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Abstract

This dissertation argues that the macabre, an estranging language of death-based motifs involving somatic doubling between uncorrupt body and putrefying corpse, was polemically employed during the first three decades of the sixteenth century to oppose, to subvert, and to satirize the idealizing mythography of the Medici, which has itself long held sway over Florence’s history and historiography.

Part one discusses Benedetto da Rovezzano’s marble cenotaph (1505-1512) for Piero Soderini, Florence’s premier and sole gonfaloniere a vita. I argue that the triumphal crown on the tomb’s monumental skull satirizes the heraldic device used by the Medici and by the Rucellai – Soderini’s deadliest enemies – and that the memorial’s proliferating and foliated skulls recast the Medici’s dynastic metaphors of an eternally regenerative Golden Age as the unnatural rule of revenants. I further demonstrate how Benedetto used the macabre to present Soderini’s tenure as the embodiment of a just and lawful Republican government, and thereby the antithesis of previous Medicean regimes.

Part two argues that the hellish banquets produced by the Companies of the Cauldron (Paiuolo) and the Trowel (Cazzuola) during the Medici’s de facto rule of 1512 to 1527 served as macabre reflections on the Medici’s triumphal spectacles, and that their deadly re-interpretations of Medici magnificence echoed contemporary criticism of the Medici and their feste. Death was employed to characterize the experience of living under Medicean rule, and to expose the Medici’s fraudulent propaganda of peace and prosperity.
The conclusion examines Michelangelo’s Medici Chapel (1519-1534) and Antonfrancesco Grazzini’s final novella of the Cene (1540s) as the respective “afterlives” of Soderini’s cenotaph and the companies’ festivities. I detail how the chapel’s frenzied masks echo Benedetto’s screaming skulls in ridiculing Medicean ambitions, and how Michelangelo similarly subverts Medicean temporal metaphors of dynastic renewal. I then evince that Grazzini’s use of the Cazzuola’s Maestro Manente for the victim of a sorcerous Lorenzo de’ Medici’s malicious beffa demonstrates the macabre’s enduring appeal for expressing dissent, and underscore the affinities between the dining sodalities and the transgressive Academia degli Umidi (1540-1541). Whether conveyed through marble or through meals, the macabre proved an ideal means to oppose Medicean supremacy.
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Introduction

This dissertation examines how the macabre, a disquieting language of death-based motifs and themes involving a somatic expression of decomposition and the doubling between the uncorrupt body and the decaying corpse, was polemically employed in Florentine art during the first three decades of the sixteenth century to counter the Medici’s own heroizing mythopoesis. As a hermeneutical system, rather than a collection of iconographical symbols with fixed or stable meanings, the macabre’s multivalent signification was, I argue, exploited to articulate political dissent, and was intentionally used to subvert the Medici’s dynastic metaphors of a regenerative lineage. Using two case studies which span the Medici’s exile and their restoration, I detail how the macabre suborns and opposes Medicean myth-making, and how it expresses an alternative and critical narrative of Medicean rule.

I begin my analysis with the cenotaph for Piero di ser Tommaso Soderini: the Florentine Republic’s newly-elected, constitutional head of state who took office in 1502 amidst rampant disorder, financial crisis, internal factionalism, and civil war. Haunting his near decade-long administration were the Medici. Although exiled in 1494, the family exerted a spectral visual presence in Florence through the ubiquity of their devices on sites of Medicean patronage, and, all too often, they manifested a tangible physical

---

presence at the head of an army outside the city’s walls. I argue that Soderini’s unused tomb, carved by Benedetto da Rovezzano in Santa Maria del Carmine (1505-1512), employs what Charles Davis termed a “gusto macabro,” a “macabre taste” of proliferating skulls and snake-entwined bones in order to demonstrate Soderini’s moral superiority over his political adversaries, and to subvert the very metaphor of botanical regeneration which undergirded the Medici’s own Golden Age mythopoiesis, a mythography that itself was being concurrently resurrected in the writings of the Orti Oricellari under the aegis of Bernardo Rucellai in order to undermine and to destabilize the Soderini-led government.

Next I turn to the first decade of restored Medicean rule and to the “macabre taste” of the banquets held by the two compagnie di piacere Giorgio Vasari described in the 1568 Life of the sculptor Giovanfrancesco Rustici. The feasts given by the artisan Company of the Cauldron (Compagnia del Piuolo) and that of the socially diverse Trowel (Compagnia della Cazzuola) infused a bawdy humor into themes of infernal torment and cannibalism. For their members in the 1510s-1520s, these dinners countered the Medici’s “official” rhetoric of their return’s instantiating a youthful, peaceful, and prosperous Age of Gold by instead contrasting the lavishness of Medicean feste with the deprivations and depredations experienced by those living under Medici rule. I also examine the Cazzuola’s participation in the Medici’s 1513 Carnival floats, which reveals the complexity and subtlety of the macabre’s critique. Through analyzing a rare chapbook which appends a canzona della morte to the Medici-sponsored floats and their

---

accompanying songs, I argue that this penitential laud, which was composed by a Cazzuola member, serves to re-cast and to re-interpret the Medici’s idealizing propaganda.

My examination of the macabre builds on Charles Davis’s insightful identification of a “gusto macabro” in Florentine art in the decades framing the turn of the sixteenth century, and on Stephen Campbell’s analysis of Rosso Fiorentino’s cadaverous figures as “counter memory” that disrupts Medicean myths of continuity. Using examples from the Soderini Republic and from the Medicean restoration, I demonstrate the macabre’s continued critical efficacy regardless of regime, and its resiliency to articulate censure irrespective of its penitential functions, which have often obscured the macabre’s biting satire in scholarship. In this regard, the dissertation is also in dialogue with the recent studies on the Danse macabre and the Encounter of the Three Living and the Three Dead that elucidate the macabre’s political and social critiques.

---

3 Ibid. As examples of the “gusto macabro,” Davis cited: the skull-bearing angels in Filippino Lippi’s Strozzi chapel; Andrea del Sarto’s Scalzo frescoes; Benedetto da Rovezzano’s tombs in Santi Apostoli and Santa Maria del Carmine; the banquets given by Giovanfrancesco Rustici and his companies; Leonardo da Vinci’s automata; Piero di Cosimo’s carro della morte; Sandro Botticelli’s speaking head in Francesco Sansovino’s Lettere sopra le diece giornate del Decamerone; and Jacopo Sansovino’s Badoer-Giustiniani tomb slab.


The dissertation also contributes to what Alison Brown termed “the problem of opposition:” the recovery of dissenting voices in a regime which silenced criticism, and whose public fashioning created a nearly impenetrable mask.7 By analyzing the macabre within the contentious and shifting political climate of the first decades of the sixteenth century, whose factionalism, sedition, and hostility towards the Medici, both within and without the regime, have been thoughtfully explicated by Humfrey Butters, Lorenzo Polizzotto, and John Stephens,8 I also expand the hermeneutical potential of the macabre beyond the meta-artistic concerns detailed by Joseph Koerner to a broader political and social commentary.9 In contrast with Tommaso Mozzati and Philippe Sénéchal, who identified the Cazzuola’s members as the Medici’s faithful and unequivocal partisans,10 I

Death in Late Medieval Culture (Boston: Brill, 2013), 109-144 discussed subsequent aristocratic appropriations of the Encounter’s political critique by pointing to examples of the dead kings’ depictions as the ancestors of the Encounter’s living patrons, whereby the macabre subject extends dynastic, secular power, rather than diminishes it; he also discussed aristocratic commissions of the macabre as ostentatious displays of self-abasement. For the macabre used to critique secular authority, see also Jean-Claude Schmitt, Ghosts in the Middle Ages: The Living and the Dead in Medieval Society, trans. Teresa Lavender Fagan (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 111-121 and 149-169.


10 Mozzati and Sénéchal, “Giovanfrancesco Rustici, un percorso,” in I grandi bronzi del battistero: Giovanfrancesco Rustici e Leonardo, eds. Tommaso Mozzati, Beatrice Paolozzi Strozzi, and Philippe
find that their infernal banquets demonstrate the multiple, shifting, or divided loyalties of the young patricians whom the Medici were attempting to cultivate, as well as these youths’ often critical evaluations of the regime.\textsuperscript{11} This “recovery” of dissent also applies to Piero Soderini’s own patronage, much of which was destroyed by Medicean iconoclasm.\textsuperscript{12} As a poetics of opposition, my study of the macabre also contributes to the broader discourse on anti-Medicean art, which was notably the subject of the Medici Archive Project’s 2016 conference, “Against the Medici: Art and Dissent in Early Modern Italy.”\textsuperscript{13}

The dissertation further contributes to a broader discussion, most recently

Sénéchal (Florence: Giunti, 2010), 49: “...la compagnia della Cazzuola, di cui è stata chiarita l’inequivocabile fede pallesca.” See also Mozzati, Giovanfrancesco Rustici, le Compagnie del Patuolo e della Cazzuola: Arte, letteratura, festa nell’età della maniera (Florence: Olschki, 2008), 191-287. In contrast to their underlying thesis, for art commissioned by the Medici which was nonetheless critical of their rule, see, for example, Bronzino’s fresco of the Martyrdom of St. Lawrence for Cosimo I, as discussed by Stephen J. Campbell, “Bronzino’s Martyrdom of St. Lawrence: Counter Reformation Polemic and Mannerist Counter Aesthetics,” \textit{Res} 46 (2004): 98-119.

\textsuperscript{11} The formal parallels between Matteo da Panzano’s hell banquet and that given by Lorenzo di Filippo Strozzi in 1519 to his extended Medici relations would suggest that his \textit{festa} also carried transgressive political overtones. For Tommaso Lippomano’s description of the event, see Marino Sanudo, \textit{I diarii}, eds. Rinaldo Fulin et al. (Venice: Visentini, 1890), vol. 27, cols. 74-75.


championed by Paola Ventrone, of how public spectacle and *feste* functioned as embattled grounds for competing political narratives.\(^\text{14}\) The framework argued here, that the Cazzuola’s macabre festivities served as a critical retort and counterpoint to the Medici’s own propagandistic events, is informed by Lorenzo Polizzotto’s thesis that the Judith play staged by the youth confraternity of the Purification during the Carnival of 1518 not only called for action against (Medicean) tyranny and ungodly rule, but was also a polemic response to Mediceans’ 1514 re-issuing of Lorenzo de’ Medici’s *La rappresentazione di Santo Giovanni e Paulo* with an appended poem that criticized the preceding administration of justice.\(^\text{15}\) Maria-Luisa Minio-Paluello’s research on the 1514 San Giovanni celebrations is also a salutary reminder of the dissention found within the Medici family itself. She argued that the young Lorenzo, whose Florentine interests diverged from those of his uncles in Rome, satirized Leo X’s plans for an upcoming crusade through the *festa*’s Ship of Fools parade float, in which the Cazzuola’s Domenico


Barlacchi was notably one of the performers. Certainly after the cardinals, who “anonymously” attended the Florentine spectacle under hooded cloaks, returned to Rome, the Venetian ambassador, who was negotiating with Leo for the chartering of ships for the crusade, was no longer received by the Pope.\(^{16}\) The Cazzuola’s use of semi-private masquerades and theatrical performances to criticize Medicean spectacles similarly demonstrates the versatility and significance of ephemeral \textit{feste} as the preferred stage for asserting autonomy and for articulating contesting political messages, which were themselves inextricably bound with the construction of memory.

The role of the macabre in creating an alternative to an “official” narrative through the entwined strands of memory, politics, spectacle, has been productively discussed by Rebecca Zorach, whose analysis of Henri II and Catherine de’ Medici’s ceremonial entry into Rouen argued that the printed account of the 1550 entry used multiple strategies, including “calculated rhetoric of speechlessness,” substitution, and fragmentation, to create a distance between the text, the accompanying woodcut images of sacrifice, and the event itself, and that perhaps these strategies also demonstrate the antagonism between Rouen’s residents and their king.\(^{17}\) Regarding the Cazzuola’s own re-membering, the Florentine pamphlet’s inclusion of a “Song of Death” with the \textit{canti} performed for the Medici’s triumphs similarly re-reads the latter’s “Golden Age” rhetoric, at the very least by reminding the reader of the actual deaths that transpired in connection


with their parade floats. Curiously, the macabre spectacles produced by Filippo and Lorenzo Strozzi for Carnival, which would lend themselves to similar analyses, namely Piero di Cosimo’s 1507 *carro della morte* and the 1519 hell banquet given in Rome to four cardinals who were Medici relations, have only been given cursory political interpretations. The similar festivities of the Cazzuola would suggest that the Strozzi’s events could have also carried an anti-Medicean purchase.

My discussion of the Cazzuola, which staged Giuliano de’ Medici’s 1513 Triumph and counted him among its members, and of their macabre meals as antagonistic towards Medici, is also indebted to the current discourse on Florentine academies as both organizations under the control of the Ducal state, and as sodalities of dissidents, whose literary works created and promoted as well as suborned and parodied Medicean propaganda. Domenico Zanré’s study of the mock funeral held by the Accademia del Piano in 1556 for the recently deceased Archbishop of Pisa and Medici partisan, Onofrio Bartolini, demonstrates the ongoing purchase of a ludic macabre to voice dissent, even

---

18 A notable exception regarding Piero di Cosimo’s *carro* is Campbell, “(Un)Divinity of Art,” 605. Luigi Lazzerini identified Castellani’s *lauda* accompanying Piero di Cosimo’s float as carrying Savonarolan and Republican significations, but did not extend these political resonances to an anti-Medicean meaning. “‘Bizzarrissime fantasie’: Piero di Cosimo’s Pageant Wagon of the Dead and Girolamo Savonarola,” in *Renaissance Studies in Honor of Joseph Connors: Toward a Festschrift*, eds. Machtelt Israëls and Louis Alexander Waldman (Florence: Olschki, 2010), 2:91-101. Both the *carro* and the banquet were given an anti-Medicean interpretation by William J. Landon; however, his misdating of the relevant documents for Piero’s *carro*, which allowed him to disassociate the parade float from Filippo’s nearly simultaneous marriage negotiations with the Medici, mar his conclusions. *Lorenzo di Filippo Strozzi and Niccolò Machiavelli: Patron, Client, and the Pistola fatta per la peste/An Epistle Written Concerning the Plague* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013), 46-65. Paola Ventroni alternatively emphasized the 1508 marriage negotiations with regards to the 1507 *carro* to argue that the Strozzi were signaling their support for the Medici through the macabre performance. *Teatro civile*, 278. William F. Prizer, in his otherwise thorough study, does not develop the political signification of the *carro*. “Reading Carnival: The Creation of a Florentine Carnival Song,” *Early Music History* 23 (2004): 185-252.
under the watchful regard of the spy who reported the event to Cosimo I. More recently, Déborah Blocker has detailed how the Accademia degli Alterati (1569-c. 1625) both allowed its patrician members to discreetly “rehearse their frustration with the Medici regime and made it possible for a number of them to integrate themselves successfully into Medici court culture.”

The affinities in the burlesque humor and political orientation between these later groups and the Paiuolo and Cazzuola are particularly noteworthy, because, as Elizabeth Pilliod discussed, Vasari specifically suppressed the inheritance of the *compagnie di piacere* in the Accademia degli Umidi (1540-1541) and subsequent Accademia Fiorentina (1541-1783). In the conclusion, I develop one such example of the continuing legacy of the Cazzuola’s macabre feasts in the final novella of Antonfrancesco Grazzini’s *Cene* (1540s), which tells of the vicious *beffa* played by “Lorenzo de’ Medici il vecchio” on “Maestro Manente.” For failing to show the proper deference, Lorenzo has Manente abducted and imprisoned, and then fakes the doctor’s death; when a year later, the newly-released Manente’s friends and family take him for a revenant, Lorenzo stages a sham exorcism whereby the “dead” Manente is reintegrated.

---

19 “Ritual and Parody in Mid-Cinquecento Florence: Cosimo de’ Medici and the Accademia del Piano,” in *The Cultural Politics of Duke Cosimo I de’ Medici*, ed. Konrad Eisenbichler (Burlington: Ashgate, 2001), 189-204. In his letters to Cosimo I, Lorenzo Pagni noted as causes for concern: the large number and suspected allegiance of the guests, the requiem’s being held on the anniversary of Alessandro de’ Medici’s assassination, the unknown significance of the cabbage stalks which featured prominently in the decor, and the effigy constructed from foodstuffs, out of which an owl emerged representing the Archbishop’s soul being liberated from hell. Although Cosimo dismissed Pagni’s conspiratorial interpretation of these events, a plot against the Medici by several members of the Piano was discovered in 1559. For political subversion within a confraternal, rather than an academic, setting, see Lorenzo Polizzotto, “Confraternities, Conventicles and Political Dissent: The Case of the Savonarolan Capi Rossi,” pts. 1 and 2, *Memorie domenicane* 16 (1985): 235-283; 17 (1986): 285-300.


into society and returned to his wife, who in the meantime had remarried and was with child. Michel Plaisance has already elucidated how Lasca’s story responds to Cosimo I’s infiltration and transformation of the Accademia degli Umidi into the Accademia Fiorentina, and how the poet’s portrayal of Lorenzo’s absolute control over Florence’s police, courts, and religious houses blandishes Cosimo’s tyrannical regime.\footnote{“La structure de la beffa dans les Cene d’Antonfrancesco Grazzini,” in Antonfrancesco Grazzini dit Lasca (1505-1584): Écrire dans la Florence des Médicis (Manziana: Vecchiarelli, 2005), 135-189.} I underscore how Lasca’s use of a companion of the Cazzuola for his protagonist, his elision between Lorenzo and the sorcerer-”exorcist” Nepo, and the parodic role given to Lorenzo’s Golden Age poetry in the novella demonstrate the enduring memory of the Trowel’s transgressive festivities, and the lasting appeal of the macabre to subvert Medicean rhetoric.

This “afterlife” of the Cazzuola’s macabre banquets in the Cene is complemented in the conclusion with an analysis of the echo of Soderini’s cenotaph in Michelangelo’s mausoleum for the Medici at San Lorenzo’s New Sacristy. I argue that the larval masks which populate the Medici Chapel recall the Soderini skulls’ ridicule of Medicean dynastic ambition, and that Michelangelo’s portrayal of Time inverts the Medici’s regenerative poetics analogously to Benedetto’s floriated skulls. I then discuss how Michelangelo’s preponderance of masks reflect on the masquerade enacted in the chapel and by the Medici’s glamorizing mythology; as the effigies’ notoriously idealized visages indicate, Michelangelo elevates the Medici while simultaneously drawing attention to the constructed artifice of this ennoblement. Whether by Michelangelo, Benedetto, the Paiuolo and Cazzuola’s signori, or Grazzini, the macabre exposes Medicean mythopoesis
as a fraudulent masquerade which deceived neither the living nor the larval dead.
Part I: Piero Soderini’s Macabre Cenotaph

On the western wall of the high chapel of Santa Maria del Carmine, a grey arch of darkened marble can just be seen rising above the altar screen (figs. 1-2); these carved friezes form the lunette of the sepulcher (fig. 3) designed for the Florentine Republic’s first and only lifetime head of state, Piero di messer Tommaso Soderini (1452-1522). Around the midpoint of what would be a near decade-long tenure (1502-1512), the gonfaloniere a vita commissioned Benedetto di Bartolomeo Grazzini da Rovezzano (c. 1474-c. 1554), who was newly returned to Florence from his work in France on Louis XII’s ancestral sepulchers, to sculpt his memorial.1 After briefly addressing the current state of the tomb, I will then argue that the memorial’s macabre ornament portrays Soderini as the devout, Republican, and just antithesis of his political enemies, the Medici and the Rucellai, by subverting the very same Golden Age mythopoesis used by the latter families to promote the Medici’s rule of the Florentine state.

The Soderini Chapel

The monument must have been largely complete by June 1509, as Francesco Albertini included the white marble and black touchstone tomb amongst Florence’s worthy sepulchers in his Opusculum de mirabilibus novae et veteris urbis Romae.2 As it


appears today, largely obscured by ornate eighteenth-century furnishings attached to white-washed walls, the tomb is the sole remnant of the sumptuous chapel which was largely destroyed in 1771, when fire broke out in the Carmine’s choir. When Benedetto carved the tomb c. 1505-1512, the walls were frescoed with scenes from the life of the Virgin (c. 1385) by Agnolo Gaddi. A large gothic window with depictions of saints in its stained glass bathed the chapel in colored light. At the foot of the altar, ser Tommaso di Guccio Soderini (knighted 1385) lay beneath his sculpted effigy, and Niccolò Soderini (d. 1381), the correspondent of St. Catherine of Siena, could be found below the nearby pavement. Hanging from the vault overhead, the stone coat of arms of Piero’s father, ser Tommaso di Lorenzo (1403-1485), articulated in vivid polychromy the Soderini’s three


4 For the chapel’s stained glass and the tombs at the foot of the altar, see Andrea Sabatini, “I Soderini e il Carmine di Firenze,” Rossetti del carmello 24 (1971): 200-201.
cervine antlers surmounted by the papal tiara and crossed keys, which Pius II bestowed on Tommaso, along with his knighthood, in 1464. In contrast to the dull, grey tones of the stones’ current condition, Piero’s tomb originally glistened in brilliant white marble and a reflective, highly polished black *pietra di paragone*, or touchstone. The 1771 fire which engulfed the choir, and thereby destroyed the chapel’s frescoes and furnishings, also damaged Benedetto’s sculpture. In the 1568 edition of his *Lives of the Artists*, Giorgio Vasari wrote that, “besides foliage, carved emblems of death, and figures, [Benedetto] made therein with touchstone, in low-relief, a canopy in imitation of black cloth, with so much grace and such beautiful finish and lustre, that the stone appears to be exquisite black satin rather than touchstone.” No trace of the baldachin remains, and the repairs indicated in the lunette’s 1780 inscription are particularly evidenced in the heavily restored sarcophagus, which now balances on stucco additions of a shell and lion paws (figs. 4-5). Where the sculpture has been heavily undercut or carved in high relief,

---

5 This is one of seven stone coats of arms Neri di Bicci painted for Tommaso in 1465. See Nicholas A. Eckstein, *The District of the Green Dragon: Neighbourhood Life and Social Change in Renaissance Florence* (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1995), 205n24. His sons presumably inherited the privilege, whence the crossed keys are displayed above the Soderini antlers. See Matucci, “Cenotafio Soderini,” 76.


7 The inscription reads: “MARMOREVM CENOTAPHIVM / QVOD SVIS CONDENDIS CINERIBVS / MANV BENEDICTI ROVEZZANENSIS / MAGNIFICE ET ADFABRE ELABORATVM / PETRVS SODERINIVS / PERP. R.P. FLORENT. IVSTITIÆ VEXILLÆR / MAGNA IMPENSA AN. P.M. MDXIII. POSVERAT / TEMPLO HVIVS INCENDIO ANNO MDCCCLXXI. / PARTIM CORRVPVTVM PARTIM FERE DELETVM / NE TANTI VIRI AGRATI SVI MONVMENTVM / AVT INIVRIA TEMPORIS PENITVS INTERCIDERET / AVT PRISTINAM DIGNITATEM NON OBTINERET / TEMPOLO IN ELEGANTIÆRÆM FORMAM RESTITVTO / TIBERIVS SACR.
particularly on the panels featuring skulls, snakes, and dionysiac figures, lacunae and broken fragments remain (figs. 6-7). The rest of the carving, however, is largely intact. The lack of an inscription attests to the cenotaph’s empty deposit; after Soderini was deposed on August 31, 1512, he fled to Ragusa (Dubrovnik), and eventually settled in Rome, where he was buried in Santa Maria del Popolo.8

Perhaps the most striking feature of the cenotaph is the band of gaping skulls flanking the sarcophagus (figs. 6-12). Carved on projecting corners, the four death’s heads address the viewer with bold, eyeless orbits and malevolent grins. Their wild, flame-like hair, tousled beards, furrowed brows, deeply-inset eye sockets, gaunt, indented temples, and especially their wide-open, cavernous maws, with teeth exposed in an eternal scream, elicit visceral terror, recoil, and revulsion. When viewed obliquely, these enlarged skulls appear about to devour the homunculi located on the adjoining recessed pilasters (fig. 8). Their disquieting force is heightened by the serpents which wind among aural cavity in the skulls on the right (figs. 7 and 9), and which writhe between the heads

8 The grave may have only been marked by an inscription. See Fabrizio M. Apolloni Ghetti, “Nuovi appunti su Francesco Soderini cardinale volterra (continuazione e fine),” L’urbe 39 (1976): 13-14. The inscription is given in Vincenzo Forcella, Iscrizioni delle chiese e di altri edifici di Roma dal secolo XI fino ai giorni nostri (Rome: Cecchini, 1879), 13:523n1294: “FRANCISCI SODERINI EPISCOPI OSTIENSIS / ET VOLATERRANI DEPOSITVM.” Argentina was also buried in Santa Maria del Popolo following her death (before March 1534). See Patrizia Meli, Gabriele Malaspina marchese di Fosdinovo: Condotte, politica e diplomazia nella Lunigiana del Rinascimento (Florence: Firenze University Press, 2008).
and crossed bones on the left (figs. 6 and 10).

Far from being inert, symbolic emblems of death, these skulls are dynamic, engaged, and even interactive. Benedetto endows speech on the pair on the right by carving an oak leaf for a tongue (figs. 9 and 12). On the left, a vine laces through the aural cavity of each head, and creates pointed ears from a splayed oak leaf before continuing upward to form a trumpet-shaped cone, out which emerges a clutch of snakes (figs. 6 and 10). The lower section of the vine trails behind the corner of the jaw, and unfurls leaves along the lower edge of the panel before scrolling into a terminating rosette. Instead of forming a tongue, another wide, heavily ribbed oak leaf descends behind the lowered mandible (fig. 11); its middle lobe extends to curl over the chin in a foliate emulation of the hairy beards found on the skulls of the opposite register (figs. 7, 9 and 12). Vegetation serves not to degrade or to disintegrate, but to activate and to enliven the skulls. These death’s heads speak and hear; they seem to come to life and to converse with the viewer.

In the pages that follow, I locate Benedetto’s voluble and lively skulls within the tomb’s larger polemic, wherein I argue that Benedetto mobilizes the macabre in order to valorize Piero Soderini as the just, devout, and legitimate head of the Republic, and to antithesize the Medici and the Rucellai – the gonfalonier’s most entrenched political enemies – as tyrannical, immoral, and ambitious usurpers who bring ruin to Florence. I begin by addressing the polyvalency of the macabre, which has engendered competing Savonarolan and Lucretian interpretations of the monument. I view both plausible, if somewhat antithetical, analyses as demonstrating the monument’s designed ambiguity,
and contend that Benedetto’s exploitation of the macabre’s inherent equivocacy demonstrates the adroit maneuverings of the shrewd gonfaloniere who deftly navigated Florence’s turbulent and dangerous politics for nearly a decade. Next, I examine the tri-leaf-crested headband adorning the lunette’s monumental skull. Benedetto’s unconventional crown, I argue, parodies the heraldic devices used by the Medici and by the Rucellai. I detail how the Medici identified themselves and their retinue by applying their three-feathered insignia to the mazzocchio – a cloth-covered ring found in Quattrocento millinery – which was used as livery in their chivalric jousts. The same three-plumed hat was also identified with the Rucellai, who adopted it as a proper device on their architecture and on other commissioned works. I argue that Benedetto crowned the tomb’s colossal and apical skull with an imitation of this headgear in order to create a Triumph of Death wherein Soderini’s humility and piety is contrasted with the ambition and avarice of his enemies. I further analyze how Benedetto’s transformation of the Medici and Rucellai’s heraldic pinions into oak fronds alludes to Dante and Hesiod’s rhetoric of a just Golden Age which will be fulfilled under Florence’s new gonfaloniere a vita, and how the tomb participates in a larger revision of Medicean imagery.

Turning to the horizontal tier on par with the sarcophagus, I next examine the paired dionysiac panels on the monument’s outer frame, which develop the Golden Age metaphor fashioned by Death’s hat. Soderini’s just Golden Age, I contend, rivals and opposes the rhetoric promoted by Bernardo Rucellai and the letterati who gathered in his villa gardens, the Orti Oricellari. In this section, I examine Rucellai’s literary campaign to restore Medicean rule, which he and the Oricellari authors associated with artistic
patronage and cultural flourishing. Their mythography revives the poetics of Laurentian Florence, in which the return of the Golden Age is inextricably entwined with the metaphor of botanical regeneration signifying dynastic continuity. I detail how Benedetto’s enlivened skulls subvert this myth by re-reading the poetics of resurrecting the dead. In my analysis, Benedetto adapts the Medici’s botanical metaphor to visualize the vibrant undead who do not rest quiescent in their graves, but who are active, present, and vocal. Benedetto’s enlivened skulls, which rejuvenate themselves by creating foliated flesh, present a very different conception of renewal than that found in mythography promoted by Lorenzo or by the Orti Oricellari. The very goal of the Oricellari’s polemic – to restore Medici rule – is characterized as the return of revenants, and Medici governance as the hellish reign of the living dead.

