pilaster at the far end of the loggia (fig. 57). Abutting it, a Corinthian pilaster supports the open archway. A horizontal band of *pietra serena* with bands of fascia further emphasizing the horizontality runs over the opening to the loggia. While this innovative building is not copied in the portrait, the classicism for which Brunelleschi was lauded is evident in the fictive architecture.¹⁰⁰ This adaptation is similar to that of poses taken from Michelangelo's sculptural works identified in several of Bronzino's portraits.

Moving forward in both time and the space of the portrait, the visual chronology of Florentine architectural innovations pauses at the distinct windows placed behind Bartolomeo's right shoulder. The trio of windows depicted obliquely adapts the imaginative architectural

⁹⁷ The gateways into the city, though decorated inside the archway, were constructed were not elegant, stuccoed facades decorated with *pietra serena*, as is the one behind Bartolomeo Panciatichi.

⁹⁸ It might have brought the *Porta San Gallo* to the mind of contemporaries, as permanent architecture existed beyond the city gate.

⁹⁹ My thanks to William Wallace, whose observation first led me to consider the architectural chronology depicted in the painting.

¹⁰⁰ Another potential referent is the arched opening over chapels and apses in the interior of renaissance churches. The Capponi Chapel in Santa Felicita, for example, features similar elements. The Old Sacristy of San Lorenzo, designed and executed by Filippo Brunelleschi in the 1420s, lacks the double-vertical characteristic in corners but uses *pietra serena* and classical elements to define and normalize the space.

innovation seen especially in the so-called “kneeling windows” of the ground level of Palazzo Medici-Riccardi (fig. 58), where the rounded consoles drape down toward the ground. Although structurally unnecessary, they appear as legs, supporting the window and its sill. Similarly, Michelangelo placed so-called “blind windows” above doorways in his designs for the New Sacristy at San Lorenzo (fig. 59). Here, the volute-like consoles reach below the fictive sill, vertically articulating and framing the top of the doorway. Bronzino adapts the recognizable design, raising the consoles to the vertical framework of the windows. They swell out below squat, rectangular pieces. This geometrical framework, located on the same horizontal line as the sitter’s face, refers to the recent architectural language of Florence.

The display of distinctive architectural articulation is on a horizontal line across the panel that ends on the viewer’s right with the Panciatichi coat of arms. Despite the heraldic crest adorning the façade, the building does not correspond to any known Panciatichi property. Rather, it generally suggests the current architectural language of Baccio d’Agnolo, the most important contemporary local architect.¹⁰¹ Known for his contemporaneous palaces for the city’s elite, his architecture is characterized by flat planes marked by *pietra serena* accents. The architectural ornamentation found just behind Bartolomeo’s shoulder reflects the architect’s style. Baccio d’Agnolo served the city’s elite for several decades and by the early 1540s was the preferred artist working for Cosimo I.¹⁰² Thus by placing his own coat of arms on this edifice that corresponds to the most contemporary fashion – and a particularly Florentine fashion – Bartolomeo asserts his presence in Florence both bodily and conceptually.

¹⁰¹ His dates are 19 May 1462 – 6 March 1543. For more on Baccio d’Agnolo see Michael Lingohr, *Der Florentiner Palastbau der Hochrenaissance: Der Palazzo Bartolini Salimbeni in seinem historischen und architekturgeschichtlichen Kontext* (Worms: Wernersche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1997).

¹⁰² All three of the architects referenced – Brunelleschi, Michelangelo, and Baccio d’Agnolo – were employed by the Medici.

The trajectory of Florentine architectural innovation moves physically from left to right, and spatially from back to front. Its course incorporates Bartolomeo. In this way the conflation of space and chronology implicates the sitter. It brings him into the history of the city, emphasizing his *fiorentinità*. While he had been an active and present citizen of Florence for only a short period of time, the composition places Panciatichi as present in a longer arc of history.

Like the gate, Bartolomeo's surroundings are not topographical references. The materials and building styles immediately give an impression of Florence, without seeking to depict a recognizable street corner, *palazzo*, or *porta*. For Ugolino Martelli and the unidentified sitter in the Bronzino portrait in the Metropolitan Museum in New York City, the general Florentine architectural idiom may express a political stance, as argued by Cropper and others. It further encloses the sitter, bringing him into an intimate and domestic space. Yet Bartolomeo Panciatichi would ingratiate himself with Duke Cosimo's nascent court shortly after the production of the portrait in question. If he had any Republican sentiments, there are no records of them in the archival materials. Rather, his family had previously served the Medici and garnered honors from Pope Leo X. Situated outside, with the expanse of the city behind him, the implementation of *fiorentinità* in the *Portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatichi* establishes a tie between the sitter and the history of the city. This aspirational portrait presents the Francophile as a Florentine gentleman, explicitly present in the city. It provides a civic identity, but an identity that he is constructing, much as Bronzino constructs the cityscape around him.

The architectural backdrop plays out through the fictive space of the panel, offering a historical dimension to a sitter who had no history in the city. It is not a cultural Florentine-ness that exclusively looks to the past, but that incorporates the present. Bartolomeo makes a claim of *fiorentinità* thereby connecting himself to the contemporary cultural world of the city. The

ambiguity of the background does not here create a disjuncture, but rather serves to show a cultural and chronological continuity, in which Bartolomeo is securely situated.

3.7 A New Noble

The *Portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatichi* introduces new possibilities for *fiorentinità* in sixteenth-century portraiture. Scholarship on the early ducal period has noted strong tendencies toward latent republicanism in portraits of the 1530s that are replaced in those executed during Duke Cosimo's reign by complicated allegorical and rhetorical flourishes. However, Bronzino's portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatichi suggests an evolution rather than a revolution in Florentine portraiture. In this work, the developing language of *fiorentinità* is coopted to present Bartolomeo as the consummate courtier.

Considering the ties between political upheaval and portraiture, Nicholas Scott Baker identified a distinction between Bronzino's portraits of the 1530s and Francesco Salviati's of the 1540s.¹⁰³ In Baker's argument, portraits by Bronzino – those often cited in discussions of *fiorentinità* – suggest interiority as the sitter pursues cultural pursuits in place of civic and political ones due to the ambiguous political situation. Salviati's, conversely, are confidently engaged in public life. Recent scholarship cited above in the discussion of *fiorentinità* refined this position, as sitters such as Ugolino Martelli were not necessarily withdrawn from public life but rather their portraits contained significant but subtle clues of dissent. The basic distinction between public civic engagement and private cultural activities, however, is a significant observation. It is during the 1530s, for example, that many of the individual portraits present men

¹⁰³ Baker, *The Fruit of Liberty*, 205-209.

in interior spaces or safely enclosed within courtyards, rather than as active agents within public spaces. They are engaged in cultural rather than civic or political pursuits.¹⁰⁴

Baker situated portraits by Francesco Salviati – namely the *Portrait of a Florentine Nobleman* and *Portrait of a Man with a Sword* (fig. 60) – as part of a lineage of portraiture of the city’s leading men. He argued that Salviati’s portraits of the 1540s are in some ways similar to those executed by Bronzino and even back to Domenico Ghirlandaio in that they “also conjured a sense of place, of belonging to Florence, of association between the city itself and the identity of the city’s elite.”¹⁰⁵ He identified especially the accoutrements of the sitters as indicative of a shift in the civic engagement of the Florentine gentlemen. “The gloves and the sword... indicate a dramatic re-conception of identity by the office-holding class removed from the anxiety and uncertainty of the 1530s. The trappings of Salviati’s subjects bespeak not introverted artistic pursuits but public display.”¹⁰⁶ In short, they are courtiers and noblemen rather than civic servants and government officials. Inserting Bartolomeo Panciatichi into this chronology allows for a more nuanced understanding of the shifting relationship between the Florentine elite and civic duty. It creates a continuum rather than a radical and revolutionary break.

Bronzino’s *Portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatichi* represents an intermediate step realized due to the sitter’s multi-national identity. Like Salviati’s sitters in Baker’s proposal, Bartolomeo is presented with clear, explicit assertions of identity and status. He is positioned confidently outdoors where he is visibly and implicitly an actor within the city. His clothing and accoutrements argue for his elevated status, intellectual pursuits, and active civic role in a newly-

¹⁰⁴ This argument should be applied to the portraits in question in a purely iconographic manner. As others have observed, there appear to be subtle and latent political underpinnings to many of Bronzino’s seemingly-alooft or unengaged sitters.

¹⁰⁵ Baker, *The Fruit of Liberty*, 208.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid*, 209.

fashioned ducal court. The costume he wears and beard he has grown give the impression of a well-manicured and urbane individual, aware of contemporary local fashions. By situating Bartolomeo within the fabric of Florence, the portrait ties him into the local setting both physically and conceptually. It builds on Bronzino's previous exploration of Florentine-ness by claiming a physical and cultural *fiorentinità*. For the sitter, the setting serves to circumvent thirty plus years of absence. The identity he claims is cultural as well as civic.

In the early 1540s, the political ambiguity and civic turmoil that had embroiled Florence was subsiding. Significantly, Bartolomeo's physical move to Florence coincided with the steady formation of a Florentine court.¹⁰⁷ Not only did Bartolomeo have familiarity with the French court but he arrived in Florence unencumbered, at least publically, by republican or ducal attachments. With no strong earlier expressions of support, he had no previous loyalty to any individual or class in Florence to overcome. Thus the portrait, devoid of hidden political endorsement, portrays Bartolomeo as a worldly, refined citizen of Florence, yet with distinctive French overtones. Employing the developing artistic language of *fiorentinità* in presentation and perceived location the portrait emphasizes his local identity while minimizing his alterity.

3.8 Conclusion

The defeat of the exiles at Montemurlo in early August 1537 was a decisive moment early in Cosimo's rule. It allowed the young Florentine ruler to consolidate power, and silenced many of his most outspoken critics. Thus, as the 1540s began, Cosimo could focus on the

¹⁰⁷ Duke Cosimo I actively encouraged cultural production, particularly those that satisfied his own self-imagining for himself and his dukedom. There is extensive literature on Cosimo's self-imagining for both himself and the nascent court. Introductions to the subject may be found in

Eisenbichler, *The Cultural Politics of Duke Cosimo I De' Medici*; Veen, *Cosimo I De' Medici and His Self-Representation in Florentine Art and Culture*; Janet Cox-Rearick, *Dynasty and Destiny in Medici Art: Pontormo, Leo X, and the Two Cosimos* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1984).

creation of a cultural policy and formation of a Florentine court. In his portrayal of Bartolomeo Panciatichi, Bronzino represents the sitter as a Florentine gentleman and intellectual. Having arrived in Florence already in his thirties, Bartolomeo was welcomed especially for his urbane connections to the French court and culture. Yet the portrait emphasizes his recent translocation to the embryonic dukedom. Having adopted the dress and style of his new surroundings, Bartolomeo is represented as an assimilated Florentine citizen. In this way, the portrait visually connects him with a class of patron and a cultural tradition while arguing for his courtly and literary persona. It positions Bartolomeo as available for service to the fledgling local court.

Bartolomeo advanced to become a trusted servant to Cosimo I. In the burgeoning Florentine court and courtly society he served in France as Cosimo's ambassador and consul. In both roles he was often dispatched to France in an official capacity. In this way he acted as a representative of the duke, the broader Florentine state, and greater Florentine interests.

From his initial reception through his later consular appointment, his position within Florentine social and political realms was enmeshed with his foreign background: it depended on his upbringing in, familiarity with, travel to, and continued contacts in France. Yet it required the courtier to be present not just as a former resident of Lyon, but as a Florentine citizen. In his official capacity Bartolomeo was trusted to place Florentine loyalty first even while using his cumulative experience in France to better position himself and execute his civic duty. The portrait was a means to socio-political advancement. It did so by accentuating Bartolomeo's Florentine-ness while reminding the viewer of his experiences at the French court. By fashioning a cultural and civic identity in Bartolomeo's implied presence, Florentine portraiture accelerated a courtly style. This united Florentine identity was possible only due to Bartolomeo's absence – a fact the portrait subtly understated but did not wholly disguise. The aspiration portrait served

Bartolomeo as a predictor of his future success. It further brought Florentine portraiture from a period of civic chaos and civil disunity to a courtly style that would influence artists outside not only the city but beyond the confines of the Italian peninsula.

Where previous scholarship has limited its discussion of *fiorentinità* to anti-Medicean expressions, my study establishes that it was used in service to the court as well. Bronzino's *Portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatichi* exemplifies a sitter who at once positioned himself locally and more internationally. The portrait adds a chronological element to both the Florentine regional architectural style and Panciatichi's own biography. Unlike Alessandro de' Medici in the portrait by Pontorno, Bartolomeo's hair is not disguised. Rather he uses the potentially-othering trait to situate himself as distinctive from his contemporaries even while constructing a collective – and Florentine – identity.

Chapter 4: Baccio Bandinelli's *Bust of Cosimo I: How Pliny Inspired an Innovation in Florentine Sculpture*

4.1 A Novel Portrait Bust for a New Type of Ruler

If Pontorno depicted Alessandro de' Medici as a Florentine citizen, how did artists respond to his successor, Cosimo I, who initiated the formal creation of a court and signed his letters "Cosimo, the Duke of Florence"? How did they balance the Florentine ethos of republicanism with the new realities of the duchy? As established in the second chapter of this study, there were not extant examples of ruler portraiture in Florence. Yet Cosimo I, unlike his predecessor, established a formal court, defined the role of Duke of Florence, and created a new form of contemporary portraiture.

On his election in 1537, Cosimo was perceived as a leader in name only. A teenager who had not previously been active in government or in Alessandro's inner circle, he was initially denied any title.¹⁰⁸ Cosimo was the *capo*, or head of the Florentine government only. Yet in remarkably few years, he established control over Florence and its surrounding territories. Cosimo's image was carefully crafted both at home and abroad. On local and international stages, he comported himself as a legitimate and powerful ruler.¹⁰⁹ While his approach to establishing his rulership was multivalent, two key characteristics appeared in many of his

¹⁰⁸ For more on the early challenges faced by Cosimo I, see Randolph Starn and Loren Partridge, *Arts of Power: Three Halls of State in Italy, 1300-1500* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1992); Konrad Eisenbichler, "Introduction," in *The Cultural Politics of Duke Cosimo I de' Medici*, Konrad Eisenbichler, ed. (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2001), xi–xxi.

¹⁰⁹ Henk Th. van Veen, *Cosimo I De' Medici and His Self-Representation in Florentine Art and Culture*, trans. Andrew P. McCormick (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 1-4 provides a chronological and martial overview of how Cosimo consolidated his power. Van Veen is particularly attentive to Cosimo's initial quest for legitimization from Charles V and later struggle to consolidate power in his own territories.

initiatives: demonstrating physical, martial control and establishing cultural pre-eminence.¹¹⁰

Conscious attempts to establish these two aspects of his rule drove Cosimo's actions and the artworks he commissioned.

Scholarship on his artistic patronage often points to its conservative nature. His cultural policies and self-presentation were modeled on other Italian princely states and on ancient Roman precedent, in particular, the emperor Augustus. Yet what is often overlooked is the importance of Florentine artistic traditions in his artistic commissions. Cosimo established his power by astutely combining a local and international persona. In his artistic commissions, he was similarly sensitive to artistic traditions both at home and abroad. This issue was of particular importance in the fashioning of a genre new to Florentine art: sculpted busts of a living ruler.

The portrait bust, a common visual form in Imperial Rome that became popular again in the fifteenth century, further evolved during Cosimo's leadership. In sculpted representations of the Florentine Duke, Baccio Bandinelli brought together traditions from the Roman Empire and Quattrocento Florence to create innovations in the purpose and context of portrait busts.

Bandinelli's *Bust of Cosimo I* (fig. 61) shaped a new fashion: the *all'antica* type.¹¹¹

In scholarship, the *all'antica* portrait bust is defined by three formal characteristics. The portrait bust had been revitalized in Italy in the fifteenth century but the mid-sixteenth century

¹¹⁰ Several specific strategies are outlined in Eisenbichler, "Introduction," xii-xiii. These include instituting new governmental structures in Florence, especially by consolidating political power away from the oligarchs. In creating a courtly society, the elite of Florence vied for prestigious positions that offered little in governmental control. Eisenbichler also outlines economic, political, and cultural tactics.

¹¹¹ Much of the scholarship on Bandinelli's *Bust of Cosimo I* is found in exhibition catalogs and monographic studies of Bandinelli. Detlaf Heikamp and Beatrice Paolozzi Strozzi, eds., *Baccio Bandinelli: Scultore e Maestro (1493-1560)* (Firenze: Giunti Editore, 2014), 234-237, 510-511; David Greve, *Status und Statue: Studien zu Leben und Werk des Florentiner Bildhauers Baccio Bandinelli* (Berlin: Frank & Timme GmbH, 2008), 250-256; Nicole Hegener, *Divi Iacobi Eqves: Selbstdarstellung Im Werk Des Florentiner Bildhauers Baccio Bandinelli*, (München: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2008), 106-107; Joachim Poeschke, *Michelangelo and His World: Sculpture of the Italian Renaissance* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1996), 175-176; Detlaf Heikamp, "Die Bildwerk des Clemente Bandinelli," *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz IX* (1960); 130-136, especially 134-135.

all'antica type differed from its Quattrocento predecessors in several significant formal qualities.¹¹² Developed from Imperial Roman examples, the *all'antica* portrait bust was distinguished by a rounded bottom termination, a hollowed-out back, and its mounted position atop a socle.¹¹³ The *all'antica* portrait bust was a specific type that arose only in the mid-sixteenth-century. The first *all'antica* portrait busts of a contemporary made from life were Baccio Bandinelli's two marble busts of Duke Cosimo I. In developing this new form, Bandinelli undoubtedly benefitted from extant examples from Imperial Rome, including a *Bust of Hadrian* owned by Cosimo and today displayed in the Uffizi galleries (fig. 62).¹¹⁴

For clarity, I will refer to the work housed at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York as the *Metropolitan Bust of Cosimo I* (fig. 63) while the work today on display at the Bargello is referred to as the *Bust of Cosimo I*. These works, which transformed the development of the form in Florence, are recognized as the first *all'antica* portrait busts of a contemporary, living individual.¹¹⁵ Beyond the three formal characteristics that define the *all'antica* type, other factors are important in considering these busts. Especially pertinent to this chapter, the *Bust of Cosimo I* conflates the image of an *all'antica* Roman Emperor and a modern ruler by outfitting him in antique-inspired, fantastic armor. Bandinelli's work differed from its predecessors and

¹¹² Thomas Martin, *Alessandro Vittoria and the Portrait Bust in Renaissance Venice: Remodelling Antiquity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 5. Martin points out that Quattrocento busts were modeled more closely on the reliquary bust type of the preceding centuries.

¹¹³ For a detailed examination of the differences between the Quattrocento and *all'antica* types, the classic article is Irving Lavin, "On Illusion and Allusion in Italian Sixteenth-Century Portrait Busts," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 119, no. 5 (1975): 353-362.

¹¹⁴ Kurt W. Forster, "Metaphors of Rule. Political Ideology and History in the Portraits of Cosimo I De' Medici," *Mitteilungen Des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 15, no. 1 (1971): 65-104, especially 76-77. Forster made the connection between this bust of the Florentine Duke and the bust of Hadrian that he owned.

¹¹⁵ The *Bust of Cosimo I*, was long considered the earliest *all'antica* bust of a contemporary sitter and the first independent bust of Cosimo I. However, the *Metropolitan Bust of Cosimo I*, purchased in 1987, would seem to merit an earlier date based on Cosimo's visage. Publications into the 2000s continue to identify the bust today housed in the Bargello as the first, perhaps reflecting the minimal publications devoted to Bandinelli's other work.

contemporaries in that it depicted a living sitter in marble and was displayed in a public context. This combination of material and context was both revolutionary and influential.

Bandinelli and Cosimo I were faced with a unique challenge: inventing a proper means of representing a ruler. While Florence did not lack a tradition of portraiture, it had no precedent for depicting a ruling duke. Earlier Florentine works primarily represented deceased individuals and were displayed as part of tomb ensembles. When living individuals were portrayed in bust form, these had a limited private function and were displayed in private contexts. Yet a ducal persona was a public one, often necessitating public viewership. Roman precedents provided a justification for the novelty of a bust of a living individual, which was rare in itself, carved for public display. A further consideration was the character of the work. In the early 1540s, as Cosimo consolidated power, he was still conscious of Florentine Republican traditions within the city-state. His portraiture avoided a heavy-handed adaptation of Roman Imperial imagery. Instead, Roman portraiture was grafted onto a Florentine tradition. Uniting two traditions of bust portraiture – the portrait of the Florentine individual with the Roman Imperial work – the *Bust of Cosimo I* was a solution for a new type of portrait bust for a new ruler. Before looking to the innovation, it is necessary to establish the tradition from which it emerges.

Considering the extant examples from the fifteenth century, terracotta works pre-dated marble busts. The *Bust of Niccolò da Uzzano* attributed to Donatello (1386-1466) is often identified as the first independent portrait bust.¹¹⁶ This polychrome terracotta work has a flat bottom termination. Thus, it differs from the ancient tradition of sculpted portrait representation.

¹¹⁶ Richard Brilliant summarizes the influences often identified in this work when he writes that, “it is generally assumed that Donatello invented the modern portrait bust, combining antique models and the traditional medieval reliquary used to house the physical relics of saints in containers made to look like complete versions of the surviving anatomical parts.” Richard Brilliant, *Portraiture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), 127. It has also been suggested that the *Niccolò da Uzzano* used a life mask to sculpt the detailed physiognomy of the sitter. Andreina Andreoni, “Niccolò da Uzzano: scheda da restauro,” in *Omaggio a Donatello 1386-1986: Donatello e la Storia del Museo*, ed. Paola Barocchi (Firenze: Studio per Edizioni Scelte, 1985), 258.

The first marble bust was sculpted nearly fifteen years later, when Mino da Fiesole represented Piero de' Medici (fig. 64). Although it was later placed above a doorway in Palazzo Medici, it most likely was originally displayed in a private context.¹¹⁷ Quattrocento busts were primarily intended for private display in interior spaces.¹¹⁸ They generally represented the sitter in contemporary garb. This decision reflects less reliance on ancient precedent, while placing the contemporary individual squarely in the contemporary moment.¹¹⁹

In the last quarter of the fifteenth century, portraits of the leading Medici men, including Lorenzo and Giuliano, were made of terracotta and wax instead of marble or bronze.¹²⁰ In the terracotta *Giuliano de' Medici* (fig. 65), Andrea del Verrocchio depicted his sitter in ornamental armor. While the polychrome on this work is no longer extant, the *Lorenzo de' Medici* (fig. 66), another work in terracotta, retains its polychromy.¹²¹ Painted sculpture, with naturally-occurring colors, was one way these Quattrocento works differed from ancient predecessors with which the artists and their sitters were familiar. Lorenzo is portrayed in the dress of a Florentine citizen, including the traditional Florentine *lucco* and *cappuccio*. It was likely modelled after a full-size

¹¹⁷ The initial display of the bust has been questioned given its highly detailed carving in the round Shelley Zuraw, "The Medici portraits of Mino da Fiesole," in *Piero de' Medici "il Gottoso" (1416-69): Art in the Service of the Medici*, eds. Andreas Beyer and Bruce Boucher (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1993), 320.