In the final section, I discuss Soderini’s cenotaph as a polemic response to the Medici’s San Lorenzo sepulchers. I argue that its white marble and black touchstone create a somber contrast to the sumptuousness of the Medici’s porphyry and bronze. I further examine how Benedetto opposes the Golden Age poetics expressed in the Medici tombs’ material language of durability and stability by thematizing transition, flux, and mutability. I interpret the play of liminality on the tomb as Benedetto’s exegesis on larva, which is both the shade of the dead and the illusory mask. I suggest that Benedetto’s phantasms destabilize not only the Medici’s myth of an eternally regenerative Golden Age, but also the tomb’s own poetics of a just Golden Age.

*The Appeal of the Multiple Macabre*

The macabre’s polysemy and its hermeneutical challenges are evinced by the
current competing interpretations of Soderini’s memorial in both Savonarolan and Lucretian keys. Although each aimed to ameliorate the fear of death, Girolamo Savonarola used the dread of punishment in the afterlife to goad the living to moral reform, while Lucretius rejected such “superstitions” of retribution in the afterlife, and instead explicated natural law to eradicate fear of the unknown.\(^9\) Alison Brown, in her seminal work on Lucretius in fifteenth and early sixteenth-century Florence, argued that part of the appeal of *De rerum natura* at the turn of the century rested specifically in its ability to counter Savonarola’s fear-mongering preaching. As she demonstrated, the Florentine chancellor Marcello Adriani (1464-1521), for example, used Lucretius to oppose the propitiatory religion at the core of Savonarola’s fundamentalism.\(^10\) While these paradigms would seem to be largely inimical,\(^11\) plausible interpretations of the Carmine cenotaph, based in large part on conflicting readings of the tomb’s macabre iconography, have been advanced for both. I contend that this diversity of interpretation was intentional, and that Benedetto specifically exploited the ambiguity inherent in the

---


\(^11\) Savonarola himself certainly ridiculed Lucretius’s readers in his 1496 Lenten sermons. Brown, *Return of Lucretius*, 49. Although Adriani was no admirer of the Frate, some among the orbit of intellectuals around Marsilio Ficino – many of whom later gathered in the Orti Oricellari – were both readers of Lucretius and continued supporters of Savonarola, such as Bartolomeo Fonzio (1446/9-1513). See, although without mention of Fonzio, Alison Brown, “Intellectual and Religious Currents in the Post-Savonarola Years,” in *La figura de Jerónimo Savonarola O.P. y su influencia en España y Europa*, eds. Donald Weinstein, Júlia Benavent, and Inés Rodríguez (Florence: Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2004), 23-50; and, although without mention of Lucretius, Polizzotto, *Elect Nation*, 139-167.
macabre in order to appeal to Soderini’s multiple constituencies.

The tomb’s display of skulls, snakes, and bones have been previously described by Alessandro Cecchi as “representations of medieval dread [terribilità] and of Savonarolan vision.”12 He also suggested that Soderini’s personal motto, “Justus ut palma florebit” (Psalm 91:13), perhaps indicated the gonfaloniere’s own devotion to the Frate, as the cedrus libani in the second half of the verse were frequently referenced in Savonarolan texts.13 Josephine Rogers Mariotti similarly stated that the “spiritual fervor” of Benedetto’s sculpture, and the “devout symbolism teeming with snakes, skulls, and crossbones” found on Oddo and Antonio Atoviti’s tomb in Santi Apostoli (1507-1510, figs. 13-15) and on the coeval Carmine cenotaph (1505-1512), “manifest the spiritual unrest and reformist sentiments of the moment, perhaps also reflecting the artist’s own inclinations.”14 Certainly the macabre iconography accords with the penitential tradition espoused in the Frate’s preaching. Particularly Savonarola’s well-published sermon on

12 “La prima repubblica (1494-1512), Savonarola e la scuola di San Marco: Soderini, Adriani e la ‘scuola del mondo,’” in L’ officina della maniera: Varietà e fiera zze nell’ arte fiorentina del Cinquecento fra le due repubbliche, 1494-1530, eds. Alessandro Cecchi and Antonio Natali (Florence: Giunta, 1996), 16: “…il cenotafio Soderini unisce alla nobile rievocazione di esemplari scultorei dell’età augustea (bucrani, festoni e leoni alati), figurazioni di medievale terribilità e di visionarietà savonaroliana, per quella sua scelta macabra di un’ossessiva ripetizione di teschi digrignanti, rilegati da serpi a tibie incrociate, a ricordare la caducità delle umane spoglie.” In the vulgate, Psalm 91:13 reads, “iustus ut palma florebit ut cedrus Libani multiplicantur.”

13 Ibid., 66n34, where he indicated Fra Benedetto da Fiorenza’s Cedrus Libani (1510). As Matucci, following Pompeo Litta, pointed out, the motto more likely expresses Piero’s civic commitment to justice, rather than a specifically Piagnone affiliation. “Cenotafio Soderini,” 96n18. See also Robert Arthur Carlucci, “The Visual Arts in the Government of Piero Soderini during the Florentine Republic” (PhD diss., Columbia University, 1999), 135. The civic connotations of the motto, which was used in the swearing-in ceremony of the Florentine Republic’s new gonfaloniere in 1461 and 1483, would undoubtedly have appealed to the new lifelong gonfalonier. For the psalm in ceremonial, see John T. Paoletti, Michelangelo’s David: Florentine History and Civic Identity (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 156. Like Cecchi, Roberta Bartoli identified in Ridolfo Ghirlandaio’s tondo of Saints Peter and Paul (1503-1504) for the camera of the gonfaloniere, a “febbre spirituale” commensurate to the San Marco Last Judgment by Fra Bartolomeo, and “severi insegnamenti morali e una religion senza compromessi.” L’ officina della maniera, 122, cat. 25.

living and dying well, in which he instructs the faithful to “make death always imprinted on your imagination [fantasia], and remember your death in everything you do,” would resonate with the mortuary motifs on the gonfalonier’s tomb.\(^{15}\) Benedetto’s germinating skulls could also visualize the resurrection metaphor of Isaiah 66:14, “your bones will sprout [germinabunt] like grass,” which Savonarola quoted in his seventh sermon on I John as an example of divine love.\(^{16}\) Although I detail below how the screaming fury of the Carmine’s sepulchral skulls problematize this heroic re-invigoration of the decomposed and fragmented body, Isaiah’s generative imagery does likely inform a similar display of florid vegetation branching from the skull on Antonio Rossellino’s tomb for the Cardinal of Portugal at San Miniato al Monte (1461-1466, figs. 16-17), and on Rossellino and Benedetto da Maiano’s sepulcher for Maria of Aragon at the Neapolitan Santa Anna dei Lombardi (1481-1491, fig. 18) as a metaphor of the body


restored and glorified at the end of time.\textsuperscript{17} Benedetto adopts a variant solution of this regenerative motif on the sarcophagus of the Altoviti tomb (figs. 14 and 15). Here the scrolling vinework is distinct from, rather than integrated with, the entwined macabre elements, and rejuvenation is instead clarified and explicated by inscribed text. Woven through two skulls, snakes, and bones, is a banderole with verses from Job 19:26-27: “And I shall be surrounded again with my skin, and in my flesh I shall see my God; this hope [is kept] in my bosom.”\textsuperscript{18}

Instead of Cecchi and Rogers Mariotti’s assumption that the tomb demonstrates Piero’s personal devotion to the Frate,\textsuperscript{19} the calculated appeal of its imagery to the

---


\textsuperscript{18} “[ET RV]RSVM CIR[CVMDABOR P]ELL[E MEA E]T IN CARN[E MEA VID]EBO DEV[M] MEVM HAEC SPES MEA IN SI[NV MEO].” The banderole quotes all of Job19:26, and following “DEVVM MEVM” skips to the last words of verse 27. For the Altoviti tomb, see Benedetta Matucci, “Benedetto da Rovezzano and the Altoviti in Florence: Hypotheses and New Interpretations for the Church of Santi Apostoli,” in The Anglo-Florentine Renaissance: Art for the Early Tudors, eds. Cinzia Maria Sicca and Louis Alexander Waldman (New Haven: Yale Center for British Art and the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, 2012), 149-176. She interpreted the eschatological inscription within her larger argument that the tomb’s ornament emulates the devotional practices found in De imitatione Christi. For exegesis of Job 19 as corporeal resurrection, see Bynum, Resurrection of the Body.

\textsuperscript{19} As Roslyn Pesman Cooper noted, no period source identified Piero as a follower of Savonarola; although his brother Paolantonio was a Piagnone, Guicciardini wrote that Paolantonio had his son associate with the Compagnacci in order to have a “foot in both camps.” “Piero Soderini: Aspiring Prince or Civic Leader?” Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History 1 (1978): 120n217, citing Storie fiorentine dal 1378 al 1509, ed. Roberto Palmarocchi (Bari: Laterza, 1931), 123-124. She also noted that Pier Andrea da Verrazzano addressed licentious verses against the Frate to Piero. Pesman Cooper, “L’elezione di Pier Soderini a gonfaloniere a vita,” Archivio storico italiano 125 (1967), 172n98. Both articles have been reproduced in Pesman Cooper, Pier Soderini and the Ruling Class in Renaissance Florence (Goldbach: Keip, 2002), 43-98 and 1-42, respectively. Lorenzo Polizzotto described Piero as unaligned, and indeed, his not being a Fratesco seems to have been one of the reasons for his election in 1502. Nonetheless, as Polizzotto described, the Piagnoni honored Soderini as “one of their own,” praising him “in terms normally reserved for Savonarola.” Elect Nation, 216-219. See also Polizzotto, “Pier Soderini and Florentine Justice,” 263-276.
Savonarolan Piagnoni more likely reflects Soderini’s concerted cultivation of the faction which formed the core of the gonfaloniere’s political base. The mutual regard held between the gonfaloniere and the Piagnoni is perhaps best demonstrated at the conclusion of Florence’s expensive and protracted war against Pisa, which haunted Piero’s gonfaloniership until the maritime city’s forced capitulation on June 8, 1509. On the eve of Pisa’s negotiated surrender, Soderini returned the Piagnona, the Dominican’s great bell, to San Marco. It had been subject to a ritual damnatio in the aftermath of Savonarola’s execution in 1498, and sentenced to exile at the hostile Franciscan convent of San Salvatore al Monte for 50 years. Lorenzo Polizzotto argued that Soderini restored the bell in order to reward the Piagnoni for their dedication to the Pisa campaign.

20 Pesman Cooper stated that “…the men whom Guicciardini viewed as the most ardent supporters of Soderini were all those whom he described as forming the ‘coda’ of followers of Savonarola and the backbone of the party of Francesco Valori.” “Aspiring Prince or Civic Leader,” 121. She again cited Guicciardini, Storie fiorentine, 123-124, where Savonarola’s supporters are listed as: Francesco Valori [d. 1498], Giovanbattista Ridolfi, Paolantonio Soderini [d. 1499], messer Domenico Boni, messer Francesco Gualterotti, Giuliano Salviati, Bernardo Nasi, Antonio Canigiani, Pierfilippo Pandolfini, and Piero Guicciardini; in addition are the moderates, “che non erano interamente annoverati fra loro”: Lorenzo and Piero Lenzi, Pierfrancesco and Tommaso Tosinghi, Luca d’Antonio degli Albizzi, Domenico Mazzinghi, Matteo del Caccia, Michele Niccolini, Battista Serpieri, Alamanino and Jacopo Salvati, Lanfredino Lanfredini, messer Antonio Malegnonelle, Francesco d’Antonio di Taddeo, Amerigo Corsini, Alessandro Acciaioli, Carlo Strozzi, Luigi della Stufa, Giovenchino Guasconi, Gino Ginori, “e molti simili.” See also ibid., 145 and 147. Lorenzo Polizzotto stated that the Piagnoni “became, as a group, Soderini’s staunch supporters and indefatigable in defending the Republic from internal and external enemies.” Elect Nation, 218. He pointed to Soderini’s judicial reform, sumptuary legislation, and expansion of the Monte di Pietà, all causes championed by the Frate and his followers, the gonfalonier’s promotion of Piagnoni to high ecclesiastical office, and the confluence of interests between Soderini and the Piagnoni concerning the war to recover Pisa. Ibid., 217-226.

21 The Piagnona, which called the faithful to worship, and which sounded the alarm on April 8, 1498, when the convent came under siege by a mob wishing to apprehend Savonarola, was removed from its belfry and whipped by the city’s executioner during its long parade to San Salvatore. Alessandro Gherardi published the relevant documents, which include the Signoria’s sentences against the bell on June 29 and 30, 1498, letters from Dominicans protesting the unjust removal of the campana, notice of the bell’s return in San Marco’s Libro di ricordanze, and a friar’s letter recording the arrival of the bell in 1509. Nuovi documenti e studi intorno a Girolamo Savonarola (Florence: Sansoni, 1887), 311-323. San Marco’s Libro credits Soderini specifically for moderating the bell due to the victory against Pisa. Ibid., 322, doc. 17: “…per eosdem Dominos restituta, reducta et reposita fuit in nostro Conventu, operante ad hoc plurimum magnifico viro Petro Soderino istius suavitatis vexillifero istius Civitatis et Populi.” “Causa vero cur Domini Florentini moti sint ad istam restitutionem faciendum fuit victoria habita hodie contra Pisanos…” See also Polizzotto, Elect Nation, 170 and 208.
which he stated became an “obsession,” even a “holy war” for the Savonarolans, who identified Pisa’s rebellion as blasphemy against Florence’s destined and divinely ordained imperium. In gratitude for the repatriation of their campana, the Dominican friars gifted Soderini two paintings by Fra Bartolomeo della Porta. Soderini also cultivated the Piagnoni as a benefactor of San Marco. On April 14, 1509 the “magnifico Gonfaloniere di Giustizia cioè Piero di messer Tommaso Soderini” gave 24 lire, 15 soldi in alms to the convent, followed by an additional donation of 7 lire on the 25th, and again on April 26, 1510. The macabre tone of Soderini’s tomb similarly demonstrates the gonfalonier’s personal piety in a penitential framework which is familiar and congenial, but not exclusive, to Savonarola’s adherents.

Emphasizing instead the absence of sacred figures and the lack of explicitly Christian iconography on the tomb, Benedetta Matucci rejected a Savonarolan reading in favor of “a symbolism rooted in the reading of ancient and pagan sources,” specifically Lucretius’s De rerum natura. In her comprehensive analysis of Soderini’s cenotaph,

---

22 See Polizzotto, Elect Nation, 226.
25 Matucci, “Cenotafio Soderini,” 77: “Queste iniziali, e pur vaghe note, portano, io credo, a delineare un
Matucci interpreted Benedetto’s combination of phytomorphosis and macabre iconography in terms of a Lucretian view of death “as mere alternation between absence and presence – where man is not death, and vice versa – and easy dissolution and recomposition of bodies.”

She cited the importance of the Soderini clan in the publication of Lucretius’s poem, and to Francesco Leoni’s epic De rerum primordiis (1503-1504), which was modeled after Lucretius’s De rerum natura, and dedicated to the gonfaloniere. Having found a close correspondence between Benedetto’s sculpture and Leoni’s poem, Matucci interpreted the vegetation sprouting from putrid skulls as base matter cycling between decomposition and rebirth.
Benedetto’s creation of a monument which can be read as both a visceral *memento mori* and as an erudite syncretism of pagan philosophy and Christian doctrine demonstrates the purchase of the macabre for a *gonfaloniere* whose candidacy to the office was favored by the “the enemies of the Frate,” and who nonetheless advanced the Frate’s partisans.  

Benedetto shows equal acumen in creating a triumph of death which can be read as both a parody of Soderini’s enemies and a penitential display of the *gonfaloniere*’s lack of worldly ambition.

*Crowning Symbols: Death’s Heraldic Hat*

At the center of the lunette, a monumental death’s head projects from the archivolt to peer down on the viewer below (figs. 2 and 19-21). Carved in high relief, and further aggrandized in both scale and ornament, this head achieves a spectral presence which reigns over the monument in a Triumph of Death. Its disquieting gaze forces the beholder to confront death’s sovereignty, whose dominion is signaled by the colossal head’s equally august crown.

In contrast with the restrained laurel wreaths and simple bands circling the temples and brows of the surrounding smaller heads, the central skull is adorned with an elaborate headdress of three gigantic oak leaves which unfurl from the back of a fillet. The crown’s adoption of fronds for a crest recapitulates the broader use of phytomorphosis throughout the cenotaph, and further unifies the skull’s embellishment

---

30 Filippo de’ Nerli, *Commentari dei fatti civili occorsi dentro la città di Firenze dall’anno 1215 al 1537* (Trieste: Coen, 1859) 1:149: “...Piero che rimase eletto, il quale fu principalmente favorito dalla parte de’ Bigi e de’ nimici del Frate...” Nerli (1486-1557) primarily wrote his *Commentari* c. 1549-1553. For Soderini’s promotion of the Frateschi, see Polizzotto, *Elect Nation*, 219-235.
through the shared foliation of hair, beard, and antlers. Compositionally, the crown’s splayed leaves, which cross the upper two bands of molding, balance the wide leaf which descends from the chin to curl just beyond the register’s lower border (figs. 20-21). Iconographically, three long-bladed leaves sprouting from a chaplet is a novel invention for death’s hat. In representations of Francesco Petrarch’s *Trionfo della morte*, for example, Death is typically portrayed as a skeleton, as in the illustrations for Bartolomeo Zani’s 1497 edition of Petrarch’s *Trionfi, sonetti e canzoni* (fig. 22), or as a cadaverous and bare-headed “donna involtà in veste negra,” as in Lo Scheggia’s painting for a *spalliera*, now in Siena’s Pinacoteca Nazionale (1465-1470, fig. 23). When other personifications of Death are crowned, the skeleton usually wears the monarch’s metal diadem as the attribute of its rule. In one of the early printings of Girolamo Savonarola’s *Predica dell’arte del bene morire*, for example, Death signals its dominion

---


32 For this convention, see Tommaso Sardi’s description of Death in *De anima peregrina: Poema di fra Tommaso Sardi domenico del convento di Santa Maria Novella in Firenze*, ed. Margaret Rooke (Northampton: Smith College, 1929), 46, “‘Capitolo decimo sexto dove si trova la morte e con quella si parla a lungo,” stanzas 9-11: “Vidi corona in testa a tal potere / la lancia al resta et piu sottil mirai / la spada cinta et l’arme tucte intere. // La briglia piu al occhio malentai / nella sinistra man la targha havia / et per livrea anchor regno et regnai.” For Sardi and his epic, see note 87 and the discussion below.
by wearing a crenellated crown (after 1496, fig. 24). On a fifteenth-century Italian Book of Hours held in the Walters Art Museum (figs. 25-26), the illuminator uses Death’s golden crown to make a witty play on the sovereign symbol. The scythe-wielding skeleton wears an identical diadem to that of the skull below, even tilting the crown to the same jaunty angle, in order to demonstrate the impotency of terrestrial rule; emperors and kings are equally subject to Death, and like the abandoned diadem, their supremacy does not transcend the grave. Likewise, at the Oratory of the Disciplini at Clusone (1485, figs. 27-28), the crowned and mantled skeleton is given primacy of place, where he surmounts the similarly-vested pope, whose luxurious garments, as well as his flesh, are now food for vermin. When Death is adorned with vegetation, the laurel wreath typically graces the skull’s bony brow, as seen on the smaller skulls of the Soderini tomb’s archivolt (figs. 29-30), or on the tomb of Cardinal Ludovico Trevisan (1402-1465) at San Lorenzo in Damaso, Rome (1505, fig. 31), where the laurel-clad skull likely signals the martial glory and learnedness of the erudite warrior. The Soderini fillet belies the horizontal orientation of these conventional crowns by the vertical thrust of its elongated oak leaves, which splay from the headband like plumage. As surrogate pinions attached to a circlet,
the skull’s jaunty cap most closely resembles a feather-crested *mazzocchio*: the ring-shaped hat worn in Quattrocento Florence.

Used by both men and women, the *mazzocchio* is a cloth-covered hoop which lies atop the head. It can be worn alone or as part of larger construction, such as the *cappuccio*, for which two bands of cloth are attached to the circular form in order to create the hood of public office. Luxury *mazzocchi*, crafted from sumptuous fabrics and embellished with jewels and feathers, were a staple of festival garb. Particularly splendid examples feature in Gentile da Fabriano’s *Adoration* altarpiece (1423, figs. 32-33) for Palla Strozzi’s family chapel in Santa Trinità. On the far right of the painting, *mazzocchi* are worn by two of the Magi’s entourage; peacock feathers cover the entire surface of the blonde attendant’s hoop, while just behind, a pheasant’s single tail feather ornaments the red ring (fig. 33). The youngest magus further enriched his pearl-encrusted and gold-threaded *mazzocchio* by mounting a golden crown within the hoop’s center void (fig. 33). A similar amalgamation graces the adolescent king’s brow in Benozzo Gozzoli’s frescoes for the Medici’s palace chapel (c. 1459, fig. 34). As seen on the three pages at the left

---

37 For the *mazzocchio* and the *cappuccio*, see Jacquelyn Herald, *Renaissance Dress in Italy 1400-1500* (London: Bell and Hyman, 1981), 55, 61, 212, and 223; Carole Collier Frick, *Dressing Renaissance Florence: Families, Fortunes, and Fine Clothing* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), 149-152, 304, and 313; and Rosita Levi Pisetzky, *Storia del costume in Italia* (Milan: Istituto editoriale italiano, 1966), 3:156. By the end of the fifteenth century, the *mazzocchio* does not appear to have been worn independently, at least by men, but only as part of the *cappuccio*. On the *cappuccio*, the shorter *foggia* hangs down to the shoulder, while the longer *becchetto* is either wrapped around the neck or draped over the shoulder. Although the *cappuccio* is particularly associated with ceremonial dress, the *mazzocchio* itself also carried civic connotations. When Luigi Pulci requested Lorenzo de’ Medici’s aid in obtaining public office, he wrote of his desire for a “mazzocchio.” See his letter of January 30, 1472, in *Morgante e lettere*, ed. Domenico de Robertis (Florence: Sansoni, 1962), 973-974: “Faresti bene alla tornata mia serbarmi quello mazzocchio, et cacciarmelo infino al naso, perché il mio padre l’è exercitò 20 volte, et fu nel 39 Podestà di Colle di Valdelsa....” From his letter of March 1472, Lorenzo was unsuccessful in obtaining him a post. Ibid., 975: “Io ti scrivio, o mio Lauro amantissimo, acciò che tu non credessi però che io mi fussi adirato del mazzocchio.” For these letters, see also Alessandro Polci, *Luigi Pulci e la chimera: Studi sull’allegoria nel Morgante* (Florence: Società editrice fiorentina, 2010), 24-25.
corner of the chapel’s southern wall (fig. 35), less regal heads don mazzocchi emblazoned with the Medici’s three-feathered device. A variation of the hat is seen among the portraits in the group at the far right of the west wall, where a now-unknown man wears a narrow, studded fillet with three golden plumes attached to the front of the band (fig. 36).  

The similarities between the foliate headgear on the Soderini tomb (figs. 20-21 and 37-38) and these feather-embellished mazzocchi suggest that the skull’s crown is a variant of this millinery type. Both plumes and fronds are presented upright and erect, bending only at the very tips in order to curl slightly downwards. Like the skull’s leaves, the feathers adorning the hats and decorating the caparison of Piero di Cosimo’s horse (fig. 39) in Gozzoli’s frescoes emphasize a frontal address; when seen head-on, the leaves’ midribs and the feathers’ main shafts are each fully visible and crisply defined, as are the broad faces of the vegetal blades and the avian vanes. While Gozzoli’s hat plumes increasingly overlap from mid-feather to the stacked quills, those on the harness maintain the autonomy of each feather. Similarly, the tomb’s fronds retain their individual integrity, albeit with a slight overlay of the central leaf’s edges due to the confined space above the skull. Just as the lavishness of the golden feathers worn by the frescoed, middle-aged

---

attendant amplifies the embellishment of a narrow, studded band, so too the leaves project ostentatiously from the skull’s flattened and dimpled version of the fat, bejeweled roll found on the pages’ heads.

By imitating this style of resplendent millinery in the headgear worn by the Soderini tomb’s colossal skull, Benedetto not only imbues the foliate crown with the sartorial luxury of a royal retinue, but also appropriates the fashion adopted by the Medici as livery. Although the tri-plumed *mazzocchio* was not exclusive to the Medici – as discussed below, Giovanni Rucellai adopted it as a heraldic device – it was strongly associated with Florence’s leading family, as I detail below. Beyond the private and restricted context of the chapel’s frescoes, where, after all, the Medici themselves are portrayed in simple red caps, mazzocchi emblazoned with three feathers identified the Medici and their retainers in the family’s sumptuous chivalric displays of 1459, 1469, and 1475.

In the spring of 1459, Florence hosted Pope Pius II and Galeazzo Maria Sforza, the fifteen-year-old heir of the Duke of Milan. Following the public festivities, the Medici sponsored an *armeggeria* of the regime’s young scions. On May Day, the ten-year-old Lorenzo, his patrician *brigata*, and their retinues processed along the Via Larga

---


to the Medici palace, where the armeggiatori tilted at a quintain and displayed an ephemeral parade float representing the “Triumph of Love.” As part of their ornate costumes, each of the twelve jousters “had a garland or a wreath [mazzocchio] of lovely silver scales, each one adorned with golden feathers that all stood erect, to decorate the helmet on his head.” These gilded feathers unified the group’s livery with the golden falcon, which Piero di Cosimo had previously used as his personal device, and which was then newly emblazoned on Lorenzo di Piero’s own standard and vestments, and on that of his retinue. By publicly fêting Lorenzo to foreign dignitaries under his father’s sigil, the young Medici was visually acclaimed as the family’s presumptive heir; by serving as the ritual signore of the regime’s sons, Lorenzo was also suggestively implied as the future lord of the commune. The three-feathered mazzocchio was central to this seigniorial


43 Volpi, Ricordi di Firenze dell’anno 1459, 30-31, vv. 1323-1328: “Figliuol di Piero e di Cosimo nipote; / Però questi gentili il fan signore, / Avendo inteso del tinor le note. // Ond’egli, come savio a tal tinore, / Volle mostrare a tutta quella gente / Ch’eran sugetti tutti a un signore.” The falcon-emblazoned livery was identified with Lorenzo’s “royalty” in the longer “Le onoranze,” 109, v. 4350, quoted in the previous note. For the armeggeria as publicly introducing Lorenzo as the Medici heir, see Paola Ventrone, “Lorenzo’s Politica festiva,” in Lorenzo the Magnificent: Culture and Politics, eds. Michael Mallett and Nicholas Mann (London: Warburg Institute, University of London, 1996), 108-109; and Ventrone, “L’immaginario cavalleresco,” 202-204. As Trexler stated, this political reading is implicit in
self-fashioning, and was the Medici’s preferred princely raiment not only in their 1459 livery, but also in their later tournaments.

On February 7, 1469, the twenty-year-old Lorenzo demonstrated his martial valor in concert with a dozen of his contemporaries in a joust held in honor of Lorenzo’s poetic beloved, Lucrezia Donati Ardinghelli. A conspicuous display of wealth and power was manifested in the magnificent attire custom-made for the tourney. The full complement of rich vestments are vividly detailed in the anonymous prose ricordo of the event, which describes not only the thirteen jousters’ garb, but also their elaborate standards and the livery worn by each competitor’s company of pages, musicians, mounted men at arms, foot soldiers, and other attendants. “Mazzocchi con penne” were worn by both the mounted noble youths and by the foot soldiers in the cavalcade of nearly every jouster. That these hats were associated with the Medici’s device, rather than being merely generic plumage, is suggested by Luigi Pulci’s later verses which eulogized the event. After describing the tumult and clamor resulting from the multitude of participants, Pulci wrote that similar visual “noise” was made by the repetitive opulence in costume, which included “a hundred head coverings like a hundred little round hats [mazzocchietti] on the head with three feathers.” In other words, the Medici device was endlessly replicated.

44 See, for example, the description for Piero di messer Luca Pitti and Piero Antonio di Luigi Pitti in Pietro Fanfani, ed., “Ricordo d’una giostra fatta a Firenze a di 7 febbraio 1468 sulla piazza di Santa Croce,” Il Borghini 2 (1864): 478-479, where the two Pitti had their livery painted with “penne d’oro;” there were “6 Giovani gentili...con celate in capo e mazzocchi e penne” and “90 Fanti a piè con celate in testa, suvi mazzocchi verdi e rossi, con penne e calze a loro divisa.” For the similarly feathered garb featured among the other jousters and their retinues, see ibid., 475-483 and 530-542.

45 Luigi Pulci, Opere minori, ed. Paolo Orvieto (Milan: Mursia, 1986), 94, stanza LXXXV: “Poi veniva la turba di canaria, / ch’erono a piè co lui cento valletti / con tante grida che intronavan l’aria, / e di velluto avean cento giubbetti / azurri, allucciolati ch’un non varia, / cento celate e cento mazzocchietti / in testa con tre penne a una guisa, / e cento paia di calze a sua divisa.” Pulci composed his Giostra between
On the Medici brothers’ own elaborate, and expensive, headgear, the three plumes were given visual and rhetorical emphasis. According to the Ricordo, Giuliano covered his head with “a black velvet cap with three upright feathers of gold filet, and above these feathers there were large pearls of great worth, and at the tip of these feathers there were three large gems hanging with chains of gold, and at the base of the feathers there was a brooch of vast worth.”\textsuperscript{46} Lorenzo wore a close-fitting berretta satiny crimson velvet, which was

...made in eleven segments in the style of an orange’s sections which join together into a point; above these wedges there were around 300 pearls, worth 50 ducats, both above and below; at the cap’s point, a fat pearl, worth 500 ducats; and on the mazzocchio, three feathers of gold fillet, on which were 11 diamonds tied onto rings of thin gold, and on the tips of the feathers, three fat, large gems hung with little golden chains; and below the 11 diamonds there was a large diamond set flat into a golden ring of great value, and at the base of the feathers there were three brooches with gems, diamonds, pearls, and other jewels; in all, this cap is worth more than 2,000 ducats or more.\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{46}Fanfani, “Ricordo,” 537: “et in capo portava una berretta di velluto nero con 3 penne d’oro filato suvi ritte, e sopra dette penne era più perle grosse di gran valuta, e nella sommità di dette penne era tre balasci grandi con catenuzze d’oro pendent, et a piè di dette penne era una brocchetta d’assai valuta. Fu stimato la sua ricchezza di ducati 8000 o più.” The 8,000 ducats refer to not just the hat, but to all of his finery, which included silver-brocaded damask and pearl-embroidered silk. Mazzocchi were also worn by three of Giuliano’s mounted pages. Ibid., 537-538: “una capelliera bianca suvi uno mazzocchio con penne, et una brocchetta grande al detto mazzocchio appicata;” “in capo aveva una capelliera suvi uno mazzocchio con penne alla sua divisa, et a piè a dette penne una brocchetta grande d’assai valuta;” “in capo una zazzera [a berretta with a fold to cover the collar] con mazzocchio e penne, suvi una brocchetta d’assai valuta;” the “tamburino” likewise wore “in capo una zazzera con mazzocchio e penne alla sua divisa.”

\textsuperscript{47}Ibid., 539: “una berretta in testa di zetani vellutato chemisi, fatta a undici spicchi a modo di spicchi di melarancio che si ricindevano [Fanfani’s note suggests “si ricongiungevano”] in punta, che sopra detti spicchi erano circa perle trecento, di valuta di ducati L l’una sotto sopra, e nella punta di detta berretta una perla grossissima di valuta di ducati 500; et d’in sul mazzocchio moveva tre penne d’oro filato, suvi undici diamanti legati in castoni d’oro fine, et in sulle punte di dette penne tre balasci grossi e grandi con catenuzze d’oro pendent; e di sotto alli undici diamanti v’era uno diamante grande in tavola, legato in castone d’oro di gran valuta, et a piè di dette penne erano tre brocchette con balasci, diamanti e perle et altre gioje di valuta, in tutto la detta berretta di ducati 2000 o piú.” Additionally, two of Lorenzo’s mounted pages wore helms crested with the palle above which were two large plumes colored white, red, and green. Ibid., 536: “2 Paggi a cavallo vestiti di detta divisa con due gonnellini, et in capo
When Luigi Pulci immortalized the joust in verse, he more succinctly stated, “I have not forgotten a cap [berretta] that had three feathers full of diamonds, which seem to spring forth out of a brooch; so many sapphires that I cannot say how many, and ribbed from the hoop-base [mazzocchio] to the peak with pearls, fewer of which I previously saw caught among certain [hat] segments made in the Turkish style.”

The feathered mazzocchio’s primacy within Medicean livery was maintained in Giuliano’s subsequent joust, when the twenty-one-year-old Medici took to the field on January 29, 1475 in honor of Simonetta Cattaneo Vespucci. Among the resplendent cavalcade, Giuliano’s trumpeters and master-at-arms wore cappuccini and mazzocchi painted with flaming olive bronconi and metallic feathers. Likewise, mazzocchi and penne were worn by the familiars who surrounded the three-year-old Piero di Lorenzo and his mount. The victorious Giuliano wore a “silk garland [grillanda] on which were portavano 2 elmi e per cimiero portavano 2 palle grosse suvi l’arme de’ Medici, e di sopra due pennacchi grandi di penne bianche, pagonazzze e verdi.”

Pulci, Opere, 92, stanza LXXXI: “E perché e’ paia ch’io non sogni e canti, / non ho dimenticato una berretta / ch’avea tre penne piene di diamanti, / che par che surghin fuor d’una brocchetta, / tanti zaffir’ ch’io non saprei dir quanti, / e rigata è dal mazzocchio alla vetta / di perle, che minor vidi già pèse, / fra certi spicchi fatti alla turchesca.”

Of the many contemporary notices of the joust, only the anonymous description in Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Florence (hereafter BNCF), II.IV.324 (formerly Magl. Cl. XXV, num. 574) provides detailed descriptions of the headgear and vestments. The text is only partially published; sections on the livery are found in Giuseppe Mazzatinti and Fortunato Pintor, Inventari dei manoscritti delle biblioteche d’Italia (Forlì: Bordandini, 1901) 11:27-29, and partially supplemented by Lucia Ricciardi, Col senno, col tesoro e colla lancia: Riti e giochi cavallereschi nella Firenze del Magnifico Lorenzo (Florence: Le Lettere, 1992), 178-184. Mazzatinti and Pintor, Inventari dei manoscritti, 28: “Erano vestiti decti trombecti di gonellini di tafectà alexandrino colle maniche tucti dipinti a rami d’ulivo et fiame di fuocho et d’ario. Et in capo avevano capuccini di tafectà alexandrino facti alla francese, dipinti come e’ gonellini cum penne d’orpello [thin copper strips like tinsel]: portavan tucti e’ sopradecti calze a sua divisa in gamba.” After the horse’s caparison is described, “Era sopra il decto cavallo uno armato di tucta arme et in capo aveva uno mazochio in capo di brucoli d’orpello cum penne a sua divisa....” These painted mazzocchi were also worn by Giuliano’s 70 foot soldiers. Ricciardi, Col senno, 179: “settanta fanti a piè cum giubboni di velluto isbiadato, allucciolati d’oro; e in capo celate brunite suvi maçochi di tafectà dipinti a rami d’ulivo e pieni di vari colori; in gambe calçe a sua divisa.”

Ibid., 178: “et a piè [of Piero’s horse] più famigli cum giuboni di velluto isbiadato alucciolato d’oro; celate maçochi et penne in capo et in gamba calçe a suo divisa.”
two white feathers, and at their bases, one has a ruby and the other a diamond and three pearls of greatest value.”

While in each of these public spectacles, the feather-crested *mazzocchio* was the Medici’s favored millinery for styling themselves as ritual lords in the chivalric games, nonetheless, the tri-plumed hat was not exclusive to their house. Giovanni di Paolo Rucellai (1403-1481), the fabulously wealthy merchant-banker and son-in-law of the exiled Palla Strozzi, employed it as a heraldic device proper. In addition to a personal *impresa* of fortune’s billowing sail, Rucellai consistently displayed the three-feathered-hat sigil in concert with two diamond-ring variants also favored by the Medici: a single ring interlaced with two feathers, and a trio of interlocking rings. Although the embellished *mazzocchio* was already associated with the Medici through their livery, its use by Rucellai could also be interpreted as a third variation on the diamond ring *impresa*. As seen on the frame surrounding the golden-rayed IHS symbol on the ceiling of the Medici’s palace chapel (c. 1449, fig. 40) the horizontally-laid ring encircling the quill points of white, red, and green plumes is not so far removed from the feather-crested hoop.

As Anke Naujokat argued, Rucellai likely paired the sail with these Medici-affiliated symbols in order to demonstrate his allegiance to the city’s leading family. By

---

51 Mazzatinti and Pintor, *Inventari dei manoscritti*, 28: “Et aveva in capo il sopradecto Giuliano sopra i suoi capelli una grillanda lavorata di seta, suivi due penne bianche, et a pié d’esse uno balascio et uno diamante et tre perle di grandissima valuta. Et è questa goia nominata per tuco il mondo.” Feathers also embellished his shield: “Et nelle penne dello scudo mancho v’era legato una perla grosissima. Et nelle penne dello scudo ricto uno balascio grande di gran valuta.”

52 Regarding the coeval appearance of the diamond-ring devices on both the Rucellai and the Medici’s architectural projects prior to the 1461 betrothal which united their houses, scholars are divided into two broad camps. Interpreting Giovanni Rucellai’s use of the sigil as completely independent from the Medici’s, both Francis Ames-Lewis and Brenda Preyer suggested that the devices’ similarities resulted
emblazoning all four badges across the facade of Santa Maria Novella (1470, fig. 41), the Tempietto of the Holy Sepulcher at San Pancrazio (1467, figs. 42-43) – both of which are also prominently inscribed with his name – and the facade of the palazzo Rucellai (1446-1451, fig. 44), Giovanni proudly proclaimed his own patronage while also visually and publicly aligning himself with the Medici. Concurrent with this strategy of visual rhetoric, Rucellai further cultivated the Medici’s favor by securing marriage alliances from their common source as an Este emblem, rather than demonstrating an intra-Florentine clientage. Although not addressing Rucellai’s use, Lorenz Bönninger followed similar logic in originating the Medici rings with a Sforza device. As Adrian Randolph noted, however, there is no documentary evidence for such a donation to either the Medici or the Rucellai. Those privileging a Medicean identification with the rings argue for Rucellai’s adoption based on earlier instances of rapport. F.W. Kent pointed to Piero de’ Medici’s role as godfather to Giovanni Rucellai’s son in 1448, just prior to Giovanni’s first known use of the diamond-ring emblem, and subsequent to the Medici’s own adoption of the diamond rings from at least the early 1440s. Luigi Borgia and Francesca Fumi Cambi Gado similarly cited the discussions of a marital alliance in 1438. Naujokat argued that the politically-suspect Rucellai’s proactive adoption of the Medicean emblems was part of his larger strategy of reconciliation with the Medici regime. By never displaying his personal sail emblem in isolation, but always in combination with the Medici’s sigils, she contended that Rucellai demonstrated his loyalty and gratitude to the Medici, as well as his hope for acceptance into the regime. Naujokat then complicated this narrative by additionally reading the mazzocchio device as a veiled allusion to Palla Strozzi’s own badge of a crown with two palm fronds. For her, the assimilation of Strozzi’s crown into the Medici’s hat was symbolic of Rucellai’s ability to join the regime’s ranks without disowning his traditional loyalty to his exiled father-in-law. For this reading, she drew on Matteo Burioni’s unpublished essay, which interpreted the mazzochi depicted between the stemme of the Pandolfini, Strozzi, Rucellai, and Guasconi clans in the Rucellai’s c. 1460 altana frescoes as a subversive sign of hostility to the Medici. Naujokat then interpreted the inauspicious location of the mazzocchio on the northern side of the San Pancrazio sepulcher, which forces the beholder to walk around the tomb to see the image, and the primacy of the rings next to the grave’s entrance, as indicative of the mazzocchio’s covert, potentially anti-Medicean meaning. The absence of the mazzocchio on the Rucellai loggia constructed for the 1466 wedding could support this reading. See Non est hic: Leon Battista Albertis Tempietto in der Cappella Rucellai (Berlin: Geymüller, 2011), 181-194. For my purposes, regardless of any private or clandestine appeal the plumed hat may have had for Giovanni, by the time of Soderini’s investiture in 1502, a Florentine viewer would have associated the emblem with the Rucellai clan due to its appearance on the family’s palace facade for the past thirty-odd years. See Francis Ames-Lewis, “Early Medicean Devices,” 122-143; Preyer, “Appendix C: The Emblems,” in Giovanni Rucellai ed il suo zibaldone, ed. F.W. Kent, vol. 2, A Florentine Patrician and his Palace (London: Warburg Institute, University of London, 1981), 198-207; Bönninger, “Diplomatie im Dienst der Kontinuität: Piero de’ Medici zwischen Rom und Mailand (1447-1454),” in Piero de’ Medici “il Gottoso” (1416-1469): Kunst im Dienste der Mediceer/Art in the Service of the Medici, eds. Andreas Beyer, Bruce Boucher, and Francis Ames-Lewis (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1993), 39-54; Randolph, Engaging Symbols: Gender, Politics, and Public Art in Fifteenth-Century Florence (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 117-118; Kent, “The Making of a Renaissance Patron of the Arts,” in Kent, Giovanni Rucellai ed il suo zibaldone, 29; Borgia and Fumi Cambi Gado, “Insegne araldiche e imprese nella Firenze medicea del Quattrocento,” in Consorterie politiche e mutamenti istituzionali in età laurenziana, eds. Maria Augusta Timpanaro Morelli, Rosalia Manno Tolu, and Paolo Viti (Milan: Silvana, 1992), 213-238.
with several of Cosimo’s close intimates, including Giovanni Bartoli (betrothal 1445), Luca Pitti (1456), Francesco Venturi (1455), and Luca degli Albizzi (1459). The pictorial anticipation on Rucellai’s architectural commissions of his integration into the regime was finally realized in 1461, when Giovanni’s son was affianced to Cosimo’s granddaughter.

Benedetto’s rendering of the skull’s headband suggests that he intentionally designed the skull’s hat to allude to the Rucellai emblem. Its single row of drilled holes, for example, reprises the detailing of the mazzocchi on the Rucellai palace’s courtyard tondo (1452, fig. 45). In both instances, the apertures serve to animate the sculptures by refracting light, and to suggest jeweled embellishment, much as the small circles dotted along the mazzocchi on the palace facade (fig. 44) and on the tempietto roundel (fig. 43) are likely meant to indicate pearls or other sumptuous embellishments. The narrowness of the skull’s band finds a parallel in the relative thinness of the courtyard’s round hoops.

Benedetto breaks millinery convention, however, by attaching the leaves to the back of the hat instead of to the front. As demonstrated by the sartorial descriptions of the jousts, and by the flower-brooch at the center of the Rucellai device, feathers were typically fastened to the textile by a jeweled pin at the front of the hoop. Gozzoli portrays an alternate method of tucking the quills into the top of the padded roll (fig. 35) or just

53 As observed by Naujokat, Non est hic, 193-194, citing Kent, “Making of a Renaissance Patron,” 29-30, who noted that Cosimo decided the dowry for Giovanni’s oldest daughter’s betrothal to Domenico di Giovanni Bartoli in May 1445, and further detailed the Rucellai’s marriage alliances. Giovanni’s eldest son, Pandolfo, was betrothed to Luca Pitti’s daughter in 1453, and wed in 1456; Margherita married Jacopo di Francesco Venturi in 1455, and Marietta married Girolamo di Luca degli Albizzi in 1459. Bernardo was affianced in 1461 to Nannina (Lucrezia) di Piero de’ Medici and wed in 1466.
54 The terracotta tondo in the center of the vault of the Rucellai loggia was painted by Apollonio di Giovanni and Marco del Buono in 1452. Brenda Preyer, “The Rucellai Palace,” in Kent, Giovanni Rucellai ed il suo zibaldone, 165.
behind the studded band (fig. 36), but in either case, the plumes are always located at the front of the head. Benedetto’s alternative solution emphasizes the skull’s unsettling stare.

Whereas placing the leaf stems at the front of the headband would draw the viewer’s gaze upwards from the empty orbits to follow the vertical veins of the blades to their curling apices, the mazzocchio’s unbroken horizontal fillet arrests such ocular movement, and forces the viewer to engage with the skull. The leaves’ rear positioning also solves the technical problem of supporting the thin marble blades. As the skull already significantly projects out from the arch, placing the three stalks at the front of the band, where they would rise completely divorced from the surrounding sculpture until the tips meet the blind molding, would likely require some form of buttressing to prevent the marble from fracturing. The posterior alignment instead allows Benedetto to support the fronds through the archivolts, to which he attaches the leaves at multiple points along the molding. Although the Rucellai mazzocchio was particularly associated with Giovanni, due to its public and prolific appearances on his “signed” architectural commissions at Santa Maria Novella and San Pancrazio, Benedetto’s millinery imitation more likely alludes to, perhaps is even addressed to, Giovanni’s son Bernardo (1448-1514): the head of the family at the turn of the sixteenth century and Piero Soderini’s bitter nemesis.

*Bernardo Rucellai and Piero Soderini*

The 1461 betrothal of teenagers Bernardo and Lucrezia (Nannina) di Piero de’ Medici (1448-1493) initiated the young Rucellai’s future ascent into the upper echelon of the Medici’s regime. As the contemporaries Lorenzo (1449-1492) and Bernardo matured, Rucellai transitioned from being a member of Lorenzo’s youthful *brigata* to serving as
his brother-in-law’s confidant and adviser. Less an ardent Medici partisan, however, than a fierce and ambitious proponent of his own primacy within an elite aristocratic rule, Bernardo became increasingly disenchanted with Lorenzo’s autocratic bearing and promotion of men of ignoble birth. From 1492 Bernardo conspired with other ottimati — including Francesco (1453-1524) and Paolantonio Soderini (1449-1499), Piero’s brothers — to replace Piero di Lorenzo de’ Medici (1472-1503), who assumed the mantle of the regime upon his father’s death, with a narrow oligarchy. Like Bernardo, the Soderini were also Medici parenti and trusted members of the Laurentian regime who became estranged from Lorenzo and sidelined by his impetuous son Piero. Their efforts came to fruition on November 9, 1494 when Piero fled the city and the Medici were exiled from Florence.

---


56 For Bernardo’s estrangement with Lorenzo and Piero, see Guicciardini, *Storie fiorentine*, 84 and 284; and Bartolomeo Cerretani, *Storia fiorentina*, ed. Giuliana Berti (Florence: Olschki, 1994), 187 and 190. For the ongoing conspiracy, see ibid., 190-191 (1492); and Piero Parenti, *Storia fiorentina*, ed. Andrea Matucci (Florence: Olschki, 1994), 1:47 (April, 1493) and 70 (April, 1494). When the 1494 plot was discovered, Bernardo escaped censure, although his two sons and Francesco Soderini, the bishop of Volterra, were exiled beyond city limits. See Alison Brown, “The Revolution of 1494 in Florence and its Aftermath,” in *Medicean and Savonarolan Florence*, 115-138, which also discusses Cardinal Giovanni de’ Medici’s antagonism towards Piero.

Florence.

Until Paolantonio’s death in the summer of 1499, the relationship between the Rucellai and the Soderini was marked by a series of successful collaborations between the two *capifamilia*. After the *ottimati*’s successful coup against Piero, Bernardo and Paolantonio were among the architects of the Republic’s reorganization, and joined forces against Francesco Valori and Piero Capponi within the *ottimati*’s internal factionalism.\(^{58}\)

When Paolantonio was targeted for execution during the reprisals against Frateschi in the aftermath of Savonarola’s execution, Bernardo, although the leader of the anti-Savonarolan faction, was instrumental in saving Paolantonio’s life.\(^{59}\)

By 1500, however, Soderini and Rucellai interests diverged. When violence erupted in the commune’s subject city of Pistoia, the conflict between the local Panciatichi and Cancellieri factions was played out in the legislative halls of the Signoria through their Florentine allies.\(^{60}\) The inciting incident appears to have been Bernardo’s corruption of Pistoia’s electoral process; he arranged to have his relative, a Cancellieri

---

\(^{58}\) See Jurdjevic, *Guardians of Republicanism*, 37.

\(^{59}\) Guicciardini, *Storie fiorentine*, 155 “...fra’ quali Franceschino degli Albizzi, che el di che fu morto Francesco Valori, venuto alla signoria disse: ‘le signorie vostre hanno inteso quello che è seguito di Francesco Valori; che comandano che si facci ora di Giovan Batista Ridolfi e di Paolantonio [Soderini]’? Quasi dicendo: se voi volete, noi andremo a amazzarlo. Da altra parte messer Guido, Bernardo Rucellai, e’ Nerli e quegli che in fatto erano e’ capi, confortavano largamente la conservazione loro, mossi massime, secondo fu opinione di molti, perché avevano creduto che battendo el frate fussi rovinato el consigl io grande, e però gli avevano sì caldamente operato contro; ma di poi ne restorono ingannati, e vedono che molti de’ loro sequaci, ed in spezie e’ compagnacci, ed universalmente tutto el popolo voleva conservare el consiglio.” Guicciardini lists Bernardo as a *capo* of the Campagnacci on 153.

partisan, appointed to public office in place of the position’s confirmed Panciatichi candidates. During the ensuing civil war, Rucellai continued to promote Cancellieri interests, while Piero Soderini supported his Panciatichi allies. As William Connell demonstrated, while serving as gonfaloniere di giustizia for March and April 1501, Piero successfully outmaneuvered Rucellai and the Cancellieri, and secured the return of the Panciatichi to Pistoia.

In the midst of Pistoia’s civil war, the Florentine government introduced a series of constitutional reforms which would result in the creation of the gonfaloniere a vita as the titular head of state. Although Rucellai was among the proponents of the office, when Piero Soderini, Bernardo’s “enemy,” was elected, Rucellai immediately left Florence and boycotted the new standard-bearer’s celebratory banquet. From 1502-1506 Bernardo retreated to his countryside villa, claiming to withdraw from political life in order to

61 For Bernardo’s role in the affair, particularly the “smoking gun” of his letter of October 1498 asking Pistoia’s priors to “reconfirm” their election of Bernardo Nutini, see Connell, “Citizen Interest,” 129-131.


63 Guicciardini, Storie fiorentine, 246, on the creation of the lifelong gonfalonier: “Aggiugnevasi che Bernardo Rucellai publicamente la disfavoriva [the election of the gonfaloniere a vita]; e la cagione si diceva perché e’ vedeva volgersi el favore a Piero Soderini, del quale lui era particolare inimico....” Ibid., 283-284: “Ma fu di una natura che, o perché gli aspirassi di essere lui capo e guida della città, o perché e’ fussi amatore della libertà e desiderassi uno stato libero e governato da uomini da bene (ma con molte cose si apunò, che era impossibile fermarlo altrimenti che di cera), non potette mai stare contento e quieto a alcuno governo che avessi la città.” Ibid., 284-285: “Ma poi creato el gonfaloniere, del quale era prima privatamente inimico, lui, seguitando lo stile suo, non volle andare a visitarlo, non mai intervenire a pratiche, e vivendo malissimo contento, benché in dimostrazione si fussi ristretto con molti litterati ed attendessi alle lettere ed al comporre, è opinione di qualcuno tenessi qualche pratica de’ Medici, tanto che ultimamente, o per paura o per sdegno, si parti da sé e non cacciato dalla città; cosa miserabile a pensarlo, che lu vecchio e che aveva in ogni stato avuto tanto credito, si partissi poi in quella forma; e nondimeno non parve se ne risentissi né curasssi persona di qualità alcuna, tanto era cominciata a dispiacere la natura ed inquietudine sua.” Parenti, Storia fiorentina, cited in Bertelli, “Petrus Soderinus,” 98n20: “dua de primati in fra gl’altri non si vollono trovare al suo convito, questi furono Bernardo Rucellai e Lorenzo di Pierfrancesco de’ Medici.” Nerli, Commentari, 1:150: “...però cominciarono Bernardo Rucellai e Lorenzo di Pierfrancesco de’ Medici e alcuni altri cittadini a discostarsi da lui, e ne fecero forse troppo presto dimostrazione e molto pubblica, non volendo essi convenire al convito che fece il Gonfaloniere innanzi la sua entrata, nel qual convennero tutti gli altri primi cittadini della città.”
study ancient authors, with the hope of conferring this knowledge to posterity. As soon became evident, however, his voluntary seclusion was a protest against the Soderini government; although he maintained ineligibility for public office by refusing to pay tax arrears, he by no means gave up his political machinations.

Rucellai spent the near decade-long rule of the gonfaloniere a vita conspiring to remove Piero Soderini and to replace the popular government with a cabal of his optimate allies. To this end, Bernardo reconciled with his Medici in-laws, whose support was facilitated by the timely deaths in 1503 of both Piero di Lorenzo and Lorenzo di Pierofrancesco, the leader of the cadet branch whom Rucellai had earlier promoted to replace Piero as the head of the Medici regime. Contravening the 1497 law prohibiting any association with the exiled Medici, Rucellai’s sons and grandson visited Cardinal Giovanni de’ Medici in Rome during Easter in 1505; in the same year Bernardo was also implicated in a failed plot centering around the Sforza and Medici cardinals to remove Soderini and to restore the Medici to power. From 1506 to 1509, Rucellai voluntarily

---

64 See Bernardo’s prefatory letter to his son Palla in his De urbe Roma, cited in Gilbert, “Bernardo Rucellai,” 122n2: “Sed cum seditione civium nihil profecissem, non fuit consilium inter dissidentes et, ut liberius loquar, infectos partibus homines frustra reliquam aetatem agere; sed ad honestum reversus otium...statui ex Romanorum gestis quaecumque obscuriora viderentur aperire, proque viribus ante oculos ponere priscum illum in regenda republica ordinem civitatis, ut si minus aetatis nostrae civibus, posteris salutem aut alienigenis conferre possemus.”


67 Guicciardini, Storie fiorentine, 283: “...alcuni crederono che Bernardo, male contento del gonfaloniere, avessi tenuto qualche pratica con Medici o con Pandolfo Petrucci circa a mutare lo stato, e massime che Giovanni suo figliuolo, di cervello e modi simile al padre, era più volte andato a Roma occultamente per le poste; e però insospettito non essere messo in una quarantìa, giudicio teribile, come di sotto si dirà, essersi partito. Ed a questa opinione, che era forse ne’ più savi, faceva fede l’averne più mesi
exiled himself from Florence. Traveling throughout Northern Italy and France, Bernardo wrote *De bello italico*, and worked to suborn Soderini policies while furthering his own and the Medici’s interests. Perhaps his most conspicuous, and successful, stratagem was the highly controversial Strozzi-Medici marriage in 1509. Technically illegal, as contracting with exiles was prohibited under Florentine law, the notorious *parentado* polarized the city, and eroded Piero’s political capital. Through this shrewd matchmaking, Rucellai struck a significant blow to Soderini leadership, while further paving the way for the Medici’s eventual return, and thereby his own resumption of political power.

*Subverting Symbols: Death’s Hat as Satire*

In the very same years that Rucellai plotted against Soderini from both his villa and from abroad, Benedetto was in Santa Maria del Carmine carving the gonfaloniere’s marble tomb. The memorial was first and foremost a commemorative site of reciprocal...
intercession, where the living pray for their dead in Purgatory, and the holy dead intercede and intervene on behalf of their living kin. The monumental sepulcher also testifies to the honor and virtue of the Soderini house; it perpetuates Piero’s identity and shapes his posthumous memory beyond his biological demise. Originally nestled amongst his house’s illustrious forbearers in the family’s sumptuous chapel, Piero’s tomb resolutely proclaims the *gonfaloniere a vita* as a Soderini, whose individual accomplishments bring honor to the extended lineage. By styling death’s crown after the heraldry of Piero’s most hostile and dangerous enemies, Benedetto ultimately fashions Piero as the Republic’s defender of justice and liberty, and the Medici and Rucellai as tyrants whose pride and endless ambition bring ruin to the commune.

The festive headgear gives the enlarged death’s head a courtly air and reinforces death’s sovereignty; projecting from the upper heights of the tomb, death literally and figuratively triumphs over the living beholder. When worn by death, the resplendence and magnificence connoted by the plumed and bejeweled *mazzocchio* become examples of vanity and vainglory; the riches and elite social standing signaled by the embellished hat are disdained as avarice and hubris. The wealth and power which are carefully cultivated and displayed by the Medici, whether emblazoned in the *penne d’oro* of their fifteenth-century jousts or more recently lavished on their Roman banquets, and by the Rucellai, whether through Giovanni’s prominent and inscribed architectural commissions or

---

69 For this and other reciprocal exchanges, see Patrick J. Geary, *Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994).

70 For the contrast between the Medici’s “princely” and the Soderini’s “Republican” patronage – both in public perception and in economic means – see Lowe, *Church and Politics*, 67-78.
through Bernardo’s “academy” in his villa gardens, do not impede death’s harvest. Worldly glory does, however, forestall the soul’s entrance into Paradise. Soderini, in contrast, demonstrates his humility by yielding to death; his sarcophagus is recessed between voracious death’s heads in recognition of his ephemeral corporeal existence and of the futility of terrestrial gain.