¹¹⁸ One potential exception is the matter of some debate. In the nineteenth century, the bust of Matteo Palmieri by Antonio Rossellino was displayed above the doorway of his house. As Pope-Hennessy observed, "...Palmieri's bust is gravely weathered because, following the antique practice, it was placed over the doorway of his house in Florence." John Pope-Hennessy, *The Portrait in the Renaissance* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1979), 77. More recent scholarship has questioned when the sculpture was first moved outside, as there is no evidence that the *Bust of Palmieri* was displayed on the exterior in the fifteenth century. Further, many of the Quattrocento busts are fully carved, with detail and polychrome on the back, characteristics unnecessary for display at such an elevation and in a niche.

¹¹⁹ Conversely, many *all'antica* busts from the sixteenth-century dressed the sitter in antique-inspired clothing.

¹²⁰ Alison Luchs, "Lorenzo from Life? Renaissance portrait busts of Lorenzo de' Medici," *The Sculpture Journal* 4 (2000): 6-23, especially 6-7.

¹²¹ The dating for this work remains uncertain. Curators at the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C. suggest it was made after a model by Andrea del Verrocchio and Orsino Benintendi some time between 1478, following the Pazzi conspiracy, and 1521.

wax sculpture of Lorenzo that was commissioned following the Pazzi conspiracy. At that time, both wax busts and full-size sculptures of Lorenzo were commissioned and displayed in several Florentine churches.¹²² With their contemporary clothing, formal qualities, and display contexts, these depictions of the Medici men and others belonged to a Florentine type, largely independent of classical prototypes. Their functions and display contexts were particularized, as portrait busts of living sitters were the purview of private, domestic spaces.¹²³

There were significant differences between Quattrocento and Cinquecento busts. Quattrocento busts differed formally from precedents and subsequent busts most obviously in the straight, horizontal termination.¹²⁴ This formal variance was revised by the *all'antica* type, which returned to a rounded termination situated atop a socle. Sitters were represented in outfits that referenced antique dress. These significant changes were introduced when Florentine sculptors and their patrons considered the ancient tradition of representation. Of particular importance for the development of portrait busts was Pliny the Elder's *Natural History*, as will be discussed in due course.¹²⁵

¹²² Luchs discusses the known full-size wax sculptures in "Lorenzo from Life?," 11-12. She notes that it is likely that Verrocchio made life-casts of Lorenzo's face, with Orsino Benintendi creating wax sculptures. For more general literature on wax *voti* see Luchs, 21 fn 24.

¹²³ The exceptions were busts that functioned as *voti*, or votive offerings, and therefore fulfilled a religious function.

¹²⁴ Dimitrios Zikos, "Benvenuto Cellini's *Bindo Altoviti* and Its Predecessors," in *Raphael, Cellini, & A Renaissance Banker*, eds. Alan Chong, Donatella Pegazzano, and Dimitrio Zikos (Boston: Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum), 133-174, especially 145.

¹²⁵ Renaissance reliance on Pliny is well noted. Jacob Isager, *Pliny on Art and Society: The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art* (New York: Routledge, 1991) isolated Pliny's discussions of art. Leonard Barkan, *Unearthing the Past: Archaeology and Aesthetics in the Making of Renaissance Culture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999), especially 65-117 considers Pliny, among others, as providing insights for Renaissance observers into ancient images. Sarah Blake McHam, *Pliny and the Artistic Culture of the Italian Renaissance: The Legacy of the Natural History* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013) traces Pliny's influence throughout several centuries of Italian art. John Pope-Hennessy, *The Portrait in the Renaissance*, 71 credited Pliny with providing Renaissance humanists with knowledge of portraiture in Roman life.

During the Quattrocento and well into the mid-Cinquecento, most portrait busts depicted deceased individuals. This study emphasizes the rarities and exceptions that, over time, became common. Focusing on Bandinelli's *Bust of Cosimo I*, this chapter considers non-funerary contexts of *all'antica* portraits and the ways patrons and artists approached their creation and display. These strategies included allusions to antique and contemporary practices that suggested the sitter merited portrayal by an honorific bust. A state of the field review establishes the necessary background and outlines the formal and stylistic changes to the genre of portrait busts in the early sixteenth century. An examination of Pliny's text will establish that by the mid-sixteenth century Renaissance patrons, artists, and viewers were aware of and often followed ancient practices. Benvenuto Cellini's *Bust of Bindo Altoviti* as well as his later *Bust of Cosimo I* both serve as further evidence for the importance of Roman precedent. While Pliny's influence has been noted elsewhere, it has not specifically been considered in relation to Baccio Bandinelli's marble portraits of Cosimo I.

By situating the work within a wider production of Florentine portrait busts, I establish the influence of antique precedent on the form and content of Bandinelli's innovative marble *Bust of Cosimo I*. Elucidating the display context and socio-political climate further clarifies the novelty of this work.¹²⁶ I demonstrate that Bandinelli relied on Pliny's text to introduce and justify an honorific type that portrayed a living rather than deceased figure. To create a new type of sculpture for a new type of ruler of an embryonic state, Bandinelli modernized an antique – but familiar – genre. The result was a fusion of Florentine and ancient Roman precedents which

¹²⁶ While the *Metropolitan Bust of Cosimo I* was the earliest *all'antica* portrait bust, here it serves as supplementary evidence, as less is known about its display in the mid-sixteenth century. Initial display and reception is particularly important in this study, and therefore I focus on Baccio Bandinelli's *Bust of Cosimo I*. Further, the ornamental armor worn by Cosimo in the Bargello portrait communicates his identity in a more nuanced and classically-inspired manner.

situated Duke Cosimo as a martially-successful, culturally advanced, and explicitly Florentine ruler.

4.2 Literature Review

Previous scholarship has focused on establishing a clear chronology of the portrait bust and exploring what prompted the rebirth of the *all'antica* type. Visual precedents have been debated, but no clear understanding or agreement has emerged on what specifically caused the rebirth and proliferation of the *all'antica* portrait bust. Portrait busts are discussed in many surveys of Italian Renaissance sculpture. Wilhelm von Bode's *Florentine Sculptors of the Renaissance* considered them primarily in connoisseurial terms.¹²⁷ Bode's discussion centered on the circle of Donatello (1386-1466) and covered Quattrocento busts. He distinguished between works by Desiderio da Settignano (1428/30-1464) and Francesco Laurana (1430-1502), to whom he attributed several portrait busts.¹²⁸ Paul Schubring expanded the geographical parameters in *Die italienische Plastik des Quattrocento*.¹²⁹ He consistently noted the development of naturalism, while revealing changes in sculptural methods and materials. Like Bode, he discussed isolated examples of portrait busts when he addressed individual Quattrocento artists.¹³⁰

¹²⁷ Wilhelm von Bode, *Florentine Sculptors of the Renaissance 2nd Edition*, trans. Jessie Haynes (Freeport, N.Y: Books for Libraries Press, 1968). For Donatello's circle see 9-10; on works by Desiderio da Settignano 134-137.

¹²⁸ Ibid, 138-153. He also covered portrait busts in his chapter of portraits of children, 154-161.

¹²⁹ Paul Schubring, *Die italienische Plastik des Quattrocento* (Berlin-Neubabelsberg: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion, 1915).

¹³⁰ Ibid. For example, Desiderio da Settignano, 120-124; Antonio Rossellino, 124-125; Verrocchio, 134-145; Adriano Fiorentino, 150-151; Benedetto da Maiano, 153-155; Mino da Fiesole, 161-162.

Charles Seymour considered the origins of the Quattrocento portrait bust in *Sculpture in Italy: 1400-1500*.¹³¹ He classified the type as “a midway stage between memories of Antiquity, the composition of the medieval bust reliquary, and a sense of actuality quite different from either.”¹³² Seymour also linked the type to both funerary contexts and a mid-fifteenth century interest in depicting men of *virtù*. He wrote more broadly about the development of the portrait bust, while addressing specific examples in his discussions of Mino da Fiesole (1429-1484) and Francesco Laurana.¹³³

Both Seymour and John Pope-Hennessy, in his *Italian Renaissance Sculpture*, identified Mino da Fiesole’s *Piero de’ Medici* as the earliest Renaissance portrait bust of a living individual.¹³⁴ Pope-Hennessy’s chapter “The Portrait Bust” traced the stylistic and technical developments of the genre over the second half of the fifteenth century.¹³⁵ He was especially attentive to the progression from works that more closely recalled death masks and ancient art to those that imbued their subjects with inner life and expression. Pope-Hennessy considered sixteenth-century portrait busts in his *Italian High Renaissance and Baroque Sculpture*.¹³⁶ Here he was less concerned with the classicizing effects and more aware of a stylistic progression, as he considered the contributions of individual artists such as Benvenuto Cellini (1500-1571) and Leone Leoni (1509-1590).

¹³¹ Charles Seymour, *Sculpture in Italy: 1400-1500* (Baltimore: Penguin, 1966).

¹³² *Ibid*, 7.

¹³³ *Ibid*, 139 for Mino da Fiesole; 164-165 on Francesco Laurana.

¹³⁴ John Pope-Hennessy, *An Introduction to Italian Sculpture, Volume II, 4th Edition* (London: Phaidon Press).

¹³⁵ *Ibid*, 181-194.

¹³⁶ John Pope-Hennessy, *Italian High Renaissance and Baroque Sculpture, 4th Edition* (London: Phaidon Press, 1996), especially 297-310.

Joachim Poeschke's *Michelangelo and his World: Sculpture of the Italian Renaissance* presented different types and genres of sixteenth century sculpture, before surveying select works of individual artists.¹³⁷ In the introductory pages dedicated to portrait busts, Poeschke made several significant distinctions important to this study: for example, by the 1540s most portrait busts of living individuals depicted princely sitters that were intended to adorn their residences while those of lesser citizens were primarily exhibited in a funerary context.¹³⁸ He also explored the different types of armor depicted in such busts, noting a general preference toward classical armor, although some sitters, including Charles V, preferred parade armor.¹³⁹ A martial outfit was the standard for ducal portrait busts in Florence until the 1560s, when contemporary clothing became more common.

The portrait bust was a topic of interest to Irving Lavin, who wrote about it in two oft-cited articles. Though of their time, these articles remain seminal to explorations of the genre. In his "On the Sources and Meaning of the Renaissance Portrait Bust," Lavin outlined the essential differences between the Quattrocento reliquary-type portrait bust and the classical form.¹⁴⁰ He concluded that the Quattrocento type borrowed from existing classical and medieval examples to create something novel not only in formal qualities but conceptually as well. Examining in particular the private, domestic settings of the Quattrocento portrait bust, Lavin established that

¹³⁷ Joachim Poeschke, *Michelangelo and His World: Sculpture of the Italian Renaissance* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1996). See especially pages 45-48 for an overview of portrait statues and portrait busts. For Quattrocento works, see Joachim Poeschke, *Donatello and His World: Sculpture of the Italian Renaissance* (New York: H.N. Abrams, 1993). Poeschke organizes his text on fifteenth-century sculpture in a similar fashion, with an introductory, chronologically-oriented section followed by entries on individual artists. He accepts the *Niccolò da Uzzano* as an autograph work by Donatello, as discussed pages 389-390.

¹³⁸ *Ibid*, 47.

¹³⁹ *Ibid*, 48.

¹⁴⁰ Irving Lavin, "On the Sources and Meaning of the Renaissance Portrait Bust," *The Art Quarterly* 333, no. 3 (1970): 207-226.

this type of work purposefully separated the figure from its base. This was done consistently as a means to integrate the sculpted figure into the private, contemporary setting. According to Lavin, the Quattrocento portrait bust disguised the support to suggest a complete individual despite its fragmentary state. Lavin emphasized the private display of the type and its dependence on an architectural framework.

When Lavin turned his attention to the *all'antica* portrait bust in “On Illusion and Allusion in Italian Sixteenth-Century Portrait Busts,” he observed that the sixteenth-century bust was no longer necessarily integrated into architecture.¹⁴¹ Lavin focused on the establishment of the type, suggesting that Michelangelo’s *Brutus* (fig. 67) was the first to impart contemporary political resonance into the classical form. He also credited Baccio Bandinelli with the innovation of applying the *all'antica* form to a contemporary sitter, thereby establishing the classical-style sculpted bust portrait.¹⁴² Throughout his article, Lavin demonstrated how such works conformed to and differed from classical models. For example, while referring to classical prototypes in form and material, Renaissance *all'antica* portrait busts as a whole imbued the figure with greater movement by adjusting the axis. Significantly, Lavin credited mid-Cinquecento Florentine artists with giving rise to three regional traditions.¹⁴³ He privileged the Tuscan tradition by ascribing the innovation to Florence. Especially concerned with formalist questions, he sought to isolate when the formal qualities developed and traced that stylistic shift.

¹⁴¹ Lavin, “Italian Sixteenth-Century Portrait Busts,” 356.

¹⁴² Lavin, and many scholars after him, identified Bandinelli’s *Bust of Cosimo I* as the progenitor of the tradition. The Metropolitan Museum of Art purchased their bust in 1987 from a private collector. It has been dated to 1539-1540 due to stylistic elements, the sitter’s youthful countenance, and the sparse beard of the Florentine ruler.

¹⁴³ Lavin separates these as Tuscan, Venetian, and Roman. “Italian Sixteenth-Century Portrait Busts,” 360-1.

Thomas Martin responded to Lavin's argument in "Michelangelo's *Brutus* and the Classicizing Portrait Bust in Sixteenth-Century Italy."¹⁴⁴ Martin's article queried how and why the initial renewal and continued transformation of the earlier type occurred. Martin problematized Lavin's assertion that the reinvention of the form could be found in Michelangelo's *Brutus* by raising questions of the chronology of the bust, and inquiring as to who would have seen the unfinished work. He suggested that rather than Michelangelo's work, the *all'antica* portrait bust was developed in the antiquarian culture of Northern Italy. He proposed Pier Jacopo Alari Bonacolsi (1460-1528), better known as Antico, as the particular artist who revived the type. He argued that Venetian busts were not dependent on – or even necessarily aware of – Tuscan works.¹⁴⁵ In maintaining that the Northern Italian production of *all'antica* portrait busts pre-dated the Tuscan, Martin did not address a distinction significant to this chapter: the creation of works of living sitters versus deceased. While Martin is correct that classicizing busts were already prevalent in the work of Antico by 1500, there would not be an *all'antica* style portrait bust depicting a *living contemporary* until several decades later. This lacuna in the literature is one that this chapter addresses.

The definition of the *all'antica* portrait bust has often been secondary in scholarship, which has explored instead questions of the location and author of the innovation. Both Lavin and Martin focused on the invention and its early development while arguing for a regional origin. Most authors isolate the *all'antica* type as part of an argument dedicated to an individual

¹⁴⁴ Thomas Martin, "Michelangelo's 'Brutus' and the Classicizing Portrait Bust in Sixteenth-Century Italy," *Artibus et Historiae* 14, no. 27 (1993): 67-83.

¹⁴⁵ Martin argues that even if the first *all'antica* busts of contemporary Venetians did not appear until after Bandinelli's, they were not dependent on the Florentine example. Rather he ties works by Simone Bianco into a more regional tradition.

region, patron, or artist.¹⁴⁶ Such studies consider the relationship between the individual subject and antiquity. For example, Thomas Martin explored the Venetian portrait bust in *Alessandro Vittoria and the Portrait Bust in Renaissance Venice: Remodelling Antiquity*.¹⁴⁷ While Martin established the artistic education, output, and further influences of Alessandro Vittoria, he also argued that it was this singular artist who established and codified the portrait bust in Venice (for example, fig. 68). He proposed that the Venetian interest in creating an antique *auctoritas* was one reason for the popularity of Vittoria's works.¹⁴⁸ In this way, Martin continued Patricia Fortini Brown's analysis of the Venetian relationship to antiquity.¹⁴⁹ Brown explored the ways Venice fabricated a classical, civic past and used *all'antica* art forms to argue for a shifting relationship with antiquity and identity. Of particular interest for this study is her observation that it was only at the conclusion of the fifteenth century that Venetians began to appropriate the ancient past for private purposes and use classical inspiration in crafting personal identities.¹⁵⁰

One significant concern addressed by scholarship on the *all'antica* portrait bust has been its context as part of funerary monuments.¹⁵¹ The proliferation of the type as a key feature in

¹⁴⁶ See, for example, Alan Chong, Donatella Pegazzano, and Dimitrios Zikos, editors. *Raphael, Cellini, & A Renaissance Banker: The Patronage of Bindo Altoviti*. Boston: Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, 2003). Of special relevance to this study are the chapters by Jodi Cranston and Dimitrios Zikos. Many monographic studies consider the relationship of individual artists to antiquity. One well-argued and relevant example is Alison Luchs, *Tullio Lombardo and Ideal Portrait Sculpture in Renaissance Venice, 1490-1530* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

¹⁴⁷ Thomas Martin, *Alessandro Vittoria and the Portrait Bust in Renaissance Venice*.

¹⁴⁸ Although often translated simply as "authority," *auctoritas* was more nuanced in ancient Roman society. One's *auctoritas* was one's socio-political position, placing one in a hierarchy of power and influence. It reflected the individual's influence and structure of support. It is best understood not only as authority, but as one's influence as well.

¹⁴⁹ Patricia Fortini Brown, *Venice & Antiquity: The Venetian Sense of the Past* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996), especially "A New Bloodline," 231-262.

¹⁵⁰ Brown, *Venice & Antiquity*, 232.

¹⁵¹ Included in this category is much of the literature reviewed above.

Venetian tomb monuments was discussed by Martin.¹⁵² Elizabeth Pilliod proposed that the Florentine sepulchral bust of Tommaso Cavalcanti was inspired by Roman models. In particular, she noted that the display of a bust as part of a tomb ensemble, framed by a recessed niche, was more prevalent in Rome than Florence in the first half of the sixteenth century. Florentine busts had not previously been placed inside an oval, a type known as an *imago clipeata*. Thomas Martin confirmed and expanded on Pilliod's observation in his article, "The Tomb of Alessandro Antinori: A Prolegomenon to the Study of the Florentine Sixteenth-Century Portrait Bust."¹⁵³ Martin established that the tomb of Alessandro Antinori (fig. 69), with a portrait bust as part of the sepulchral monument, was influenced not by the extant Florentine tradition but rather by Roman examples modeled on the older tradition of the *imago clipeata*.¹⁵⁴ In this context, the bust was often one element of a tomb ensemble. It commonly appeared above the sarcophagus, where it might be in a niche or framed by architectural elements of the wall ornamentation. Raised on a socle, an *all'antica* bust had greater potential for implied movement and animation even in a recessed location.

A final consideration is literature exploring and establishing the importance of Pliny's treatise in Renaissance Italy.¹⁵⁵ Most notably, Sarah Blake McHam's *Pliny and the Artistic Culture of the Italian Renaissance: The Legacy of the Natural History* offered a wide-ranging and insightful survey of Pliny's influence on Italian Renaissance art, including a discussion of

¹⁵² Martin, *Alessandro Vittoria and the Portrait Bust in Renaissance Venice*.

¹⁵³ Thomas Martin, "The Tomb of Alessandro Antinori: A Prolegomenon to the Study of the Florentine Sixteenth-Century Portrait Bust," *The Burlington Magazine* 143, no. 1185 (Dec. 2001): 746 especially.

¹⁵⁴ For more on the *imago clipeata*, see Jane Fejfer, *Roman Portraits in Context* (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), especially 233-235.

¹⁵⁵ See footnote 1, above, for these sources.

sculpted portraits.¹⁵⁶ She focused her attentions on the *imago clipeata*.¹⁵⁷ McHam balanced textual and visual evidence as well as the interests of an individual artist with the contemporary courtly milieu to situate Andrea Mantegna's *Self-Portrait* (fig. 70) as a conscious reference to Pliny's text. She proceeded to study the after-life of Mantegna's *imago clipeata* and its influence particularly on the tombs of artists. McHam's work confirmed a clear connection between a sculpted portrait and Pliny's text. As this chapter establishes, Pliny's influence was not limited to the sepulchral context or the *imago clipeata*. In fact, Pliny was crucial to the development of sculpted portraiture at the nascent court of Cosimo de' Medici, contributing both form and legitimacy.

4.3 Pliny on Portraiture

Extant classical sculpture provided visual clues as to the formal qualities of the works, but it was from Pliny that one learnt about the varied materials and especially the display practices of ancient portraiture. Pliny differentiated between private and public works. His discussion of the former focused on ancestral portraits, which were displayed at the deceased's tomb or in the descendant's home and made primarily in wax or terracotta. For heroes and rulers, however, public display of a work in metal or marble was appropriate. Public display of private individuals was, to Pliny, a questionable use of portraiture, dependent on many several factors, including the financing of the work.

Pliny first discussed the evolution of depictions of individuals, looking back to Greek culture, as follows:

¹⁵⁶ McHam, *Pliny and the Artistic Culture of the Italian Renaissance*.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid*, 162-163, 179-181.

But after a time this art in all places came to be usually devoted to statues of gods. ... This practice passed over from the gods to statues and representations of human beings also, in various forms. ...It was not customary to make effigies of human beings unless they deserved lasting commemoration for some distinguished reason, in the first case victory in the sacred contests and particularly those at Olympia, where it was the custom to dedicate statues of all who had won a competition; these statues, in the case of those who had been victorious there three times, were modelled as exact personal likenesses of the winners – what are called *iconicae*, portrait statues. I rather believe that the first portrait statues officially erected at Athens were those of the tyrannicides Harmodius and Aristogeiton. This happened in the same year as that in which the Kings were also driven out at Rome. The practice of erecting statues from a most civilized sense of rivalry was afterwards taken up by the whole of the world, and the custom proceeded to arise of having statues adorning the public places of all municipal towns and of perpetuating the memory of human beings....¹⁵⁸

Pliny outlined the development of the depiction of individuals: beginning with gods, then including the likeness of individual men. However, these men were exemplars, representing primarily civic and athletic heroes. Both types of victors were depicted as portrait statues with their exact mimetic qualities. Additionally, they were displayed in public places, serving as models and exempla while visible to the entire populace. This can be contrasted with Pliny's discussion of ancestor portraits.

In the halls of our ancestors it was otherwise; portraits were the objects displayed to be looked at, not statues by foreign artists, nor bronzes nor marbles, but wax models of faces were set out each on a separate side-board, to furnish likenesses to be carried in procession at a funeral in the clan, and always when some member of it passed away the entire company of his house that had ever existed was present.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁸ Pliny the Elder, *Natural History Volume IX, Libri XXXIII-XXXV*, trans. H. Rackham (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1952), 34.9.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid*, 35.2.