Benedetto’s translation of the sartorial emblem into the attribute of death also re-interprets the Medici and Rucellai’s sigil as harbingering mortal demise; as bearers of the device whose jaunty variation crowns the tomb’s giant death’s head, the Medici and Rucellai are thereby cast as death-bringers. To the extent that they were behind two assassination attempts on the gonfalonier, this was not an idle or slanderous conjecture, but a rather sinister reminder of how dissent was silenced by the previous Medici regime. Although Benedetto portrays Soderini’s enemies as heralds of death, he denies their badge both death’s all-encompassing power and the crown’s sovereign associations.

In other words, the tomb’s “King Death,” whose foliage sprouts from the skull’s ear canal

---


74 See Brown, “Lorenzo and Public Opinion in Florence,” esp. 88-89 for capital punishment summarily given to conspirators against Lorenzo, and 102-103 for the riot during the execution of Neri Cambi, after which Lorenzo ordered that four spectators who vocally encouraged Cambi to escape be arrested, tortured, and exiled.
in emulation of the family’s heraldic antlers, is a Soderini. The hat-bearing Medici and Rucellai, in contrast, are merely death’s servants.

This pointed moral critique serves to neutralize the Rucellai’s and the exiled Medici’s virtual presence in the city by re-reading the signs prominently inscribed on their ubiquitous public patronage. While in 1497, “in every place where the Commune of Florence had jurisdiction” the Medici stemme had been removed, destroyed, and replaced “with the insignia of the Florentine people,” Medici devices were indelibly branded into two of the city’s holiest sites. Michelozzo’s tabernacle (1447-1448) for St. Giovanni Gualberto’s speaking crucifix at San Miniato al Monte is inlaid with friezes of feather-laced diamond rings and a “SEMPER” banderole, and emblazoned on the back with Piero di Cosimo de’ Medici’s falcone clutching a diamond ring with the “SEMPER” motto (figs. 46-47); likewise, that for the cult image of the Annunciation at Santissima Annunziata displays the Medici’s palle on its coffered ceiling (1448-1452, fig. 48).

Benedetto underlines the princely character of imprinting a personal device throughout

---

75 Iodoco del Badia recorded the decree of May 8, 1497 in Luca Landucci, Diario fiorentino dal 1450 al 1516, ed. Iodoco del Badia (Florence: Sansoni, 1883), 149n2: “...ed ordinò che in ogni luogo, dove il Comune di Firenze ha giurisdizione, si distruggano le armi e insegne di Lorenzo de’ Medici e de suoi figli ed eredi; e che in luogo di quelle (dove si potesse fare commodamente), si ponga l’insegna del popolo fiorentino, cioè la croce rossa in campo bianco; tutto questo a spese degli Ufficiali dei Ribelli e Sindacì dei suddetti eredi, come fu decretato con altro partito del di 13.” Landucci wrote, 149: “E a di 11 di maggio, la Signoria, ch’era gonfaloniere Piero degli Alberti, feciono disfare e scarpellare tutte l’arme delle palle nel palagio de’ Medici e in Sa’ Lorenzo e altrove.” Parenti stated that the arms were taken down in April 1497. Storia fiorentina, 2:106: “In segno d’alienata mente contro a Piero de’ Medici, per decreto della Signoria si levorono tutte l’arme sue in qualunque luogo le avessi, si come al palazzo suo, a San Gallo, a San Lorenzo e in ogni altro principale edifizio in cui cambiò la del popolo, cioè la croce rossa nel campo bianco.”

the fabric of the city by investing death’s crown with political overtones. Among the multiple significations of the Medici and Rucellai’s devices, Francis Ames-Lewis, Brenda Preyer, Linda Koch, and Lorenz Böninger have argued for the *imprese*’s aristocratic purchase; they posit that these emblems derived from Italy’s northern courts, and likely signaled an affiliation between the Florentine patricians and northern lords.\(^77\) To the extent that sixteenth-century viewers read a relationship between the Medici’s feathers or the Rucellai’s plumed *mazzocchio* and the insignias of the Este, Sforza, or Gonzaga, Benedetto heightens the contrast between the Medici and the Rucellai’s aristocratic affinities and the Republican commitment of the Soderini, by investing death’s crown with civic resonances. The oak leaves which uniquely crest the tomb’s monumental skull, in contrast to the laurels wreathing the surrounding smaller heads, allude to the *corona civica* of ancient Rome.\(^78\)

The garland of Jove’s sacred fronds was the honor reserved for the Roman

---

\(^77\) See note 52 above. Ames-Lewis additionally noted that emblematic ostrich feathers were used by the Sforza of Pesaro and the Gonzaga of Mantua. “Early Medicean Devices,” 129n30. Koch also located Piero di Cosimo de’ Medici’s falcon *impressa* in the “aristocratic sign system of the type then developing at the Italian courts, including Ferrara where he had spent time.” “Falcon *Impresa* of Piero,” 507. Although turning away from the heraldry of the courts, Randolph also identified the aristocratic appeal in the Medici’s use of the diamond ring as a metaphor of the prince’s marriage to the state. *Engaging Symbols*, 108-138. For the Italian *impressa*’s courtly and chivalric origins, see Kristen Lippincott, “The Genesis and Significance of the Fifteenth-Century Italian *Impresa*,” in *Chivalry in the Renaissance*, ed. Sidney Anglo (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1990), 49-76.

\(^78\) See, for example, the description by Piero’s great-nephew, Giovannettorio Soderini (1526-1597), in his treatise on trees, first partially published in 1600. *Trattato degli arbori*, ed. Giuseppe Sarchiani (Milan: Silvestri, 1851), 9: “Sono stati ancora destinati ad onore degli uomini vari abori, come agli egregi Cittadini la Corona civica, tessuta di arredevoli rametti di quercia, ed a’ Poeti d’alloro; a quelli che in alcun combattimento vincevano, la Palma e l’Ulivo in segnale d’averne conseguita la vittoria; e l’Alloro ancora si prendeva per insegna da’ Romani, e denotava vittoria. Le corone che erano richieste nelle nozze s’intesessero di foglie d’arbori che tenessero il verde; e gli stessi Re si coronavano di questa medesima sorte di fronde. Giulio Cesare fu coronato d’alloro, le cui frondi dipo i veggiogno impresse in tutte le Medaglie degli altri Imperadori.” In Death’s foliate crown, the oak leaves signal valor, civic piety, and sovereignty.
citizen, traditionally a soldier, who saved the life of a fellow citizen in battle. As the “savior of the citizens,” Julius and Augustus were respectively and exceptionally awarded the oak crown by the Roman Senate in 45 and 27 B.C. for ending civil warfare and showing clemency to the defeated. On Soderini’s tomb, Death, the universal leveler who wears these esteemed greens, is not unironically fashioned as an analogous savior of the Florentine Republic and the ideal of martial valor. Through the skull’s foliation of surrogate cervine horns, this virtus and pietas is also imparted to Soderini. In an ingenious hermeneutical superlatio, Benedetto imitates the form of plumed mazzocchio to recast the Medici and the Rucellai as the vanquished enemies not just of Soderini, but the commune itself. The Medici tyrants and their Rucellai collaborators, who had de facto usurped the state, are metaphorically slayed by the newly-elected Piero Soderini, who de jure leads the restored Republican government. The decadent and aristocratic

---

79 For the corona cívica’s strict criteria, see Aulus Gellius, Noctes atticae 5.6.11-15, which also identifies the oak as the earliest food of man; and Pliny, Naturalis historia 16.5, which additionally notes the crown’s connection to Jove. For the oak wreath and Jove, see also Ovid, Tristia 3.1.35-40. For the corona cívica in Roman art, see Birgit Bergmann, Der Kranz des Kaisers: Genese und Bedeutung einer römischen Insignie (New York: Gruyter, 2010), 135-212.

80 For the corona cívica bestowed on Julius Caesar in 45 B.C., citing the end of the civil war and Julius’s clemency, see Appian, The Civil Wars 2.106; Cassius Dio, Historiae Romanae 44.4.4 and 44.6.4; and Lucius Annaeus Florus, Epitome 2.13.90-91, noting instead the corona radiata. See also Stefan Weinstock, Divus Julius (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 149-142, 163-167, and 271-272. For Octavian, who was also acclaimed as Augustus in 27 B.C., see Cassius Dio, Historiae Romanae 53.16.4; Ovid, Tristia 3.1.47-48; Valerius Maximus, Facta et dicta memorabilia 2.8.7; the fullest account in Augustus’s Res gestae was only recovered in 1555. Note, however, Pliny’s ironic remarks in Natural History, trans. H. Rackham (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938), 4:390, Naturalis historia 16.7: “Glandiferi maxime generis omnes, quibus honos apud Romanos perpertuos: hinc cívicae coronae, militum virtutis insignis clarissimum, iam pridem vero et clementiae imperatorum, postquam civilium bellorum profano meruitimum coepit videri civem non occidere.” “They are practically all of the acorn-bearing class of oak, which is ever held in honour at Rome, because from it are obtained the Civic Wreaths, that glorious emblem of military valor, but now for a long time past also an emblem of the emperors’ clemency, ever since, owing to the impiety of the civil wars, not to kill a fellow-citizen had come to be deemed meritorious.”

81 Soderini’s use of Davidic imagery similarly combines civic virtue, anti-Medicean sentiment, and martial valor. See Polizzotto, “Pier Soderini and Florentine Justice,” 272-274, noting the corrections of Joost Keizer that Soderini did not commission Michelangelo’s David, but only becomes involved from 1504,
associations of the pinions are surmounted by the sober and civic connotations of the *quercus*. Without the violation of decorum which would result from a conventional depiction of the civic crown as presumptively assuming an unbestowed honor, Benedetto’s oak-pronged band simultaneously and suggestively allegorizes Soderini as the exemplary patriot who defeats Florence’s foes and defends her citizens, even at the peril of his own life.  

In addition to valorizing Piero as an exemplary citizen, Benedetto draws on the oak’s association with justice to equate Soderini’s election as Florence’s newly-created perpetual *gonfaloniere di giustizia* with the inauguration of a Golden Age. The oak’s acorns nourish man in Dante’s “first age,” as “beautiful as gold,” when “time renews itself and justice returns.”  

Hesiod similarly identifies the acorn-bearing oak, along with peace and prosperity, as the bounties of justice, over which Jove presides. In Cicero’s *De legibus* (1.1-4), shady oak groves provide the setting for the classical dialogue on laws. Writing in the aftermath of the Pazzi conspiracy, Alamanno Rinuccini (1426-1499) reprises this convention in his *Dialogus de libertate* (1479), where civic liberty, rule of

---

82 See, for example, Soderini’s speech to the Great Council in 1510, following Prinzivalle della Stufa’s assassination attempt. Cerretani, *Storia fiorentina*, 402, editor’s brackets and parentheses: “Io stimai che questa corazza di questo segno publicho che m’avete dato fussi acta e potentte a ghuardarmi. Ora s’è visto che la non è, e sanza mia colpa alcuna sono perseguitato per tormi la vita; io non mi churo di morire et morrò chontentto purché voi salviate questa libertà vostra. Ho voluto dirvi et conferire queste cose perché io non sono certto del vivere; ho nemici potenti, e di che qualità voi vedete, e solo per salvare la libertà vostra et non ho nessuno che per me sia, abandonato da c[i]aschuno nessuno si risentte, si leva al chustodire questo si mag(nific)o dono.”

83 *Purgatorio*, 22:148-149: “Lo secol primo, quant’ oro fu bello; / Fe’ savorose con fame le ghiande” and 70-72: “quando dicesti: ‘Secol si rinnova; / torna giustizia e primo tempo umano, / e progenie scende da ciel nova.’ ” For Dante’s association of Jove with justice, see *Paradiso*, cantos 18-19.

84 Hesiod, *Opera et dies* 225-237. Niccolò della Valle’s translation was available from 1471. Jove’s oak likewise nourishes the first golden age of man in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* 1.89-112; in this idyllic age there was no need for justice or law, as man lived uncorrupted in safety and harmony.
law, and the administration of justice are closely interwoven. As symbols of justice restored, Benedetto’s metamorphosis of feathers into fronds is a particularly biting piece of visual invective, since, at least from 1513, the Medici’s trio of plumes was identified as ostrich feathers, which, being equal in length, symbolized justice.

Re-Inscribing Medicean Symbols

Benedetto’s vegetal and judicial translation was not the only way in which the Medici’s feather *impresa* was inverted. A more pointed re-reading was given by Tommaso di Matteo Sardi (1458-1517) in his *Anima Peregrina* (1494-1509). In imitation of Dante, the Conventual Dominican narrates his journey through the realms of the afterlife, where he meets Simonetta Cattaneo Vespucci (1453-1476): the poetic beloved of Giuliano de’ Medici, whose joust, held in her honor, is described above.

85 For the quercine setting, see Alamanno Rinuccini, “Dialogus de libertate,” ed. Francesco Adorno, *Atti e memorie dell’Accademia toscana di scienze e lettere* “La Colombaria” 22 (1957): 276: “Sed iam, ut videtis, ad nemus perventum est: itaque, sub hac patula quercu sedentes vel iacentes ut cuique libet, Alithem audiamus.” Ibid., 291, at the beginning book 2: “…in prato quod undique densae quercus opacant consederimus; itaque me nunc ducem sequamini.” Justice and liberty are also mutually dependent in Leonardo Bruni’s *Laudatio Florentinae urbis* (1404). Ames-Lewis cited the decorations on the Capitoline theater when Giuliano and Lorenzo de’ Medici were granted Roman citizenship in 1513. “Early Medicean Devices,” 129n30: “Tutto fatto di leoni et anelli con diamanti ornate di penne di strutto.” He noted, however, that St. Gregory read the ostrich feathers alternatively as symbols of hypocrisy in his *Moralia*. “Early Medicean Devices,” 129n30. Pierio Valeriano, who was in the Medici’s Roman “court” from 1509, glossed the ostrich feathers, as well as Bacchus, in terms of justice in his *Hieroglyphica* (composed 1510s, printed 1556). See Claudia Cieri Via, “Villa Madama: Una residenza ‘solare’ per i Medici a Roma,” in *Roma nella svolta tra Quattro e Cinquecento: Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi*, ed. Stefano Colonna (Rome: De Luca, 2004), 349-374. The five manuscripts Sardi commissioned are still extant, including the autograph, to which he appended a commentary by 1515, at Santa Maria Novella (IB 59), his home convent. For a thorough overview of the work, see Chiara Nardello, “*Anima Peregrina*: Il viaggio dantesco del dominicano Tommaso Sardi,” *Miscellanea marcellana* 17 (2002): 119-176. After his 1509 attempt to secure Filippo di Filippo Strozzi’s patronage failed, the Medici partisan commissioned a manuscript for Piero Soderini in 1511 (BNCF Banco Rari 17), followed by a manuscript for Leo X in 1513 (Rome, Biblioteca dell’Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei e Corsiniana MS 55 K 1); none resulted in the publication of his work. The first book of Sardi’s three-part epic is published in *De Anima Peregrina: Poema di fra Tommaso Sardi Domenicano del Convento di Santa Maria Novella in Firenze*, ed. Margaret Rooke (Northampton, MA: Smith College, 1929).
Whereas Lorenzo placed Simonetta the heavens as the morning “star of Venus,” Sardi locates her in the “fire of avarice,” where she burns for her infidelity with Duke Alfonso of Calabria. Instead of hair, Simonetta has gilded feathers (dorate penne), which bear her aloft. Sardi explicates this curious alteration in his commentary to his epic (1509-1515), where Simonetta is revealed as “Simonia,” whose “gilded feathers fly higher because if Simonetta was loved by a duke, I [Simony] am loved by popes and cardinals and emperors and kings;” for, as it is said, “she flies with gilded feathers because in simony the end is gold.” Sardi’s transformation of Simonetta into Simony unmasks the corruption embedded in the very golden feathers which featured in Giuliano’s joust. Instead of virtue the feathers signal vice.

A similar reprisal might be seen in Michelangelo’s David (1501-1504). Aside from Michelangelo’s reclamation of David as a Republican symbol from the Medici’s

---


89 Sardi, De anima peregrina, 38, 1.13.49-51: “Non ella ad me ne mecho si convenne / et se amata fu assai piu io / piu alto volon mie dorate penne.” Sardi’s commentary is cited in Judith Allan, “Simonetta Cattaneo Vespucci: Beauty, Politics, Literature and Art in Early Renaissance Florence” (PhD diss., University of Birmingham, 2014), 269, italics hers: “Nonella ad me: qui responde la Simonia et dice che non è quella Simonetta et adgiungue et dice: ‘ne mecho si convenne perché à uno sine stima la Simonia et à un altro sine era amata la Simonetta. Qui nella Simonia si cercha beni spirituali, et la Simonetta era bene temporale però non era capace lei di benefici; però convene non con la Simonia et pratica, et se amata fu la Simonetta, assai piu io Simonia sono amata; però dice piu alto volon mie dorate penne perché se la Simonetta fu amata da un duca et io sono amata da’ papi et cardinali et da’mperadori et re etc.,’ et dice ch’vola con dorate penne perché nella simonia el fine sie [sic] l’oro.”
appropriation of the Biblical hero, particularly through Donatello’s David, which was removed from the palazzo Medici and transferred to the Signoria in 1495, Michelangelo’s gigante could also recast Lorenzo de’ Medici’s broncone metaphor. Irving Lavin proposed that the tree stump, or broncone, is not only a conventional means of providing the figure structural support, but also a transformation of the deceased Lorenzo de’ Medici’s personal device into an attribute of David; with the expulsion of the Medici, the “pruned” broncone served as “David’s trophy.” The Soderini tomb’s complementary re-reading of Medicean poetics, which, as will be discussed in the conclusion, also inform Michelangelo’s monument for the defunct Medici in San Lorenzo’s New Sacristy, suggests that this tightly-knit group of Piero Soderini, Benedetto da Rovezzano, and Michelangelo, were particularly invested in creating a visual counterpoint to or inversion of the Medici’s own narrative. Particularly as, if he did not commission Michelangelo’s David himself, Piero Soderini was largely responsible for its installation in front of the Signoria, directly below his newly-refurbished apartments, where it could be associated with his own adoption of the psalmist on his official seal.

---


91 Fundamental to Lavin’s argument is his reading of the Louvre drawing 714R, which along with a sketch for Michelangelo’s 1508 bronze David and a study for the marble David’s right arm, contains a fragment of Petrarchan verse penned by Michelangelo, “Roct lalta cholonna elverd.” Lavin interpreted Michelangelo’s truncation of the opening line of Petrarch’s sonnet lamenting the deaths of Giovanni Colonna and his beloved Laura, “Rotta è l’alta colonna e ’l verde lauro,” as presenting the deceased Lorenzo de’ Medici (d. 1492) as a “broken laurel.” He also argued that Cosimo I’s resurrection of the broncone impresa with a new motto, “uno avulso non deficit alter” is a “triumphant rejoinder” to Michelangelo’s subversion of the broncone on the David as a “broken laurel.” “David’s Sling and Michelangelo’s Bow: A Sign of Freedom,” in Past-Present: Essays on Historicism in Art from Donatello to Picasso (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 29-62.

92 For Giuliano Salviati and the Opera del Duomo’s commissioning the David, and for Piero’s role in its installation, see Keizer, “Giuliano Salviati,” 664-668, where he also noted Soderini’s similar role in the final execution, but not the initial commission, of the 1508 bronze David modeled by Michelangelo and
As Michelangelo’s *David* attests, the Soderini were at the center of a broader Republican “reclamation” of the city after the Medici’s expulsion; particularly at the Duomo and the Signoria – the religious and political centers of the commune – the Medici’s visual presence was systematically effaced or neutralized through a combination of iconoclasm, re-appropriation, and new fabrication.\(^{93}\) In an unpublished diary brought to light by Joost Keizer, political reform, Republican symbolism, and sculpted object are inextricably entwined in the unknown author’s description of how in 1495, Francesco Soderini and Giovacchino Guasconi “made in our city of Florence a new reform around the government of the city, and as a sign of justice, for having oppressed the tyrant, they placed on the *ringhiera* to the entrance of the Palazzo [della Signoria], the *Judith* of bronze, an excellent work by Donatello.”\(^{94}\) Francesco also targeted Lorenzo’s refurbishment of the Duomo’s Chapel of St. Zenobius, one of Florence’s patron saints, cast by Benedetto da Rovezzano. For the 1504 discussion of where the David should be installed, and giving the arguments of the Signoria’s heralds, which Keizer argued voiced Soderini’s own preferences, see Saul Levine, “The Location of Michelangelo’s *David*: The Meeting of January 25, 1504,” *Art Bulletin* 56 (1974): 31-49. For the bronze *David*, see also Luca Gatti, “ ‘Delle cose de’ pittori et sculptori si può mal promettere cosa certa’: La diplomazia fiorentina presso la corte del Re di Francia e il *Davide* bronzo Michelangelo Buonarroti,” *Mélanges de l’École française de Rome* 106 (1994): 433-472; Francesco Caglioti, “Il perduto ‘David mediceo’ di Giovanfrancesco Rustici e il ‘David’ Pulszky del Louvre,” *Prospettiva* 83-84 (1996): 80-101; and Caglioti, *Donatello e i Medici: Storia del David e della Giuditta* (Florence: Olschki, 2000), 1:315-316. For Soderini’s refurbishment of the Signoria, see Nicolai Rubinstein, *Government, Architecture, and Imagery in the Civic Palace of the Florentine Republic* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 43-45, 76-77, and 97-100. For Soderini’s use of David for his seal, and for other Davidic imagery in his gonfalonierato, see Polizzotto, “Pier Soderini and Florentine Justice,” 274.


\(^{94}\) Cited and translated in “History, Origins, Recovery,” 54 and n97, his brackets: “Il Vescovo di Volterra [Francesco Soderini] et Giovacchino Guasconi con [tu]tte trubolenze di fuori, si fece nella n[ost]ra citta di Firenze nuova riforma circa al Governo della Città, ed in segno di Giustizia, di ‘avere oppresto il Tiranno, riposti in sulla Ringhiera della Porta del Palazzo, la Giudicata di Bronzo, op[er]a egregia di Donatello. [In the margin:] 1495.” As Keizer discussed, the Medici’s inscription on the statue’s base was replaced with “EXEMPLUM. SAL[US]. PUB[LICAE]. CIVES. POS[UE RUNT].” and in 1498, the arms of the *popolo* and the commune were added to the base.
when he advocated translating the saint’s body into a new underground chapel at the Duomo, which would have effectively destroyed the Laurentian plan to cover with walls with mosaic.95

Upon becoming the perpetual gonfalonier, Piero’s hand in the city’s visual renewal can also be prominently seen. He was responsible for the altarpiece by Fra Bartolomeo (1510) and the murals by Leonardo (1503), which notably was to include his name-saint Peter presiding over the Florentines’ victory at Anghiari,96 and by Michelangelo (1504) – none of which were completed – in the Signoria’s newly-created Sala del Gran Consiglio, whose inextricable identification with a post-Medici Republic resulted in its being used as a “brothel,” “tavern” and barracks following the Medici’s

95 See Lorenzo Fabbri, “The Restoration of Florence Cathedral in the Nineteenth Century and the Dismantling of Bandinelli’s Choir,” in Sotto il cielo della cupola: Il coro di Santa Maria del Fiore dal Rinascimento al 2000, progetti di Brunelleschi, Bandinelli, Botta, Brenner, Gabetti e Isola, Graves, Hollein, Iozaki, Nouvel, Rossi, ed. Timothy Verdon (Milan: Electa, 1997), 110-132. For the mosaics Lorenzo intended for the chapel, of which only the vault was executed, see Margaret Haines, “Il principio di ‘mirabilissime cose’: I mosaici per la volta della cappella di San Zanobi,” in La difficile eredità: Architettura a Firenze dalla Repubblica all’assedio, ed. Marco Dezi Bardeschi (Florence: Alinea, 1994), 38-54. For other anti-Medicean iconoclasm in the Duomo, including Giuliano’s 1478 epitaph, the re-use of marble intended for Lorenzo’s library, and the marble which would become Michelangelo’s David, see Keizer, “History, Origins, Recovery,” 23-86. For the destruction of the bust of Lorenzo’s favored organist, Antonio Squarcialupi, whose epitaph was composed by Lorenzo, see F.W. Kent, Lorenzo de’ Medici and the Art of Magnificence (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), 106. Note also that in 1509, Francesco and Tommaso di Paolantonio bought Medicean estates seized by the state. See Lowe, Church and Politics, 70-71, who read the purchase as the Soderini “acquiring a material interest in the continued exclusion of the Medici from Florence, and perhaps establishing a claim, along with other leading families, to succeed the position of prominence vacated by the Medici.”

96 Keizer, “History,Origins,Recovery,” 121. He cited the description found in The Literary Works of Leonardo da Vinci, Compiled and Edited from the Original Manuscripts, ed. Jean Paul Richter (London: Low, 1883), 1:348, doc. 669: “Parlato ch’ ebbe pregò Dio ad mani giunte, compari una nugola, dalla quale usciva san Piero che parlò al Patriarca....” Keizer also argued that Piero was the indirect patron of Michelangelo’s St. Matthew (1506), which was commissioned by the Opera del Duomo, based on the importance of Matthew to Soderini’s gonfaloniership (the day prior to his election, September 21, 1502, the Madonna del Impruneta was processed on the feast of St. Matthew, and she was implored to grant Florence a leader who would direct the city “on the path of God,” “in the observance of justice,” and “good laws”), and Soderini’s careful monitoring of the progress on the statue (citing Piero’s letters to Francesco regarding the work). Ibid., 105-133. For Michelangelo’s Matthew, see also Michaël J. Amy, “The Dating of Michelangelo’s St. Matthew,” Burlington Magazine 142 (2000): 493-496.
1512 return. In 1506, Soderini also secured and reserved an exceptional block of Carrara marble intended for a statue in the Piazza della Signoria, which Michelangelo “alone” could carve. Arriving in Florence in 1525, the material itself remained so invested with Republican memory and political signification, that when the popolo petitioned Clement VII to allow Michelangelo, who was then working on the Medici tombs in the New Sacristy, to carve a Hercules as a pendant to his David, Clement refused to interrupt the execution of the mausoleum, and instead had Baccio Bandinelli execute the much-derided Hercules and Caucus (1534).

Piero himself realized a similar strategy, as in tandem with the creation of a “Republican” art, he also affected the destruction of Medici images. In 1505, Piero had the life-size ex-voto of Giuliano de’ Medici, newly commissioned by the Medici siblings Lucrezia Salviati and Contessina Ridolfi, removed from Santissima Annunziata, where

---

97 Bartolomeo Cerretani, Ricordi, ed. Giuliana Berti (Florence, Olschki: 1993), 291: “Il palazzo di sopra, di sotto e nel mezzo pe’ fantti della guuardia si guuardava, e la sala del consiglio in un chanto era la taverna ne l’altro il fraschato ne l’altro la ghrichia ne l’altro il bordello, che era una miseria; e ‘n sulla portta del palazzo era e dentro e fuori molti armati pel mezzo de’ quali passava chi andava in palazzo.”


99 For this interpretation, see “History, Origins, Recovery,” 257-266, especially his reading of the anonymous 1525 ricordo that discussed the popolo’s request and Clement’s refusal. As he discussed, after the Medici were expelled in 1527, the marble, which Bandinelli had begun to carve, was given to Michelangelo by the Signoria in 1528. When the Medici were restored in 1530, Michelangelo returned to the Medici Chapel, and Clement re-awarded the block of marble, for which Michelangelo had made a clay model but never actually carved, to Bandinelli. For the vitriolic reactions to Bandinelli’s Hercules, see Louis Alexander Waldman, “‘Miracol’ novo et raro’: Two Unpublished Contemporary Satires on Bandinelli’s Hercules,” Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz 38 (1994): 419-427.
his own wax effigy stood. At the Medicean stronghold of Le Murate, Piero similarly had the votive of Lorenzo il magnifico taken down and replaced with an image of the Virgin, “in an attempt,” according to one Medici partisan, “to extinguish the memory of Lorenzo as much as possible.”

It is within this larger strategy of substitution and appropriation that Benedetto recasts and replaces the Medici and the Rucellai’s imagery. The stalwart, civic valor of the oak presents Soderini as the antithesis of the corrupt Medicean regime; eschewing pride and vainglory, the gonfaloniere inaugurates a new era when justice and law return to Florence. Benedetto reprises these themes on the tomb’s dionysiac panels, where Benedetto combines the quercine leaves and the liberating god to create a visual metaphor of Soderini and his gonfaloniership.

---

100 Butters, _Governors and Government_, 77-78 and 90. He also noted that Soderini asked the Otto to destroy all the vases in the city that bore Medici arms in 1508.