Pliny established a clear distinction between ancestor portraits – depictions of the deceased – and the trend toward likenesses of the living. While Pliny extolled the virtues of displays of heroes and other meritorious subjects, he also bemoaned the contemporary practice that turned the collection of portraits into a display of wealth.

The painting of portraits, used to transmit through the ages extremely correct likenesses of persons, has entirely gone out. Bronze shields are now set up as monuments with a design in silver, with only a faint difference between the figures; heads of statues are exchanged for others, about which before now actually sarcastic epigrams have been current: so universally is a display of material preferred to a recognizable likeness of one's own self. And in the midst of all this, people tapestry the walls of their picture-galleries with old pictures, and they prize likenesses of strangers, while as for themselves they imagine that the honour only consists in the price for their heir to break up the statue and haul it out of the house with a noose. Consequently nobody's likeness lives and they leave behind them portraits that represent their money, not themselves.¹⁶⁰

Pliny was concerned with both private displays of art, especially portraits, as a mere sign of wealth and with instances of private individuals funding public displays of these works.

The proliferation of public monuments honoring undeserving but wealthy individuals was an especially lamentable development. Pliny was not alone in condemning the trend.¹⁶¹ By the

¹⁶⁰ Pliny, *Natural History* Vol. IX, 35.2.

¹⁶¹ Secondary scholarship on Renaissance portrait busts has not noted the nuances of Pliny's work when applying the ancient precedent to Italian Renaissance practice. It must be noted as well that Pliny is often discussing sculpted portraits in general, which tended to be statues rather than solely busts. Surviving busts of especially imperial rulers provided visual precedent for this form.

second century BCE, a law was passed to curb abuses and combat the increase of public displays of portraiture by the wealthy.¹⁶²

In the above excerpts, Pliny made distinctions in form, material, content, and context. He emphasized that portraits of the living should only be made to honor the most worthy individuals. I consider all four of these criteria to conclusively establish that Baccio Bandinelli's *Bust of Cosimo I* was made in accordance with ancient practice.

Pliny's *Natural History* was widely read in Renaissance Italy, but there is one fact, heretofore unremarked upon in scholarship, that connects Bandinelli and the classical author. An inventory of Bandinelli's Roman household in 1541 included, among other volumes, a work in Latin by Pliny.¹⁶³ While the inventory does not specify the title, the *Natural History*, as the author's most important surviving work, is most likely. The date is especially significant, as it was a period in which Bandinelli divided his time – and work – between projects in Rome and Florence. This period immediately preceded the creation of the *Bust of Cosimo I*. The sculpture is commonly dated to 1542-1544 based on the approximate age of the sitter and the fact that he lacks the honorific chain of the Golden Fleece, which was incorporated into many of his portraits once he was awarded it in July, 1545. Bandinelli was surely acquainted with Pliny and his summary of ancient artistic traditions before he began work on the portrait bust.

In early modern Italy, a sculpted likeness was most likely to be found in a tomb context. Depicting the deceased, it primarily fulfilled a memorial function similar to the ancestral portraits extolled by Pliny. Yet they were also found outside the sepulchral context in rare

¹⁶² Kathleen Wren Christian, *Empire Without End: Antiquities Collections in Renaissance Rome, c.1350-1527* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010), 18 and footnote 14 page 223; Isager, *Pliny on Art and Society*, 89.

¹⁶³ Louis Waldman, *Baccio Bandinelli and Art at the Medici Court: A Corpus of Early Modern Sources* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2004), 215, document 351.

instances. It was precisely this type of portrait – of contemporary, still-living individuals, which were carved in marble or cast in bronze – that had the potential to recreate a practice lamented by Pliny.¹⁶⁴ As noted above, Pliny was adamantly opposed to the proliferation of sculpted portraits of private individuals in public locations. He specifically praised works, in bronze or marble, of worthy leaders, most notably military men. Given that Bandinelli’s portrait busts of Cosimo were created for a ruler, they fall within the parameters approved by Pliny in adherence with Pliny’s text. In his *Bust of Cosimo I*, Bandinelli transformed the fifteenth-century Florentine practice by incorporating Roman forms and prototypes.

Dressing his sitter in classically-inspired armor, Bandinelli was careful to carve the honorific sculpture in a way that would conform to antique practices as outlined by Pliny. The purpose was two-fold. It transformed the Florentine Republican practice of sculpted portraiture, placing Cosimo within both Florentine and Imperial Roman traditions. It also made him an exemplar. By following the limited guidelines explicated by Pliny, Bandinelli’s bust placed Cosimo I as the worthy inheritor of ancient imperial tradition. It depicted a sitter in circumstances praised by Pliny: an armored individual, portrayed in marble, and displayed in a public context.

¹⁶⁴ “At first, Pliny related, setting up these figures in marble, or in more prestigious materials such as bronze or gold, was an honorable sign of piety and a fitting tribute to Rome’s military heroes. However, by his own time, the genuinely exemplary portrait had started to seem a thing of the past, as the wealthy had begun to set up their own portraits in public streets and fora, which contrasted starkly with those that had been deserved by merit and publicly degraded. By the second century CE the Senate passed laws to contain the abuse of portraiture by the wealthy, who were crowding the streets with their unmerited statues.” Christian, *Empire Without End*, 18.

4.4 Baccio Bandinelli: Sculptor-Draftsman to the Medici

Baccio Bandinelli was born Bartolommeo Brandini on 17 October 1493 to the goldsmith Michelangelo di Viviano da Gaiuole and Caterina di Taddeo di Ugolino.¹⁶⁵ Baccio began training early in his father's workshop, where he first learned the art of *disegno*.¹⁶⁶ The elder artist was recognized among the foremost goldsmiths and jewelers of the city and was often employed by the Medici. Baccio was engaged with various arts from a young age, having first frequented the workshop of an obscure painter, Girolamo del Buda.¹⁶⁷ He visited sites throughout the city where he could draw the work of painters and sculptors alike, and Vasari mentions in particular his study of works by Filippo Lippi (1406-1469), Donatello, and Verrocchio, among others.¹⁶⁸ By 1508, Baccio entered the workshop of the sculptor Giovanni Francesco Rustici (1475-1554).

Bandinelli also pursued knowledge of the painter's skill. In imitation of Michelangelo, he desired to be an accomplished painter-sculptor. He did so – and improved his draftsmanship – by studying the great artist's *Battle of Cascina* cartoon. Vasari, who wrote that Bandinelli examined it more often than any other artist, also accused him of destroying the original by cutting it into

¹⁶⁵ Baccio was a common Florentine diminutive for Bartolommeo. Although his family name was Brandini, he changed it to Bandinelli, preferring a more aristocratic cognomen, and it is by this name that he is remembered.

¹⁶⁶ Many Florentine sculptors began working in this field, including Benvenuto Cellini, who was briefly part of Bandinelli's father's workshop. For more on the Florentine tradition, see Wolk-Simon, "*Disegno as Ritratto*," 77.

Further biographical information is contained in Heikamp and Strozzi, eds., *Baccio Bandinelli: Scultore e Maestro (1493-1560)*. See especially Michaela Zurla, "Profilo biografico," 28-33; Roberta Bartoli, "Bandinelli contra tutti. L'artista negli occhi dei contemporanei," 36-59; Hana Grundler and Alessandro Nova, "Concorrenza e invenzione: la biografia vasariana di Baccio Bandinelli," 60-69. A complete biography can also be found in Michael Hirst, "BANDINELLI, Baccio in 'Dizionario Biografico,'" accessed October 4, 2017, [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/baccio-bandinelli_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/baccio-bandinelli_(Dizionario-Biografico)).

¹⁶⁷ Hirst, "BANDINELLI, Baccio in 'Dizionario Biografico.'"

¹⁶⁸ Vasari, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori e architettori*, Vol. V, 239-240.

pieces.¹⁶⁹ His voracious desire to acquire the skills of a painter led Baccio to commission a portrait by Andrea del Sarto. He did so in order to study the artist's oil painting techniques, observing Andrea's process while the established artist produced a small, veristic panel featuring Baccio's visage. He pursued painting in his early career, trying his hand at oil painting but with uninspiring results.¹⁷⁰ More successful were his first independent sculptural commissions, which he received and executed in the same period.

His entire career was assisted by Medicean intercession and patronage. As early as 1515 he received a commission from the Opera del Duomo for a *St. Peter*, with the intervention of Giuliano de' Medici. The same year, he undertook several projects for the Medici, including, most importantly, a sculpture of *Orpheus* for the courtyard of the family palace. He applied the knowledge of antique models, gained over several visits to Rome, to create a successful marble work.¹⁷¹ In addition, he executed several works for the Medici in Rome, most notably under the patronage of Pope Leo X and Cardinal Giulio de' Medici (the future Pope Clement VII).¹⁷²

By the 1520s, his reputation as a sculptor and a master of *disegno* was well-established. In particular, his design for the *Massacre of the Innocents* (fig. 71), engraved by Agostino

¹⁶⁹ Ibid, 241. According to Vasari, Bandinelli studied the artwork so often in part because he obtained a key so he could access it at any time. Using this key, he snuck in and cut the cartoon into pieces. Vasari theorized it was so he could own a piece, or in order to prevent others from having access. In any case, the story is apocryphal, but was used by Vasari to illustrate Bandinelli's avarice.

¹⁷⁰ He also tried to produce a fresco on the wall of his own home. Wolk-Simon, "*Disegno as Ritratto*," 80.

¹⁷¹ Hirst, "BANDINELLI, Baccio in 'Dizionario Biografico.'"

¹⁷² One such project was a copy of the *Laocoön* group. It was intended as a gift for King Francis I of France. However, upon completion, in 1525, Pope Clement VII was so impressed by the statue that he chose to keep it. He sent it only as Florence, where he had it installed in the Palazzo Medici. Like *Orpheus*, the *Laocoön* gave Bandinelli an opportunity to amalgamate the lessons of classical sculpture and prove himself the equal or superior to the ancients. For more on Bandinelli's *Laocoön*, see Gabriella Capecchi, "Superare l'antico: il *Laocoonte* 'perfetto,'" in *Baccio Bandinelli*, 128-155.

Veneziano and Marco Dente da Ravenna, resulted in “great fame all over Europe.”¹⁷³ A large-scale print, Bandinelli filled the page with movement and variety. It was an ambitious work which proclaimed his success as a sculptor-draftsman.¹⁷⁴

In the 1520s, Baccio split his time between Florence and Rome, completing works for the Medici popes in Rome and accepting commissions from civic institutions and private patrons. In the first half of the following decade, he executed one of his most ambitious – and most criticized – sculptures: an over-life-size *Hercules and Cacus* (fig. 72) to serve as a pendant to Michelangelo’s *David* in the Piazza della Signoria.¹⁷⁵ Installed on 1 May 1534, the monumental figural group was lampooned, especially in relation to Michelangelo’s *David*.¹⁷⁶ The dominating Hercules and his subdued foe glower over the piazza. The sculpture has been interpreted primarily as Medicean propaganda, a bombastic Hercules crushing his opposition. There was a strong tradition of Hercules as a representation of Florence, explored below, which likely made the amalgamation of civic and Medicean symbol a particularly galling and heavy-handed statement.

Despite the vicious criticism of his *Hercules and Cacus*, Bandinelli continued to receive important commissions from the ruling Medici family. At the end of the decade, he interrupted

¹⁷³ “...e gli recò per tutta Europa gran fama.” Vasari, *Le vite de’ più eccellenti pittori scultori e architettori*, Vol. V, 245.

¹⁷⁴ It should be noted that Bandinelli also executed a model in wood and wax for a tomb for the King Henry VIII of England, which was executed by Benedetto da Rovezzano in metal. Bandinelli would continue to design two- and three-dimensional works to be executed by his workshop and others.

¹⁷⁵ Although commissioned by Clement VII in the 1520s, the gigantic block was actually carved in the early 1530s.

¹⁷⁶ For more on Bandinelli’s *Hercules and Cacus*, see Francesco Vossilla, *L’Ercole e Caco di Baccio Bandinelli tra pace e Guerra*, in *Baccio Bandinelli*, 156-167; Greve, *Status und Statue*, 113-154; Sarah Blake McHam, “Public Sculpture in Renaissance Florence,” in *Looking at Italian Renaissance Sculpture*, ed. Sarah Blake McHam, 166-169 summarizes the political context of the work, which certainly shaped its reception.

work on the tombs of Popes Leo X and Clement VII in Rome to return to Florence.¹⁷⁷ There, Bandinelli actively sought and received his first commission from the new Florentine Duke: the tomb of Cosimo I's father, Giovanni dalle Bande Nere.¹⁷⁸ Bandinelli's strong design skills, previous output, and compliant manner impressed the young duke.

Following the contract for the Bande Nere tomb in May of 1540, Bandinelli was appointed head of the Opera dell' Duomo workshop in November of the same year. In this new role, Bandinelli became master of a large workshop, furnishing ideas and designs and directing the work of others. Bandinelli's role as a master designer and teacher was celebrated in two engravings: Agostino Veneziano's *The Academy of Baccio Bandinelli* and Enea Vico's *Academy of Baccio Bandinelli* (figs. 73-74).¹⁷⁹ In both, Bandinelli is surrounded by young men studiously drawing while the master looks on. Both privilege Bandinelli's role as a sculptor-draftsman by showing students practicing their *disegno*. This was a key factor in Bandinelli's self-fashioning as an intellectual artist. Several important sculptors of the following generation, including Vincenzo de' Rossi and Giovanni Bandini, benefited from his instruction in drawing.¹⁸⁰

Cosimo's partiality for Bandinelli was apparent from the commissions the Florentine Duke allocated to him. Like Bronzino in painting, Bandinelli was responsible for molding Cosimo's image in three-dimensional forms. Bandinelli and his workshop created numerous portraits of Cosimo, including marble reliefs, marble and bronze portrait busts, and a full-figure

¹⁷⁷ Bandinelli's primary contribution was to be sculptures of the two pontiffs. Although he returned to Rome briefly in mid-1541 and worked on several saints for the tomb projects, he did not complete either papal portrait.

¹⁷⁸ The project, originally for a chapel in San Lorenzo, was not completed. The current display, in front of the church, was erected with Bandinelli's sculpture only in 1881.

¹⁷⁹ As Wolk-Simon, "*Disegno as Ritratto*," 90 observed, Bandinelli became an embodiment of "the quintessential Cinquecento role of designer – the master who conceives ideas and realizes them in the form of drawings, cartoons, and modelli, then leaves the execution of the actual work to assistants (or, alternatively, as was frequently the case with Bandinelli, abandons it entirely.)"

¹⁸⁰ Hirst, "BANDINELLI, Baccio in 'Dizionario Biografico.'"

sculpture as well as an engraving by Niccolò della Casa based on his design.¹⁸¹ Bandinelli was also entrusted with a large-scale project for the *Udienza* on the north side of the Salone dei Cinquecento of Palazzo Vecchio, for which he carved a series of portraits depicting members of the Medici family.¹⁸²

Moreover, Cosimo's preference for Bandinelli was expressed in other ways. For example, Bandinelli designed the *Lamentation* painted by Bronzino in the Chapel of Eleonora in Palazzo Vecchio.¹⁸³ Cosimo insisted that Bronzino follow Bandinelli's designs, and Bronzino confirmed that he would not depart from it.¹⁸⁴ Even Vasari observed Cosimo's unfaltering belief in the sculptor, writing that "The Duke knew that Bandinelli's ability, judgement and design" were better "than any other sculptor he had employed."¹⁸⁵ Although many of his works were unfavorably received, he received encouragement from his patron, Duke Cosimo I. Bandinelli remained busy as a sculptor, designer, and court impresario. The sheer quantity and occasional quality of his production in marble and bronze attest his continuing success.

¹⁸¹ For more on Bandinelli's contributions to shaping Cosimo's image, see especially Alessandro Cherubini, "Nato sotto una buona stella. Pensieri sull'iconografia militare e civile di Cosimo I nei ritratti del Bandinelli, del Bronzino, e del Vasari," in *Baccio Bandinelli*, 240-253; Van Veen, *Cosimo I De' Medici and His Self-Representation in Florentine Art and Culture*; Karla Langedijk, *The Portraits of the Medici, 15th – 18th Centuries* (Firenze: Studio per edizioni scelte, 1981-1987), 88-91, 495.

¹⁸² *Udienza*, which translates as "audience", eventually became the setting for the ducal throne. The *Sala dell'Udienza* was a separate project. Here, the title *Udienza* is applied to Bandinelli's project for the north side of the large room, where it served as a large-scale backdrop for ducal audiences.

¹⁸³ This panel, finished in 1545, was sent as a diplomatic gift to Charles V's secretary in Besançon, where it is still located today. For more on the project see Janet Cox-Rearick, "From Bandinelli to Bronzino: The Genesis of the 'Lamentation' from the Chapel of Eleonora di Toledo," *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 33 (1989): 37-83.

¹⁸⁴ Both communications are reproduced in Janet Cox-Rearick, *Bronzino's Chapel of Eleonora in the Palazzo Vecchio* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1993), in documents 3 and 13. According to Bronzino, Cosimo instructed him not to make any changes to the now-lost design, because Duke Cosimo liked Bandinelli's design.

¹⁸⁵ Translation by Wolk-Simon, "*Disegno as Ritratto*," 89. The original can be found in Vasari, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori e architettori*, Vol. V, 271. "*Conosceva il duca che la virtù e 'l giudicio e 'l disegno di Baccio era ancora meglio di nessuno scultore di quelli che lo servivano....*" Vasari bestows the same praise, though reversing the order of the three virtues, on Bandinelli on page 274.

Bandinelli's proximity to Cosimo and his court are reflected in his *Self Portrait* (fig. 75), in which Bandinelli presented himself as a designer and a gentleman. He is not depicted in the physical act of carving, despite his primary legacy as a sculptor. Rather he wears a long, blue tunic and prominently displays the emblem of the chivalric order of St. James. This knighthood, which elevated the sculptor to the ranks of nobility, was conferred by Emperor Charles V in 1529.¹⁸⁶ Bandinelli sports a long, carefully-groomed beard. In his self-presentation, he emphasizes his accomplishments in the civic world. The key reference to his artistic undertakings is a highly-finished, red chalk drawing, likely related to his *Hercules and Cacus*.¹⁸⁷ The portrait promotes his image as a master of *disegno*. Bandinelli died on 7 February 1560.

Vasari much maligned his fellow artist in *The Lives of the Artists*. Yet Bandinelli's lengthy biography is the second longest, shorter only than that of Michelangelo.¹⁸⁸ Although Vasari's account should be read with an understanding that Bandinelli was a rival, with Vasari's own antipathy and prejudicial opinions coloring his account, there appears to have been some truth to his critical exposé. Contemporaries, including his patrons and colleagues, often found Bandinelli to be haughty and truculent.¹⁸⁹ Thus, it is worth noting when Vasari praised his hated rival. He did so most frequently in reference to Bandinelli's command of *disegno*, but he also

¹⁸⁶ Bandinelli petitioned Charles V for this honor. He presented artistic gifts to the emperor, including a bronze relief of the *Deposition*. He also claimed noble status. He changed his cognomen, and identified himself as a descendent of the noble family Bandinelli of Siena. Hirst, "BANDINELLI, Baccio in 'Dizionario Biografico.'"

¹⁸⁷ Heikamp and Strozzi, eds., *Baccio Bandinelli: Scultore e Maestro (1493-1560)*, 510.

¹⁸⁸ Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori e architettori: nelle redazioni del 1550 e 1568*, eds. Rosanna Bettarini and Paola Barocchi, (Firenze: Sansoni, 1966-1987), Vol. V, 238-276. Louis Waldman assembled a corpus of archival documents to further elucidate the artist's life and output in *Baccio Bandinelli and Art at the Medici Court*.

¹⁸⁹ For more on Bandinelli's contemporary reception – as an individual, more so than as a sculptor – Linda Wolk-Simon, see Wolk-Simon, "Disegno as Ritratto: Drawing in the Biography of Baccio Bandinelli," in *Donatello, Michelangelo, Cellini: Sculptors' Drawings from Renaissance Italy*, ed. Michael Cole (Boston: Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, 2014): 74-101, especially 75-76; Bartoli, "Bandinelli contro tutti. L'artista negli occhi dei contemporanei," 36-59.

lavished praise on the sculptor's *Bust of Cosimo I*, which Vasari described as "the best head he ever made."¹⁹⁰ Let us turn from the character that Vasari hated to the art he admired.

4.5 *Bust of Cosimo I: Form and Material*

Baccio Bandinelli's marble *Bust of Cosimo I* was carved from a single piece of white marble. The portrait of Duke Cosimo I is centered frontally over the socle with the duke's head turned to his left. Cosimo's visage, familiar from various portraits in diverse media, is easily recognized.¹⁹¹ The socle bears the inscription "COS•MED / FLOR•DVX / •II•" which identifies the sitter as Cosimo de' Medici, the second Florentine Duke.¹⁹²

While his torso is centered and frontal, Cosimo's right shoulder pulls back and his left is inclined forward. It is a subtle shift, but a significant decision made by Bandinelli that departed from much precedent. Although the text on the socle and frontal depiction of the torso suggest a viewer should stand centered to the base, Cosimo is best viewed from the right, where the turn of the body and twist of the head most invigorate the sculpture.

Cosimo's smooth skin, masterfully carved, is blemish-free. His nose is shapely and lips ideally proportioned.¹⁹³ Bulbous and heavy lidded, Cosimo's eyes are similar to those depicted in Bronzino's *Cosimo I in Armor* (fig. 38). Cosimo does not meet the viewer's gaze. Rather his

¹⁹⁰ Of the bust, Vasari noted, "una di marmo, la quale Of the bust, Vasari noted, "una di marmo, la quale è oggi nel medesimo palazzo nelle camera di sopra, e fu la migliore test ache facesse mai." Vasari, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori e architettori*, Vol. V, 263.

¹⁹¹ For more on portraits of Cosimo, see Janet Cox-Rearick and Mary Westerman Bulgarella, "Public and Private Portraits of Cosimo de' Medici and Eleonora di Toledo: Bronzino's Paintings of his Ducal Patrons in Ottawa and Turin," *Artibus et Historiae* 29, no. 49 (2004): 101-159; Langedijk, *The Portraits of the Medici, 15th – 18th Centuries*, 79-120, 407-530.

¹⁹² Part of Cosimo's concentrated effort to establish a hereditary dukedom included this self-styling, which emphasized the Medici lineage as Florentine Dukes. It does not reflect the initial statues of the city, but is an argument by assertion. Cosimo's insistence, consistency, and larger cultural and political policies were successful in transforming Florence into a court society and a hereditary principality.

¹⁹³ Although dated several years previous, a drawing by Pontormo in black chalk of *Cosimo I in Profile* shows a more distinctive – and less idealized – physiognomy.

stare follows the turn of his head, with his pupils placed higher in his eyes and to the proper left, as though responding to action occurring in that direction. He is an authoritative figure: we can look at him, but he will not deign to meet our gaze.

Engaged not with the viewer but with a third party, the duke is presented as an active figure deep in concentration. His seriousness of purpose is expressed by his pursed lips and intense stare. Bandinelli enlivened the figure by tilting the head. Combined with the costume, discussed below, this single bust portrait suggests Cosimo as both active and contemplative.

His hair is distinctively-styled. His widow's peak is consistent in representations of Cosimo in diverse media. Bandinelli has carved the locks atop his head in high relief. Styled into distinct and overlapping tufts, the soft waves taper as they fall over his forehead. Within the curls, Bandinelli has carefully carved a few individual strands, giving them volume and a degree of naturalism. The tufts continue around the crown of his head, descending to the bottom of his ear. On the sides of his skull they are less volumetric as they are tucked behind his ears. On either side of his face, a series of thin waves, less manicured than those atop his head, fall along a vertical axis. They are carved in low relief and divided into smaller tufts with individual strands delineated. His beard, which only covers part of his chin, is formed of four corkscrews. Instead of a sparse or scraggly beard, the hair has been shaped into whorls.

The uniformity of the styling of his hair and evolution of his beard correspond to Imperial Roman portraiture practices. Consistency of image was an important element in Imperial Roman portraiture, where the likeness of the emperor was often distributed over vast distances through the replication of sculpted portrait types and coins. One way this was achieved was through

designating a clearly-recognizable imperial visage, with key traits that could be easily reproduced.¹⁹⁴

For example, in 27 BCE a new type of portrait sculpture of Augustus emerged.¹⁹⁵ A carefully orchestrated combination of idealized forms and distinct physiognomic features, the facial features of this type remained surprisingly fixed even as Augustus aged.¹⁹⁶ Above all, his distinctive cowlick hairstyle was maintained in his portraiture throughout his rule and following his divination. The consistency of the emperor's hairstyle remained a key characteristic of Imperial portraiture for centuries.¹⁹⁷ Similarly, Cosimo's hair thins over the years but his widow's peak remains.

Karla Langedijk identified three distinct phases of Cosimo's official portraiture that reflect his aging physiognomy.¹⁹⁸ In each stage, there is a standard image from which there is little departure. The close control and dissemination of Cosimo's image was not unusual for the period. Further, it too looked back to Imperial Roman strategies. Marcus Aurelius, for example, also had three well-defined periods of representation: as a youth, a bearded young man, and a mature individual. While his face matures slowly, the presence – and later fullness – of Marcus

¹⁹⁴ Fejfer, *Roman Portraits in Context*, 405. For a more nuanced introduction to the creation and distribution of the Roman Emperor's likeness, see Fejfer, 373-429.

¹⁹⁵ For more Augustus's self-presentation, see Paul Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, trans. by Alan Shapiro (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1988); Dietrich Boschung, *Die Bildnisse des Augustus* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1993).

¹⁹⁶ For a complete analysis of this type, see Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, especially pages 98-100. Zanker observed, "It was reproduced in every part of the Empire and fixed the visual image of Augustus for all time, although it had little to do with his actual appearance." 99

¹⁹⁷ Fejfer, *Roman Portraits in Context*, 406. Fejfer noted that "the front locks of hair constituted an important element in the overall recognizability of an emperor's portrait. At the same time they were a key element in the portrait that was easy to replicate."

¹⁹⁸ Langedijk, *The Portraits of the Medici, 15th – 18th Centuries*, 79-120, 407-530 for her discussion of portraits of Cosimo I.

Aurelius's beard is most indicative of his aging process. Like a Roman Emperor, Cosimo's maturation was marked most conspicuously by his facial hair.

Cosimo's beard is one characteristic that changes and progresses. Cosimo was still a teenager when he was elected in 1537. Bronzino depicted him as Orpheus by 1539 (fig. 76), at which time Cosimo's beard was a patchy work in progress. In a period when most men sported beards, Cosimo too was determined to grow one.¹⁹⁹ By the time Bandinelli portrayed the duke, Cosimo's beard had developed. In his official portraits, Cosimo's visage did not age and mature, remaining a youthful countenance for approximately twenty years. His beard, however, was consistently updated. In 1543 Bronzino painted *Cosimo I in Armor*, discussed in the preceding chapter.²⁰⁰ This portrait, in which he sports a wispy beard, became the standard representation of the young Cosimo. In the years following, Cosimo would be depicted with a fuller beard, as it grew along with his power and maturity. A beard was a way to separate men from boys, and Cosimo, who came to power unexpectedly at a young age, used its growth and fashioning to present himself first as a mature male and eventually as a majestic prince.²⁰¹

A thick neck joins Cosimo's head to his torso, where his arms are intentionally truncated just a few inches below the shoulder. There is the slightest hint of an unadorned arm below the costume before its truncation. Where the torso was rectangular in the Quattrocento with a linear

¹⁹⁹ Douglas Biow, *On the Importance of Being an Individual in Renaissance Italy: Men, Their Professions, and Their Beards* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015), 197-203. Biow considers Cosimo I as a case study of an individual – and leader – who struggled to grow a beard and assert his individuality in this way. He traces the development of Cosimo's facial hair, from his late teenage years to the 1560s.

²⁰⁰ See Chapter Three, pages 87-89; figure 38.

²⁰¹ “Cosimo I's insistence on growing a beard at once calls attention to his desire to impress on people in these official portraits an image of his ‘majesty,’ his legitimate princely right to rule. Biow, *On the Importance of Being an Individual in Renaissance Italy*, 203.

termination, here the lower termination curves in with the pectoral muscles. The result is a lighter figure that seems more mobile than the stiffness and heaviness of a blocky, square shape.

Cosimo I wears an antique-inspired cuirass (fig. 77). The cuirass was not worn by ordinary soldiers in Imperial Rome. Rather, as Carolyn Springer elucidates, it was reserved for important officers, where “The powerfully articulated musculature, formalized stomach, and rectangular chest reflected a physical ideal that was associated metaphorically with the highest military and moral virtue.”²⁰² The cuirass was a common element in Imperial Roman portrait busts. As the following analysis reveals, the shape and ornamental motifs reference classical precedents while incorporating contemporary components. Tight fitting, the cuirass reveals the pectoral muscles beneath and responds to the contours of his upper chest, especially where it moves across and indents inward toward the armpits. Like the *Augustus of Prima Porta* and other classical antecedents, Cosimo’s cuirass is at once armor, intended to protect the body, while revealing the body beneath. The suggested power of Cosimo’s taut thorax is revealed without exposing it.

On his shoulders and upper arms, Cosimo does not wear contemporary pauldrons, which would be recognizable as overlapping, horizontally-oriented metallic ringlets.²⁰³ Rather leather straps ring his arm, arranged vertically. These pteruges – or straps – were common in the antique world, where they were stitched together into leather skirts or on the shoulders as epaulettes. Before the popularity of plate armor, pteruges allowed for ease of movement and joints to bend while still offering protection. Around the armholes are animal heads carved in low-relief.

²⁰² Carolyn Springer, *Armour and Masculinity in the Italian Renaissance* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 25. Springer notes that the thorax was democratized in Christian Rome.

²⁰³ These pieces of armor were primarily made up of lames that were riveted together in an overlapping pattern. Lames were especially important for body parts that needed freedom of movement, as they offered flexibility and protection.

Currently, there is no clear understanding of the iconographic meaning of these figures, which include a bull and eagle.²⁰⁴

There is a distinct v-shape to the top of the cuirass with a thin band of floral ornamentation. Only small details of the symmetrical decoration are visible. A goat's head – specifically the astrological symbol of the Capricorn – is centered on Cosimo's chest. This naturalistically-carved Capricorn, which is discussed in greater detail below, stares out intently from the cuirass. His twisting horns trace the v-shape of the cuirass's upper edge, while his beard rests in the crevice between Cosimo's pectoral muscles. A mascarón with a snake-haired Gorgon is positioned to either side of the Capricorn. On his chest Cosimo sports his personal, astrological sign and two apotropaic Gorgons. These important iconographic elements permitted Bandinelli to demonstrate his mastery of marble carving. Throughout the cuirass, he added many distinctive details, such as the rough texture on the Capricorn's horns.

A wide strap descends from each shoulder, obscuring the low relief ornamentation carved about the collar. Each strap has a sunken interior area, where Bandinelli has created the suggestion of scale armor. At the bottom of each is a lion holding a diamond ring in its mouth. The lion-and-ring motif was a Medici emblem favored by Pope Leo X. The diamond ring was an old Medici family device, often incorporated into artworks they commissioned, such as the pattern on Minerva's gown in Botticelli's *Minerva and the Centaur* (figs. 78-79). The humanist Paolo Giovio, who wrote a treatise on heraldic devices, describes two versions of the ring motif: three interlocking rings, and a ring with three feathers.²⁰⁵ The former he connected with Cosimo

²⁰⁴ One suggestion is that they relate to the labors of Hercules, as proposed in Carlo Falciani and Antonio Natali, eds., *Bronzino, Artist and Poet at the Court of the Medici* (Firenze: Mandragora, 2010), 118. This proposal would further amalgamate Cosimo I, the city of Florence, and the ancient hero.

²⁰⁵ Paolo Giovio, *Dialogo dell'impresa militare et amare* (Lyon: Guglielmo Roviglio, 1559). Giovio discusses Medici symbols pages 40-55, and the rings in particular pages 40-42.

il Vecchio, though he admitted that he could never discover the symbolic significance of the motif. The latter he attributed to Lorenzo il Magnifico, who adapted his grandfather's symbol. He inserted a religious tenor by adding three feathers, each of a different color – red, green, and white – to correspond to the three Catholic virtues. Thus the diamond rings, while they do not precisely match either the elder Cosimo's or Lorenzo's *imprese*, connect Cosimo I with the senior branch of the Medici family.

The lion was a familiar symbol in Republican Florentine imagery that was also adopted by the Medici. In addition to its importance as the symbolic *Marzocco* common to Florentine civic imagery, the lion was connected to Hercules and the pelt of the Nemean Lion with which he was often depicted. Hercules was a well-established symbol in civic imagery and the identity of the city since the late thirteenth century.²⁰⁶ According to one tradition, Hercules was the legendary founder of Florence. He appeared on coinage and even on major monuments, including the Cathedral complex. The Medici began to assimilate Hercules as a symbol in the fifteenth century, and made the connection explicit with Bandinelli's *Hercules and Cacus*.

As David Greve has observed, adopting the Hercules-Florentine imagery, Bandinelli did more than create a correlation between the classical hero and Cosimo.²⁰⁷ By this time, Hercules was already recognized as a stand-in for Florence. Thus, by grafting Herculean imagery onto the cuirass, Cosimo assumes a civic identity. He is at once a stand-in for Florence and her protector. Further, Hercules was connected in Renaissance thought with virtuous rulers.²⁰⁸ He served as an

²⁰⁶ The classic text on Hercules imagery in Renaissance Florence remains Leopold D. Ettlinger, "Hercules Florentinus," *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 16, vol. 2 (1972): 119-142.

²⁰⁷ Greve, *Status und Statue*, 255.

²⁰⁸ Sarah Blake McHam, "Public Sculpture in Renaissance Florence." See especially page 168, and footnote 61, page 185 for literature related to Hercules and exemplary rulers. Additionally, McHam notes the strong presence of this idea already in the preceding century.

exemplar for princes. Thus the lions, with their Herculean connection, suggest that Cosimo is an exemplary ruler. The motif further defines Cosimo's civic and familial identity. This singular cuirass, worn by Cosimo, contains the most familiar Florentine and Medicean heraldic emblems, grafting both a Florentine and Medicean identity onto Cosimo I. Equally important as Cosimo's dress is the manner in which the bust was displayed.

4.6 A Study for the Living

One significant aspect in Pliny's – and subsequent scholars' – discussion of sculpted portraits is the context of their display. Sculptures of contemporary individuals were acceptable in private, but not in public spaces.²⁰⁹ Yet in Renaissance Italy, the production of portrait busts challenged the distinction between private memorial and public honorific, especially in works honoring the living persons. As the following example illustrates, there was already a general adherence to ancient protocol as recorded in the *Natural History* in the creation of portrait busts. By limiting the context, the work of a contemporary individual did not come into conflict with practices well established since classical antiquity.

To consider the issue of display, we turn to the bust of a wealthy private citizen commissioned several years after Bandinelli's *Bust of Cosimo I*. By the mid-Cinquecento, when portrait busts began to proliferate, *all'antica* works representing living citizens remained a rarity, especially for a non-princely patron.²¹⁰ An early exception was Benvenuto Cellini's bronze *Bust*

²⁰⁹ Lavin observed that there were two broad groups of classical sculpted portraits: those displayed privately and those displayed publicly. To the former category belonged portraits of deceased individuals, which were housed in the private residence of the descendent or on the deceased's tomb. The latter were the portraits of individuals who merited an honorific sculpted likeness. Lavin, "On the Sources and Meaning of the Renaissance Portrait Bust," 209. It should be noted that tombs, especially wall tombs in churches, were not strictly private spaces. For the purposes of this chapter, the more important distinction for these tombs is that they portrayed deceased individuals.

²¹⁰ Joachim Poeschke, *Michelangelo and his World: Sculpture of the Italian Renaissance*, trans. Russell Stockman (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1996), 47.

of *Bindo Altoviti* (fig. 80).²¹¹ The elegant, smoothly-polished bust of the banker depicts an older man with a full beard. His arms are terminated midway between the shoulder and elbow, and the edge of the bust is enveloped in a swath of drapery. This drapery de-emphasizes the fragmentary nature of the bust, as the arms and body appear to be disguised behind it. Bindo's cloak drapes his left side whereas on the right it cuts boldly across the front. The folds of the drapery add volume to the bust while conveniently concealing the join between figure and socle. In this way the drapery creates the illusion that the figure is not dramatically fragmented.²¹²

Bindo wears contemporary dress, more in the style of a Quattrocento portrait bust than the fanciful, Roman-inspired armor in Bandinelli's depiction of Cosimo I. Although his clothing does not reference classical tradition, the work is *all'antica* according to Lavin's definition, given that it is displayed on a socle, has a rounded bottom termination, and a hollow back. He is dressed in an elegant, contemporary costume. The banker's tight-fitting cap is distinguished via its texture and decoration.²¹³ This one element draws attention to the sitter's profession.²¹⁴ Although his body is centered over the socle, his left shoulder is brought forward. Further, his head is turned slightly, with his gaze directed in the same direction, as though the sitter's attention has been attracted by someone at his left. Combined with the full drapery and lack of a visible linking between base and portrait, this animates the figure.

²¹¹ This sculpted bust has all three formal qualities of the *all'antica* type: a hollowed-out back, a rounded bottom edge, and displayed atop a socle.

²¹² According to Zikos, "Benvenuto Cellini's *Bindo Altoviti* and Its Predecessors," 162. Zikos goes on to suggest that Cellini's treatment of the drapery is rare, as it cuts diagonally across the chest in most sixteenth-century busts. Pope-Hennessy, *Italian High Renaissance and Baroque Sculpture*, 304 also notes that the cloak is used to suggest the continuance of the body beneath the bust.

²¹³ Jodi Cranston, "Desire and Gravitas in Bindo's Portraits," in *Raphael, Cellini, & A Renaissance Banker*, 126.

²¹⁴ Zikos, "Benvenuto Cellini's *Bindo Altoviti* and Its Predecessors," 163 suggests the texture may be meant to evoke gold thread and reflects Cellini's training as a goldsmith.

All'antica in style if not content, the work was intended for private display. Placing a depiction of a contemporary in a private setting followed ancient precedent. A 1644 inventory notes that the bust was displayed in a niche.²¹⁵ However, earlier documents confirm that this was not the original placement. According to Cellini himself,

I had done a bronze bust of Bindo d'Antonio Altoviti, life-size, and had sent it to him in Rome, where he put it in his study, which was beautifully furnished with antiques and other fine objects. But the study was not suitable for works of sculpture, still less for paintings, because the windows were on a lower level than the works themselves, and so the light reached them badly and this spoiled the effect they would have had in a proper light.²¹⁶

Cellini's *Autobiography* expressed his dissatisfaction with the patron's choice of the bust's installation due to the poor lighting. Cellini's complaint highlights that ideal viewing conditions were superseded by other considerations. Yet there is no indication that the visual display was altered from its intended position. While the turned head and downcast gaze are clues that suggest a viewpoint from below, the bust was set low in Bindo Altoviti's private study. The work was placed among his collection of ancient busts, thus complementing the assemblage while concurrently differentiating itself by its clothing and over life-size scale. The *all'antica* rendering of the sitter made formal visual connections to the ancient luminaries and emperors. Yet, with his contemporary clothes, the sculpted portrait by Cellini was also distinguished from the other busts. With its modern dress, it was not intended to pass for an ancient work.

²¹⁵ Ibid, 143.

²¹⁶ Benvenuto Cellini, *La Vita: The Autobiography of Benvenuto Cellini*, trans. George Bull (London: Penguin, 1998), 352-353. Cellini goes on to recount a story of how Michelangelo saw the bust in situ in Bindo's study. According to Cellini, Michelangelo praised the artwork and the artist, but agreed that the viewing conditions were poor.

There were ample display opportunities in the Altoviti palazzo. Bindo's growing collection of antiquities was not confined to a single space but rather distributed throughout his palazzo; pieces were placed in private rooms and the courtyard. Like other contemporary collectors, he mixed classical and contemporary works in the same spaces.²¹⁷ The sculpture could have made the same visual references in a variety of spaces in the palazzo. According to Cellini, there were spaces that were better suited for viewing it. Why, then, did Bindo insist on displaying his portrait bust in his ill-lit study?

As Dimitrios Zikos elucidated in his study of the bust, the wealthy banker not only physically placed his bust among the virtuous and extolled ancients, but also conceptually followed display practices articulated by Pliny the Elder.²¹⁸ In the *Natural History*, Pliny specifically discussed the display of collections of bronze portraits in libraries, writing, "We must not pass over a novelty that has also been invented, in that likenesses made, if not of gold or silver, yet at all events of bronze are set up in the libraries...."²¹⁹ Pliny specified the type, medium, and setting preferred by the ancients. While the *studiolo* and library were not interchangeable terms, their functions were similar as locations for study, contemplation, and the pursuit of knowledge. By placing himself among such *exempla* in his own study, Bindo would be inspired not only by the achievements of those who had gone before, but also by his own wish to

²¹⁷ Francis Haskell and Nicholas Penny, *Taste and the Antique: the Lure of Classical Sculpture, 1500-1900* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981), 7-15. For a more recent study focused on Renaissance Roman collections of antiquities see Christian, *Empire Without End*.

²¹⁸ "Bindo initially placed it in his study next to other busts, following Pliny's precept of arranging bronze busts in libraries." Zikos, "Benvenuto Cellini's *Bindo Altoviti* and Its Predecessors," 143.

²¹⁹ Pliny, *Natural History Vol. IX*, 35.2. Furthermore, Pliny specified the material of bronze. This accounts for the early and still-unusual commission for a bronze life-size bust of a private individual.

achieve immortality.²²⁰ Displaying the bust within a private space in his own residence, Bindo avoided Pliny's disgust with the proliferation of wealthy men placing privately-commissioned portraits in public spaces.²²¹ Not only did Bindo control who had access to the palazzo as a whole, but his *studiolo* was intended as a private space. Thus the viewership was limited and curated by the patron.

Cellini's *Portrait of Bindo Altoviti* exemplifies sixteenth-century attention to the ancient tradition of portrait types and their display. Bindo's portrait – a bronze depiction of a living sitter – followed ancient practices with regards to material, function, and display. Rather than privileging the ideal viewing conditions, the patron favored a specific setting. This bust, made several years after the *Bust of Cosimo I*, was a rare example of an *all'antica* bust of a living contemporary but not a ruler. Its placement in a space dedicated to study, following Pliny's precepts, demonstrates the influence of antique precedent on the genre. Similarly, in earlier ducal portraits, many on public display, we see Pliny's *Natural History* used as a justification for the rebirth of the *all'antica* style, its martial content, and its public display context.

4.7 *Bust of Duke Cosimo I: Content and Context*

The clear allusion to antique imagery has hitherto been the limit of scholars' attention to the *all'antica* armor of Bandinelli's *Bust of Cosimo I*. Careful consideration of several distinct elements, however, highlights the contemporary elements of the figure. The subtle combination

²²⁰ Cranston, "Desire and Gravitas in Bindo's Portraits" considers the implications of the patron placing his own bust among a collection of ancient works. She suggests that "In doing so, Bindo created significant connections with the decorative tradition of the *studiolo* in which the learned gentleman surrounded himself with objects of delectation and visual exempla of famous and virtuous men." 125-26.

²²¹ It is tempting to attribute Bindo's restrained and undecorated clothing to this as well. Without more specific knowledge of Bindo's influence in the design of the sculpture, but with the understanding that Cellini was unaware of the intended placement, this remains uncertain.

of antique and contemporary prototypes situates Cosimo among his antique predecessors and contemporaries as a ruler who exemplifies both martial and civic leadership.

Baccio Bandinelli's marble *Bust of Duke Cosimo I* references antiquity in both its formal qualities and its content. This innovative work unites the contemporary and the antique; the Florentine Quattrocento tradition with the Imperial Roman. First, I will consider the ancient tradition before turning to its Florentine aspects. In particular, Bandinelli's sculpture was modelled on the bust of Emperor Hadrian in Cosimo's own collections.²²²

The *Bust of Hadrian* depicts a stoic figure, facing to his left.²²³ Like the sixteenth-century *all'antica* type, this classical portrait features the head and upper chest of the sitter. It has a hollow back and a rounded lower termination which requires display on a socle. His eyebrows arch down at the center of his face, emphasizing the *gravitas* of the honorific bust. Deep drill marks define the wavy tufts of Hadrian's hair, and his short beard is carefully delineated. Hadrian wears a thick under-garment, which cascades over his left shoulder. It ruffles around his neck, extending beyond the square cut of his leather cuirass. A small section of his right arm is visible: it extends beyond his dress, with a clean horizontal termination. His left shoulder is hidden under voluminous drapery. The *paludamentum*, or military cloak, attached with a round cloak pin, covers approximately the left third of his body.

His cuirass features a Gorgon's head centered on his upper chest. The only other evident ornamentation is a wolf's head visible at the end of the shoulder strap on his right pectoral area,

²²² A general recognition of the relationship between Bandinelli's sculpture and the ancient predecessor entered the literature with John Pope-Hennessy, *Cellini* (New York: Abbeville Press, 1985), 216.