101 K.J.P. Lowe, “Patronage and Territoriality in Early Sixteenth-Century Florence,” _Renaissance Studies_ 7 (1993): 262-26n 24, citing Goro Gheri’s letter to Baldassare Turini da Pescia on December 7, 1516: “Escendo ogi stato al vespro alle Murate per passare um poco di tempo, quando ero a sedere presso al coro, un ciaptadino da bene che m’era acanto parlando con meco come accade, mi mostrò una nostra donna che era attachata nel muro dirimpetto all’altare et mi dixe quivi soleva stare la imagine del magnifico Lorenzo, la quale fece levare Piero Soderini et el magnifico Lorenzo mi dixe botò una volta a quella chiesa che le gotte lo stringevano forte, et Piero Soderini per extinguere la memoria sua più che poteva lo fece levare. Egli è vero che la nostra donna vi sta molto bene et meglio che la imagine de uno homo mortale ma se lo fece per devizione della nostra donna o per odio de’ Medici, iudicatelo voi.” For the association of Le Murate with the Medici, see F.W. Kent, “Lorenzo de’ Medici, Madonna Scolastica Rondinelli, and the Politics of Architectural Patronage at the Convent of Le Murate (1471–72),” in _Princely Citizen: Lorenzo de’ Medici and Renaissance Florence_, ed. Carolyn James (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), 105-130. For Soderini’s wife, Argentina’s own substantial patronage of the convent, see also Sharon T. Strocchia, _Nuns and Nunneries in Renaissance Florence_ (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009), 102-108. Malaspina’s patronage marks an anomaly among the convent’s main benefactors, who throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were either Medici relations or their allies. See Giustina Niccolini, _The Chronicle of Le Murate_, ed. and trans. Saundra Weddle (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2011), 12-16. Soderini’s effigy is known through Landucci’s description of its removal in 1512. _Diario_, 330: “E a dì 2 d’ottobre 1512, e Medici feciono ridipignere l’arme loro al Palagio loro, alla Nunziata e in molti luoghi; e feciono levare la immagine del Gonfaloniere dalla Nunziata de’ Servi.”
Dionysus and a Just Golden Age

All’antica figures are portrayed on the monument’s outer frame in two panels located just above the reliefs of deer, and recessed behind the horizontally contiguous registers of skulls next to the sarcophagus. On the left, Benedetto depicts a now-headless sea goat and a nude human, also missing his head and his hands (fig. 49); on the right, he includes an amphora, a panther, and a phytomorphic male, also headless (fig. 50). The feline and the wine jug identify the latter as Dionysus, the resurrecting god of the grape and of revelry. The arboreal manifestation of the labile god invokes his association with the oak-laden Golden Age through a semantic play on the Greek drus (δρῦς), meaning both oak and tree. Benedetto’s leaf-clad form recalls Dionysus’s epithet Dendrites (Δενδρίτης), “of the oak tree,” and indicates his affinity for the woodland dryad, who is linguistically the oak-bound nymph. As the leader of the water and sylvan nymphs, Marsilio Ficino described Dionysus as the “god who presides over both generation and regeneration. Thus perchance he is supposed twice born.” Benedetto’s foliate appendage clutching a sheaf of bones similarly visualizes Dionysus’s own rebirth

102 For Dionysus, his rebirths, vines and wines, and ecstatic revelries, and their use from the second century as both positive Christian allegories and as negative antitypes, see Philippe Morel, “Le christianisme dionysiaque,” in Renaissance dionysiaque: Inspiration bachique, imaginaire du vin et de la vigne dans l’art européen, 1430-1630 (Paris: Le Félin, 2015), 649-702. For Dionysus in Christian syncretism from the second to the fifteenth centuries, see also Regina Stefaniak, “Regeneration,” in Mysterium Magnum: Michelangelo’s Tondo Doni (Boston: Brill, 2008), 63-118.

103 Dionysus is Δενδρίτης (Dendrites) in Plutarch, Moralia 675F, Quaestiones convivales 5.3.1. For the oak-dwelling dryad, see Ambrogio Calepino, Cornucopiae (Reggio: Dionigi Bertocchi, 1502), s.v.: “Dryades: nymphae siluarum ab aboribus. Nam apud graecos δρῦς omnis arbor dicebatur, quamuis postea pro quercu usurpata sit. Hae enim sylus habitare dicuntur.”

as verdant regrowth, and underscores death as the prerequisite for both.

Although the regenerated god or participants in his ecstatic retinue (thiasos) are not uncommon in Florentine funerary art by the turn of the sixteenth century, his foliated appearance is unusual. The leaf-clad limbs found on the far right figure in Andrea Mantegna’s Bacchanal with a Wine Vat (c. 1470-1490, fig. 51), and on the left bearer of the corpulent male nude in his Bacchanal with Silenus (c. 1470-1490, fig. 52), are the closest comparisons to Benedetto’s own invention. In Mantegna’s representations, as in Benedetto’s, the fronds are not merely worn by the male nudes like clothing, but are organically bound to the figures’ flesh. The lifted right foot of Mantegna’s bearer (fig. 52) and the raised left leg of his bell-wearing drinker (fig. 51) show leaves which are fused to and growing from the body, rather than autonomous vegetation which lies atop the skin. In Benedetto’s representation, the wide leaves are recognizably oak fronds, which visually and conceptually tie the figure to the lunette’s triumphal skull. By featuring the oak for the botanical incarnation of the god of the vine and the ivy – neither of which appear on Soderini’s tomb – Benedetto minimizes the libidinous and intoxicating aspects of the god of the grape and berry,105 and emphasizes Dionysus’s adjudicating, law-giving, and emancipating qualities, which are shared by Zeus.

In Benedetto’s formulation, Dionysus is the archetype for Soderini who bears the standard of justice (gonfaloniere di giustizia), and who leads a free Republic that rallies

---

105 See, for example, Raffaele Regio’s gloss in Ovidii Metamorphosis cum luculentissimis Raphaelis Regii enarrationibus (Venice: Giovanni da Cerreto [Ioannes Thacuinus de Tridino], 1513), fol. XXXVIr, 3.664: “Hederae autem, quae est Baccho dicata, inest uis quae mentes in furore agit, ac sine uino ebrietatem inducit, ut in problematis Plutarchis ait. Hederae igitur sic remos impediebant, ut nautas in furore agerent. Bacchus et ipse et eius sacerdotes hedera coronabantur, quo ad libidinem promptiores redderentur. Vnde et a graecis κιττος uocatur απο του κιτταν ut scribit Eustathius, quod significat pronum in libidinem ferri.”
to the cries of “libertà.” Benedetto’s embodiment of civic liberty and justice in the quercine Liber also notably parallels the similar imagery used by Alamanno Rinuccini in his anti-Medicean *Dialogus de libertate* (1479). Among the three interlocutors is Eleutherius: the “Lover of Liberty” epithet shared by Dionysus and Zeus.106 Reclining beneath the “spreading oak,”107 Alitheus (the Truthful) and Eleutherius enumerate the injustices and the loss of liberty under Lorenzo de’ Medici’s rule of the Florentine state, and deplore the manifest corruption in the city’s laws, courts, and elections, as well as the suppression of open debate. At the close of the dialogue, Eleutherius denounces Lorenzo as “the tyrant of Florence,” and withdraws from public life, because the “Lover of Liberty” “cannot peacefully tolerate the usurpers of our liberty.”108 Bacchus is likewise identified with justice, the Golden Age, and the abolition of tyranny in a 1472 *protesto di giustizia* made by Bernardo di Simone Canigiani.109

Dionysus also embodies civic liberty as the Roman Liber, for, as Servius, in his commentary on Virgil states, “Liber is the sign of a free city; in fact, at the time of our ancestors, cities were either tributary, or confederated, or free.”110 The liberator is also a

---

106 Rinuccini, “*Dialogus de libertate*,” 272: “libertatis amor et studium Eleutherii tibi cognomen indiderit.”
107 Ibid., 276: “Sed iam, ut videtis, ad nemus perventum est: itaque, sub hac patula quercu sedentes vel iacentes ut cuique libet, Alitheum audiamus.” Ibid., 291, at the beginning of book 2: “…in prato quod undique dense quercus opacant consederimus; itaque me nunc ducem sequamini.”
109 “Questo è adunque el vero civile vivere; in questa forma si ghovernavano e magistrati ne’ primi secoli, ne’ quali, perché regnava la giustizia et la innocenzia, furono chiamati l’età de l’oro. Con simil reghole fu administrato il populo d’Israel prima dell’antico Noè, et di poi successive insino a’ patriarchi Abram, Isache et Jacob; questi furono e constumi del sapientissimo insieme et fortissimo et tanto accepto a ddio Moisè, né per altra causa furono reputati iddi Isis et Osiris, Bacho et Erchole, et alcuni altri appresso agli Egiptii, se non che tutto il tempo di loro vita in niente altro posono che in dare beneficio a’ popoli et mantenere loro la quieta e reprimere le ingiurie de’ tiranni.” Emilio Santini, “La ‘protestatio de iustitia’ nella Firenze Medicea del sec. XV,” *Rinascimento* 10 (159): 63.
110 Servius, *Commentary on the Aeneid of Vergil* 3.20: “Quod autem de Libero diximus, haec causa est, ut
legislator in the *Hymns to Nature* by Michele Marullo (c. 1453/4-1500), the Greek soldier and son-in-law of Bartolomeo Scala, who writes in his hymn to Bacchus, “to you laws, to you cities, to you the pure heart, ignorant of crime, to you the spirit that does not suffer a despotic master.”

Benedetto’s foliated Liber commends Soderini as the upholder and defender of Florentine liberty and justice, and implicitly condemns the Medici and their Rucellai cohorts as the usurping tyrants who bring ruin to the city. An analogy between Soderini’s gonfaloniership and a renewed Golden Age is explicitly articulated in the *encomia* celebrating Soderini’s election. In a poem dedicated to the gonfalonier, Paolo Orlandini (d. 1519) rhapsodizes: “Like Caesar Augustus you will remake our earth from bricks into marble, through the custom and learning you possess. Then, Mars has ended the war, Mercury will come in greatest peace, that the Golden Age will be realized in your age.”

A corresponding image of renewal is expressed in a Christian context by Castellano Castellani (1461-c. 1519), whose pun on Piero Soderini as solid rock (*soda petra*) – also

---

111 Translation and citation in Michael Marullus, *Poems*, ed. and trans. Charles Fantazzi (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012), 216-217, 1.6.43-44, “Baccho:” “Tibi iura, tibi urbes, tibi mens bona nescia scelers, / Tibi impotentis male perpetiens animus heri.” The *Hymni et epigrammata* was first published in Florence, 1497. Marullo was also an important scholar of Lucretius, whose notes for an unfinished commentary were left to Piero Candido, who dedicated his 1512 edition of Lucretius to the gonfalonier’s nephew, Tommaso Soderini. See Brown, *Return of Lucretius*, 98-99.

used by Niccolò Machiavelli – recalls Christ’s similar play on the Apostle Peter as the foundation stone of the Church (Matthew 16:18).113

Solid rock [solida pietra], where the sacred fruit descends to adorn the beautiful Flora, how could it be said that henceforth heaven honors you if not that Jove turns entirely towards you? …Holy laws come out of this rock; this rock transforms every bitter war into peace. Therefore, what more is there to fear if heaven supports it [Piero}?114

The return of justice in a renewed Golden Age also appears in Cipriano Bracali’s description of the feast given by Piero and Argentina in October 1502 to celebrate his election. Following a corrupt era, when “justice would be sold for avarice, or for little return, the high Jove, who displeased with all this, in order to renew the ancient Golden Age, and to make the world bound to virtue, elected Florence to give such a leader.”115

Golden Age rhetoric might also inform the paired register on the far left of the tomb, which depicts a now-headless sea goat and nude (fig. 49). Benedetta Matucci, for example, cited the 1507 discovery of an Augustan relief of a standing, nude, caduceus-bearing Mercury next to a seated goat (fig. 53) in her identification of Benedetto’s figure

---

113 Opere, ed. Corrado Vivanti (Turin: Einaudi, 1997), 1:102-103, Decennale 1.373-381: “Venuto adunque il giorno si tranquillo / nel qual el popul vostro, fatto audace, / el portator creò del suo vessillo, / ne fur d’un Cerbio duo corna capace, / acciò che sopra la lor soda petra / potessi edificar la vostra pace; / e se alcun da tal ordine si arretra, / per alcuna cagion, esser potrebbe / di questo mondo non buon geometra.”

114 Gustavo C. Galletti, ed. Laude spirituali di Feo Belcari e di Lorenzo de’ Medici, di Francesco d’Albizzo, di Castellano Castellani, e di altri (Florence: Mondini e Cecchi, 1863), 288: “Solida pietra, ove il sacrato frutto / Descende per ornar la bella Flora, / Che si può dir, da poi che ’l ciel ti onora / Se non che Giove a te s’ è volto tutto? // Felice giglio, un tempo stato strutto, / Manda le dolce fronde al vento fora: / Cambiato è il tempo, la stagione e l’ora / Di gaudio si riveste el pianto e il lutto. // Trasse la pietra ai nostri padre in terra / Acqua per consolar l’afflitto gregge, / Ma per noi grazia assai maggior si serra // Da questa vengon fuor le sante legge, / Questa trasmuta [sic] in pace ogni aspra guerra. // Dunque che più temer se il ciel la regge?” In the dedication of his Evangeli della quaresima to Argentina Malaspina, Castellani accompanies this verse with another poem to Piero, “Leggiadra insegna, e gloriose corna,” and the “Gloriosa Madonna, in cui si troova” to Argentina. Castellani is also the author of the lauda sung with Piero di Cosimo’s Carro della morte discussed in the second part of this dissertation. For the Savonarolan leanings of Orlandini and Castellani, see Polizzotto, Elect Nation, 219.

115 Cited in Butters, “Soderini and the Golden Age,” 63: “Nel tempo che già ’l mondo in prezzo crebbe / Assai più che virtù, gemme, o tesoro, / E la giustizia venduta sarebbe / Per avarizia, o per piccol ristoro, / El sommo Giove che di ciò gl’increbbe, / Per rinnovar l’antica età dell’oro, / E far’ el mondo di virtù mancipio, / Firenze elesse a dar tanto principio.”
as the messenger god, who assisted the translation of the goat into the constellation Capricorn.\footnote{Matucci, “Cenotafio Soderini,” 86: “…Mercurio, che, pur soggetta a variazioni, sarebbe stata tramandata nelle \textit{Inscriptiones sacrosanctae vetustatis} di Appiano, nelle \textit{Immagini degli dei} di Vincenzo Cartari fino alle \textit{Antichità} di Pirro Ligorio, dove si assiste alla probante traslazione del capro nel mitologico Capricorno con coda pisciforme.” She also identified Mercury with the Gallic Hercules, which later appeared on the façade of Francesco Soderini’s Roman palace, the Torre Sanguigna (1521-1522). Ibid., 88. For the 1507 “Mercurio di Augusta” now Augsburg’s Maximiliumuseum, see Caterina Volpi, \textit{Le immagini degli dèi di Vincenzo Cartari} (Rome: De Luca, 1996), 342-345.} She also noted encomiastic identifications between the eloquent god and the gonfalonier. Paolo Orlandini elided the peace-bringing Mercury with the Golden Age in the poem given above, and elsewhere praised Soderini as a caduceus-holding gonfaloniere.\footnote{Matucci supplemented the poem originally published by Butters, as in note 112 above, with another verse from the multiple pages of Orlandini’s \textit{encomia} in same manuscript. BNCF, Conventi soppressi, G.IV 826, fol. 101r, cited in Matucci, “Cenotafio Soderini,” 105n190: “Poi che harà Marte finita la guerra / Mercurio ne verrà con larga pace / che il secolo d’oro nel tuo tempo afferra”; and fol. 97r: “E [lost] tu ci se gonfaloniere / el caduceo veggiam nella tua mano / e il gran tridente che [ha] ogni sensiere.” Matucci also associated the intertwined snakes in the adjacent register with the caduceus. Ibid., 87 and 104-105n189.} Francesco Leoni likewise played on the semantic lability of the stony Piero and the mercurial Achates when he wrote, “Through baptism, he is Christ’s Peter; out of said name there was hitherto faithful Achates along with stone’s agate.”\footnote{Rome, Biblioteca Corsiniana, Manoscritti, 45.E.9, v. 1014, cited in ibid., 105n192: “Petrus Christi baptismate Achates / Quondam cum fidus lapis ex de nomine dictus.” Sergio Bertelli first published excerpts of the dedication of the \textit{De rerum primordiis} (1503-1504), where Leoni originates the Soderini lineage with Achates, and the family’s cervine \textit{stemma} with the Libyan deer felled by Aeneas and his arms-bearer Achates (Virgil, \textit{Aeneid} 1.184-194). “Petrus Soderinus,” 102-103. Matucci also gives Nerlo Nerli’s use of the \textit{topos} in his epigram “Petro Soderino” in Florence’s Biblioteca Riccardiana (hereafter Riccardiana) 951, fols. 16r-16v, in “Cenotafio Soderini,” 98n55, brackets hers: “Necque ideo oportet natales vestros ad ultima repetere origine vel quod poeticum est fabulari Soderinam sobolem a Syderite lapide nomi[nem] trahere: quod vanum et mendax […] cornibus illis septe[m] cervorum quos figit Eneas in Libia insignive vestrum genus.”} Leoni’s paired puns associate Piero with the apostolic Rock, as well as with Achates, who is both the companion of Aeneas, from whom the Soderini claim descent, and the agate stone which is consecrated to Mercury.\footnote{For Achates, agate, and Mercury, who was also called “the faithful Achates of the Sun,” see Marsilio Ficino, \textit{Three Books on Life}, ed. and trans. Carol V. Kaske and John R. Clark (Tempe: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1998), 251 and 301.}

Given the lack of attributes and the significant losses of heads and hands, a
definitive identification of the figure with Mercury cannot be definitively made, as Matucci noted. The ephebe youth, and the sea goat, as well as the foliated mask which Benedetto inflects with a skeletal visage throughout the tomb, are part of a repertoire of dionysiac motifs derived from the sarcophagi of ancient Rome. The phytomorphic face, for example, can be seen on the sides of the second-century sarcophagus now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (fig. 54), and is ubiquitous in Filippino Lippi’s frescoes for Filippo Strozzi’s burial chapel in Santa Maria Novella (1487-1502, fig. 55). A strident nude similar to Benedetto’s is found on the relief below Francesco Sassetti’s touchstone tomb at Santa Trinità (c. 1485-1488, fig. 56), while, much like the Carmine’s sea goat, aquatic hybrids in the forms of nereids and tritons frame the casket of Sassetti’s wife, Nera Corsi (fig. 57). Among the meanings articulated by these dionysiac figures, which are significantly located around the coffins in the Sassetti examples and on par with the casket in the Carmine, is the hope of the afterlife. Perhaps as important are the very lack of attributes for Benedetto’s figures, and the absence of the quotational references that have allowed several of the all’antica figures on the Sassetti reliefs to be identified with specific Roman works. In this respect, the parallel with Mantegna’s prints is all the more telling. Stephen Campbell has argued that the engravings function as novel

120 “Cenotafio Soderini,” 86-88 for discussions of the figure as Apollo, Hercules, and Mercury.
122 See Borsook and Offerhaus, Francesco Sassetti, 21-27, where they also note that the nereids are a pun on Nera.
fabulae; they are “designed to constitute a canonical artistic vocabulary, their meaning is not limited or fully determined.” Benedetto also leaves the meaning of his “pagan” figures open-ended, which, like the macabre’s own equivocacy, enables his figures to carry multiple significations, and thereby to appeal to varied constituencies. Benedetto further uses classical models not necessarily as citations, but as the basis for new inventions. In addition to the foliated mask which becomes a sprouting skull, on the tomb’s base (fig. 58), for example, he reprises a common combination from classical reliefs of an urceus and a patera between festoon-bearing bucrania, but transforms the skulls’ bovine horns (fig. 59) into the cervine antlers of the Soderini stemme which flank either side (fig. 60). This cervine bucranium forms the core conceit of the tomb’s ornament. The variations on this head structure the monument into alternating registers which realize an “enfleshing” process which plays between life and death, animal and human, flora and fauna, and stone and bone. On the lunette’s outermost band, Benedetto depicts miniature, fillet-wearing deer skulls (figs. 29 and 61), which he follows with the central frieze’s sprouting human crania (figs. 29-30 and 61), and the soffit’s robust deer skulls with long leaf-ears and wide frond-hair (fig. 62). Below the sarcophagus, two of

123 The Cabinet of Eros: Renaissance Mythological Painting and the Studiolo of Isabella d’Este (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 166; see also 145-168. Benedetto is not, however, claiming himself an origin on par with antiquity or with nature as Mantegna does.

124 Benedetto could also be recalling the decoration Bartolomeo Cerretani described in February 1503 in his list of “dimolti erori contro alle leggi che non si punirono.” Ricordi, 73: “...che segni publichi mescholati fra marzocchi et cervi cher erano la sua arme, et quella de l’ultimo ghomonaliero in sulla ringhiera prese, chose permitiose; diploi haveva cincisitato il palazo et fatto de le trate una chucina, et dipoi uno chancello alla finestra di vetro della crocie chon uno sportelino picholissimo dove s’entrava, et questo voleva perché voleva sapere chi andava su a’ signori et non voleva si sapessi chi andava alli altri.” Carlucci, for example, read Cerretani’s text as “the gonfaloniere combined (mescholati) the Marzocco with the deer’s head of his own family stemma.” He additionally suggested that, “It is possible that such a combination of the Florentine Marzocco and Soderini’s stemma, or elements of it, was done on the occasion of a public festival, and may not have been at his request.” “Visual Arts,” 405n21.
the three festoon-laden bucrania appear as inert objects fixed atop ornamental candlesticks (figs. 58-59), while above, the cervine skulls each generate two complete, foliated bodies (figs. 63-64), which are then paired with fully fleshed stags in the adjoining panels. In the next highest level, and adjacent to the sarcophagus intended for human remains, are the memorial’s liveliest and hairiest skulls, which blend human bone with verdant vegetation (figs. 6-7). The fully formed, autonomous bodies of the dionysiac figures on either side are the culmination of this process. As will be detailed further below, the labile play between animal, plant, and mineral in the tomb’s dionysiac panels combine with Liber’s judicial qualities, described above, to create a Republican Golden Age, which eulogizes not only Soderini and his leadership of Florence, but also counters the alternative claim to the Golden Age poetics made by Bernardo Rucellai and the writers of the Orti Oricellari.

**Contesting the Golden Age**

From the advent of Soderini’s election in 1502 until his voluntarily exile in 1506, Bernardo Rucellai abandoned the halls of the Signoria to continue his political intrigues from the shady alcoves of his gardens along the via della Scala. In these eponymous Orti Oricellari, Bernardo hosted discussions of classical literature, culture, philology, and history, which were often pertinent to the current political situation. Bernardo also used these gatherings to foment sedition against Soderini and the governo popolare, particularly among patrician youth.

Filippo de’ Nerli (1485-1556), who attended the Oricellari’s later incarnation

---

under the auspices of Cosimino di Cosimo di Bernardo (1495-1519), described the
garden’s popularity amongst “a certain quality of youths who began to lash out against
the Gonfaloniere [Soderini], and there [in the gardens] without any respect at all, they
spoke ill of him, and his every action was criticized.” Secure in the backing of Rucellai
and other powerful ottimati, such youths continued their brazen disparagement, and,
under Bernardo’s direction, even created masquerades “dishonoring” Soderini. Francesco Guicciardini (1483-1540) also acknowledged the Oricellari youths’ central role
in Bernardo’s schemes. Describing the Oricellari’s seductive allure as “an academy,
where many learned men and young lovers of letters discussed their work and fine
things,” Guicciardini characterized Rucellai as a “corrupter of youths,” “a refuge of
malcontents,” and a “siren.” Guicciardini ultimately held Rucellai responsible for

126 Nerli, Commentari, 1:158: “Era intanto rincresciuto a Bernardo Rucellai quel suo volontario esilio, che
s’era preso poco dopo l’assunzione di Piero Soderini al Supremo Magistrato; però se n’era ritornato a
Firenze, e nel suo molto dilettevol giardino convenivano spesso de’ cittadini e massimamente una certa
quality di giovani che avevano cominciato ad urtare il Gonfaloniere, e quivi senza rispetto alcuno si
sparlava di lui, era biasimata ogni sua azione....” Nerli continues by speculating why Soderini, although
fully aware of these calumnies, chose not to act. Ibid., 158: “e benchè egli lo sapesse e gli fossero note
le pratiche di que’ giovani o per troppa bontà, o per non credere, come doveva, ch’elie gli potessero
nuocere, o credendo poter colla pazienza superar tutte quelle difficoltà, o perché gli paresse pericoloso
il tentare impresa alcuna, andava tollerando costoro, alcuno di essi ne tratteneva....” For Nerli’s
participation in the Oricellari, see ibid., 138-139. See also Gilbert, “Bernardo Rucellai,” 116.

127 Nerli, Commentari, 1:160: “Ed era cagione tal divisione, che que’ giovani i quali nell’orto de’ Rucellai
convenivano, con più sicurità potessero offendere il Gonfaloniere, sperando nella parte de’ Salviati, che
da’ magistrati o dalle Quarantie gli potesse difendere, e però ogni giorno pigliavano più animo contro al
Gonfaloniere, e più animosamente e con meno rispetto l’offendevano, come più volte avvenne in certe
mascherate che in que’ tempi si feceono per ordine di quelli dell’orto, che tutte si facevano per dar
carico al Gonfaloniere e in suo disonore.” Butters related these to the masques put on by Filippo
Strozzi, Prinzivalle della Stufa, Antonfrancesco degli Albizzi, and Antonio di Luca degli Albizzi in

128 Translation adapted from Alison Brown, “Defining the Place of Academies in Florentine Culture and
Politics,” in Everson, Reidy, and Sampson, Italian Academies, 25. Francesco Guicciardini, Oratorio accusatoria, 229-230: “...o per sdegni che ebbe con Piero Soderini ancora innanzi che fussi
gonfaloniere, o più presto per la natura sua impaziente di questa equalità, volse lo animo al ritorno loro,
cominciò a essere uno refugio de’ malcontenti, uno corruttore de’ giovani, e’ quali facilmente si
lasciono ingannare dalle cose cattive quando hanno colore di buone. Cominciò quello orto suo a essere
come una academia: quivi concorrevano molti dotti, molti giovani amatori di lettere, parlavasi di studi,
di cose belle. Era udito come una sirena perché era ornatissimo ed eloquentissimo, né si vedeva
Florence’s lost liberty, likening the gardens to a “Trojan horse” out which exited “conspiracies, the return of the Medici, and the flames that burned this city.”

Certainly Rucellai was among the architects of the successful coup in 1512, and many of the youths stormed the Signoria on August 31st to physically depose the sixty-two-year-old Soderini were known to frequent the Rucellai gardens.

In addition to inciting insurrection among the city’s young ottimati, Rucellai also fostered hostility against Soderini more broadly through the Orti Oricellari’s coeval literary campaign. Felix Gilbert demonstrated that their calculated rehabilitation of Lorenzo’s image was a central feature of this effort. By the time of his death in 1492,
Lorenzo’s reputation for tyranny was already well-established; whether in Savonarola’s fiery sermons, the private diaries of both shopkeepers and patricians, or even the mutterings of his disaffected brother-in-law Bernardo Rucellai, Lorenzo was consistently characterized as a tyrant or a prince.\footnote{In addition to the previous note, for public opinion c. 1500, see Nicolai Rubinstein, “Lorenzo’s Image in Europe,” in Mallett and Mann, \textit{Lorenzo the Magnificent}, 297-312. For Lorenzo’s tyranny during lifetime, see Brown, “Lorenzo and the Problem of Opposition.” See also Brown, “Lorenzo and Guicciardini” in Mallett and Mann, \textit{Lorenzo the Magnificent}, 281–296; and Lorenzo Polizzotto, “Lorenzo il Magnifico, Savonarola, and Medicean Dynasticism,” in \textit{Lorenzo de Medici: New Perspectives}, ed. Bernard Toscani (New York: Lang, 1993), 331-355.} This assessment began to be re-evaluated in the war-torn and factious climate at the turn of the sixteenth century. In September 1501, amidst contentious constitutional reform and financial crisis, Piero Parenti noted that, “The disorder existing in Florence has made people praise the times of Lorenzo de’ Medici and many began to advocate a form of government similar to that of the Magnifico, and indicting the present, they spread information among the masses about the pleasures of the past.”\footnote{Translation and citation in Gilbert, \textit{Machiavelli and Guicciardini}, 111-112 and 112n14: “Questo disordine faceva comendare e tempi di Lorenzo de Medici, et molti appitivano si tornassi a simile stato et seminavano per il vulgo la buona stagione preferita, biasimando la presente.”} Building on this burgeoning nostalgia, the Oricellari’s letterati likewise used epideictic rhetoric to promote the Medici and to criticize Soderini and the governo popolare. The Oricellari authors idealized Lorenzo as a munificent patron and his rule as Florence’s Golden Age, then contrasted this sanitized memory with the city’s current factionalism and conflict, thereby tacitly rendering Soderini as the antithesis of their contrived Medicean exemplar.