²²³ This bust is an example of the "Termini-type," which dates it to 117 – 121. This places it in the early years of Hadrian's reign. For more on Hadrian's portraiture and the development of the iconography of his cuirass see Richard A Gergel, "Agora S166 and Related Works: The Iconography, Typology, and Interpretation of the Eastern Hadrianic Breastplate Type," in *Charis: Essays in Honor of Sara A. Immerwahr*, ed. Anne P. Chapin, (Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 2004), 371-410, especially 375-8.

although matching decoration is likely obscured by the *paludamentum*. The animal clutches a ribbon in its mouth, which arches over a decorative floral motif. The portrait bust exhibits the formal qualities that defined the later *all'antica* type. It further presents Hadrian as a dignified, martial emperor.

In examining *all'antica* armor manufactured in mid-sixteenth-century Italy, Stuart W. Pyrr and Jose-A. Godoy observed that the depiction of simulated scales armor, or *lorica squamata*, was a recognized reference to antiquity.²²⁴ For his bust, Bandinelli has relegated the representation of scales to the two straps that descend vertically over Cosimo's chest, ending at the lions on his chest. Such parallel straps are present on the antique *Bust of Hadrian*, but they are austere and unornamented. The addition of *lorica squamata* not only embellishes the ducal portrait, but suggests a contemporary interpretation of antique armor. As such, the armor suggests both Cosimo's his role as a sixteenth-century ruler, while also associating him with ancient Imperial precedent.

Bandinelli's *Bust of Cosimo I* is more ornamented than its model. The head of a Gorgon at the center of Hadrian's bust is replaced by the Capricorn, whose twisting horns mirror the v-shaped opening at the top of Cosimo's cuirass.²²⁵ The Capricorn was Cosimo's zodiacal sign. Cosimo consistently included it in decorative projects undertaken under his patronage. For example, it is found throughout the Palazzo Vecchio, which starting in 1540 was the ducal residence and political seat of power.²²⁶ Highly visible in the city, a Capricorn head was also

²²⁴ "The mere presence of scales would have been sufficient to convey to even the most critical antiquarian the "Roman-ness" of such a harness." Stuart W. Pyrr and Jose-A. Godoy, *Heroic Armor of the Italian Renaissance: Filippo Negroli and his Contemporaries* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1998), 271.

²²⁵ The Capricorn represented the zodiacal sign Cosimo had chosen for himself. It further connected him to Augustus. Additionally, it should be noted that Bandinelli frames the Capricorn with two Gorgon's heads.

²²⁶ See for example Van Veen, *Cosimo I De' Medici and His Self-Representation in Florentine Art and Culture*, especially pages 24-26.

positioned at the center of the Ponte Santa Trinità. The ubiquitous symbol connected the Florentine Duke to both Charles V and Emperor Augustus. The first Roman emperor consistently included his astrological sign as part of his imagery, including on the coinage he issued. Thus Cosimo legitimized his rule by referencing two well-established rulers: one ancient and one contemporary. Although Bandinelli replaced the Gorgon on Hadrian's chest with a Capricorn on Cosimo's, he framed the central device with two Gorgon heads that fit in the curve of the goat's horns. In this way, Cosimo's portrait bust makes subtle allusions to Augustus and Hadrian, placing him in the company of two admired emperors.

These references to classical antiquity were particularly important to Cosimo in the early years of his reign, as he steadfastly styled himself after ancient Roman rulers to legitimize his rule. Following Alessandro de' Medici's ambiguous status and reviled person, Cosimo I took great pains to establish his own authority while modeling himself on ancient prototypes of a strong, virtuous ruler. It is for this reason that particular references to the portrait bust of Hadrian were important, given that Hadrian was recognized as one of the most morally-upright and effective emperors.

In small but significant ways, Bandinelli modernized the antique cuirass worn by Cosimo. The duke is shown not only in the guise of an *all'antica* emperor, but primarily as a modern ruler. The v-shape of the neckline is a distinct break with antique-type armor. Roman cuirasses were consistently rounded or rectangular at the neck.²²⁷ Renaissance breastplates, however, often broke the linearity of the top edge of the cuirass by adding this incision. In the sixteenth century, this angular opening was crucial for the armored individual, as it allowed the

²²⁷ Roman cuirasses were rounded or rectangular at the neck. Artistic representations of armored classical figures, from portrait sculptures such as the *Augustus of Prima Porta* to a variety of portrait busts to the relief figures on the *Column of Trajan* consistently represent the cuirass in these two forms, but never with a v-shaped neckline.

contemporary helmet and throat guard to fit snugly. This distinctly contemporary element therefore conflates ancient and contemporary armor.

The modern shape of the cuirass additionally allowed for more of Cosimo's shirt to be visible. The delicate carving undertaken by Bandinelli to create the illusion of a thin, lighter cloth beneath the armor recalls not ancient Roman predecessors, but Quattrocento antecedents. The thin material calls to mind works such as the half-length portrait *Woman with Flowers* by Andrea del Verrocchio (1435-1488). While depicting fabric above the neckline of the cuirass was common in classical portrait busts, including Cosimo's own *Bust of Hadrian*, buttons were not.²²⁸ Hadrian's drapery, which extends above the cuirass, is carved thickly. A weightier material would have been necessary to protect the body from the heavy armor, unlike Cosimo's delicate drapery.

The more fanciful components of Renaissance armor were frequently employed not for the protection of soldiers on the field, but for the wealthy and rulers as examples of parade armor.²²⁹ Cosimo's cuirass acts therefore not only as a reference to Roman antiquity and to an object in his own collection, but to contemporary practices.²³⁰

Another clear distinction between the depiction of Cosimo and that of Hadrian is the lack of a cloak. This addition of a garment over the armor, often on one side though sometimes draped across the chest, was common to ancient Imperial portrait busts. Its omission allowed for

²²⁸ Buttons became widespread in Italy only in the fourteenth century.

²²⁹ It is clearly of a different type than Leone Leoni's *Bust of Emperor Charles V* (fig 87), which exemplifies a type that would grow in popularity. The emperor is shown in contemporary plate armor, with an honorific sash diagonally crossing the bust. Leoni's bust does not disguise the martial aspect of Charles V. The bust is almost more precisely termed a trophy than a portrait bust.

²³⁰ Decorative armor might have been associated with times of peace. A non-functional object, such fanciful pieces of armor transcended the martial implications. This would support John Pope-Hennessy's observation that Cosimo, "though a successful military commander, looked upon himself as the inaugurator of a period of peace..." Pope-Hennessy, *Italian High Renaissance and Baroque Sculpture*, 217.

a clear view of Cosimo's decorated cuirass.²³¹ The emphasis on Cosimo's martial dress was especially appropriate given its public location in the Palazzo Vecchio.

Before discussing the display context, it is necessary to outline how the *Bust of Cosimo I* differed from the extant Florentine tradition and what these variances achieved. The Quattrocento reliquary-type portrait bust was primarily a private commission for private display. It differed therefore not only formally but also functionally from the classical portrait bust. Pliny differentiated between the function of the bust and the material it was made from. Wax or terracotta was appropriate for ancestor portraits, and many, though not all, Quattrocento portrait busts were made of terracotta, as discussed above. This ties the Quattrocento works into the history of ancestor busts, rather than honorific depictions of contemporaries.²³² As discussed previously, Pliny differentiated between materials corresponding to distinctive functions of sculpted portraits.

More exclusive materials were initially reserved for military heroes or leaders as a means to visually mark their public achievements. Pliny therefore explicitly connected the initial tradition of an honorific portrait with martial service.²³³ Emphasizing Cosimo's military prowess not only situated him as a protector of Florence, but corresponded to ancient practices. In this way, Bandinelli justified creating an honorific portrait bust of a living figure for public display.

The placement atop a socle was a formal quality that linked the *all'antica* style to ancient works and differed from Quattrocento precedents. While a socle could be square and block-like,

²³¹ The combination of armor and cloth drapery, such as employed in the *Bust of Hadrian*, served multiple purposes. It added volume, drama, and movement to the bust. It additionally presented the emperor as both a military and civic leader.

²³² These materials "were a deliberate imitation of the antique, since, according to Pliny, the three-dimensional, independent portrait had its origin in *plastice* (the art of modeling)...." Zikos, "Benvenuto Cellini's *Bindo Altoviti* and Its Predecessors," 143.

²³³ Pliny, *Natural History Vol. IX*, 34.15-17.

such as that beneath Bindo Altoviti, this marble support is rounded like a column. Pliny discussed the placement of statues on top of columns as a way to bestow honor.²³⁴ The visual form of the socle subtly recalls the connection made in the *Natural History* between honorific sculptures and their display. This is also true of the *Metropolitan Bust of Cosimo I*. Thus, wherever these works were placed, they carried with them, attached as a functioning base, the implication that the sitters merited honor in accordance with ancient practice.

There is archival and visual evidence for the display of the *Bust of Cosimo I*. A 1553 inventory of Palazzo Vecchio placed Bandinelli's *Bust of Cosimo I* in the Camera di Penelope. At what point it was first displayed there is uncertain. While not in the most public, civic room of the palace, it has been characterized as a "prestigious display" by Alessandro Cherubini.²³⁵ Significantly, in his decorations for the ceiling of the Salone dei Cinquecento, Vasari located a scene in this particular room. *Cosimo I Plans the War of Siena* (fig. 81) depicts the duke in profile seated at a table with a model of Siena.²³⁶ He is surrounded by allegorical figures, including Fortitude, Vigilance, and Prudence. Vasari included an identifiable representation of Bandinelli's *Bust of Cosimo I* behind Cosimo (fig. 82). Over an open doorway, set into a square niche, the portrait bust gazes dispassionately into the space. On the wall above it two putti extend a crown. Although there is a single Medici *palla* between the crown and the bust, it is aligned

²³⁴ As per Isager, *Pliny on Art and Society*, 86. "Statues on the tops of columns is another way to bestow honour." This observation is based on Pliny, *Natural History Vol. IX*, 34.11, where he notes in a section on Roman traditions for the display of sculptures that "The custom...of statues on pillars is of earlier date, for instance the statue of honour of Gaius Maenius...." Pliny continues, for the entirety of 34.11, to discuss examples of sculptures placed on pillars, explaining why each individual was deserving of that honor.

²³⁵ Alessandro Cherubini, "Busto di Cosimo I," *Baccio Bandinelli*, 304. Of the location, Cherubini explained the "Il busto...aveva trovato una collocazione prestigiosa."

²³⁶ For more on this scene see Starn and Partridge, *Arts of Power*, 182-184; Van Veen, *Cosimo I De' Medici and His Self-Representation in Florentine Art and Culture*, 77-79. Both authors relate this scene and the larger program of the ceiling of the Salone dei Cinquecento to Cosimo's emulation of Augustus. Van Veen further relates it to Cosimo's campaign for a more elevated status, as he sought to gain the title Grand-Duke of Tuscany. He was eventually awarded this designation in 1569.

centrally over the figure, creating a clear connection between the carved marble bust and crown above it.

Cosimo, watched over by the portrait bust, studies the plan of Siena, devising a siege that would eventually subdue the city, bringing it under his dominion. Although his only companions in the panel are allegorical figures, the initial design for this scene called for Cosimo amidst his advisors, arriving at a decision with the assistance of his counselors. After Cosimo himself criticized this initial conception, his counselors were replaced by allegories of Cosimo's virtues.²³⁷ Thus the scene initially depicted Cosimo in consultation with his military advisors, where they could have viewed Bandinelli's marble bust. The space, where Cosimo could meet with his advisors under the watchful gaze of Bandinelli's portrait bust, was therefore civic in nature.

4.8 *All'Antica* Becomes All the Rage

Comparing the character and display context of Bandinelli's *Bust of Cosimo I* with other sculpted portraits of the duke further reveals the importance of its public display. For example, the public character of the *Bust of Cosimo I* can be contrasted with a nearly-contemporaneous small bronze bust of Cosimo, also by Bandinelli (fig. 83).²³⁸ The smaller portrait depicts the Florentine Duke in three distinct layers of clothing: a thin shirt, a cuirass, and

²³⁷ Starn and Partridge, *Arts of Power*, footnote 137 page 354 suggests documentary evidence from recent studies to confirm that strategic decisions were reached collaboratively. Van Veen, *Cosimo I De' Medici and His Self-Representation in Florentine Art and Culture*, footnote 80 page 205 instead argues that Cosimo's assertion that "noi soli fume" (as quoted on page 77) in regards to the planning reflects that Cosimo I chose to engage in the war with Siena despite his advisors' suggestions, as confirmed by the Venetian ambassador to Venice. Both authors, however, agree that it served Cosimo's greater purpose and propaganda.

²³⁸ Other, similar busts were later made after models by Bandinelli, including the example in the Victoria and Albert Museum.

a voluminous mantle.²³⁹ Only small glimpses of the cuirass are visible from behind the heavy drapery which is knotted over Cosimo's right shoulder. Though the pose and turn of the head are similar to the marble bust, it lacks visible emblems or other ornamentation. The thin shirt beneath his armor is ruffled vertically along the neck. This cloth disappears behind the cuirass at a narrow v-shape, much as in the marble bust. Although some of the basic elements of dress are similar, the appearance – with the mantle being most visible – results in a figure that although he wears a cuirass, does not appear as martial in character.

The bronze portrait of Cosimo I and its pendent *Bust of Eleonora da Toledo* (fig. 84) were small *bustini*, objects for private delectation.²⁴⁰ Although evidencing the *all'antica* style and dress, especially in the case of Cosimo, Bandinelli's small portraits do not make the same claims to honorific portraiture as the larger marble bust. Self-contained works on a reduced scale, they were not intended for public display. Despite the material and their *all'antica* character, these works for private consumption would not have violated decorum. The differences of function and context are reflected in Cosimo's costume, which emphasized his civic leadership.

Conversely, Benvenuto Cellini's over life-size bronze *Bust of Cosimo I* (fig. 85) was an honorific sculpture that was intended for public display.²⁴¹ Like Bandinelli, Cellini's presentation

²³⁹ In the costume, Bandinelli plays with dualities of hard and soft, of linear and curved, creative dynamic movement and strong visual interest in the small-scale object.

²⁴⁰ Kurt W. Forster, "Metaphors of Rule: Political Ideology and History in the Portraits of Cosimo I de Medici," *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 15 (1971): 78 n.35. These small scale works are discussed as examples of private commissions for private use and delectation in Cox-Rearick and Bulgarella, "Public and Private Portraits of Cosimo de' Medici and Eleonora di Toledo," 108, 116.

²⁴¹ Vasari records that Cosimo set up a competition between Bandinelli and Cellini to create a bronze bust of the duke. *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori e architettori*, Vol. V, 269. This competition was discussed briefly by Rona Goffen, *Renaissance Rivals: Michelangelo, Leonardo, Raphael, Titian* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002), 368. It is Zikos, "Benvenuto Cellini's *Bindo Altoviti* and Its Predecessors," 158 who more carefully connects the contest to Cellini's bronze bust now in the Bargello and Bandinelli's bronze *Bust of Cosimo I* today in the Palazzo Pitti. Although unstated by Zikos, Vasari's narrative has Cosimo challenging the artists to create a portrait bust that extends to his waist. This would explain the unusual length of Bandinelli's later bronze *Cosimo I*.

of the duke was *all'antica* in both form and costume. Cellini's figure, however, is more powerful in every aspect. Where Bandinelli's marble bust conveys quiet strength, Cellini's bursts off his socle with dynamic movement. The intensity and drama is evident in the overall composition as well as many of the details.

The tension in the duke's face is exemplified by his furrowed brow, intense gaze, and the careful attention to his taut muscles. This dynamic rendering extends down into his body with the straining muscles of his long neck. Every aspect of the sculpture is alert and tense. Like Bandinelli, Cellini created movement by turning the duke's head, this time to his right, and thrusting the right shoulder forward. The swirling motion is continued by the drapery that enfolds the figure. Cosimo I swells into the viewer's space with his angled torso, as the bottom of the bust angles toward the viewer. This motion is amplified by the knotted drapery.

Although most scholars comment on the classicizing cuirass, Cellini's armor is more inventive than dependent on antique precedents.²⁴² Joachim Poeschke's observation that Cosimo "wears classical parade armor" is more accurate.²⁴³ While the armor is clearly not intended to replicate contemporary plate armor, neither does it correspond to existing examples of Imperial Roman portrait busts. It is more precisely a conflation of antique and contemporary forms.²⁴⁴ Like Bandinelli's marble bust, Cellini's *Bust of Cosimo* wears not plate armor for protection but

While it might elucidate the unusually large dimensions of Cellini's bronze bust, it should be noted that Cellini chose not to extend the sculpture down to the waist.

²⁴² John Pope-Hennessy does make the interesting observation that, "In Rome, imperial figures wearing an elaborate cuirass were normally depicted in full length, but cuirass busts were also made." *Cellini* (New York: Abbeville Press, 1985), 216. He suggests that Cellini's concept of the highly-decorated cuirass might follow the prototype of a Julius Caesar bust in the Palazzo dei Conservatori in Rome. Poeschke, *Michelangelo and his World*, 212 finds that the energetic quality recalls Late Imperial busts.

²⁴³ Poeschke, *Michelangelo and his World*, 212.

²⁴⁴ In particular, the shape and decoration of the cuirass call to mind mid-sixteenth-century armor, as exemplified by the Milanese production of Giovan Paolo Negroli. See, for example, catalog 43 and 45 in Pyhrr and Godoy, *Heroic Armor*.

parade armor for presentation. Despite the differing character of the portraits by Cellini and Bandinelli, both rely on inventive confluences between contemporary and Roman cuirasses. Bandinelli's earlier strategy for an honorific portrait of the duke was in this way replicated by Cellini. This is one way in which Bandinelli's bust precipitated a change in Florentine art.

The original display of Cellini's bust has been disputed, in no small part due to confusion over its initial reception. In the historiography – on the artist and more generally on sculpted portraiture – the bust has long been considered a rejected artwork. On 15 November 1557, it was sent to Portoferraio, a town built by Cosimo on Elba. There, it was installed over the entry to an important fort. It has been interpreted as a work exiled from the political and cultural capital of Florence.²⁴⁵ However, following its completion the sculpture remained in Florence for approximately a decade. A 1553 inventory recorded the bust in Cosimo's *guardaroba* in Palazzo Vecchio. Recent scholarship has suggested that while the bust was not in the most public place, the location was important. Therefore, the bust was visible to the Florentine leader and his most important visitors.²⁴⁶ Furthermore, a letter from Cellini to Cosimo on 20 May 1548 implies that Cellini expected the bust to be available for public viewing.²⁴⁷ Only a few years after Bandinelli's busts, it was acceptable to consider public display of a portrait bust of the Florentine Duke in armor.

²⁴⁵ A departure from this predominant view is explicated in Virginia Gardner Coates, "Cellini's *Bust of Cosimo I and Vita*," in *Benvenuto Cellini: Sculptor, Goldsmith, Writer*, ed. Margaret A. Gallucci and Paolo L. Rossi (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 148-168. She argues that the bust was made for Portoferraio. Her assertion that the work was not a failure deserves greater consideration. Similarly, Zikos, "Benvenuto Cellini's *Bindo Altoviti* and Its Predecessors," 157-159, 441 proposed that the installation of the bronze bust at Elba, especially at the entry to a fort, would have been meant to show Cosimo's impressive authority in martial and civic terms.

²⁴⁶ The argument in favor of the potential success of the bust is cogently expressed in the catalog entry in *Raphael, Cellini, & A Renaissance Banker*, 441, where Zikos refers to the *guardaroba* as a location "of great prestige...."

²⁴⁷ As suggested *ibid*, 441.

Once transferred to Elba, the work was positioned on the façade of the duke's primary fortress. Installed above a gate at Portoferraio, Cellini's *Bust of Cosimo I* presented Cosimo as an imposing military leader.²⁴⁸ The new context fulfilled another function for portrait busts articulated in Pliny's *Natural History*, where he discussed the display of portraits of eminent men above entryways.

Outside the houses and round the doorways there were other presentations of those mighty spirits, with spoils taken from the enemy fastened to them, which even one who bought the house was not permitted to unfasten, and the mansions eternally celebrated a triumph even though they changed their masters. This acted as a mighty incentive, when every day the very walls reproached an unwarlike owner with intruding on the triumphs of another!²⁴⁹

In this passage, Pliny praised the display of triumphant military figures above entryways, which imbued them with an apotropaic function. The installation of Cellini's bust above an important entryway paralleled the ancient Roman practice described by Pliny. Given the intense, dramatic, and forcefully-martial nature of Cellini's work, its position on a fortress was especially appropriate. This type of public display was a notable one which would become more common as the century advanced. It was precipitated by Bandinelli's *Bust of Cosimo I*.

Cellini's two bronze busts illustrate that mid-sixteenth-century display practices for such busts were shaped by antique tradition. A bronze bust in the library and a military hero over a doorway both corresponded to ancient practices. Yet both of Cellini's works were made subsequently to Bandinelli's *Bust of Cosimo I*.

²⁴⁸ Pope-Hennessy, *Cellini*, 217.

²⁴⁹ Pliny, *Natural History Vol. IX*, 35.2

In the last third of the sixteenth century, several ducal portrait busts were commissioned specifically for entryways in Florence. In 1572, Giovanni Bandini (1540-1599) received the commission for a *Bust of Cosimo I* to be placed over the doorway to the Opera dell’Duomo (fig. 86). In Bandini’s bust, the Florentine Duke has visibly aged, but maintains his steadfast gaze and strong presence. While a mantle covers much of his chest, the cuirass he wears beneath it is evident around his right shoulder. It is further suggested by the shape beneath the drapery, where his pectoral muscles and one nipple are discernable. Bandini executed four additional marble busts of Duke Cosimo I, each of which was placed above the entrance to a Florentine *palazzo*. These busts were used to mark the homes of families loyal to Cosimo. They acted as visible markers of the families’ honored status. Thus, as Pliny had discussed in the *Natural History*, the bust communicated Cosimo’s favor and patronage.²⁵⁰ By the end of the century, the form and the content – both martial and civic – had become commonplace, but was especially popular for ducal portraits carved in marble. Not only do these later works illustrate the proliferation of the *all’antica* portrait bust, but they corresponded to antique practices.

The *all’antica* portrait bust continued to gain popularity throughout the sixteenth century.²⁵¹ By the close of the century, *all’antica* portrait busts could be seen as part of tomb monuments, in palazzi, and adorning the facades of buildings. These busts faced the street, visible to anyone who passed by. Like their Roman predecessors, the Florentine portrait bust again became an object of public display, but only in limited and precise contexts. The ruler-in-armor type similarly spread, as evidenced by a series of busts by Leone Leoni (for example, fig.

²⁵⁰ Ibid, 34.9. This practice conflates Pliny’s discussion of portraits above doorways with that of setting up public sculptures – or “even in private houses and in our own halls” where they served to illustrate “the respect felt by clients inaugurated this method of doing honour to their patrons.”

²⁵¹ Bandini went on to carve a *Bust of Francesco I* which was installed above the entrance to the Florentine Mint five years later. Bandini also executed four additional marble busts of Grand Duke Francesco.

87). The form of the *all'antica* portrait bust was highly adaptable, as the socle freed it from an architectural framework.²⁵² Raised on a socle, it could inhabit and enliven any number of spaces. The possibility for dynamism in the fragmented figure was especially appealing to Baroque sculptors and the heightened drama of the swirling cloak was exploited through the seventeenth century.²⁵³

Yet the change from classical and pseudo-classical sculpture to portraiture was initially a bold act, tempered only by observance of ancient practice. The consistency with which portrait busts were displayed following Pliny's precepts reveals a careful reading of the text as a means to ascertain and incorporate antique precedent. As literary evidence for ancient practice, Pliny's text served as important source and justification for contemporary practice.

4.9 Conclusion

The first *all'antica* public busts depicting a living sitter, Bandinelli's sculpted portraits of Duke Cosimo I were innovative and influential. When Bandinelli carved an honorific sculpture of his duke, he was careful to do so in a way that adapted the earlier tradition of Florentine busts by conforming to antique precedent. Bandinelli adapted the Florentine Quattrocento bust by following these precepts for form, material, context, and content to fashion a modern ruler who merited the honorific form. He recalled classical busts in form, making significant changes to the formal characteristic of the Florentine Quattrocento type. This resulted in a dynamic design that remained popular for centuries. Bandinelli dressed his sitter in armor to follow the principle of

²⁵² Although outside the realm of this study, the varying contexts raise an interesting question. How often were the backs of such busts exposed? Since the type required a hollow back, how did artists and patrons address this unfinished aspect? Was it cultivated? The tension between fragmentation and life-likeness is mirrored by contemporary trends in painted portraiture that simultaneously made claims to represent reality and emphasized artificiality.

²⁵³ Poeschke, *Michelangelo and his World*, 48.

public portraiture honoring a military hero. Further, by 1553 the *Bust of Cosimo I* was situated above a doorway. The work featured a martial leader, honored and honorable, in a prestigious location in accordance with ancient practices.

In content, Bandinelli included Imperial Roman and Florentine iconography. The cuirass was ornamented with symbols of Cosimo I and his reign. Grafting civic and familial iconography onto the martial dress of the elite, Cosimo's identity was fused with Florence. He was not only a representative of and protector of the state; he was Florence. In its references, both overt and subtle, the sculpture associated Cosimo with Roman emperors and the modern, peaceful state of Florence. Bandinelli merged the ancient Roman past with the recent Florentine, to create a sculpture that was historically-grounded but contemporary. He adopted and adapted a Roman practice and in doing so established a new Florentine tradition.

Where previous scholarship has emphasized the Imperial Roman elements in the development of the *all'antica* portrait bust in general and Cosimo's portrait busts in particular, I have considered the importance of the extant Florentine practice as well. This chapter has established how Cosimo and Bandinelli intentionally combined ancient and Florentine precedent to instigate a tradition of Florentine ruler portraits. Politically, Cosimo was a Florentine outsider, removed from the government of Florence. He used public policy, diplomatic organization, and strategic artistic commissions to overcome his young age and inexperience. As part of this larger strategy, Bandinelli's bust of the young duke elided his personal past, emphasizing instead his civic duties, political promise, and Florentine pedigree.

Conclusion

Florence of the late 1540s was significantly different than a century or even several decades previous. Between the Siege of Florence and the plague, its citizenship had been halved. Its form of government and civic organizations would have been entirely unrecognizable to the previous generation. These changes were also visible in the portraiture of the period. Though commissioned only ten years apart, Pontormo's *Portrait of Alessandro de' Medici* and Bandinelli's *Bust of Cosimo I* present two distinctly different concepts of a Florentine leader.

Alessandro is depicted as a Florentine. Aspects that set Alessandro apart from his fellow citizens, such as his distinctive hair, are disguised or minimalized. Similarly, the work eschews more recognizable depictions of power or authority. The ambiguity often present in Pontormo's portraiture was appropriate for this sitter, whose position remained enigmatic even following the institution of the new constitution of the city in 1532. Alessandro, *il duce della repubblica fiorentina*, emphasizes his Florentine civic identity and subverts the title, honorary or otherwise, of *duce*. Alessandro meets the viewer's gaze and draws attention to the metalpoint drawing he presents for our perusal. His act of drawing adds to his Florentine identity and implicates the viewer in a recognizably Florentine and humanist pursuit of *buon disegno*. A universally disliked leader, his portrait depicts him as part of a patrician class, rather than what he truly was – a tyrannical head of the city.

The depiction of his successor, Cosimo I, exploits multiple traditions. Bandinelli amended the Florentine Republican form of the portrait bust by adapting Roman Imperial practices inspired by visual examples and in careful accordance with ancient precepts as outlined in Pliny's *Natural History*. As Cosimo securely established his princely state – and moved

ambitiously toward the creation of the Grand-Ducal state of Tuscany – his portrait bust presented him as a martial but peaceful ruler in the tradition of emperors Augustus and Hadrian. Whereas portrait busts were more commonly associated with tomb monuments, Cosimo's bust depicted a living personage. One of the earliest busts of a living contemporary, Cosimo is presented in dialogue with both the recent Florentine and ancient Imperial Roman past. The content and context of Cosimo's bust securely situate him at the head of the Florentine state. The iconography of the ducal ruler emphasizes his role as guardian of Florence. This visible work, displayed in a public room of Palazzo Vecchio, became an influential type of representation of a princely ruler.

Bronzino's *Portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatichi* bridges the two Medici sitters. Presenting the recently relocated author as a consummate Florentine aristocrat, Bronzino's depiction of Bartolomeo embodies the nascent court ethic of the early 1540s. The portrait firmly places him in Florence, reminding the viewer of his courtly resume while eliding his physical absence from the city. It positions Bartolomeo within the city both visually and conceptually. Bartolomeo's courtly persona is on display in his confident self-presentation. The details of his costume and setting place him firmly in the milieu of the Florentine elite. The setting additionally offers a chronological element. In this way, Bartolomeo is inserted into the cultural and chronological history of the city.

All three sitters are depicted in ways, both subtle and overt, that emphasize their civic identity. Examined as a series of interrelated case studies, they document the historical and visual shift from a republican to a ducal state. Each subject asserts both an individual character and a collective identity. These bold claims are especially significant as they are made amidst political and social turmoil. Additionally, all three proclaim a Florentine civic identity at the cost of other

characteristics of the sitter. All three were Florentine interlopers. Thus, the portraits both reveal and disguise while situating the sitter within this complicated period and place. Positioning themselves as part of a collective, they use this assertion of civic identity to transcend a sense of otherness, as they forge new identities and define new positions that had not previously existed. The novel roles of the sitters required invention in the history of Florentine art and the genre of portraiture.

This study re-inserts these innovative portraits into their nuanced and difficult contexts. The quantity of portraits produced during this exceptionally disruptive period is surprising. Further, strong assertions of civic identity in a period when what it meant to be a Florentine was in flux and uncertain are unexpected. My dissertation further offers a framework for considering portraiture and expressions of identity in times of turmoil. Beyond the specific time frame that is my focus, this work contributes to a fuller understanding of art and portraiture made during other periods of serious social and political disruption, such as the transition from Republic to Empire in ancient Rome, or the place of portraiture during the French Revolution.

This study also suggests new avenues of exploration in early modern studies. Where previous scholarship has positioned depictions as *fiorentinità* as distinct expressions of anti-Medicean sentiment, my dissertation examines how it functions in the pro-Medicean faction. Florentine-ness therefore can be disassociated from republicanism, and instead constitute part of a broader civic identity. In the future, fruitful research can be done on the relationship between the individual and the commune. Recognizing the artificiality in these portraits, and the way they fit into the artist's production, allows us to consider the portraits as part of a broad examination of Mannerism, whether we choose to apply the ill-defined term or not. A more holistic approach

may lead to breakthroughs, as portraits – assertions of identity in a self-confident and self-conscious age – are reinserted into wider cultural considerations.

My work answers the question: how do outsiders position themselves within the civic landscape? These individuals, whose portraits positioned them as part of a collective identity, laid the groundwork for others, including Duchess Eleonora of Toledo (1522-1562) and Grand Duchess Joanna of Austria (1547-1578). Both of these women, who brought both wealth and political connections to their husbands, are identified as outsiders even in the names by which we remember them. They benefitted from the artistic and socio-political work of previous interlopers, who sought and obtained a Florentine identity.

This study also raises questions on the agency of the artist and sitter. It begins to ask why an individual sitter commissioned a particular artist to craft his image. An intentional choice – based on the artist's style, reputation, and/or the experience of previous images – was an important part of the sitter's identity-formation. It impacted how he situated himself in the cultural, political, and social landscape.

The second quarter of the sixteenth century was a period where order was eventually imposed on chaos. Given how often and how swiftly change occurred, it is impossible to know when Florentine citizens recognized that a hereditary duchy would last. While Florentine art had become the vanguard of courtly art by the end of the 1540s, the preceding years were a period of intense artistic experimentation and advancement. The lack of Florentine political predecessors for princely rule encouraged innovative engagement with local artistic practices and ancient precedents.

This study charts the establishment of a Florentine duchy not only chronologically, but artistically as well. Even in a time of intense change and uncertainty, these portraits assert

stability. As scholars looking backwards over the long arc of history, we can identify a development. We are aware of the order eventually established. But these sitters and artists were making claims in a particular moment, without knowledge of the future. Through their self-fashioning, they legitimized themselves and their place in Florence. Despite the years of upheaval and violent change, their portraits legitimized Florence in a way that was novel even as it referenced the past. They fashioned Florence and what it meant to be a Florentine, maintaining a sense of civic identity even in the mutable city-state. The fictions they created – a Florentine leader as just an elite citizen without the formal formation of a court, a French-born and -raised citizen as a Florentine aristocrat, a Florentine Duke as part of a long tradition of rulers – have endured.

Bibliography

- Accidini Luchinat, Cristina, et al. *The Medici, Michelangelo, and the Art of Late Renaissance Florence*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002.
- Akker, Paul Van Den. *Looking for Lines: Theories on the Essence of Art and the Problem of Mannerism*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2010.
- Alazard, Jean. *The Florentine Portrait*. Translated by Barbara Whelpton. New York: Schocken Books, 1968.
- Albertini, Rudolf von. *Firenze dalla Repubblica al Principato: Storia e Coscienza Politica*. Torino: Einaudi, 1995.
- Allen, Denise and Peta Motture, editors. *Andrea Riccio: Renaissance Master of Bronze*. New York: The Frick Collection, 2008.
- Allison, Ann H. "Four New Busts by Antico." *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 20 (1976): 213-224.
- Ames-Lewis, Francis. *The Intellectual Life of the Early Renaissance Artist*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Ames-Lewis, Francis, ed. *Florence*. New Haven, CT: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- _____, and Paul Joannides, eds. *Reactions to the Master: Michelangelo's Effect on Art and Artists in the Sixteenth Century*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003.
- Bacchi, Andrea, Catherine Hess, and Jennifer Montague, eds. *Bernini and the Birth of Baroque Portrait Sculpture*. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2008.
- Baker, Nicholas Scott. *The Fruit of Liberty: Political Culture in the Florentine Renaissance, 1480-1550*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2013.
- Bambach, Carmen. *Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop: Theory and Practice, 1300-1600*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- _____, ed. *The Drawings of Bronzino*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2010.
- Bandinelli, Baccio. "Il Memoriale." In Paola Barocchi, ed. *Scritti d'arte del Cinquecento*, edited by Paola Barocchi, 1359-1411. Milan: Ricciardi, 1974.
- Barasch, Moshe. *Theories of Art from Plato to Winckelmann*. New York: New York University Press, 1985.

- Barolsky, Paul. *Michelangelo's Nose: a Myth and its Maker*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1990.
- Barkan, Leonard. *Unearthing the Past: Archaeology and Aesthetics in the Making of Renaissance Culture*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Barnes, Bernadine Ann. 2010. *Michelangelo in Print: Reproductions as Response in the Sixteenth Century*. Farnham, England ; Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Baron, Hans. *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance; Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1966.
- Barzman, Karen-edis. *The Florentine Academy and the Early Modern State: The Discipline of Disegno*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- _____. *The Limits of Identity: Early Modern Venice, Dalmatia, and the Representation of Difference*. Boston: Brill, 2017.
- Battisti, Eugenio. *L'antirinascimento: con un'appendice di testi inediti*. Milano: Garzanti, 1989.
- Baxandall, Michael. *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth Century Italy: A Primer in the Social History of Pictorial Style*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- _____. *Patterns of Intention: On the Historical Explanation of Pictures*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Bayer, Andrea, ed. *Art and Love in Renaissance Italy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Becherucci, Luisa. *Bronzino*. Firenze: Electa Editrice, 1949.
- Bellosi, Luciano. "Il ritratto fiorentino del Cinquecento." In *Il Primato del disegno, Firenze e la Toscana dei Medici nell'Europa del Cinquecento*, 39-46. Firenze: Edizioni Medicee, 1980.
- Belting, Hans. *Face and Mask: A Double History*. Translated by Thomas S. Hansen and Abby J. Hansen. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2017.
- Berger, Harry, Jr. *Fictions of the Pose: Rembrandt against the Italian Renaissance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000.
- Berti, Luciano. *Pontormo*. Firenze: Edizioni d'Arte il Fiorino, 1966.
- _____. *Pontormo e il suo Tempo*. Firenze: Casa Editrice Le letter per la Banca Toscana, 1993.

- Biow, Douglas. *On the Importance of Being an Individual in Renaissance Italy: Men, Their Professions, and their Beards*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015.
- Birbari, Elizabeth. *Dress in Italian Painting 1460-1500*. London: J. Murray, 1975.
- Black, Jane. *Absolutism in Renaissance Milan: Plenitude of Power under the Visconti and the Sforza, 1329-1535*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Blockmans, Wim and Nicolette Mour. *The World of Emperor Charles V*. Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 2004.
- Bocchi, Francesco. *The Beauties of the City of Florence: A Guidebook of 1591*. Translated by Thomas Frangenberg and Robert Williams. London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 2006.
- Bode, Wilhelm von. *Florentine Sculptors of the Renaissance 2nd Edition*. Translated by Jessie Haynes. Freeport, N.Y: Books for Libraries Press, 1968.
- Borghini, Raffaello. *Il Riposo. Saggio biobibliografico e indice analitico*. Edited by Mario Rosci. Milano: Labor riproduzioni e documentazioni, 1967.
- _____. *Il Riposo*. Translated by Lloyd H. Ellis Jr. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007.
- Borsook, Eve and Johannes Offerhaus. *Francesco Sassetti and Ghirlandaio at Santa Trinità, Florence: History and Legend in a Renaissance Chapel*. Doornspijk, Holland: Davaco, 1981.
- Boschung, Dietrich. *Die Bildnisse des Augustus*. Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1993.
- Boulton, D'Arcy Jonathan Dacre. *The Knights of the Crown: The Monarchical Orders of Knighthood in Later Medieval Europe, 1325-1520*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987.
- Bowd, Stephen D. *Venice's Most Loyal City: Civic Identity in Renaissance Brescia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Brackett, John, "Race and Rulership: Alessandro de' Medici, first Medici Duke of Florence, 1529-1537." In *Black Africans in Renaissance Europe*, edited by T.F. Earle and K.J.P. Lowe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Braudel, Fernand. *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Phillip II, Vols. I-II*. Translated by Sian Reynolds. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.
- Briganti, Giuliano. *Italian Mannerism*. Translated by Margaret Kunzle. London: Thames and Hudson, 1962.
- Brilliant, Richard. *Portraiture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.

- Brock, Maurice. *Bronzino*. Translated by David Poole Radzinowicz and Christine Schultz-Touge. Paris: Flammarion, 2002.
- Brown, David Alan. *Leonardo Da Vinci: Origins of a Genius*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998.
- _____, ed., *Virtue and Beauty: Leonardo's Ginevra de' Benci and Renaissance Portraits of Women*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- Brown, Patricia Fortini. *Venice & Antiquity: The Venetian Sense of the Past*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Brucker, Gene. *The Civic World of Early Renaissance Florence*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- _____. *Living on the Edge in Leonardo's Florence*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2005.
- Burckhardt, Jacob. *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*. Translated by S. G. C. Middlemore. London: Phaidon, 1965.
- _____. *The Altarpiece in Renaissance Italy*. Edited and translated by Peter Humfrey. Oxford: Phaidon, 1988.
- _____. *Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte von Italien: das Altarbild das Porträt in der Malerei die Sammler*. Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing, 2010.
- Burke, Jill and Michael Bury, eds. *Art and Identity in Early Modern Rome*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008.
- Burke, Jill, ed. *Rethinking the High Renaissance: The Culture of the Visual Arts in Early Sixteenth-Century Rome*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012.
- Burke, Peter. *The Historical Anthropology of Early Modern Italy: Essays on Perception and Communication*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- _____. *The Italian Renaissance: Culture and Society in Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- _____. *The Fabrication of Louis XIV*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992.
- _____. *The Fortunes of the Courtier*. University Park, PA.: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996.
- Butterfield, Andrew. *The Sculptures of Andrea Del Verrocchio*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997.

- Cadogan, Jeanne K. *Domenico Ghirlandaio: Artist and Artisan*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Cairns, Christopher, ed. *The Renaissance Theatre: Texts, Performance, Design*, vol. 2. Brookfield, VT: Ashgate, 1999.
- _____, ed. *Scenery, Set and Staging in the Italian Renaissance: Studies in the Practice of Theatre*. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1996.
- Campbell, Lorne. *Renaissance Portraits: European Portrait-Painting in the 14th, 15th and 16th Centuries*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990.
- _____, et al, eds. *Renaissance Faces: Van Eyck to Titian*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Campbell, Malcolm. "Il ritratto del Duca Alessandro de' Medici di Giorgio Vasari: Contesto e Significato." In *Giorgio Vasari tra decorazione ambientale e storiografia artistica*, edited by Gian Carlo Garfagnini, 339-61. Florence: Olschki, 1985.
- Campbell, Stephen J., ed. *Artists at Court: Image-Making and Identity 1300-1550*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- _____, and Stephen J. Milner, eds. *Artistic Exchange and Cultural Translation in the Italian Renaissance City*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Caponetto, Salvatore. *La Riforma Protestante nell'Italia del Cinquecento*. Torino: Claudiana, 1997.
- Capponi, Gino, ed. *Archivio Storico Italiano I*. Firenze: Gio. Pietro Vieusseux, 1842.
- Caravale, Giorgio. "PANCIA TICHI, Bartolomeo in 'Dizionario Biografico.'" Accessed October 26, 2016. [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/bartolomeo-panciatichi_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/bartolomeo-panciatichi_(Dizionario-Biografico)).
- Castiglione, Baldassare. *The Book of the Courtier – The Singleton Translation*. Edited by Daniel Javitch. New York: Norton & Company, 2002.
- Cavelli-Björkman, Görel. *Face to Face: Portraits from Five Centuries*. Stockholm: Nationalmuseum, 2001.
- Cecchi, Alessandro. "Percorso di Baccio d'Agnolo Legnaiuolo e Architetto Fioretino. Dal Ballatoio di Santa Maria del Fiore alle Ultime Opera, 2." *Antichità Viva* 29/2-3 (1990): 50-57.

- _____. *Agnolo Bronzino*. Translated by Christopher Evans. New York: SCALA/Riverside, 1996.
- _____. "Il Maggiordomo Ducale Pierfrancesco Riccio e gli Artisti della Corte Medicea." *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 42 (1998): 115-43.
- Cellini, Benvenuto. *La Vita: The Autobiography of Benvenuto Cellini*. Translated by George Bull. London: Penguin, 1998.
- Chambers, David S. and Francois Quiviger, editors. *Italian Academies of the Sixteenth Century*. London: The Warburg Institute, 1995.
- Chastel, André. *The Sack of Rome, 1527*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- Cheney, Liana de Girolami, ed. *Agnolo Bronzino: The Muse of Florence*. Washington, DC: New Academia Publishing, 2014.
- _____, ed. *Readings in Italian Mannerism*. New York: P. Lang, 1997.
- Chong, Alan, Donatella Pegazzano, and Dimitrio Zikos, editors. *Raphael, Cellini, & A Renaissance Banker: The Patronage of Bindo Altoviti*. Boston: Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, 2003.
- Christian, Kathleen. *Empire Without End: Antiquities Collections in Renaissance Rome, c. 1350-1527*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010.
- _____, and David Drogin, editors. *Patronage and Italian Renaissance Sculpture*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010.
- Christiansen, Keith and Stefan Weppelmann, eds. *The Renaissance Portrait from Donatello to Bellini*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011.
- Clapp, Frederick Mortimer. *Jacopo Carucci da Pontormo, his Life and Work*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1916.
- Cochrane, Eric. *Florence in the Forgotten Centuries, 1527-1800: A History of Florence and the Florentines in the Age of the Grand Dukes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.
- _____. *Italy, 1530-1630*. New York: Longman, 1988.
- Cole, Alison. *Virtue and Magnificence: Art of the Italian Renaissance Courts*. New York: Harry H. Abrams, 1995.
- Cole, Bruce. *Italian Art 1250-1550: The Relation of Renaissance Art to Life and Society*. New York: Harper and Row, 1987.