Giovanni Corsi (1472-1547) provides one of the more explicit examples of the Oricellari’s concerted myth-making in his biography of Marsilio Ficino (1506). Corsi wrote the memoir as a panegyric to Medicean patronage, and portrayed Ficino’s career as
illustrative of the flourishing of the arts under Medicean rule. After describing the revival of learning under Cosimo de’ Medici’s leadership, and Cosimo’s support of Ficino in particular, Corsi turned to Lorenzo’s influence on the arts.

This was that great Lorenzo, son of Piero and grandson of Cosimo, both of whom we have mentioned before. To the Florentine Republic he was Augustus, to the liberal arts Maecenas. For while he was alive there was no branch of learning, however obscure, which did not flower or was not given its due; and at that time the city of Florence was universally called a second Athens on account of the gathering of such learned men. Hence, with good reason, one of the learned men [Poliziano] has written thus: “Indeed the studies of letters owed most to the Florentines; amongst the Florentines, most to the Medici; amongst the Medici, most to Lorenzo.” It is therefore the calamity of our times, and utterly deplorable, that in our State, in place of instruction and the liberal arts, ignorance and lack of knowledge prevail; in place of modesty and restraint, ambition and excess; in place of generosity, greed. And so much so that nothing at all is done for the Republic, nothing for the laws, but all things are done for pleasure; thus it is that all the best men are assailed by the people as objects of derision. Bernardo Rucellai, detesting the Republic as a most barbaric stepmother, considered he would rather go into exile than remain any longer in that city, from which the disciplines of all the liberal arts and the best institutions of our ancestors, together with the Medici, were banished.134

Corsi valorized the Laurentian era as the embodiment of virtue and the antithesis of the city’s subsequently debased condition. By fashioning Lorenzo as Augustus and

Maecenas, Corsi entwined the Virgilian and Periclean metaphors to portray Lorenzo’s governance as bringing about a new Golden Age with Florence as “a second Athens.” Corsi not only implicitly indicted Soderini for failing to achieve a similar state, but also presented the Golden Age exemplar as contingent on Medicean rule; when the Medici “were banished,” so too were “all the liberal arts and the best institutions of our ancestors.” Corsi then intimated the corollary of this construction; when the Medici return, so too will Florence’s cultural flourishing.

Pietro del Riccio Baldi, better known as Petrus Crinitus (1474-1507), presented a similar polemic in his De poetis latinis of 1505. He prefaced his account of classical Latin poets by addressing the circumstances for men of letters living in Florence. After acclaiming the noble discipline of the liberal arts, Crinitus derided the “evils which prevail in our time,” where “owing to adverse fortune and the iniquitous condition of the times, no favor at all is given to superior intellects;” among whom, Crinitus included Bernardo Rucellai.135 Crinitus then contrasted this current nadir of literary patronage under Soderini’s aegis with its earlier apogee under Lorenzo’s auspices. Whereas the gonfaloniere withheld merited honors, Lorenzo, “with actions that were as famous as they were generous, he brought it to pass that those who seemed deserving on account of their studies might, ever more energetically and intently, remain alive to the possibility of

---

pursuing and cultivating the highest learning."\textsuperscript{136} This promotion of the “highest learning” (\textit{optimis disciplinis}) styled Laurentian Florence as a Golden Age by alluding to Crinitus’s analogous description of Augustan Rome in the preface to Book Three. “For when Augustus ruled it seems obvious that things went so favorably and fortunately for the human race that no one could doubt that power was wielded throughout those times with the greatest guidance and counsel, and that all the branches of erudition shone in the highest degree in Rome.”\textsuperscript{137} In contrast with this unity of political power and cultural efflorescence found in the Augustan and Laurentian Golden Ages,\textsuperscript{138} Soderini’s Florence is characterized by misfortune (\textit{adversam rerum fortunam}) and injustice (\textit{iniquiorum temporum conditionem}). The demise of Rome’s Golden Age, which Crinitus ascribes to an immoderate desire for luxuries and an excessive ambition to rule,\textsuperscript{139} finds an echo in the avarice, ambition, and excess which Giovanni Corsi subsequently characterized as

\textsuperscript{136} Translation in Christopher S. Celenza, “Petrus Crinitus and Ancient Latin Poetry,” in \textit{Essays in Renaissance Thought and Letters in Honor of John Monfasani}, eds. Alison Frazier and Patrick Nold (Boston: Brill, 2015), 43. Crinitus, \textit{De poetis latinis}, prefatory letter: “Laurentius Medices avunculus tuus [the book was dedicated to Lorenzo’s cousin, Cosimo de’ Pazzi, bishop of Arezzo], cum illi relatum foret in civitate sua nonnullos esse, qui praeclaro ingenio ac excellenti eruditione praestarent, primum laetitia incredibili affectus est, dein multum his pollicendo clareque et munifice agendo effecit, ut et bene meriti viderentur de suis studiis et acrius atque attentius indies pervigilarent in prosequendis atque excollendis optimis disciplinis.” Celenza analyzed Crinitus’s linkage of political dominion with cultural progress in the passages on Lorenzo de’ Medici and Augustus; see the subsequent notes below.

\textsuperscript{137} Translation in Celenza, “Petrus Crinitus and Ancient Latin Poetry,” 42. Crinitus, \textit{De poetis latinis}, preface to book three: “Imperant enim Caesare Augusto tam prospere tamque feliciter humano generi consultum videret, ut nemini dubium sit optimis auspiciis atque consiliis per ea tempora administratum fuisse imperium et omnes artes in summam dignitatem Romae clarississe.” See also the opening line of the preface: “Perventum est ad ea tempora, Cosme Pont. Arretine, quibus omnes bonae disciplinae accesserunt ad sumnum fastigiunm una cum maiestatem Romani imperii.”

\textsuperscript{138} For Crinitus’s coupling of political power and cultural production, see Celenza, “Petrus Crinitus and Ancient Latin Poetry,” 39-45.

\textsuperscript{139} Crinitus, \textit{De poetis latinis}, preface to book three: “Sequentibus deinde saeculis posthabita virtute, cum vita hominum magis aequali sunt, paulatim respublica delapata est in partem deteriorem et simul fortunae conditio cum moribus immutata est. Itaque luxus et immoderatae libidines civitatem primo invaserunt. Deinceps, ut in magni malo atque licentia accidit, nimirum imperandi ambitio cuiusque animos occupavit. Quibus malis impedita ac fatigata civitas non tantum pristinam dignitatem diminuit sed ipsum praeterea imperium pessime afectat.”
Florence’s own miserable, post-Laurentian state.\textsuperscript{140}

This idealization of Laurentian Florence forms the cornerstone of the Orti Oricellari’s literary endeavor as the foil to which contemporary Florence, and Soderini’s governance, were compared and found lacking. The Oricellari’s Golden-Age mythography was not a novel invention born of Rucellai’s gardens, but as Melissa Bullard established, a resurrection of Lorenzo’s own self-conscious myth-making.\textsuperscript{141} As Janet Cox-Rearick and others have argued, under Lorenzo’s guidance, the temporal trope of a cyclic Golden Age was interwoven with the organic metaphor of perennial regrowth to fashion a perpetually renewing, eternally regenerating era of prosperity under Medicean rule, which was itself fashioned as endlessly renewable.\textsuperscript{142} The revival of this mythopoesis by the Orti Oricellari members – many of whom conspired against the gonfaloniere – makes this imagery particularly relevant and charged for Soderini. Below, I argue that Soderini answers his enemies’ mythic fashioning in his funerary memorial, which both subverts the Medici’s own imagery and presents Soderini as a pious

\textsuperscript{140} Corsi, “Vita Marsilii Ficini,” 684: “quocirca nostrorum temporum calamitas maxime miseranda; quandoquidem in nostra Civitate pro disciplinis ac bonis artibus inscitia et ignorantia, pro liberalitate avaritia, pro modestia et continentia ambitio et luxuria dominantur.”


alternative to Medicean precedents.

Re-Reading Metaphors: Eternal Renewal vs. Endless Undeath

A central image in Lorenzo’s mythopoesis is the broncone: the withered, yet re-flowering laurel branch adopted by the eponymous “laurel” Medici as his personal device. Under Lorenzo’s aegis, the plant’s classical associations of indestructible regeneration, evergreen rejuvenation, and divine protection, were appropriated as attributes of the Medici house and their rule.143 As a dynastic analogy, the laurel’s perennial regrowth was likened to generational succession; just as the broncone regenerates itself by putting forth new shoots as soon as one bough is severed, so too the Medici’s youthful progeny rise in the place of their defunct forbearers. When the grandson of the recently-deceased Lorenzo was born in 1492, Ugolino Verino, for example, used the broncone’s regenerative qualities to eulogize the neonate as resurrecting his grandfather, writing, “For indeed, the extinct laurel becomes verdant by the renewed offshoot.”144 In this verse, Verino elides the nominative convention of Lorenzo di Piero de’ Medici “remaking” his namesake145 with the magnifico’s poetic senhal of the regenerating laurel to portray the infant as his grandfather rejuvenated and

143 See, for example, Angelo Poliziano, Stanze 1.4, drawing on Pliny, Naturalis historia 15.11.134-136.
144 Ugolino Verino, Genethliacon ad Petrum Medicem in natali Laurentii filli sui, cited in Francesco Bausi, “Il Broncone e la Fenice (morte e rinascita di Lorenzo de’ Medici),” Archivio storico italiano 150 (1992): 453, v. 8. The full stanza (vv. 6-12) reads: “Patria iam tristem posuit gavisa dolorem; / Luctificum Aprilem perpulerunt gaudia Librae: / Namque extincta viret redivivo germine laurus. / Non ita laetatur dives Pachaia, quando / Surgit odorato de funere iunior ales / Solis et illustrat pennis radiantibus aedem, / Quam Laurente novo exultat Florentia foelix.” As Bausi discussed, the larger poem interweaves the broncone metaphor with that of the phoenix, whose resurrection symbolism was also a favored image in the Medici’s self-fashioning. Ibid., 453-454. This manuscript, Riccardiana 915, is notably in the hand of Petrus Crinitus, and passed into the collection of Pallante Rucellai.
reborn. In this mythopoesis, the Medici never die, but are regenerated by their successive progeny.

In addition to the broncone’s dynastic fashioning, the emblem also served as a political metaphor. Complementing Lorenzo’s own figurative reincarnation through subsequent generations, his rule was equally presented as self-perpetuating and evergreen. To inflect his verdant governance as inaugurating a new Golden Age, Lorenzo paired the broncone symbol with a chivalric motto, “le tems revient.” In the poetic commemoration of the 1469 joust where Lorenzo publicly debuted the inscribed emblem, Luigi Pulci explicated the phrase as “time renewing itself,” alluding to the Virgilian trope of the Golden Age’s return and time beginning anew.146 As Janet Cox-Rearick argued, by integrating botanical and temporal metaphors of renewal, Lorenzo poetically figured himself as presiding over an era of peace and prosperity which perpetually reinvigorated itself in an endless springtime.147 One of the fullest articulations of this mythic fashioning is Bernardo Bellincioni’s (1452-1492) elegy on Lorenzo’s death in 1492. Addressing Pierfilippo Pandolfini (1437-1497), the gifted orator and diplomat, Bellincioni writes:

To the Florentine ambassador: spoken by Apollo to Florence, happy beneath the laurel’s [Lorenzo’s] shade; the laurel being the tree that Apollo loves, therefore this Republic rejoices and is grateful, loving him and praising the ambassador.

---

146 Pulci articulates the motto’s meaning in his description of Lorenzo’s standard in Opere minori, 86, stanza LXIV: “e nel suo bel vexillo si vedea / di sopra un sole et poi l’arcobaleno, / dove a lettere d’oro si leggea: / “Le tems revient”, che si può interpetrarsi / tornare il tempo e ’l secol rinnovarsi.” In ibid., 89, stanza LXXI: “Era, quel verde, d’alloro un broncone / che in tutte sue divise il di si trouva, / e lettere di perle vi s’appone, / che dicon pur che ’l tempo si rinuova....” As Cox-Rearick observed, Pulci’s “tempo si rinuova” paraphrases Dante’s Purgatorio 22.67-72 (“Secol si rinova; / torna giustizia e primo tempo umano, / e progenie scende da ciel nova”), which itself derived Virgil’s fourth Ecologue. Dynasty and Destiny, 20-21.

147 See “Themes of Time and Rule,” 184. She referenced Politiano’s Stanze 1.72 (“Ivi non volgon gli anni il lor quaderno, / ma lieta Primavera mai non manca”) as describing an eternal, vernal, Medicean Golden Age.
I see another lovely maid, her lap full of flowers [i.e. Florence], known to the world as the New Athens reclining joyfully beneath the shade of that tree I so loved in living form. Amid its boughs a godlike star is lodged, dispensing virtue and such brilliant light that soon the world’s first, safe, and sacred age will come again: for her, heaven augurs it. I would be thankless, even short of sight, not to commend her, who so adores my Laurel, and always takes such pains to honor him. I thank her too, that Pier Filippo once sent his own true treasure to this place, remembrance of that sweet and ancient love.\footnote{Translation in Aby Warburg, The Renewal of Pagan Antiquity, trans. David Britt (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 1999), 441. Le rime di Bernardo Bellincioni risontrate sui manoscritti, ed. Pietro Fanfani (Bologna: Romagnoli, 1876), 224, sonnet CXCVII, editor’s parentheses: “All’oratore fiorentino, parlando Apollo a Fiorenza, che è lieta all’ombra del lauro (di Lorenzo) essendo il lauro l’albero amato da Apollo, però si rallegra e ne ringrazia quella repubblica, che lo ama, laudando l’oratore. // Co’ fiori in grembo un’ altra donna bella / Veggio, che nova Atene el mondo canta, / Lieta posarsi a l’umbra della pianta, / Che tanto amai in viva forma quella. // Fra’ rami alberga una divina stella, / Unde piove splendore e virtù tanta, / Che quella prima età sicura e santa / Ritornerà: per questa el ciel favella. // Ben sarei ingrato, e del veder poi lippo, / Non commendar colei che ama il mio Lauro, / E che si sforza sempre fargli orore. // Ma la ringrazio ancor che Pier Filippo / Abbia mandato or qui, suo ver tesauri, / In testimon del dolce antico amore.”}

Alluding to the Virgilian and Petrarchan conceit of the arboreal ombra as a metaphor for patronage, Bellincioni represents Lorenzo’s provision of the city as Florence resting in the shade of the laurel tree.\footnote{The laurel’s ombra was a widely-used metaphor in encomiastic literature, in which Lorenzo’s rule was equated with the city’s peace and prosperity. See also Poliziano, Stanze 1.4: “Et tu, ben nato Laur, sotto il cui velo / Fiorenza lieta in pace si riposa.” For these examples, and the image of a personified Florence seated under the laurel tree on the obverse of Lorenzo’s posthumous medal by Niccolò Fiorentino, see Cox-Rearick, Dynasty and Destiny, 18-23; and Randolph, Engaging Symbols, 103-107.} He integrates this vegetative imagery with the Golden-Age poetics of Florence as a “new Athens” where time’s first peaceful and devout age (\textit{che quella prima età sicura e santa}) is destined to return (\textit{ritornerà: per questa el ciel favella}) under Lorenzo’s divine star (\textit{fra’ rami alberga una divina stella}). In addition to his heaven-sent rule, as the beloved of Apollo (\textit{il lauro l’albero amato da Apollo}), Lorenzo himself is equally favored by the gods.

This “Lauro” refers not only to the current Lorenzo, whose death Bellincioni subtly acknowledges in line four (\textit{che tanto amai in viva forma quella}), but also to the
magnifico’s figurative rebirth in his progeny. By using the future tense (ritornerà) for the return of this fated, idyllic, and Laurentian age, Bellincioni presents the Medici dynasty as renewing both Lorenzo and his rule. In this mythography, even though Lorenzo dies, the Laurel lives on. Through the integration of the laurel and Golden-Age metaphors, neither the Medici house nor their rule ultimately perish, but are perennially rejuvenated and divinely sanctioned.

On the Soderini tomb, Benedetto gives the Medici’s extended metaphor of nature’s verdant regrowth a more subversive rendering. Although symbols of death, the cenotaph’s skulls are neither inert nor lifeless. Like the broncone, whose desiccated wood contains within it nascent life which germinates and flourishes in death, these dead-yet-vibrant heads generate thriving vegetation which rejuvenates corrupted forms. By growing leaves to replace disintegrated organs, the animated human crania flanking sarcophagus further vivify themselves with oral and aural sensations (figs. 6-12). The cervine skulls located just below shoot forth leafing vines to form new, floriated bodies (figs. 6-7 and 63-64). The very play of life in death and death in life that underlies the desiccated yet verdant laurel\textsuperscript{150} is figured through the sensate skulls as living death. Neither quiescent nor fallow, the skulls are instead voluble, active, and prolific.

In granting the dead the power of life, Benedetto reinterprets the broncone metaphor’s dynastic implications. Whereas the Medici’s dead renew themselves through procreation, with the newborn descendent “remaking” his namesake, the Soderini dead literally re-make themselves by begetting living bodies and missing tissue. What the Medici mythologize as eternal life through figurative reincarnation across subsequent

\textsuperscript{150} See the discussion in Cox-Rearick, \textit{Dynasty and Destiny}, 17.
generations, Benedetto portrays as endless living death. Instead of the Medici’s linking of the living to the dead, Benedetto coils the verdant growth of the archivolt’s skulls with the snakes’ winding tails to connect the dead to each other. In the terms of the Medici’s mythopoesis, Benedetto’s evergreen chain of animate death’s heads recasts dynastic renewal as the replication of unquiet dead; nature’s reinvigoration is not a pristine rebirth but a resurrection of revenants.

The political implications of this macabre reframing address the revival of the Golden-Age poetics that were integrated with the Medici’s own laurel self-fashioning, and which were themselves being resurrected by the Orti Oricellari concurrent with the Soderini tomb’s construction. Whereas the Medici used nature’s regrowth to inflect their Golden Age rule and dynasty as equally verdant and renewable, Benedetto appropriated the botanical metaphor for death and death’s reign. As demonstrated by the skulls’ lush growth and by the verdant oak fronds of Death’s triumphal crown, Death continuously rejuvenates itself, and its dominion is eternally evergreen. In Benedetto’s framework, a return to Medicean rule is akin to bringing the dead back to life. Instead of the halcyon days acclaimed by Crinitus, when Lorenzo rewarded the learned, his heirs, as the unquiet dead, would devour the living much like the disquieting skulls flanking Soderini’s sarcophagus seem perched to eat the lateral homunculi (figs. 6-8). As discussed by Stephen Campbell, and as will be further elucidated in the second part of the dissertation, a returned Laurentian age was not necessarily the idealized era of peace and prosperity promoted by the Orti Oricellari, but was equally figured as the terrifying rule of gruesome revenants. This macabre transformation is also a suggestive interpretation of

151 “(Un)Divinity of Art,” 604-615.
the lingering memory of the Medici in the city, and of their continued danger to the Soderini Republic. Like wraiths haunting Florence, the Medici’s spectral presence was felt through their ubiquitous and public visual emblems scattered throughout the city, and through the nostalgic writings of the Rucellai gardens. Their phantasmatic presence also hovered over the city through the constant threat of restored Medicean rule; as Piero’s drowning in 1503 demonstrated, the individual’s demise would be no bar to the dynasty’s return.

In addition to subverting the Medici’s regenerative imagery, Benedetto also undermined the ideological underpinnings of the Medici’s narrative. By likening themselves to the dead laurel that renews itself, the Medici notionally overcame and ultimately denied biological death through figurative rebirth. Benedetto instead made death viscerally present and inexorably powerful. He used the macabre to force viewers to contemplate their own mortality by staging an encounter between the living and the Soderini’s dead. At the charged site of the tomb, where the realm of the quick intersects with that of the dead, the living intercede for the deceased and, in Benedetto’s configuration, the dead answer back.

Following the interactive tradition of the Three Living and the Three Dead or the *Danse macabre*, dialogue is initiated by the tomb’s garrulous human skulls, whose open mouths indicate speech, and whose foliated ears enable conversation. For the Soderini viewer, the address of Benedetto’s vivified skulls is particularly poignant. As discussed above, the human skulls across the archivolt are endowed with foliate versions of the family’s heraldic antlers to identify them as the clan’s defunct ancestors, whose actual
bones lie buried beneath the chapel’s pavement. For Piero’s living kin, who would have stood inside their family’s chapel, in front of Piero’s wall tomb, the spectral presence of the skulls hovering overhead and on par with the sarcophagus is the community of their forbearers. These vocal death’s heads remind their descendants that like Piero, they too will join the surrounding ranks of the Soderini’s august dead and should prepare accordingly. As with the crowning Triumph of Death discussed above, this penitential framework aspires to future eternal glory through present privations, and thereby recasts the Medici’s terrestrial magnificence as vanity. In contrast to the Medici’s triumphal and prospective focus of future descendants remaking their ancestor’s achievements in a perpetual Golden Age, the tomb’s retrospective attention to the Soderini’s defunct progenitors reminds the viewers that only death is eternal, and that worldly accomplishments are fleeting. Instead of the Medici’s destined renewal, the Soderini are promised inevitable death.

These alternative perspectives also carry political undertones. Piero’s lack of living offspring aided his election as gonfaloniere a vita precisely because of the impossibility of his establishing a hereditary dynasty.152 Benedetto’s populating of Piero’s tomb with the skulls of Soderini ancestors attests to the dearth of Piero’s direct blood heirs, which itself testifies to Piero’s unique qualification to head the Republican state.

The generational renewal which underlies the Medici’s mythopoesis is inherently denied in a Soderini Golden Age. What would otherwise forebode the extinction of lineage and family memory, Benedetto transforms into a Republican virtue. The very anonymity of the tombs’ skulls, identifiable only as Soderini and not as specific individuals, belies the efficacy of the Medicean myth. Death effaces the self, reducing the unique body to common bone. On Piero’s tomb, neither the features nor the accomplishments of the Soderini are evergreen, only their status as Soderini.

As a Republican alternative to Medicean dynastic metaphors, Benedetto’s retrospective “dynasty” of the Soderini’s illustrious dead, or, as I detail in the conclusion, a prospective “dynasty” of saints whose eternal abode is heaven, finds a complement in the poetics of Matteo Bigazzi da Cascia. In a letter to his colleague Marco Strozzi, a priest at Santa Maria del Fiore, Matteo, a canon at San Lorenzo, addresses the newly-elected *gonfaloniere a vita’s* childless state.

...from your just government, not through force, nor through violence, but willing, and voluntary, and happy, through charity [*Caritas*] and love of country [*patria*], they bring you treasures of full wombs.... Many were thinking, perhaps, that by now, God did not want to give children to Piero Soderini, nor to build the splendor of him and of the most noble house, and of his most excellent brother; and behold, he is made the most illustrious father of all the city, and of more children than any other Florentine ever had in his country, and with so much majesty, counsel, and order, God made him all these things, and made of his life, his substitute prince and pastor.153

---

Rather like Benedetto’s dead, but paradoxically generative, skulls, Piero’s barrenness in Bigazzi’s presentation is nonetheless abundantly, and supernaturally, fertile; through the very impossibility of fathering a hereditary dynasty, Piero is given a divinely-granted sovereignty (*substituto principe, et pastore*), and more children than any Florentine has ever had (*di più figliuoli che mai fussi alcuno altro fiorentino*). Not through violence (*per violentia*), but through virtue, specifically upholding justice (*giusto governo*), Piero achieves the very ambitions that resulted in the Medici’s expulsion. Through a similar inversion of the Medici’s self-fashioning, Benedetto likewise inflects Soderini’s tomb as a pious corrective to the Medici’s sepulchers at San Lorenz.

*Destabilizing Metaphors: Metamorphosis and Change from San Lorenzo to Santa Maria del Carmine*

In both material and in ornament, Benedetto constructed the *gonfaloniere*’s memorial as a polemic alternative to, and critique of, Medicean precedents. I first address the imperial connotations of the Medici’s favored sepulchral media, which I then contrast with the local and civic emphasis in Benedetto’s choice of stone. I next turn to Benedetto’s emphasis on transitional bodies and labile forms which unravel the Medici’s myth of a durable Golden Age. Finally, I address the impact this instability has on Soderini’s own Golden Age poetics, which are themselves articulated through a poliform god. Ultimately Benedetto creates a deeply equivocal monument which configures Soderini’s posthumous existence not as apotheosis, but as haunting specter.

The Medici’s combination of white marble with red and green porphyry and
bronze for the sumptuous memorials of Giovanni di Bicci (1360-1429) and Piccarda Bueri (1368-1433) (after 1434, fig. 65), Cosimo il vecchio (1389-1464) (1464-1465, fig. 66), and Piero (1416-1469) and Giovanni de’ Medici (1421-1463) (1469-1472, fig. 67), evinces the riches and ambitions of the Medici house both in their financial cost, and also in the materials’ associations with imperium.\textsuperscript{154} While small amounts of bronze and colored marbles were frequently used in the inscriptions and stemme of Florentine tombs, particularly floor slabs (fig. 68), the Medici’s extensive and predominant use of both luxury materials has few imitators among the city’s elite. By entombing their dead in precious stone and costly bronze, the Medici appropriate the media’s connotations of civic authority, sacrality, and imperial prerogative to grant their dead the prestige and privilege of the state, the saint, and the prince, not the private citizen. Like Lorenzo’s poetic self-fashioning, the combination of hard, durable stones with the divine approbation of the cosmatesque patterning on Cosimo’s floor marker and on Piero and Giovanni’s tomb, and of the reliquary shape of the latter’s sepulcher, and the lush, bronzed vegetation on the sacristy and wall tombs, presents the dynasty as equally enduring, ordained, and forever evergreen.\textsuperscript{155}

These rarefied stones and metalwork also associate the Medici with many of


\textsuperscript{155} For the Medici’s integration of material meaning into their poetic self-fashioning, see Wright, “Marking Time,” 295-310.
Florence’s most prestigious dead, such as Count Hugo Margrave of Tuscany (d. 1001), whose original free-standing porphyry sarcophagus was replaced by Mino da Fiesole’s marble and porphyry monument in the Badia (1469-1481, fig. 69); Baldassare Cossa, the anti-pope John XXIII, whose remains lie in the Baptistry’s bronze, marble, and gilded pietra serena memorial (1422-1428, fig. 70); and Saints Protus, Hyacinth, and Nemesius, whose bronze reliquary was located in the Duomo (1432-1443, fig. 71). Since Cosimo commissioned both Donatello and Ghiberti’s works, the material resonances of these latter two examples in the Medici’s own tombs are intentionally close, and further demonstrate how the Medici cunningly manipulated Florentine funerary conventions to transcend their own mercantile and civilian origins. These privileged media are almost exclusively found in the memorials of a restricted elite, which included prelates, knights, doctors of law and medicine, and distinguished friars, who were also entitled to special funerary honors, and to what was perhaps the most restricted of these status signifiers, an effigy on the sepulcher. By incorporating bronze and porphyry into their tombs, the Medici appropriate the social distinction signaled by the materials without violating decorum by including the representation of the cadaver, to which they were not, strictly speaking, entitled. Notably, porphyry also marks the grave of Bernardo Rucellai, who had

156 See Andrew Butterfield, “Monument and Memory in Early Renaissance Florence,” in Art, Memory, and Family in Renaissance Florence, eds. Giovanni Ciappelli and Patricia Lee Rubin (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 135-160; and Butterfield, “Social Structure and the Typology of Funerary Monuments in Early Renaissance Florence,” Res 26 (1994): 47-67. Other examples of this type include Antonio Rossellino’s tomb (1461-1466) for James of Lusitania, the Cardinal of Portugal, who rests amongst colored marbles, porphyry, polychromy, and gold at San Miniato al Monte, and Fra Leonardo Dati’s bronze effigy (1425-1427) by Lorenzo Ghiberti, which graces the pavement of Santa Maria Novella. For the status and rarity of lay effigies, see Brendan Cassidy, “The Tombs of the Acciaioli in the Certosa del Galluzzo outside Florence,” in Studies in Carthusian Monasticism in the Late Middle Ages, ed. Julian M. Luxford (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), 323-353. Examples of lay effigies in wall tombs, as opposed to floor slabs, include the chancellors Carlo Marsuppini and Leonardo Bruni, who lie amongst white and red marble and polychromy at Santa Croce (late 1450s and late 1440s), and the jurist and knight Bernardo Giugni, who rests in red and white marble at the Badia (1469).
a stone tablet inserted into the riser of the step leading into the central doorway of the Dominican church (1514, fig. 72). Vasari was so impressed by the technical skill and invention of new tools required to incise the “eighteen antique letters, very large and well-proportioned,” that spell out the gilded “BERNARDO ORICELLARIO,” that he attributed the work to Leon Battista Alberti (d. 1472). Giovanni Cambi, however, gave a far different interpretation to Bernardo’s use of the precious stone, stating that Bernardo’s sons “made his tomb at the entrance of the door of Santa Maria Novella, and put his name in porphyry, which had been cut before he died,...and thus he had his tomb made while he was alive, in order to leave memory of himself inscribed in the earth, because he was not deemed worthy to have it [his name and/or porphyry] in heaven.”