- _____. *Titian and Venetian Painting, 1450-1590*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1999.
- Cole, Michael. *Cellini and the Principles of Sculpture*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Colomina, Beatriz, ed. *Sexuality and Space*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1992.
- Connell, William J., ed. *Society and Individual in Renaissance Florence*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002.
- Conti, Alessandro. *Pontormo*. Milano: Editoriale Jaca Book, 1995.
- Coonin, Arnold Victor. "Portrait Busts of Children in Quattrocento Florence." *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 30 (1995): 61-71.
- _____. "The Most Elusive Woman in Renaissance Art: A Portrait of Marietta Strozzi." *Artibus et Historiae* 30, no. 59 (2009): 41-64.
- Costamagna, Philippe. *Pontormo*. Milano: Electa, 1994.
- _____. "De la fiorentinità des portraits de Pontormo et de Bronzino." *Paragone* 62 (2005): 50-75.
- _____. "The Formation of Florentine Draftsmanship: Life Studies from Leonardo and Michelangelo to Pontormo and Salviati." *Master Drawings* 43:3 (2005): 274-291.
- Cox-Rearick, Janet. *The Drawings of Pontormo: a Catalogue raisonnee with Notes on the Paintings, 2nd Edition*. New York: Hacker Art Books, 1981.
- _____. *Dynasty and Destiny in Medici Art: Pontormo, Leo X, and the Two Cosimos*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- _____. "From Bandinelli to Bronzino: The Genesis of the 'Lamentation' from the Chapel of Eleonora di Toledo," *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 33 (1989), 37-83.
- _____. *Bronzino's Chapel of Eleonora in the Palazzo Vecchio*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1993.
- _____ and Mary Westerman Bulgarella. "Public and Private Portraits of Cosimo de' Medici and Eleonora di Toledo: Bronzino's Paintings of his Ducal Patrons in Ottawa and Turin." *Artibus et Historiae* 29.49 (2004): 101-159.
- Cranston, Jodi. *The Poetics of Portraiture in the Italian Renaissance*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

- Cropper, Elizabeth. "On Beautiful Women, Parmigianino, Petrarchismo, and the Vernacular Style." *Art Bulletin* 58.3 (Sept., 1976): 374-394.
- _____. "Prolegomena to a New Interpretation of Bronzino's Florentine Portraits." In *Renaissance Studies in Honor of Craig Hugh Smyth, Volume 2*, edited by Andrew Morrogh, 149-160. Florence: Giunti-Barbera, 1985.
- _____. *Pontormo: Portrait of a Halberdier*. Los Angeles: Getty Museum, 1997.
- Crum, Roger J. and John T. Paoletti, eds. *Renaissance Florence: A Social History*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Currie, Elizabeth. "Clothing and a Florentine Style, 1550-1620." *Renaissance Studies* 23, no. 1 (Feb., 2009): 33-52.
- _____. *Fashion and Masculinity in Renaissance Florence*. London: Bloomsbury Academic Publishing, 2016.
- De Gaetano, Armand L. *Giambattista Gelli and the Florentine Academy: the Rebellion against Latin*. Firenze: L.S. Olschki, 1976.
- Del Bravo, Carlo. "Dal Pontormo al Bronzino." *Artibus et Historiae* 6.12 (1985): 75-87.
- Della Casa, Giovanni. *Galateo*. Translated by Konrad Eisenbichler and Kenneth R. Bartlett. Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 1986.
- Denker, Eric and William E. Wallace, "Michelangelo and Seats of Power," *Artibus et Historiae* 36, no. 72 (2015): 199-210.
- Didi-Huberman, Georges. "The Portrait, The Individual and the Singular: Remarks on the Legacy of Aby Warburg." In *The Image of the Individual: Portraits in the Renaissance*, edited by Nicholas Mann and Luke Syson, 156-188, 231-235. London: British Museum, 1998.
- Dixhoorn, Arjan van and Susie Speakman Sutch, editors. *The Reach of the Republic of Letters: Literary and Learned Societies in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe, Volume 2*. Boston: Brill, 2008.
- Donati, Andrea. *Ritratto e figura nel manierismo a Roma: Michelangelo Buonarroti, Jacopino del Conte, Daniele Ricciarelli*. Repubblica di San Marino: Asset Banca, 2010.
- Dubus, Pascale. *Qu'est ce qu'un portrait?* Paris: Insolite, 2006.
- Eclercy, Bastian, editor. *Maniera: Pontormo, Bronzino and Medici Florence*. New York: Prestel, 2016.

- Edelstein, Bruce. *La Fecundissima Signora Duchessa: the Courtly Persona of Eleonora di Toledo and the Iconography of Abundance*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004.
- _____. *The Early Patronage of Eleonora di Toledo: the Camera Verde and its Dependencies in the Palazzo Vecchio*. PhD diss., Harvard University, 1995.
- Eisenbichler, Konrad. "Bronzino's Portrait of Guidobaldo II della Rovere." *Renaissance and Reformation* 12 (Winter 1988): 21-33.
- _____, editor. *The Cultural World of Eleonora di Toledo Duchess of Florence and Siena*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004.
- _____, editor. *The Cultural Politics of Duke Cosimo I de' Medici*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2001.
- Eisenstein, Elizabeth L. *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Eisler, William. "The Impact of Emperor Charles V upon the Italian Visual Culture 1529-1533." *Arte Lombarda*, 65, No. 2 (1983): 93-110.
- Elias, Norbert. *The History of Manners*. Translated by Edmund Jephcott. New York: Urizen Books, 1978.
- Emison, Patricia. *The Italian Renaissance and Cultural Memory*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Enekel, Karl, Betsy de Jong-Crane and Peter Liebrechts, eds. *Modelling the Individual: Biography and Portrait in the Renaissance*. Atlanta, Georgia: Rodopi, 1998.
- Ekserdjian, David. *Parmigianino*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006.
- Everson, Jane E., Denis V. Reidy, and Lisa Sampson, eds. *The Italian Academies 1525-1700: Networks of Culture, Innovation and Dissent*. Cambridge: Legenda, 2016.
- Falciani, Carlo. *Pontormo: disegni degli Uffizi*. Firenze: L.S. Olschki, 1996.
- _____. *Il Rosso Fiorentino*. Firenze: L.S. Olschki, 1996.
- _____, and Antonio Natali, editors. *Bronzino: Artist and Poet at the Court of the Medici*. Firenze: Mandragora, 2010.
- _____, and Antonio Natali, editors. *Pontormo and Rosso Fiorentino: Diverging Paths of Mannerism*. Firenze: Mandragora, 2014.
- Farrell, Joseph and Paolo Puppa, eds. *A History of Italian Theatre*. New York: Cambridge

- University Press, 2006.
- Feeser, Andrea, Maureen Daly Goggin, Beth Fowkes Tobin, eds. *The Materiality of Color: The Production, Circulation, and Application of Dyes and Pigments, 1400-1800*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012.
- Fejfer, Jane. *Roman Portraits in Context*. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.
- Ferino-Pagden, Sylvia and Andreas Beyer, eds. *Tizian versus Seisenegger: die Portraits Karls V mit Hund: Ein Holbeinstreit*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2005.
- Firpo, Massimo. *Gli affreschi di Pontormo a San Lorenzo. Eresia, politica e cultura nella Firenze di Cosimo I*. Torino: G. Einaudi, 1997
- Fletcher, Catherine. *The Black Prince of Florence: The Spectacular Life and Treacherous World Of Alessandro de' Medici*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Fornari Schianchi, Lucia and Sylvia Ferino Pagden, eds. *Parmigianino e il manierismo europeo*. Milano: Silvana, 2003.
- Forster, Kurt W. *Mannerist Painting: the Sixteenth Century*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- _____. *Pontormo: Monographie mit kritischem Katalog*. München: Bruckmann, 1966.
- _____. "Metaphors of Rule: Political Ideology and History in the Portraits of Cosimo I de' Medici." *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 15 (1971): 65-104.
- Fragenberg, Thomas and Robert Williams, eds. *The Beholder: The Experience of Art in Early Modern Europe*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006.
- Franklin, David. *Leonardo Da Vinci, Michelangelo, and the Renaissance in Florence*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.
- _____. *Painting in Renaissance Florence 1500-1550*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001.
- _____. *Rosso in Italy: the Italian Career of Rosso Fiorentino*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994.
- Freedberg, S. J. *Painting of the High Renaissance in Florence and Rome*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961.
- _____. *Parmigianino: His Works in Painting*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1971.
- _____. *Painting in Italy, 1500-1600*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993.

- Freedman, Luba. *Titian's Portraits through Aretino's Lens*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995.
- _____. *The Revival of the Olympian Gods in Renaissance Art*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Friedlaender, Walter. *Mannerism and Anti-Mannerism in Italian Painting*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1965.
- Gáldy, Andrea M. *Cosimo I de Medici as Collector: Antiquities and Archaeology in Sixteenth-Century Florence*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009.
- _____, editor. *Agnolo Bronzino: Medici Court Artist in Context*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013.
- Gallo, Daniela. "Small Portraits for Great Men: The Miniature Portrait Bust in the Sixteenth Century." *The Rijksmuseum Bulletin* 58, no. 1 (2010): 56-73.
- Gallucci, Margaret A. and Paolo L. Rossi, editors. *Benvenuto Cellini: Sculptor, Goldsmith, Writer*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Gamba, Carlo. *Il Pontorno*. Firenze: Fratelli Alinari, 1921.
- Gentili, Augusto, editor. *Il Ritratto e la Memoria: Materiali I*. Roma: Bulzoni Editore, 1989.
- Gergel, Richard A. "Agora S166 and Related Works: The Iconography, Typology, and Interpretation of the Eastern Hadrianic Breastplate Type." In *Charis: Essays in Honor of Sara A. Immerwahr*, edited by Anne P. Chapin, 371-410. Princeton, NJ: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 2004.
- Ghiberti, Lorenzo. *I commentarii: Biblioteca nazionale centrale di Firenze, II, I, 333*. Edited by Lorenzo Bartoli. Firenze: Giunti, 1998.
- Goffen, Rona. *Renaissance Rivals: Michelangelo, Leonardo, Raphael, Titian*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002.
- Goguel, Catherine Monbeig, ed. *Francesco Salviati o la Bella Maniera*. Milano: Electra, 1998.
- Goldthwaite, Richard A. *Wealth and the Demand for Art in Italy 1300-1600*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.
- _____. *The Economy of Renaissance Florence*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009.
- Gombrich, E.H. *Norm and Form*. New York: Phaidon, 1978.

- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- _____. *The Swerve: How the World Became Modern*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2011.
- Greve, David. *Status und Statue: Studien zu Leben und Werk des Florentiner Bildhauers Baccio Bandinelli*. Berlin: Frank & Timme GmbH, 2008.
- Guicciardini, Francesco. *Dialogue on the Government of Florence*. Translated by Alison Brown. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- _____. *The History of Florence*. Translated by Mario Domandi. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- _____. *History of Italy*. Translated by Sidney Alexander. New York: Macmillan, 1968.
- Hairston, Julia L. and Walter Stephens, eds. *The Body in Early Modern Italy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010.
- Hale, J. R. *Artists and Warfare in the Renaissance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Hall, Marcia. *After Raphael: Painting in Central Italy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Hanning, Robert W. and David Rosand, editors. *Castiglione: The Ideal and the Real in Renaissance Culture*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983.
- Hariman, Robert and John Louis Lucaites. "Performing Civic Identity: The Iconic Photograph of the Flag Raising on Iwo Jima." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88, no. 4 (Nov. 2002): 363-392.
- Hartt, Frederick. "Art and Freedom in Quattrocento Florence." In *Essays in Memory of Karl Lehmann*, edited by Lucy Freeman Sandler, 114-131. Locust Valley, NY: J.J. Augustin Publisher, 1964.
- Haskell, Francis and Nicholas Penny. *Taste and the Antique: the Lure of Classical Sculpture, 1500-1900*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981.
- Hauser, Arnold. *The Sociology of Art*. Translated by Kenneth J. Northcott. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Hegener, Nicole. *Divi Iacobi Eqves: Selbstdarstellung im Werk des florentiner bildhauers Baccio Bandinelli*. München: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2008.
- Heikamp, Detlaf. "Die Bildwerk des Clemente Bandinelli." *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* IX (1960): 130-136.

- _____ and Beatrice Paolozzi Strozzi, eds., *Baccio Bandinelli: Scultore E Maestro (1493-1560)*. Firenze: Giunti Editore, 2014.
- Hekler, Antal. *Greek and Roman Portraits*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1912.
- Herald, Jacqueline. *Renaissance Dress in Italy, 1400-1500*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1981.
- Hillard, Caroline S. "Mythic Origins, Mythic Archaeology: Etruscan Antiquities in Sixteenth-Century Narratives of the Foundation of Florence." *Renaissance Quarterly* 69, no. 2 (Summer 2016): 489-528.
- Hirst, Michael. "BANDINELLI, Baccio in 'Dizionario Biografico.'" Accessed October 4, 2017. [Http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/baccio-bandinelli_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/baccio-bandinelli_(Dizionario-Biografico)).
- Hollingsworth, Mary. *Patronage in Sixteenth-Century Italy*. London: John Murray, 1996.
- _____ and Carol M. Richardson, eds. *The Possessions of a Cardinal: Politics, Piety, and Art, 1450-1700*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2010.
- _____. "Art Patronage in Renaissance Urbino, Pesaro, and Rimini, c. 1400-1500." In *The Court Cities of Northern Italy: Milan, Parma, Piacenza, Mantua, Ferrara, Bologna, Urbino, Pesaro, and Rimini*, edited by Charles M. Rosenberg, 325-368. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Hughes, Diane Owen. "Representing the Family: Portraits and Purposes in Early Modern Italy." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 17 (1986): 7-38.
- Humfrey, Peter. *The Altarpiece in Renaissance Venice*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993.
- _____. *Painting in Renaissance Venice*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995.
- _____, ed. *Venice and the Veneto*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Ianziti, Gary. *Writing History in Renaissance Italy: Leonardo Bruni and the Uses of the Past*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2012.
- Isager, Jacob. *Pliny on Art and Society: The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art*. New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Jacks, Philip, ed. *Vasari's Florence: Artists and Literati at the Medicean Court*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Janson, H.W. "A Florentine Sixteenth Century Portrait." *Bulletin of the City Art Museum of St.*

- Louis* 29 (Nov. 1944): 1-7.
- Jenkins, Marianna. *The State Portrait: Its Origins and Evolution*. New York: College Art Association of America in conjunction with the Art Bulletin, 1947.
- Jurdjevic, Mark. *A Great and Wretched City: Promise and Failure in Machiavelli's Florentine Political Thought*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014.
- Kammerer, Elsa. *Jean de Vauzelles et le creuset lyonnais: Un humaniste catholique au service de Marguerite de Navarre entre France, Italie et Allemagne (1520–1550)*. Genève: Librairie Droz, 2013.
- Kampen, Natalie Boymel. *Family Fictions in Roman Art*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Kemp, Martin. *Behind the Picture: Art and Evidence in the Italian Renaissance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Kent, Dale. *Cosimo de' Medici and the Florentine Renaissance: the Patron's Oeuvre*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000.
- _____. *Friendship, Love, & Trust in Renaissance Florence*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2009.
- Kent, F.W. *Household and Lineage in Renaissance Florence: The Family Life of the Capponi, Ginori, and Rucellai*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- Keutner, Herbert. *Sculpture: Renaissance to Rococo*. Greenwich, CT: New York Graphic Society, 1969.
- Klein, John. *Matisse Portraits*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001.
- Landau, David and Peter Parshall. *The Renaissance Print, 1470-1550*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994.
- Landucci, Luca. *A Florentine Diary from 1450 to 1516*. Translated by Alice de Rosen Jervis. New York: Arno Press, 1969.
- Langdon, Gabrielle. "Pontormo and Medici Lineages: Maria Salviati, Alessandro, Giulia and Giulio de' Medici." *RACAR* 19.1-2 (1992): 20-40.
- _____. *Medici Women: Portraits of Power, Love, and Betrayal from the Court of Duke Cosimo I*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.
- Lavin, Irving. "On Illusion and Allusion in Italian Sixteenth-Century Portrait Busts." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 119, no. 5 (1975): 353-362.

- _____. "On the Sources and Meaning of the Renaissance Portrait Bust." *The Art Quarterly* 33, no. 3 (1970): 207-226.
- Lazzaro, Claudia. "Michelangelo's Medici Chapel and Its Aftermath: Scattered Bodies and Florentine Identities under the Duchy." *California Italian Studies* 6, no. 1 (January 1, 2016): 1-35, <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/4gv6c9b5>.
- Le Gall, Jean-Marie. *Un Idéal Masculin?: Barbes et Moustaches (XVe - XVIIIe Siècles)*. Paris: Payot, 2011.
- Levey, Michael. "A Prince of Court Painters: Bronzino." *Apollo* 76 (1962): 165-72.
- Levi Pisetzky, Rosita. *Storia del costume in Italia, Volume 3*. Milano: Istituto Editoriale Italiano, 1966.
- Lewis, Douglas. "An Early Series of Dynastic Portrait Busts by Alessandro Vittoria." *Artibus et Historiae* 19, no. 35 (1997): 113-134.
- Lingohr, Michael. *Der Florentiner Palastbau der Hochrenaissance: Der Palazzo Bartolini Salimbeni in seinem historischen und architekturgeschichtlichen Kontext*. Worms: Wernersche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1997.
- Litchfield, R. Burr. *Emergence of a Bureaucracy: the Florentine Patricians, 1530-1790*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Lloyd, Christopher. *Italian Paintings before 1600 in The Art Institute of Chicago*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Loh, Maria H. "Renaissance Faciality." *Oxford Art Journal* 32.3 (2009): 341, 343-363.
- _____. *Still Lives: Death, Desire, and the Portrait of the Old Master*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2015.
- Lomazzo, Giovanni Paolo. *Trattato dell'arte della pittura, scoltura, et architettura*. Milano: P.G. Pontio, 1585.
- Luchs, Alison. *Tullio Lombardo and Ideal Portrait Sculpture in Renaissance Venice, 1490-1530*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- _____. "Lorenzo from Life? Renaissance Portrait Busts of Lorenzo de' Medici." *The Sculpture Journal* 4 (2000): 6-23.
- Mann, Nicholas and Luke Syson, eds. *The Image of the Individual: Portraits in the Renaissance*. London: British Museum Press, 1998.

- Machiavelli, Niccolò. *Art of War*. Translated by Christopher Lynch. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- _____. *Florentine Histories*. Translated by Laura F. Banfield and Harvey C. Mansfield. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988.
- _____. *The Prince*. Translated by Harvey C. Mansfield. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- Marotti, Ferruccio. *Lo spettacolo dall'Umanesimo al Manierismo: Teoria e tecnica*. Milano: Feltrinelli, 1974.
- Martin, Thomas. "Giovanni Caccini's Bust of Baccio Valori." *The Burlington Magazine* 144, no. 1197 (Dec., 2002): 724-734.
- _____. "The Tomb of Alessandro Antinori: A Prolegomenon to the Study of the Florentine Sixteenth-Century Portrait Bust." *The Burlington Magazine* 143, no. 1185 (Dec. 2001): 741-746.
- _____. *Alessandro Vittoria and the Portrait Bust in Renaissance Venice: Remodelling Antiquity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- _____. "Michelangelo's 'Brutus' and the Classicizing Portrait Bust in Sixteenth-Century Italy." *Artibus et Historiae* 14, no. 27 (1993): 67-83.
- Matthews, P.G. "Jakob Seisenegger's Portraits of Charles V, 1530-32." *The Burlington Magazine* 143, No. 1175 (Feb., 2001): 86-90.
- McComb, Arthur K. *Agnolo Bronzino; his Life and Works*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928.
- McCorquodale, Charles. *Bronzino*. New York: Harper and Row, 1981.
- McHam, Sarah Blake. *Pliny and the Artistic Culture of the Italian Renaissance: The Legacy of the Natural History*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013.
- _____, editor. *Looking at Italian Renaissance Sculpture*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Middledorf, Ulrich. "On Some Portrait Busts Attributed to Leone Leoni." *The Burlington Magazine* 117 no. 863 (Feb. 1975): 84-89, 91.
- Moda alla corte dei Medici: gli abiti restaurati di Cosimo, Eleonora e don Garzia*. Firenze: Centro Di, 1993.
- Morrison, Alan S., Julius Kirshner, and Anthony Molho. "Epidemics in Renaissance Florence."

- American Journal of Public Health* 75:5 (May 1985): 528-535.
- Moskowitz, Anita. "Donatello's Reliquary Bust of Saint Rossore." *The Art Bulletin* 63, no. 1 (March, 1981): 41-48.
- Motture, Peta, Emma Jones and Dimitrios Zikos, editors. *Carvings, Casts & Collectors: The Art Of Renaissance Sculpture*. London: V&A Publishing, 2013.
- Murray, Linda. *The High Renaissance and Mannerism: Italy, the North, and Spain 1500-1600*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Murry, Gregory. *The Medicean Succession: Monarchy and Sacral Politics in Duke Cosimo dei Medici's Florence*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014.
- Musacchio, Jacqueline Marie. *Art, Marriage, and Family in the Florentine Renaissance Palace*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Nagel, Alexander. *The Controversy of Renaissance Art*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011.
- _____ and Christopher S. Wood. *Anachronic Renaissance*. New York: Zone Books, 2010.
- Najemy, John. *A History of Florence 1200-1575*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008.
- Nardi, Jacopo. *Istorie della citta di Firenze*. Edited by Agenore Gelli. Firenze: Felice le Monnier, 1858.
- Nodelman, Sheldon. "How to Read a Roman Portrait." In *Roman Art in Context: An Anthology*, edited by Eve d'Ambra, pp. 10-26. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1993.
- Norris, Herbert. *Tudor Costume and Fashion*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 1997.
- Olson, Roberta J.M. *Italian Renaissance Sculpture*. New York: Thames & Hudson, 1992.
- O'Malley, Michelle. *The Business of Art: Contracts and the Commissioning Process in Renaissance Italy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Orsi Landini, Roberta and Bruna Niccoli. *Moda Firenze, 1540-1580: lo stile di Eleonora di Toledo e la sua influenza*. Firenze: Pagliai Polistampa, 2005.
- Panofsky, Erwin. *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art*. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1960.
- _____. *Idea: A Concept in Art Theory*. Translated by Joseph J.S. Peake. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1968.

- Paoletti, John T. *Michelangelo's David: Florentine History and Civic Identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Parker, Deborah. *Bronzino: Renaissance Painter as Poet*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Partridge, Loren and Randolph Starn. *A Renaissance Likeness: Art and Culture in Raphael's Julius II*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.
- Partridge, Loren. *Art of Renaissance Florence, 1400-1600*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2009.
- Passerini, Luigi. *Genealogia e Storia della Famiglia Panciatichi*. Firenze: Tipi di M. Cellini ec., 1858.
- Perkinson, Stephen. *The Likeness of the King: A Prehistory of Portraiture in Late Medieval France*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2009.
- Phyrr, Stuart W. and Jose-A. Godoy. *Heroic Armor of the Italian Renaissance: Filippo Negroli and his Contemporaries*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1998.
- Pilliod, Elizabeth. "Le Noli me Tangere de Bronzino et la décoration de la Chapelle Cavalcanti de l'église Santo Spirito à Florence." *La revue du Louvre et des musées de France* v-vi (1991): 50-61.
- _____. *Pontormo, Bronzino, Allori: A Genealogy of Florentine Art*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001.
- Pinkus, Debra, ed. *Small Bronzes in the Renaissance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001.
- Piovan, Francesco. "Gli studi padovani di Bartolomeo Panciatichi." *Quaderno per la Storia dell'Università di Padova* 20 (1987): 119-122.
- Plazzotta, Carol. "Bronzino's Laura." *The Burlington Magazine* 140, no. 1141 (1998): 251-63.
- Pliny the Elder. *Natural History Volume IX, Libri XXXIII-XXXV*. Translated by H. Rackham. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1952.
- Poeschke, Joachim. *Donatello and his World: Sculpture of the Italian Renaissance*. Translated by Russell Stockman. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1993.
- _____. *Michelangelo and his World: Sculpture of the Italian Renaissance*. Translated by Russell Stockman. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1996.
- Pommier, Eduard. *Théories du portrait: De la Renaissance aux Lumières*. Paris: Gallimard,

- 1998.
- Pontorno, *Diario*. Milano: Abscondita, 2005.
- Pope-Hennessy, John. *Essays on Italian Sculpture*. New York: Phaidon, 1968.
- _____. *The Portrait in the Renaissance*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979.
- _____. *Cellini*. New York: Abbeville Press, 1985.
- _____. *Italian High Renaissance and Baroque Sculpture, 4th Edition*. London: Phaidon Press, 1996.
- Pyhrr, Stuart W. and Jose-A. Godoy. *Heroic Armor of the Italian Renaissance: Filippo Negroli and his Contemporaries*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1998.
- Rabelais, François. *Gargantua and Pantagruel*. Translated by M. A. Screech. New York: Penguin Books, 2006.
- Raeymaekers, Dries and Sebastiaan Derks, eds. *The Key to Power? The Culture of Access in Princely Courts, 1400-1750*. Boston: Brill, 2016.
- Rebecchini, Guido. *Un altro Lorenzo: Ippolito de' Medici tra Firenze e Roma (1511-1535)*. Venezia: Marsilio, 2010.
- Reiss, Jonathan B. "The Civic View of Sculpture in Alberti's De re Aedificatoria." *Renaissance Quarterly* 32 no. 1 (Spring, 1979): 1-17.
- Rice, Eugene F. *The Foundations of Early Modern Europe 1460-1559*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1970.
- Ripa, Cesare. *Iconologia*. New York: G. Olms, 1970.
- Rogers, Mary, ed. *Fashioning Identities in Renaissance Art*. Brookfield, VT: Ashgate, 2000.
- Rosenthal, Margaret F. and Ann Rosalind Jones, translators. *Cesare Vellio's Baiti Antichi et Moderni. The Clothing of the Renaissance World: Europe, Asia, Africa, the Americas*. London: Thames and Hudson, Ltd., 2008.
- Roth, Cecil. *The Last Florentine Republic*. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1925.
- Rubin, Patricia Lee. *Images and Identity in Fifteenth-Century Florence*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Rubinstein, Nicolai. *The Palazzo Vecchio, 1298-1532: Government, Architecture and Imagery in The Civic Palace of the Florentine Republic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.

- Ruffini, Franco. *Teatri Prima el Teatro: Visioni dell'edificio e della scena tra Umanesimo e Rinascimento*. Roma: Bulzoni editore, 1983.
- Sale, Heather Lynn. "Defining the Florentine Mannerist Portrait: Its Origins, Development, and Cultural Environment." PhD diss., Indiana University, 2001.
- Schaeffer, Emil. *Das florentiner Bildnis*. München: Verlagsanstalt F. Bruchmann, 1904.
- Scher, Stephen, ed. *Perspectives on the Renaissance Medal*. New York: Garland Publishers, 2000.
- _____. *The Currency of Fame: Portrait Medals of the Renaissance*. New York: H.N. Abrams, 1994.
- Schlosser, Julius von. "History of Portraiture in Wax." Translated by James Michael Loughridge. In *Ephemeral Bodies: Wax Sculpture and the Human Figure*, edited by Roberta Panzanelli, 171-314. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2008.
- Schneider, Norbert. *The Art of the Portrait: Masterpieces of European Portrait Painting, 1420-1670*. Köln: Benedikt Taschen, 1999.
- Schubring, Paul. *Die italienische Plastik des Quattrocento*. Berlin-Neubabelsberg: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion, 1915.
- Seymour, Charles. *Sculpture in Italy: 1400-1500*. Baltimore: Penguin, 1966.
- _____. "A Florentine Portrait of the Sixteenth Century." In *Papers on Objects in the Collections of the City Art Museum of St. Louis*, in *St. Louis Art Museum Monographs II*, 8-34. St. Louis: City Art Museum of St. Louis, 1970.
- Shearman, John. *Mannerism*. New York: Penguin Books, 1967.
- _____. *Only Connect--: Art and the Spectator in the Italian Renaissance*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Simoncelli, Paolo. *Fuoriuscitismo Repubblicano Fiorentino 1530-54: Volume Primo – 1530-37*. Milano: FrancoAngeli, 2006.
- Simons, Patricia. "Portraiture and Patronage in Quattrocento Florence: with special reference to the Tornaquinci and their Chapel in S. Maria Novella." PhD diss., University of Melbourne, 1985.
- _____. "Women in Frames: The Gaze, the Eye, the Profile in Renaissance Portraiture." *History Workshop Journal* 25 (1988): 4-30.

- _____. "Alert and Erect: Masculinity in Some Italian Renaissance Portraits of Fathers and Sons." In *Gender Rhetorics: Postures of Dominance and Submission in History*, edited by Richard C. Texler, 163-186. Birmingham, NY: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1994.
- _____. "Disegno and Desire in Pontormo's Alessandro de' Medici." *Renaissance Studies* 22.5 (2008): 650-668
- Smyth, Craig Hugh. *Bronzino as Draughtsman: an Introduction, with Notes on his Portraiture and Tapestries*. Locust Valley, NY: J.J. Augustin, 1971.
- Soussloff, Catherine M. *The Subject in Art: Portraiture and the Birth of the Modern*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.
- Spini, Giorgio. *Cosimo I e l'Indipendenza del Principato Mediceo*. Firenze: Vallecchi, 1980.
- Springer, Carolyn. *Armour and Masculinity in the Italian Renaissance*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010.
- Stallybrass, Peter and Ann Rosalind Jones. "Fetishizing the Glove in Renaissance Europe." *Critical Inquiry* 28, no. 1 (Autumn, 2001): 114-132.
- Starn, Randolph and Loren Partridge. *Arts of Power: Three Halls of State in Italy, 1300-1500*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
- Steen Hansen, Morten. *In Michelangelo's Mirror: Perino del Vaga, Daniele da Volterra, Pellegrino Tibaldi*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2013.
- Steinberg, Leo. "Pontormo's Alessandro de Medici, or, I only have eyes for you." *Art in America* 63.1 (January-February 1975): 62-65
- Stephens, J.N. *The Fall of the Florentine Republic, 1512-1530*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.
- Stewart, Peter. *Statues in Roman Society: Representation and Response*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Strehlke, Carl Brandon. "Pontormo, Alessandro de' Medici, and the Palazzo Pazzi." *Philadelphia Museum of Art Bulletin* 81 (Autumn, 1985): 3-15.
- _____. *Pontormo, Bronzino and the Medici: The Transformation of the Renaissance Portrait in Florence*. Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art in association with the Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004.
- Summers, David. *The Judgment of Sense: Renaissance Naturalism and the Rise of Aesthetics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

- Syson, Luke and Dora Thornton. *Objects of Virtue: Art in Renaissance Italy*. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2001.
- Thornton, Peter. *The Italian Renaissance Interior, 1400-1600*. New York: H.N. Abrams, 1991.
- Trachtenberg, Marvin. *Dominion of the Eye: Urbanism, Art, and Power in Early Modern Florence*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Trexler, Richard C. *Public Life in Renaissance Florence*. New York: Academic Press, 1980.
- Van Veen, Hank Th. *Cosimo I de' Medici and His Self-Representation in Florentine Art and Culture*. Translated by Andrew P. McCormick. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Varchi, Benedetto. *Storie fiorentine*. Edited by Lelio Arbib. Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2003.
- Vasari, Giorgio. *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori e architettori: nelle redazioni del 1550 e 1568*. 6 vols. Edited by Rosanna Bettarini and Paola Barocchi. Firenze: Sansoni, 1966-1987.
- Vecellio, Cesare. *Habitichi Antichi et Moderni di Tutto il Mondo. The Clothing of the Renaissance World: Europe, Asia, Africa, the Americas*. Translated by Margaret F. Rosenthal and Ann Rosalind Jones. London: Thames and Hudson, Ltd., 2008.
- Venturi, Lionello. *The Sixteenth Century: From Leonardo to El Greco*. Translated by Stuart Gilbert. New York: Skira, 1956.
- Villa, Giovanni Carlo Federico, ed. *Tiziano*. Milano: Silvana Editoriale, 2013.
- Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca*. Venezia: G.G. Hertz, 1686.
- Wackernagel, Martin. *The World of the Florentine Renaissance Artist: Projects, Patrons, Workshop and Art Market*. Translated by Alison Luchs. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981.
- Waldman, Louis A. *Baccio Bandinelli and Art at the Medici Court: A Corpus of Early Modern Sources*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2004.
- _____ and Brenda Preyer. "The Rise of the Patronage Portrait in Late Renaissance Florence: An Enigmatic Portrait of Giovanni di Paolo Rucellai and its Role in Family Commemoration." *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 54 (2010-2012): 133-154.
- Walker-Oakes, Vanessa. "Representing the Perfect Prince: Pontormo's Alessandro de Medici." *Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 32 (2001): 127-146.

- Wallace, William, editor. *Michelangelo: Selected Readings*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc. 1999.
- Warburg, Aby. "The Art of Portraiture and the Florentine Bourgeoisie." In *The Renewal of Pagan Antiquity: Contribution to the Cultural History of the European Renaissance*, trans. by David Britt, 185-221. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1999.
- Warnke, Martin. *The Court Artist: On the Ancestry of the Modern Artist*. Translated by David McLintock. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Weil-Garris, Kathleen. "Bandinelli and Michelangelo: A Problem of Artistic Identity." In *Art the Ape of Nature: Studies in Honor of H.W. Janson*, edited by Moshe Barasch and Lucy F. Sandler, 223-251. New York: H.N. Abrams, 1981.
- Welch, Evelyn S. *Art and Authority in Renaissance Milan*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995.
- West, Shearer. *Portraiture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Wittkower, Rudolf and Margot Wittkower. *Born under Saturn: The Character and Conduct of Artists: A Documented History from Antiquity to the French Revolution*. New York: Norton, 1969.
- Wood, Jeryldene M., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Piero della Francesca*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Woodall, Joanna, ed. *Portraiture: Facing the Subject*. New York: Manchester University Press, 1997.
- Woods-Marsden, Joanna. *Renaissance Self-Portraiture: The Visual Construction of Identity and the Social Status of the Artist*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998.
- _____. "Piero della Francesca's Ruler Portraits." In *The Cambridge Companion to Piero della Francesca*, edited by Jeryldene M. Wood, 91-114. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- _____, ed. *Titian: Materiality, Likeness, Istorica*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2007.
- _____. "The Sword in Titian's Portraits of Emperor Charles V." *Artibus et Historiae* 34, no. 67 (2013): 201-218.
- Zanker, Paul. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Translated by Alan Shapiro. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1988.

Zöllner, Frank. "The Motions of the Mind in Renaissance Portraits: The Spiritual Dimension of Portraiture." *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 68 (2005): 23-40.

Zorzi, Ludovico. *Il teatro e la città: Saggi sulla scena italiana*. Torino: Giulio Einaudi editori, 1977.

Zuraw, Shelley. "The Sculpture of Mino da Fiesole (1429-1484)." PhD diss., New York University, 1993.

_____. "The Medici portraits of Mino da Fiesole." In *Piero de' Medici 'il Gottoso' (1416-69): Art in the Service of the Medici*, edited by Andreas Beyer and Bruce Boucher, 317-339. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1993.

Figures



Figure 1 Pontormo, *Portrait of Alessandro de' Medici*, 1534-35, oil on panel, 101.3 x 81.9 cm.
Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia.



Figure 2 Pontormo, *Alessandro de' Medici*, 1534-35, oil on panel, 35.3 x 25.8 cm. Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago.



Figure 3 Andrea del Castagno, *Portrait of a Man*, c. 1450, tempera on panel, 55.5 x 41.2 cm.
National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.



Figure 4 Sandro Botticelli, *Portrait of Giuliano de' Medici*, c. 1478-80, tempera on panel, 75.5 x 52.5 cm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.



Figure 5 Sandro Botticelli, *Portrait of a Man with a Medal of Cosimo the Elder*, c. 1474, tempera on panel, 57.5 x 44 cm. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.



Figure 6 Leonardo da Vinci, *Portrait of Ginevra de' Benci*, c. 1474-78, tempera on panel, 38.1 x 37 cm. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.



Figures 7-8 Raphael, *Portrait of Agnolo Doni* and *Portrait of Maddalena Doni*, c. 1506, oil on panel, 63 x 45 cm each. Galleria Palatina, Florence.



Figure 9 Ridolfo Ghirlandaio, *Portrait of a Gentleman*, c. 1505, oil, probably with some tempera, on panel, later transferred to canvas, 68.2 x 49.2 cm. Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago.



Figure 10 Giuliano Bugiardini, *Portrait of Leonardo de' Ginori*, c. 1528, oil on panel, 62.9 x 47 cm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.



Figure 11 Pontormo, *Portrait of a Goldsmith*, c. 1517-18, oil on panel, 70 x 53 cm. Musée du Louvre, Paris.



Figure 12 Pontormo, *The Visitation*, c. 1528-29, oil on panel, 202 x 156 cm. Pieve di San Michele Arcangelo, Carmignano.



Figure 13 Pontormo, *Youth in a Pink Coat*, c. 1525, oil on panel, 85 x 61 cm. Museo Nazionale di Palazzo Mansi, Lucca.



Figure 14 Andrea del Sarto, *Portrait of a Woman with a Basket of Spindles*, c. 1517, oil on panel, 76 x 54 cm. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.



Figure 15 Andrea del Sarto, *Portrait of a Woman with a Petrarchino*, c. 1528, oil on panel, 87 x 69 cm. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.



Figure 16 Pontormo, *Maria Salviati with Giulia de' Medici*, c. 1537, oil on panel, 88 x 71.3 cm.
The Walters Art Museum, Baltimore.



Figure 17 Pontormo, *Maria Salviati*, c. 1543, oil on panel, 87 x 71 cm. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.



Figure 18 Pontormo, *Maria Salviati with Giulia de' Medici* detail, oil on panel, 88 x 71.3 cm.
The Walters Art Museum, Baltimore.



Figures 19-20 Bronzino, *Portrait of Bia de' Medici* and detail, c. 1542, oil on panel, 63 x 48 cm.
Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.



Figure 21 Giorgio Vasari, *Portrait of Alessandro de' Medici*, 1533-34, oil on panel, 157 x 114 cm. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.



Figure 22 *Portrait of Alessandro de' Medici*, sixteenth century, oil on panel. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.



Figure 23 Domenico di Polo, *Cameo of Alessandro de' Medici*, 1532-47, green chalcedony and gold, 38 x 25.5 mm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London.



Figure 24 Benvenuto Cellini, *Alessandro de' Medici* obverse, sixteenth century, silver testoon, 2.9 cm diameter. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.



Figure 25 Pedro Berruguete and/or Justus of Ghent, *Portrait of Federico da Montefeltro and his Son*, 1480-81, oil on panel, 134 x 77cm. Galleria Nazionale delle Marche, Urbino.



Figures 26-27 Sperandio Savelli, *Medal of Federico da Montefeltro* obverse and reverse, c. 1482, bronze, 8.7 cm diameter. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.



Figure 28 Titian, *Portrait of Charles V with a Hound*, c. 1533, oil on canvas, 194 x 112.7 cm.
Museo del Prado, Madrid.



Figure 29 Jacob Seisenegger, *Portrait of Charles V with a Hound*, 1532, oil on canvas, 204 x 123 cm. Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna.



Figure 30 Pontormo, *Portrait of Alessandro de' Medici* detail, 1534-35, oil on panel, 101.3 x 81.9 cm overall. Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia.



Figure 31 Copy after Pontormo, *Alessandro de' Medici*, 1530s, black chalk on paper, 23.8 x 18.7 cm. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.



Figure 32 Agnolo Bronzino, *Portrait of Bartolomeo Panciatichi*, c. 1541, oil on panel, 104 x 85 cm. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.



Figure 33 Agnolo Bronzino, *Portrait of Lucrezia Panciatichi*, c. 1541, oil on panel, 102 x 83.5 cm. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.



Figure 34 Agnolo Bronzino, *Portrait of Ugolino Martelli*, c. 1537-40, oil on panel, 102 x 85 cm.
Staatliche Museen, Berlin.



Figure 35 Agnolo Bronzino, *Portrait of Lorenzo Lenzi*, c. 1532, oil on panel, 90 x 71 cm. Castello Sforzesco, Milan.



Figure 36 Agnolo Bronzino, *Portrait of Laura Battiferri*, 1555-60, oil on canvas, 83 x 60 cm.
Palazzo Vecchio, Florence.



Figure 37 Agnolo Bronzino, *Portrait of Guidobaldo II della Rovere*, 1531-32, oil on panel, 114 x 86 cm. Galleria Palatina, Florence.



Figure 38 Agnolo Bronzino *Portrait of Cosimo I de' Medici in Armor*, 1543, oil on panel, 74 x 58 cm. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.



Figure 39 Jean Clouet, detail from *Les Trois premiers livres de Diodore Sicilien*, 1534, color on parchment, 29 x 20 cm. Musée Condé, Chantilly, France.



Figure 40 Jean Clouet, *Francis I*, c. 1530, oil on panel, 21 x 17 cm. Musée du Louvre, Paris.



Figure 41 Studio of Jean Clouet, *Jean de Tais*, c. 1535. Musée Condé, Chantilly, France.



Figure 42 Studio of François Clouet, *Jean de Tais*, 1540s. Musée Condé, Chantilly, France.



Figure 43 *Portrait of Ugolino Martelli*, mid-sixteenth century, oil on panel, 91 x 68 cm.
National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.



Figure 44 Lorenzo Lotto, *Double Portrait of a Couple*, 1523-24, oil on canvas, 96 x 116 cm.
The Hermitage, St. Petersburg.



Figure 45 Florentine School, *Portrait of a Man and Woman*, sixteenth century, oil on panel. Galleria Palatina, Florence.



Figure 46 Filippo Lippi, *Portrait of a Woman with a Man at the Casement*, c. 1440, tempera on panel, 64 x 42 cm. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.



Figures 47-48 Ercole de' Roberti, *Portrait of Giovanni II Bentivoglio* and *Portrait of Ginevra Bentivoglio*, 1474, tempera on panel, 54 x 38. Cm and 54 x 39 cm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.



Figures 49-50 Attributed to the Maestro delle Storie del Pane, *Portrait of a Man*, possibly Matteo di Sebastiano di Bernardino Gozzadini and *Portrait of a Woman*, possibly Ginevra d'Antonio Lupari Gozzadini, c. 1494, tempera on panel, 49 x 36 cm each. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.



Figures 51-52 Domenico Ghirlandaio, *Portrait of a Man* and *Portrait of a Woman*, c. 1490, tempera on panel, 20 x 16 cm each. The Huntington Library and Art Collections, San Marino, California.



Figure 53 Pontormo, *Monsignor della Casa*, c. 1541-44, oil on panel, 102 x 79 cm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.



Figure 54 Agnolo Bronzino, *Portrait of A Young Man*, c. 1534-38, oil on panel, 97 x 75 cm.
Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.



Figure 55 After Francesco Rosselli, *Carta della Catena*, 1470s, woodcut.
Staatliche Museen, Berlin.



Figure 56 Filippino Lippi, *Nerli Altarpiece*, c. 1486, tempera on panel, 160 x 180 cm.
Santo Spirito, Florence.



Figure 57 Filippo Brunelleschi. *Ospedale degli Innocenti*, 1419-26,
Museo degli Innocenti, Florence.



Figure 58 Kneeling window, *Palazzo Medici-Riccardi*.



Figure 59 Michelangelo, *New Sacristy*, c. 1520-34. San Lorenzo, Florence.



Figure 60 Francesco Salviati, *Portrait of A Florentine Nobleman*, 1546-48, oil on panel, 102 x 83 cm. St. Louis Art Museum, St. Louis.



Figure 61 Baccio Bandinelli, *Bust of Cosimo I*, 1545, marble, 91 cm tall. Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence.



Figure 62 *Bust of Hadrian*, 2nd century CE, marble, 68 cm tall, Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.



Figure 63 Baccio Bandinelli, *Metropolitan Bust of Cosimo I*, 1539-40, marble, 80 x 78.4 cm, 95.9 cm with socle. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.



Figure 64 Mino da Fiesole, *Piero de' Medici*, c. 1453, marble, 54 cm height. Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence.



Figure 65 Andrea del Verrocchio, *Giuliano de' Medici*, c. 1475-78, terracotta, 61 x 66 cm.
National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.



Figure 66 Florentine sculptor probably after a model by Andrea del Verrocchio and Orsino Benintendi, *Lorenzo de' Medici*, 15th or 16th century, painted terracotta, 65.8 x 59.1 cm. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.



Figure 67 Michelangelo, *Brutus*, 1540s-50s, marble, 95 cm height (including base). Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence.



Figure 68 Alessandro Vittoria, *Bust of Tommaso Rangone*, c. 1571, bronze, 81 cm height.
Ateneo Veneto, Venice.



Figure 69 *Tomb of Alessandro Antinori, c. 1555-57. Santi Michele e Gaetano, Florence.*



Figure 70 Andrea Mantegna, *Self-Portrait*, 1504-06, bronze, 47 cm height. Sant' Andrea, Mantua.



Figure 71 Marco Dente after a design by Baccio Bandinelli, *Massacre of the Innocents*, c. 1520, engraving, 41 x 58.2 cm. Princeton University Art Museum, Princeton.



Figure 72 Baccio Bandinelli, *Hercules and Cacus*, 1525-34, marble, height 505 cm. Piazza della Signoria, Florence.



Figure 73 Agostino Veneziano after Baccio Bandinelli, *The Academy of Baccio Bandinelli*, 1531, engraving, 27.4 x 30 cm. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.



Figure 74 Enea Vico after Baccio Bandinelli, *The Academy of Baccio Bandinelli*, first of two states, c. 1544, engraving, 30.6 x 43.8 cm. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.



Figure 75 Baccio Bandinelli, *Self-Portrait*, c. 1530, oil on panel, 142.5 x 113.5 cm. Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston.



Figure 76 Agnolo Bronzino, *Portrait of Cosimo I de' Medici as Orpheus*, c. 1537-39, oil on panel, 93.7 x 76.4 cm. Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia.



Figure 77 Baccio Bandinelli, *Bust of Cosimo I* detail, 1545, marble, 91 cm tall overall. Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence.



Figures 78-79 Sandro Botticelli, *Minerva and the Centaur* and detail, c. 1482, tempera on canvas, 207 x 148 cm. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.



Figure 80 Benvenuto Cellini, *Bust of Bindo Altoviti*, 1549, bronze, 105.5 cm height. Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston.



Figure 81 Giorgio Vasari, *Cosimo I Plans the War of Siena*, 1563-55, oil on panel. Palazzo Vecchio, Florence.



Figure 82 Giorgio Vasari, *Cosimo I Plans the War of Siena* detail, 1563-55, oil on panel.
Palazzo Vecchio, Florence.



Figures 83-84 Baccio Bandinelli, *Bust of Duke Cosimo I* and *Bust of Eleonora di Toledo*, 1544, bronze, Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence.



Figure 85 Benvenuto Cellini, *Bust of Cosimo I*, 1545-48, bronze, 110 cm height. Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence.



Figure 86 Giovanni Bandini, *Bust of Cosimo I*, c. 1572, marble, 83 cm height. Detroit Institute of Arts, Detroit.



Figure 87 Leone Leoni, *Bust of Emperor Charles V*, c. 1553, bronze, 112 x 58 cm. Museo del Prado, Madrid.