Soderini instead articulated his familial bonds in the expanse of once glisteningly white marble. His father-in-law was Gabriele Malaspina (r. 1467-1508), the Marquis of Fosdinovo, whose family controlled the Carrara quarries. Through the abundance of Carrarese stone on his imposing wall tomb, Soderini highlights his eminent marital

157 Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 1:34: “...nella soglia della porta principale di Santa Maria Novella di Fiorenza le diciotto lettere antiche che, assai grandi e ben misurate, si veggono dalla parte dinanzi in un pezzo di porfido, le quali lettere dicono: BERNARDO ORICELLARIO.”


159 During Soderini’s tenure as gonfaloniere a vita, Carrara was governed by Gabriele’s nephew, Alberico Malaspina. The Soderini betrothal negotiated by Lorenzo de’ Medici in 1469, when Tommaso, Piero’s father and Lorenzo’s uncle, was at the height of his power in the regime, is one of several marriages though which Malaspina allied himself to the Medici and to Florence. In a double wedding of 1476, Gabriele’s nephew Leonardo married Aurante Orsini, the sister of Lorenzo’s wife, Clarice Orsini, and Malaspina’s son Galeotto married Zaffira, the daughter of Aurante Orsini by her marriage to Giovan Ludovico Pio di Carpi. In 1477, Gabriele contracted with the Rucellai to give his daughter Giovanna to Cosimo di Bernardo Rucellai (d. 1497), who was the nephew of Lorenzo. See Meli, Gabriele Malaspina, x-xi and 56-77. For the marble quarry at Carrara, see Klapisch-Zuber, Les maîtres du marbre, 107-149.
network and links his funerary patronage to the Republic’s ambitious sculptural campaign to renew the city center, whose need for a constant flow of high quality marble was secured through the personal interventions of Piero and Argentina with her Malaspina relatives.160

The use of touchstone for the coffin ties Piero’s monument to the black-stone sepulchers used by Filippo Strozzi the elder (1428-1491) at Santa Maria Novella (1478, fig. 73), Francesco Sassetti (1421-1490) and Nera Corsi at Santa Trinità (1485-1491, figs. 74-75), and Francesco di Matteo Castellani (1418-1494)161 and his second wife, Lena Alamanni, at Santa Croce (c. 1505, fig. 76). These earlier arcosolia affect polychromy by framing the touchstone with red and white marbles for Strozzi and the Castellani, and with the gilded pietra serena used by Giuliano da San Gallo for the Sassetti. At the Carmine, Benedetto’s stark pairing of black and white stone instead creates a compelling visual contrast to these examples and to the Medici’s sumptuous jeweled tones at San Lorenzo. The Medici’s tombs delight the senses with their combination of vibrant hues, polished surfaces, and multiple textures. Benedetto instead creates an austere monochromatic effect through multiple layers of white relief, which he punctuates with black touchstone in two elements derived from burial rites. The canopy, which was

---


161 For the wealthy son of a knight who was punitively taxed and barred from public office after Cosimo de’ Medici defeated the Albizzi faction in 1434, see most recently, with bibliography, Giovanni Ciappelli, Memory, Family, and Self: Tuscan Family Books and Other European Egodocuments (14th-18th Century), trans. Susan Amanda George (Boston: Brill, 2014), 36-52. As he had no surviving legitimate male offspring by either his first wife, Ginevra di Palla Strozzi, or by Lena di Boccaccino Alamanni, Francesco delegated the construction of his tomb to his son-in-law, Giovanni Cavalcanti. See Francesco di Matteo Castellani, Ricordanze, ed. Giovanni Ciappelli (Florence: Olschki, 1992), 1:31-32.
destroyed in the 1776 fire, replicates a cloth of honor atop the funeral bier, and the sarcophagus was intended to house his mortal remains. The polychromed frescoes by Agnolo Gaddi that originally surrounded the Soderini memorial, for which the Castellani chapel’s incorporation of Francesco’s Cinquecento tomb into Gaddi’s Trecento cycle (c. 1384, fig. 77)\textsuperscript{162} suggests how the Soderini chapel at the Carmine might have appeared, do not soften, but instead emphasize the austerity of the black-and-white memorial. Benedetto continues this unrelenting mortuary emphasis in the tomb’s macabre imagery, whose abundance of skulls testify to the viewer’s somatic future.

The Medici tombs, in contrast, seem to sanitize and to transcend death with their insistence on endurance and resurrection. While the inscription on Giovanni di Bicci and Piccarda’s sepulcher acknowledges death’s dominion, its glorification of the deceased and its preservation of their memory more readily accords with a Petrarchan construction of the surmounting Triumphs of Fame and Eternity:

If services to his native city \textit{patria}, if the glory of his line and of his generosity to all, were free from dark death, alas, with his virtuous spouse he would live happily for his \textit{patria}, an aid to the wretched and a haven and fair wind to his friends. But since death conquers all, Giovanni lies in this tomb, and you Piccarda, lie there also. Therefore the old, the young, the children, indeed those of every age grieve. Bereft of its parent, the sorrowful \textit{patria} sighs.\textsuperscript{163}


\textsuperscript{163} Citation and translation from Dale V. Kent, \textit{Cosimo de’ Medici and the Florentine Renaissance: The Patron’s Oeuvre} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 141 and 444n76: “SI MERITA IN PATRIAM SI GLORIA SANGUIS ET OMNI LARGA MANUS NIGRA LIBERA MORTE FORENT VIVERET HEU PATRIAE CASTA COM CONIUGE FELIX AUXILIUM MISERIS PORTUS ET AURA SUIS OMNIA SED QUANDO SUPERANTUR MORTE JOHANNES HOC MAUSOLEO TUQUE PICARDA IACES ERGO SENEX MOERET IUVENIS Puer OMNIS ET AETAS ORBA PARENTE SUO PATRIA MOESTA GEMIT.” Kent alternatively argued that the inscription demonstrates Time’s triumph over Fame, and thus Death; she concluded, “The knowledge that death conquers all, particularly fame, and the belief that nothing would be remembered of him fifty years after
Like the Triumph of Fame’s overcoming Death, the epitaph’s valediction of the deeds and the virtues of Giovanni and Piccarda ensures that their names and worthiness will survive well beyond the couple’s physical demise. The Triumph of Eternity is likewise indicated in the bronze ivy which “grows” over the edge of the vesting table; as an evergreen symbol of immortality, the perennial fronds look to the resurrection at the end of time, when death will finally be conquered. Similar poetics underlie the bronzework of the diamond embedded amongst flourishing vegetation on Piero and Giovanni’s coffin. By nestling the durable, adamantine rock of the Medici’s SEMPER device amongst the lush vegetation and the laden cornucopia fixed at the peak of their bounty in imperishable bronze, Verrocchio allegorizes the Medici house as equally everlasting and evergreen.

Just as the verdant, bronzed fronds of Giovanni and Piccarda’s sacristy tomb anticipate the rejuvenation of the body at the resurrection, Verrocchio’s timeless harvest likewise mitigates death’s power. This emphasis on death’s defeat also underlies the arch’s decoration. As Andrew Butterfield noted, Verrocchio’s interlacing of the diamond rings within alternating bunches of palm fronds and olive branches, both of which were associated with San Lorenzo’s liturgy during Holy Week, locates the Medici within the context of Christ’s resurrection and its promise of eternal life. The regenerative vegetation also replicates Lorenzo’s Golden-Age rhetoric, and enfolds the tomb into the family’s larger mythopoesis. In both the material construction and the aniconic imagery

---


165 For the relationship between the tomb and the Holy Week masses at San Lorenzo, see Butterfield, Verrocchio, 51-54. Butterfield also read the “cornucopias growing from acanthus” as alluding to Lorenzo’s Golden-Age mythography. Ibid., 54.
of their funerary sculpture, as well as in their poetic self-fashioning, the Medici consistently combined themes of permanence and stability with those of resurrection and botanical renewal to figuratively overcome death through an eternal and self-perpetuating dynasty.

On Soderini’s cenotaph, Benedetto instead brings death to the visual and conceptual foregrounds. He counters the Medici’s poetics of permanence and constancy by underscoring mutability and transition, and subverts their emphasis on resurrection and eternal life by thematizing death as the interminable and liminal state between this life and next. Benedetto’s ornament blurs the line between life and death and literally embodies flux, indeterminacy, and mutability. With very few exceptions, nearly every figure on the tomb is a composite of bodies that flow seamlessly between flesh, mineral, and plant. Vases combine flourishing leaves with living sea creatures to bring vitality to an otherwise inanimate object (figs. 50 and 78-79). Neither fully alive nor completely dead, the skulls chattering on either side of the sarcophagus (figs. 9-12) grow foliate sense organs. On the base of the monument, a leonine head, avian wings, and a leaf-corpus blend seamlessly together (figs. 80-81). Man melds with plant in the adjacent foliate faces (figs. 80-81) which exhale flowering vinework on either side of the central blank tablet, and in the seated phytomorphic men who support open books on the pilasters above (figs. 78-79). The imaginative invention at the base of these pilasters, which is comprised of an aquiline head, feathered and foliated body and legs, and a serpentine tail (figs. 78-79) thematizes the amalgamation and ambivalence of forms which populate the facade. This leitmotif of transformation and change also typifies

166 The two pairs of recumbent deer, a single nude, and the embattled eagle and serpents.
Dionysus’s appearance on the tomb. The sea-goat, wine vase, and panther are each incarnations of the metamorphic god, whose phytomorphic aspect (fig. 50) is shown in the very process of transmutation. The nude’s entire left appendage has fully transformed into a long, wide oak leaf, while only the hand of his raised right arm is completely foliated. Broad fronds splay across his muscled legs even while the toes of both feet dissolve into a three-lobed leaf.

Benedetto also thematizes lability through the mirrored symmetry between the dionysiac panel on the left and its paired register on the right (figs. 49-50). The two nude men stand in mirror positions: the engaged knees are bent; the toes of the extended legs rest just beyond the lower borders; the chests are presented frontally; and the elbows above the bent knees are similarly crooked. In both reliefs, Benedetto pairs man with animal, while alternating hybridity between the two forms. On the left, the autochthonous human is accompanied by a blended beast. On the right, the panther is ontologically distinct, while the male figure is a mixture of plant and man. The left ichthocaper’s aquatic and terrestrial natures are divided on the right panel between the wine-bearing amphora and the land-based feline. The combination of life and death embodied in the verdant figure holding a clutch of bones is reprised in the sea goat, who as the zodiac sign of Capricorn, is the “Gate of the Gods,” through which the soul ascends to await rebirth.167 The location of these labile forms on par with the sarcophagus underscores the tomb as the threshold between the living and the dead, and of death as itself the transition between

this life and the next. The dual qualities of vivification and petrification are further instantiated in the adjacent skulls which haunt the dionysiac figures.

Omnipresent death looms large on the tomb, whether bearing down on the viewer from the lunette, or raging just above the beholder’s eye-level on either side of the sarcophagus (figs. 9-12). These latter skulls dwarf the adjacent dionysiac figures; their menacing countenances cast a literal and metaphorical pall over the recessed and miniaturized men. With their open jaws next to the nudes’ vulnerable forms, the disembodied skulls appear about to bite into the exposed flesh. Close enough to feel the exhale of the voracious skulls on bare skin, each male turns away from the threatening heads. Their swift movements are suggested by the swaths of fabric that billow behind the figures that are poised with bent knees to flee.

_Problematizing the Golden Age_

These ravening skulls complicate a heroic narrative of a perennially renewing Golden Age or a vernal resurrection of the body. When lability is integrated with the logic of the dionysiac panels’ political allegory, as argued above, Benedetto’s association of the oak-clad, polymorphic Dionysus with a just Golden Age suggests that this ideal era is as inherently unstable as the shape-shifting god. A “renewed” Golden Age might not necessarily be the pristine, self-perpetuating version touted in the Medici’s mythography, but a fragile and transitory period that is all too vulnerable to outside forces.

As I detail below, the particular physiognomies of the tomb’s two pairs of voracious and disquieting skulls further call into question the very possibility of achieving a sustainable Republican Golden Age. Of the multitude of crania depicted on
the tomb, only the four closest to the sarcophagus bear hair (figs. 9-12); all four have rioting, tousled locks crowning the head, and the pair on the right are additionally bearded. The skulls on the left uniquely have a single oak leaf substituting for the ear (figs. 10-11), rather than the protruding trumpet shapes on the lunette (fig. 30). Those on the right eschew pinnae entirely for serpents which coil through the aural cavity (figs. 9 and 12). These four skulls’ hirsute features, combined with the pointed ears of the skulls on the left, and the coil forms created by the winding serpents near the temporal bones on the right, allude to the physiognomy of the satyr: the hybrid of man and beast who accompanies Dionysus as part of the reveling thiasos. Particularly close comparisons to these skulls are the foliate faces with curling rams’ horns that are located below the bust of Christ on the tomb of Giuliano Maffei da Volterra (1434-1510) at San Pietro in Montorio in Rome (figs. 82-83).

The menacing scowls and screaming maws of Benedetto’s satyr-like skulls suggest furor: a raving madness, possession, or fury which typified the bacchic rites. For Marsilio Ficino and Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, bacchic frenzy was a form of divine inspiration (furor divinus) which could excite the intellect towards contemplation of the divine, and thereby transcend the body and draw the soul closer to God. If the

---

170 Following Plato, Ficino divided divine frenzy into a four-part hierarchy, each of which was associated with a pagan divinity: poetry (Muses), mysteries (Dionysus), prophecy (Apollo), and love (Venus). Marsilio Ficino, Commentaire sur Le Banquet de Platon, De l’amour: Commentarium in Convivium Platonis, De amore, ed. and trans. Pierre Laurens (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2002), 241, 7:14: “Primus quidem poeticus furor, alter mysterialis, tertius uaticinium, amatorius affectus est quartus. Est autem
passions of the body are not restrained however, the result is insanity (insania) which, redolent of the satyr’s own blend of human and animal, “by this madness man devolves to the nature of the beast.”

The insane mind is plagued by perturbations, including obsessive thoughts (assidua cogitatione) which “ceaselessly assail the mind day and night with dreadful and horrible images [imaginibus].” These “dreadful and horrible images” which infest and plague the mind include simulacra, or false, phantom resemblances.

These simulacra were further identified not only with psychological anxiety and illusion, but also with the realm of the dead. Benedetto brings these frightening specters from the imagination into the physical realm by exploiting the multivalent larva as a mask or persona, a dream or illusion, and an unquiet ghost or spirit of the dead, who can both manifest among the living, and possess a body of the quick or the dead. Much like

---


172 Ficino, Commentaire, 155, 6.9: “Animi amantis intentio in assidua amati cogitatione tota se uersat.” “Ex sicco enim crasso atroque sanguine melancolia, id est atra bilis efficitur, que suis caput uaporibus opplet, cerebrum siccat, animam tetris horrendisque imaginibus diu noctuque sollicitare non cessat.”

173 For example, Marsilio Ficino, Platonic Theology, trans. Michael J.B. Allen, ed. James Hawkins (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005), 5:176, 15.16.7: “Quod testatur et habitus confirmatio et libera discursio ab imaginibus in imaginibus, qua saepe fit reminiscenciae studio. Mentem vero esse memorem illud significat, quod cum primum aliqua discimus, difficillime nos et vix ad illa conferimus...quando et ipse ad priora simulacra gradatim reminiscendo revertitur.”

174 See Nancy Mandeville Caciola, Afterlives: The Return of the Dead in the Middle Ages (Ithaca: Cornell
his word play with the verdant son of Zeus described above, Benedetto creates visual affinities to parallel linguistic equivalencies. Masks, much like the skulls they resemble, proliferate across the tomb. Located directly above the double pair of larval skulls, the masks carved on the tomb’s inner pilasters (figs. 78-79) are the imaginative combination of the three types of skulls found on the tomb. Their scowling visages imitate the skulls below (figs. 9-12); their flattened and down-turned ears derive from the soffit’s cervine heads (fig. 62); and the ossified vegetation growing down the sides of the faces recall the archivolt’s death’s heads (figs. 29-30). The three-lobed headgear found atop these skull-masks unifies the pair across the void between the pilasters while also individuating them from the other skulls depicted on the tomb. The small faces carved just below these heads, in the gap between the fantastic bird-headed animals at the base of the pilaster, elide an easy segregation between the mask, the living, and the dead. The foliate mask found on the right recessed pilaster, notably above the arboreal Dionysus, and not replicated on the left candelabra, mimics the curling vegetation extending from the skulls above and to the left, while tying the skulls and the vegetative god to the pair of foliate masks flanking the base’s blank tablet (figs. 80-81).

These foliated profiles are perhaps the most life-like visages on the tomb. Unlike the disturbing stare of the skulls’ eyeless orbitals, eyes gaze from above the aquiline noses. Their exhaled vegetation links the foliation throughout the tomb with the breath of life, suggesting that a verdant nature likewise enlivens the tomb’s skulls. Yet, rather like the skulls’ blank sockets and cavities, these faces are ultimately blind and breathless; their

lively visages are merely empty masks. Benedetto emphasizes their hollow pretense through a bravura display of technically challenging carving; by deeply undercutting the leaf edges, Benedetto exposes the void behind the masks. The human face, whether foliated, as here, or stripped to the bone, is a simulacrum. The very vibrancy of these foliated profiles emphasizes the equivocacy, perhaps also equivalency, of illusionistic art and the spectral dead. Like the profile masks, the ornament across the tomb can be interpreted as false, insubstantial images: inert stone given a semblance of life through the sculptor’s skill. At the same time, Benedetto’s phantasmatic faces are ghosts given form; the immaterial spirits of the dead are made perceptible to the senses. Benedetto foregrounds this ambivalence by thematizing liminality throughout tomb, which is itself the threshold between the quick and the dead.

Benedetto instantiates this intermediacy by locating the quartet of larval satyr-like skulls at the physical intersection between the living and the dead. Positioned next to the touchstone sepulcher, these four death’s heads transition between the deposit of mortal remains and the monument’s surrounding sculpture. These same skulls are the human crania closest to the viewer. They further partake of both death and life as the most animated of the skulls which populate the tomb.

While agape mouths indicate speech and breath for all the human skulls, only this double pair have fully lowered mandibles or leaves for tongues. Movement is implied in the tousled locks uniquely grown by this quartet of skulls. Benedetto’s style of foliation on these heads also liberates the skulls from the petrifying effects found on the upper arch. In contrast to the trumpet-shaped foliation of the lunette skulls’ ear-antlers, the ears
of the heads on the lower left are each distinctly comprised of a single oak leaf (figs. 10-11). In the profile view of two of these ears, Benedetto creates visual continuity and variety with the skulls above by trailing the oak’s long stem behind and below the lowered jaw, where it curls into a terminating rosette. The cornucopias of quercine leaves sprout from behind the ear, and open to clutches of writhing snakes above the top of the skulls, approximate to the fronds’ termination above the crania on the archivolt. By maintaining the integrity of the skulls’ structure on the lower level, where even the leaf tips curl over the chins rather than melding seamlessly with bone, the foliage further enhances the skulls’ already vibrant and organic force. For the matching set of skulls on the right (figs. 9 and 12), Benedetto achieves the same vivifying effect by omitting pinnae entirely in favor of serpents coiling through the aural cavity. The lunette skulls (figs. 19, 29-30, and 61), in contrast, appear bound to the stone from which they are carved. The vegetation growing from the bones does not enliven the static skulls as much as it is itself ossified by them. The wide leaf forming the beard of the lunette’s central skull adds majesty, but not the dynamism of the hirsute version seen on the lower right.

By animating these latter heads, Benedetto reinforces the sarcophagus’s flanking skulls as the site of the liminal encounter between life and death, between the living and the dead, and between illusionistic sculpture, mortal human remains, and the living beholder. In the last of this triad of mediations, the quartet of skulls bridges not only the tomb and the viewer, but also the sarcophagus and the surrounding carved ornament.\(^\text{175}\) While the figures on the reliefs located both above and below these skulls are fully

enclosed within carefully articulated borders, the skulls nearest the sarcophagus span across the corners of the marble panel (figs. 11-12), where the two inner heads nearly touch the touchstone grave. In addition to transgressing into the burial space, the panels’ paired heads impose on the adjacent and recessed registers with dionysiac figures (figs. 6-8). The lack of vertical frames separating the carving flanking the sarcophagus, which would otherwise compartmentalize each discrete scene, allows an interpenetration of the viewer’s and the sculpture’s spaces. A similar dissolution of boundaries also characterizes the multitude of composite bodies carved across the monument. Benedetto’s elision of the permeable image and the larval phantasm not only destabilizes the durable Golden Age of the Medici’s rhetoric, but also suggests that Soderini’s own mythos of the just Golden Age is equally impermanent. A transitory Golden Age is further affected through the tomb’s material poetics. In Castellano Castellani and Niccolò Machiavelli’s encomia, the new era is built on Piero, the living “soda petra.”

On the tomb, Benedetto’s “living” petrae are death’s heads; the burgeoning life which enlivens the skulls is, at the same time, also paradoxically death-like. Benedetto’s material realization of the linguistic pun of the living Piero and the inert pietra in the monument’s stone, which is itself both alive and defunct, also inflects the related petrine metaphor of the community of the church as living stones (lapides vivi).

As Brigitte Buettner has shown, the relationship between

---


177 I Peter 2:4-6, New International Version: “As you come to him, the living Stone – rejected by humans but chosen by God and precious to him – you also, like living stones, are being built into a spiritual house to be a holy priesthood, offering spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ.” Vulgate: “ad quem accedentes lapidem vivum ab hominibus quidem reprobatum a Deo autem electum honorificatum et ipsi tamquam lapides vivi superaedificamini domus spiritualis sacerdotium sanctum offerre spiritales hostias acceptabiles Deo per Iesum Christum propter quod continet in scriptura ecce
stones and saints is not only metaphoric, but also metamorphic; rock, in particular precious stones, such as those found on reliquaries, possesses an Aristotelian “vegetative soul,” and thereby, like the relic, is both nascently alive and manifestly dead.\textsuperscript{178} Benedetto visualizes this duality by rendering stone in a constant state of flux; \textit{anima}, whether human, animal, or vegetal, exists as betwixt and between.\textsuperscript{179} If the dead, whose larval skulls haunt the tomb, lie between life and death, so too does stone itself; and like the unquiet wraith, Benedetto’s “living” stone mediates between this life and the next, which is not necessarily divine.

The resurrection of the body is also called into question when vernal regenesis produces unnatural hybrid forms. Instead of visualizing a verdant paradise populated by the perfected bodies of the saints, Benedetto realizes a macabre underworld composed of

\begin{quote}
pono in Sion lapidem summum angularem electum pretiosum et qui crediderit in eo non confundetur.”
\end{quote}


\begin{quote}
“Heinrich von Neuenbürg visualizes this duality by rendering stone in a constant state of flux; \textit{anima}, whether human, animal, or vegetal, exists as betwixt and between.”
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{179} See Caroline Walker Bynum’s perceptive comments on the materiality of \textit{transi} tombs and \textit{memento mori} as thematizing matter as “that which changes,” and as a place of metamorphosis where humans can access the holy. \textit{Christian Materiality: An Essay on Religion in Late Medieval Europe} (New York: Zone, 2011), 66-82, quoted here at 79.
\end{quote}
false illusions and living undead. Unlike the Medici or the Rucellai, Soderini does not presume his own salvation, but instead identifies his afterlife with suspension. Ever the consummate statesman, Soderini exploits the equivocal possibilities of the macabre to enable multiple, shifting, perhaps even conflicting, but certainly open-ended, meanings. Although he was removed from office and exiled, Soderini’s monument creates his own enduring and larval presence in the city, whereby the deposed *gonfaloniere a vita*, like his sepulchral skulls, gets the last laugh.
Part II: The Paiuolo, the Cazzuola, and Macabre Feste

On September 1, 1512, Giuliano di Lorenzo de’ Medici (1479-1516), who had been exiled from Florence for nearly eighteen years, “shaved his beard,” “donned civilian dress,” and entered the city “as a citizen.” Bartolomeo Cerretani’s succinct description of the youth’s sartorial transformation from the bearded warrior to the sober citizen registers both Giuliano’s carefully crafted public image, and the resistance to this same Medicean self-fashioning which is developed over the course of this dissertation. Cerretani’s emphasis on Giuliano’s newly clean-shaven face is a reminder that in the days immediately prior, the hirsute Medici, his brother Giovanni (1475-1521), and an army of Spanish troops breached Prato’s walls and brutally sacked the city.

1 Bartolomeo Cerretani, *Dialogo della mutatione di Firenze*, ed. Raul Mordenti (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1990), 32: “El mercoledì [September 1, 1512] venne Giuliano de’ Medici in Firenze, e con volontà di godere Firenze come cittadino; et che sia il vero il giovedì levatosi la barba, sendo suto incitato d’assai, usci fuori col luccho, vesta civilissima, con meco et cor un altro, senza famiglia alcuno, et andamo a spasso per tutto.” See also Cerretani, *Storia fiorentina*, 444, editor’s brackets: “Insino che mercholedì G[i]uliano di Lorenzo de’ Medici come privato, che così fu loro sempre intentione tornare, g[i]unse in Firenze et alloggiò in casa d’alcuno privato e dopo l’essere suto vicitato dagl’amici, e quali hebbono a male assai che non allogg[i]asi in casa sua, e levatosi una lunghia barbba, con veste civile alla fiorentina con tre amici usci fuori andando per la citpà come gl’altri.” See also Pitti, *Istoria fiorentina*, 111-112: “Venne, il giorno dipoi, Giuliano de’ Medici in Firenze, con animo civilissimo. Levossi la barba e, visitato da molti, usci fora con il lucco, senza famiglio alcuno.” Cerretani’s *Dialogo* is set in 1520 and written c. 1520-1524; his *Storia* was composed between 1512 and 1514. Jacopo Pitti’s (1519-1589) *Istoria* was written c. 1574-1589.

2 For the beard as martial valor, see Trexler, *Public Life*, 540. Douglas Biow alternatively argued that the beard was the attribute of the rough contadino, not the clean-shaven urbanite, and that following the French invasion of Italy, the beard masked anxiety over a lack of martial prowess. See his *On the Importance of Being an Individual in Renaissance Italy: Men, Their Professions, and Their Beards* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), esp. 181-206.

3 The pillaging of Prato began on August 29, 1512. Cerretani wrote that “more than 4,500” were slain, and ambiguously noted the efforts of Giovanni, the papal legate, in saving women, girls, and nuns by harboring them in his palace, and those of Giuliano and Giulio in saving the men; he then obliquely indicted Giovanni for failing his pastoral duty. *Storia fiorentina*, 441, editor’s brackets: “così im poche ore amazorno più che 4500 homini.... Il leghato de’ Medici, entrato dentro e preso l’alog[i]amento, scapò moltitudine infinite di donne fan[i]jule e monache rinchiodendole in una parte del suo palazo in luogo salvo; così con Iuliano suo fratello e messer Iulio loro cugino salvorno più homini che potettono, et quello che l’auctoritá loro poté fare di bene non restò indietro, ma al furore et la rabbia de’ soldati non fu possibile opporsi, che si facevano beffe de’ comandamenti del viceré loro signore.” The *Dialogo* alternatively affects satire through a biting gallows humor; in the lines prior to Giuliano’s Florentine
atrocities committed some ten miles from Florence are so heinous and horrific that in
1528, “the affair of Prato” was cited as one of the reasons why the title pater patrie
should be removed from Cosimo il vecchio’s tomb in San Lorenzo. According to the
complaint lodged with the Otto di Guardia, the Medici “have always been tyrants...[they
have] decapitated our citizens and stolen the money of the commune.... I recall to Your
Lordship the affair of Prato. They deserve to be burnt in their palace and given to dogs.”

Violence, although not bloodshed, also marked Piero Soderini’s deposition; on
August 31, 1512, armed youth entered the Florentine Signoria and forced the
gonfaloniere, upon pain of death, to leave office.\(^4\) Among the approximately thirty
giovani who compelled Soderini to resign, many of whom were associated with the Orti
Oricellari gatherings, were Bernardo Rucellai’s kinsman, Francesco and Domenico di

---

\(^4\) Translation in Stephens, Fall of the Florentine Republic, 234. Cited in Cecil Roth, The Last Florentine
della libertà del popolo fiorentino si fa questa querela come egli è uno epitaphio in Santo Lorenzo che
dice pater patrie, e ind ete e con dishonore di questa libertà, perche sono stati sempre tiranni, e
hanno sempre vituperato questa Città tagliato capi a vostri Cittadini e rubato e’ danarii del comune e lo
honor diviver da homini nobili et meriato esser recti pater patrie quelli che hanno sempre tenuta in
servitù la cosa di prato si ricorda a V.S. meritano d’i
di esser corsi in casa e dati a Cani, quelli non vogliono
che questo partito si vinca vogliono tenere el pie in dua staffe voglioni salvare a tucti e’ tempi e
aspetano la tornata di questi tiranni.”

\(^5\) See Roslyn Pesman Cooper, “La caduta di Pier Soderini e il ‘Governo popolare’: Pressioni esterne e
dissenso interno,” Archivio storico italiano 143 (1985): 253; and Pitti, Istoria, 110-111. Soderini
notably fashioned himself as the antithesis to the blood-stained Medici during his last days in office;
according to one of the Motti e proverbi collected by Girolamo da Sommaia (1573-1635), the
gonfaloniere stated, “senza sangue hebbe il governo di questo stato, senza sangue ho tenuto et senza
sangue sono pronto di lasciarlo.” Cited in Pesman Cooper, “Aspiring Prince or Civic Leader,” 124n262.
Girolamo Rucellai. Along with Jacopo Bottegari (b. 1476), who was one of the armed men occupying the piazza della Signoria on September 16, 1512 to force a parlamento and reform the state, the Rucellai brothers were members of one of the two compagnie di piacere whose macabre festivities are the focus of the second part of this dissertation. Through an analysis of these companies’ transgressive dinner parties and their contributions to Medicean spectacles, I detail how the artisan Company of the Cauldron (Compagnia del Paiuolo, c. 1511-1512) and the socially diverse Company of the Trowel (Compagnia della Cazzuola, 1512) employed the macabre to resist, to oppose, and to subvert the Medici’s self-fashioning.

The political purchase of these sodalities’ feste has been obscured by the emphasis in previous scholarship on the “filopallesco” affiliation of these associations and of their members. Tommaso Mozzati, whose fundamental archival research identified and enriched the biographies of the groups’ lesser-known figures, pointed to the Cazzuola’s inclusion of the three above-mentioned participants in the 1512 coup, and of Giuliano de’ Medici’s later enrollment, when characterizing the Cazzuola as “a company born from an avowedly pro-Medicean inspiration.” Andrea Gareffi, in his analysis of one of the

---


7 See Mozzati, Giovanfrancesco Rustici, 370.

8 Ibid.: “Si può credere dunque che lo stesso Iacopo fosse fra i più precoci aderenti di una compagnia nata da un’ispirazione dichiaratamente filomedicea e destinata ad accogliere fra i suoi membri lo stesso Giuliano.” For “le simpatie pallesche della maggior parte dei suoi affiliati più noti,” see ibid., 239-243. For the Cazzuola’s membership, see below.
Trowel’s infernal banquets as theatrical performance, had already described “the pro-Medicean and restoration atmosphere of this circle” as “almost a second Orto Orichellario...intended to execute the Leonine program of replicating the Golden Age of Lorenzo the Magnificent.” Philippe Sénéchal, whose biographical analysis of the Cazzuola noted the preponderance of giovani among its patrician members, likewise defined the compagnia as a “pro-Medicean network.” In these interpretations, Giuliano de’ Medici was not merely the most illustrious of the Cazzuola’s 45 companions, but the company’s official patron.

I would like to complicate this filopallesco narrative by underscoring the autonomous agency of the individual members, and the pragmatic, multiple, or shifting allegiances that problematize a binary or stable opposition between pro- and anti-

---

9 La scrittura e la festa: Teatro, festa e letteratura nella Firenze del Rinascimento (Bologna: Mulino, 1991), 154-155: “L’atmosfera di questo cenacolo era filomedicea e restauratrice, quasi esse fosse un secondo Orto Orichellario in tono più dimesso, ma non per questo meno inteso alla esecuzione del programma leonino di replicare il secol d’oro di Lorenzo il Magnifico.”


Medicean affiliations. Additionally, I would like to emphasize that neither the Medici regime nor the family itself was a unified collective. Their internal divisions and rampant discord are given a telling account in Cerretani’s *Dialogo della mutazione di Firenze.* Following the above-cited passage on Giuliano’s civilian entrance into Florence, the subsequent discussion of political reform articulates one such rivalry between two opposing factions within the regime, both which were notably identified with Medici *parenti.* After describing the newly-established Senate and an annual *gonfaloniere di giustizia,* Giovanni di Bernardo Rucellai (1475-1525), Giuliano’s cousin and the *Dialogue*’s proponent of a *governo stretto* of elite patricians, stated, “These things gave no satisfaction at all, neither to myself nor to many others.”¹³ Championing the moderates’ cause was Jacopo di Giovanni Salviati (1461-1533), Giovanni’s brother-in-law and a prominent follower of Savonarola, who urged the papal legate “not to touch the Great Council,” because “the state was in the hands of the universal citizenry for 18 years,” and therefore could not be dismantled without “great scandal and danger.” Salviati continued that if the state were successfully seized, Giovanni would then have to

---


¹³ Cerretani, *Dialogo,* 32: “Queste cose né a me né a molti altri mai satisfeciono e conoscemo che molti volevano, levato Piero Soderini, restare a quel modo; il che quanto in me fu non riuscì loro, perché non mancò che molti frateschi et altri non dicessino ‘se li Spagniuoli si partono e’ si farà e dirà,’ il che de’ pensare se ci destava.” When the Savonarolan Giovanibattista Ridolfi was elected *gonfaloniere,* the Rucellai faction pressed Giovanni de’ Medici to call a *parlamento.* For these events, see Butters, *Governors and Government,* 181-183.
consider how it could be held, “because after a break of 18 years, those remaining friends of the house are few, poor, and universally unvalorous men.”

Salviati’s assessment reveals the ideological diversity held by leading figures in the Medici regime, and further suggests the limits of Medicean partisanship. Even commitment to a Medicean state does not preclude hostility from the inner circle of the regime, as Bernardo Rucellai infamously demonstrated when he publically refused to attend Leo X’s inauguration. Instead of a bastion of fervent Mediceans, the Cazzuola and the Paiuolo might be better understood as sodalities of *parenti, amici*, and *vicini* whose support the Medici were attempting to cultivate, and their macabre spectacles as expressing the widespread dissatisfaction with or antagonism towards the Medici that Bartolomeo Cerretani repeatedly and consistently attributed to the office-holding class.

---

14 The moderates’ position was articulated by Salviati, Lanfredino Lanfrendini, and messer Piero Alamanni. Cerretani, *Dialogo*, 35, editor’s brackets: “Quelli che confortavano i[ll] legato a non toccare il Consiglio dicevano come lo stato era stato 18 anni nelle mani de l’universale civiltà, e che per mezzo delli honorí molti erano nella città qualificati, e che senza grandissimo scandoló e pericolo di guastare la città non si levava di mano loro lo stato, e quali erano assai e bene qualificati e uniti et usi a vivere di loro arbitrio, et che sua Signoria haveva a pensare con chi gli havessi a tenere quello stato, quando gli riuscissi il pigliarlo, perché quelli amici di quella casa erano in una pausa di 18 anni restati pochi, poveri, et in universale non molto valenthuomini, e che gli harebbono a diventare ministri di violenza, di che ne seguiria una violenza da durare poco e con carico grandissimo della casa loro, et che s’intendeva per cosa risoluta che non erano, uscito Piero Soderini et hauti e denari, per alterare il governo popolare.” For Salviati and the Frateschi, see Polizzotto, *Elect Nation*, 16, and passim.


I begin my analysis with the Cazzuola’s participation in, and its macabre reframing of, the Medicean triumphs created for Florence’s 1513 Carnival celebrations. Giuliano’s Triumph of the Three Ages of Man, whose parade floats and accompanying songs were staged by the Compagnia della Cazzuola, utilized a dynastic metaphor of cyclical time to mythologize Giuliano as his father reborn. His nephew Lorenzo’s complementary Triumph of the Golden Age likened the Medici to a series of exemplary Roman Emperors whose rules were marked by stability, piety, rule of law, and prosperity. An alternative narrative, I argue, is found in a small chapbook held in Florence’s Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale (Palatino E.6.6.154.1.14, fig. 84), which memorialized the 1513 trionfi. As its frontispiece literally visualizes, the songs which accompanied the Medici’s parade floats are located within a macabre framework, between the upper title (Canzona della morte) and a lower woodcut representing the Triumph of Death. The booklet opens with Cazzuola-member Giovambattista dell’Ottonaio’s Song of Death, continues with two canzone which are otherwise known to have been sung as part of the Medici’s 1513 Triumphs, and concludes with a brief summary of Lorenzo’s Golden Age carri. I argue that Ottonaio’s Canzona della morte, whose bleak imagery presents death as an escape from warfare, insecurity, and the troubles of the world, and whose injunction to youth to be aware of vices and deceptions, specifically responded to and recast the Medici’s Triumphs and their accompanying canti, one of which Ottonaio also penned. I then interpret the judicial emphasis of Ottonaio’s Canzona della morte as subverting the Triumphs’ mythologizing by underscoring the fear, reprisals, and miscarriage of justice that marked the handful of
months between the Medici’s restored rule and the Carnival celebrations. Much as the Soderini tomb previously re-interpreted the Medici’s poetic self-fashioning, I argue that the Palatine chapbook subverts the family’s Golden Age mythmaking by aligning their rule with death.

I next turn to the macabre dinner parties held by Companies of the Cauldron and of the Trowel that are vividly described in Giorgio Vasari’s 1568 Life of the sculptor Giovanfrancesco Rustici (1475–1554). The Paiuolo’s single feast featured elaborate edible sculptures whose macabre undercurrents have been normalized by John Varriano and Guendalina Ajello Mahler as examples of witty, ironic humor and illusionistic marvels. Allen J. Grieco instead rightly noted the disquieting doubling between the diners, who were seated around a table which was placed inside a large vat, and the gastronomic inventions they consumed, which included human figures made from poultry.

Paola Ventrone also usefully framed the artists’ culinary inventions as “a parodic reprise of the ‘dressed’ viands found in court banquets,” while Sanne Wellen

18 Varriano, “Edible Art,” in Tastes and Temptations: Food and Art in Renaissance Italy (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 179-201. Mahler described both Strozzi’s 1519 black banquet and a similar descent into hell staged by the Cazzuola as the “transgressive jocularity” of the burla (243), which Bernardo Dovizi da Bibbiena states should “not offend, or only slightly” (255). “Ut Pictura Convivia: Heavenly Banquets and Infernal Feasts in Renaissance Italy,” Viator 38 (2007): 235-264. See also Mozzati, Giovanfrancesco Rustici, 258-259, and the discussion below.

19 Grieco also noted a similar doubling in the Cazzuola’s descent into hell, and linked the macabre foodstuffs to the intermingling of human, animal, and vegetal forms in the grotesque. “Au pays de Cocagne: Ulysse dans le chaudron,” in L’Honnête Volupté: Art culinaire, art majeur, ed. Paul Noirot (Paris: EVRSH, 1989), 103-106.

20 Gli araldi della commedia: Teatro a Firenze nel Rinascimento (Pisa: Pacine, 1993), 167, her brackets: “In queste ’sculture,’ di prevedibile effetto ridicolo nonostante l’impegnativa fattura, par di vedere una ripresa parodica delle vivande ‘vestite’ in uso nei banchetti di corte, come nel famoso convito nuziale pesarese del 1475 durante il quale fu servito un ‘daino vestito cotto cum tutta la sua pelle portato in piedi [...] senza che se vedesse ch’il portasse.’ ” Although Ventrone only mentioned the courts, animals which were “redressed” in their own skin or plumage and which were made to seem alive were also found in Soderini’s 1502 banquet and in Lorenzo Strozzi and Lucrezia Rucellai’s 1503 marriage feast. For Soderini’s feast, see Claudio Benporat, “Convito offerto da Piero Soderini in occasione della sua nomina a gonfaloniere di Firenze,” in Cucina e convivialità italiana del Cinquecento (Florence:
developed Carlo Falciani’s association of these food sculptures with the “non-sensical, anti-conformist sonnets” of Burchiello (1404-1449) to locate the Paiuolo and the Cazzuola within Florentine vernacular culture.21

The tradition of the *beffa*, the elaborate hoax or prank with which Wellen identified the Paiuolo’s inventions, also frequently features in analyses of the Cazzuola’s coeval banquets.22 Citing a Florentine penchant for infernally-themed dinner parties, Tommaso Mozzati also identified the “bizarre” entertainments of Rustici’s sodalities as examples of *beffe*, but denied the meals a subversive signification; he stated that, as a genre of *festa* “alla fiorentina,” the “banchetto macabro” was merely a “playful form of social ritual.”23 Carlo Falciani, however, rightly framed the artists’ inventions as socio-

---


political criticism. He interpreted Andrea del Sarto’s exquisite edible baptistery as a satire of austerity-adverse clergy, stating that they were pejoratively fashioned from thrushes (*tordi*), and noted that Vasari left unresolved the implications of social inversion in Giuliano Bugiardini’s costumed party for the Cazzuola, where rank was determined by the diners’ dress, likely symbolizing “the unity and equality of all in the Republican city.”

Building on these insights, I discuss the banquets’ transgressive purchase as opposing Medicean self-fashioning. After analyzing how the Paiuolo’s culinary inventions combined an irreverent humor with simulations of cannibalism and the

---

24 *Rosso Fiorentino*, 36-37: “Ci sembra che la stessa vena satirica contro la parte del clero avversa alla via austera proposta da Savonarola e dal gruppo degli Spirituali fosse anche in alcune cene delle due compagnie... Non sarà sfuggito, nei commenti arguti dei commensali, che in quel tempio fiorentino i canonici cantori eran tordi - parola dal noto significato dispregiativo - e che le loro cotte di trina altrove non eran che rete di porco, buona ad avvolger fegatelli.”

25 *Rosso Fiorentino*, 37: “Ma alcune di quelle radunate avranno avuto anche un significato politico, che Vasari preferì lasciar intendere senza rivelarlo,... Vasari lasciò all’immaginazione di chi leggeva l’incontro tra principi, gentiluomini e popolo durante i giochi che seguirono, quando certo furono abbandonati i ranghi assegnati, a favore di una comunanza che forse doveva simboleggiare l’unità e l’uguaglianza di tutti nella città repubblicana.” For Sarto’s baptistery, see ibid., 36-37. Gareffi, who interpreted Lorenzo Strozzi’s 1519 infernal banquet as an intentional gesture of moral reproach to the Medicean cardinals, indicated the political significance of the Florentine banquets when he analogized the artisans of the Paiuolo and the Cazzuola to the Roman buffoon, who “è l’unico che può contraddire il re, è l’unico che può contrastare la rigidità normativa dell’etichetta....” *La scrittura e la festa*, 165. Phyllis Bober likewise implied that political undertones informed the Paiuolo’s feast and the Cazzuola’s descent into Hell when she originated the infernal banqueting motif with Domitian’s “malign exploit designed to terrorise alleged sartorial enemies....” *The Black or Hell Banquet,* in *Fasting and Feasting: Oxford Symposium on Food and Cookery, 1990*, ed. Harlan Walker (London: Prospect Books, 1991), 56.
punishments of hell, I contend that meal’s satire of the cauldron, which both restored and dissolved, problematizes the regenerative myths promoted by the Medici. I then examine how the Cazzuola’s macabre banquets served as allegories for the experience of living under Medicean rule. By reading Cazzuola’s feasts against the critical assessments of the Medici’s lavish and contemporaneous feste made by Luca Landucci (1437-1516), Giovanni Cambi (1458-1535), Piero Parenti (1450-1519), and Bartolomeo Cerretani (1475-1524), I find that the Trowel’s themes of impure foodstuffs, privation, and infernal torment ingeniously echo the chroniclers’ repeated castigations of the Medici for their personal aggrandizement at Florentines’ expense. The banquets not only reveal the fraudulence of the Medici’s own self-fashioning, but also create alternative narratives of Medici rule. If the Paiuolo and Cazzuola’s festivities were indeed parodies of the tavola dei principi, the table being derided was the Medici’s.

1513 Carnival

Though the Medici took control of the Florentine state in September 1512, the first public celebrations of their restored rule were held during Carnival in February 1513. After laying out the preparations for the winter festivities, which included the creation of the Medici’s own festive companies of the Diamante and the Broncone, I will briefly examine the rhetoric of Medici’s triumphs themselves. I will then address a pamphlet “ricordo” of the Carnival, and detail how the Canzona della morte penned by a Cazzuola versifier subverted the trionfi’s narratives by re-reading their poetics of regeneration, renewal, and a restored Golden Age through a prism of death.
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In order to demonstrate continuity with earlier Medicean leadership and to solidify their family’s rule, Giuliano di Lorenzo (1479-1516) and his nephew Lorenzo di Piero (1492-1519) intentionally revived the lavish displays of carri and mascherate which characterized civic feste under Lorenzo il vecchio, and which were largely suppressed in the Savonarolan and Soderini Republics. To this end, by mid-November 1512, each founded a festive youth brigade and named it after a Medici impresa;26 Giuliano formed the Diamante (Diamond) and Lorenzo created the Broncone (Severed Bough).27 In his Dialogo, Bartolomeo Cerretani described the origin of the Diamante as a recapitulation of the Lorenzo il vecchio’s favored youth confraternity of the Magi, and

26 In his letter to his brother Francesco of January 8, 1513, Jacopo Guicciardini described the foundation and purpose of these festival companies. Le lettere, ed. Pierre Jodogne (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per l’età moderna e contemporanea, 1986), 1:325: “Giuliano, circa un mese et mezo fa, [thus, mid-November] fondò una compagnia di stendardo, dove sono molti huomini da bene. Chiamonla el Diamante. Et il simile fecie Lorenzo, figliuo di Piero, dove sono molti giovani suoi molti giovani suoi choetanei. Chiamono questa il Bronchone. Doverranno questo charnesciale fare feste e buon tempo.” Cerretani also noted the November 1512 creation of the companies in his Ricordi, 294, editor’s brackets, “G[i]uliano de’ Medici creò una compagnia, intitolata in San G[i]uliano et chiamolla del Diamante e fu di stendardo, raunossi in sala del papa, d’huomini quasi di sua età. Lorenzo ne chreò una, intitololla del Bronchone e in Sa[n] Lorenzo.”
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detailed the role the company was meant to play in the governance of the city and in the commune’s festive life.

At our behest, Giuliano formed a company, just as his father Lorenzo il Magnifico had done, and he called it the Diamante, because it was an old device among the Medici. It had its beginning in this way: we made a list of 36, nearly all sons of men who were colleagues of Lorenzo il Magnifico in the company of the Zampillo (or Magi). And having had them summoned for an evening at palazzo Medici, where they dined, Giuliano spoke, calling to mind how his family and the others who were there had happily possessed the city, and because that had to continue, he encouraged and proposed festivities for the coming Carnival, and they were planned; Giuliano was thinking of giving the order that this company govern the city, and already there wasn’t a magistracy formed where there wasn’t one of our number.... It transpired that Lorenzo came to their meeting; he was the son of Piero and Alfonsina Orsini, about eighteen years old, and raised in Rome, without advantages but freely. There were those who persuaded him that the city, having been his father’s, belonged to him, which induced him to want to form a company; and he did and called it the Broncone, all of its members were his contemporaries from the leading families, and they also ordered a masquerade, as we had previously done.28

These explicitly political and propagandistic functions were reaffirmed by Jacopo Nardi (1476-1563)29 and by Filippo de’ Nerli (1485-1556),30 who also described the purpose of

28 Translation in Cummings, *Politicized Muse*, 15-16, with the emendation of “mumieria” as “masquerade,” rather than Cumming’s “pantomime.” Cerretani, *Dialogo*, 47-48: “Il quale creò per nostro ordine una compagnia, come haveva Lorenzo Vecchio, et chiamossi ‘il diamante,’ perché era loro livrea vecchia. Hebbe principio in questo modo, che facemo una listra di 36, quasi tutti figli di que’ padri che con Lorenzo Vecchio furno nel ‘Zampillo,’ o volete ne’ ‘Magi,’ e fattili richiedere per una sera in casa e Medici dove si cenò, parlò Giuliano ramentando come la casa loro con quelle di chi vi si trovò presente hevevono felicemente goduta la città. E perché quel medesimo haveva a essere, e’ confortò et offeri, et ordissi feste per il futuro carnovale, pensando di dare ordine che questa compagnia gouvernassi la città. Et di già non si faceva magistrato dove non fussi alcuno di noi.” Cerretani continues with the founding of Lorenzo’s Broncone, ibid., editor’s parenthesis: “Cominciò la benignità di Giuliano, non vi vincendo alcuno, con la presuntione d’alquanti, a chiedere di gratia che il tale vincessi, di sorte che si mescolò quel nome stietto di giovani che erono de l’età sua come si era fatto de’ vecchi. Accadde che in questa lor tornata venne Lorenzo, figl(iuol)o di Piero et di madonna Alfonsina / Ursina, d’età d’anni 18 incirca, allevato in Roma non riccamente ma liberale. Non mancò chi lo persuase che era figl(iuol)o di Piero il quale era il maggiore, et che a lui si aparteneva lo stato della città sendo suto del padre; il che lo spinse a voler fare una compagnia, e fella e chiamolla del ‘Broncone,’ tutti sua pari d’età et delle prime case, et ordinorno fare anche una mumieria come havevamo già fatto noi.”

29 Nardi wrote the statues for the Compagnia del Broncone in which he stated the group’s purpose. Giuseppe Palagi, ed., *I capitoli della Compagnia del Broncone* (Florence: Le Monnier, 1872), 10:
these youth companies as securing the goodwill of the popolo through public spectacles, and as keeping the city’s patrician youths well-disposed to the Medici. By January, Giovanni de’ Medici already had plans underway for triumphs, comedies, and moresche, boisterous or grotesque dances supposedly “Moorish” in style, for the upcoming Carnival.31

TheBroncone’sDeadlyAgeofGold

The entertainment began on February 6, 1513, when Lorenzo’s Broncone staged a seven-part Triumph of the Golden Age.32 The initial carro featured the bucolic Age of Gold of Saturn and Janus, who were accompanied by shepherds; next, a dozen priests attended Numa Pomphililus, who restored religion and sacrifice to Rome. The third parade float portrayed senators and lictors that represented the justice of Titus Manlius Torquatus. Either Julius Caesar, surrounded by soldiers carrying trophies of his conquest,

30 Nerli, Commentari, 1:193: “Fecero di più i Medici due compagnie, delle quali l’una, che fu la prima, si chiamò il Diamante, detta così da una dell’ insegne e imprese della casa de’ Medici, e di questa fu capo Giuliano, e dell’ altra, che si chiamò il Broncone, detta similitmente da un’ altra insegnadicaostagio di casa loro, fu capo Lorenzo. Concorsero nella prima tutti i giovani simili d’età a Giuliano, e nell’altra tutti quelli di minore età simili a Lorenzo. Furono ordinate queste due compagnie per due effetti principali, oltre a molti altri; prima per tenere il popolo e la plebe in allegrezza, con trionfi, feste e pubblici spettacoli, che si facevano nel tempo del festeggiare per le due compagnie, e per mantenere anche in esse ben disposta la gioventù nobile verso di Giuliano e di Lorenzo e così andar facendo ristrignimento di partigiani più dichiarati a benefizio dello stato.”


32 Although Vasari misdated these events to the subsequent Carnival of 1514, and also erroneously indicated that Giuliano’s triumphs occurred first, he provides the fullest description of the triomfi in the 1568 Life of Pontormo. Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:311-313. For the date and the order of events, see the discussion below.
followed, or Titus and Vespasian were next shown bringing order and stability with their soldiers. Poets then accompanied their patron Augustus Caesar, who was followed by the just Trajan and twelve doctors of law. The seventh float allegorized the Medici as the culmination of these illustrious predecessors, and as the originators of a new Golden Age.

Regarding this last *carro*, Giorgio Vasari stated in the *Life of Pontormo* that,

> From the centre of the car rose a great sphere in the form of a globe of the world, upon which there lay prostrate on his face, as if dead, a man clad in armour all eaten with rust, who had the back open and cleft, and from the fissure there issued a child all naked and gilded, who represented the new birth of the Age of Gold and the end of the Age of Iron...and this same significance had the dry trunk putting forth new leaves, although some said that the matter of that dry trunk was an allusion to Lorenzo de’ Medici who became Duke of Urbino.

By inaugurating the Triumph with the Golden Age of Saturn and Janus, which featured the Temple of Peace and Fury bound, and then culminating the parade with a nubile Golden Age which was born out the defunct, warmongering Age of Iron, the Medici fashioned their restoration as a new era of peace which triumphed over the (Savonarolan and Soderini Republics’) previous era of war. By integrating the re-branching laurel with Golden Age poetics, the Medici both valorized and idealized the earlier Laurentian

---

33 Vasari lists Julius Caesar as the fourth car, followed by Caesar Augustus and Trajan. The BNCF chapbook Palatino 6.6.154.1.14 lists Augustus as the fourth triumph, then Titus and Vespasian followed by Trajan. See note 51 below.

34 Vasari-De Vere, 7:154-155. Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:312-313: “Nel mezzo del carro surgeva una gran palla in forma d’apamondo, sopra la quale stava prostrato bocconi un uomo come morto, armato d’arme tutte ruginose, il quale avendo le schiene aperte e fesse, della fessura usciv un fanciullo tutto nudo e dorato, il quale rappresentava l’Età dell’oro resurgente e la fine di quella del ferro, della quale egli usciva e rinasceva per la creazione di quel Pontefice: e questo medesimo significava il broncone secco, rimettente le nuove foglie, comeché alcuni dicessero che la cosa del broncone alludeva a Lorenzo de’ Medici, che fu duca d’Urbino.”

age, and further suggested that Florence would again experience this idyllic era under Lorenzo’s progeny.

A more disquieting interpretation, however, is indicated in Vasari’s brief epilogue to Giuliano’s Triumph. After explicating the invention and the significance of the final carro, Vasari concludes, “I should mention that the gilded boy, who was the son of a baker, died shortly afterwards through the sufferings that he endured in order to gain ten scudi.”36 In one short sentence, which is presented as an aside to his preceding elaboration of the Triumph’s program, Vasari re-interprets the entire spectacle as an indictment of the magnificence and good governance of the Medici. For this youth, the Medici restoration brought neither peace nor prosperity; instead, he was another casualty of the family’s violent return to the city. As Stephen Campbell argued, the boy who symbolized “The Golden Age Resurrected” in the Broncone float, and who thereby became himself a corpse, reconfigures the Medici “Golden Age” as deathless instead of eternal, as unnatural instead of supernatural, and as demonic instead of divine.37

This conception of the Medici’s Triumphs as dissimulating veneers which denied the macabre experience of those who live under their reign, reoccurs in Giovanni Cambi’s narration of these events. In line with Cerretani’s above assessment, the Savonarolan sympathizer cynically exposes the Medici’s spectacles as a means to distract and to entertain the popolani while aggrandizing themselves as the leaders of the city. He likens the 1513 feste to a mask which attempts to hide poverty and disenfranchisement

---

36 Vasari-De Vere, 7:155. Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:313: “Non tacerò che il putto dora
to, il quale era ragazzo d’un fornaio, per lo disagio che patì per guadagnare dieci scudi, poco appresso si morì.”
37 “(Un)divinity of Art,” 605.
with riches and power; once removed, however, everything returns to its prior state.

Cambi writes,

On the 6th of February, 1513, Giuliano di Lorenzo de’ Medici, and Lorenzo di Piero di Medici, his nephew, each asked their companions and their friends among the citizens, according to the appropriate age group, to organize some celebration during Carnival in order for it to seem that the city was celebrating and in good order; and in fact it was like someone who puts on a costume for a masquerade [in maschera]. Because he is dressed in silk and gold, he looks rich and powerful; and then, when he takes off the mask [maschera] and the costume, he is still the same as he was before.\(^\text{38}\)

In describing the festa as a maschera, Cambi not only indicts the entertainment type favored by Lorenzo il vecchio and his heirs as a deceptive illusion, but also connotes it as something spectral, terrifying, and false.\(^\text{39}\) This ominous characterization echoes the grim fate of Vasari’s baker’s boy, who was sacrificed to Medici ambition and made an actual phantasm. This theme of resisting the Medicean narrative by juxtaposing death against the parade floats’ propaganda of peace and prosperity finds further elaboration in a canzona della morte linked to the Diamante’s Triumph.

---


\(^{39}\) For maschere as larve, see Benedetto Varchi’s explication on Giovanni della Casa’s sonnet on Cura. Opere (Trieste: Lloyd Austriaco, 1859), 2:577: “...LARVE in lingua latina significa, oltre quello che noi diciamo maschere, l’anime dannate de’ rei, che noi volgarmente chiamiamo spiriti. Ma qui vuol dire sotto varie figure ed apparizioni, come dicono, appariscono quelle, ed è tolto dal Petrarca quando disse nel sonetto: Fuggendo la prigione, ove Amore m’ ebbe...” See also the discussion in Dempsey, Inventing the Renaissance Putto, 103. For maschera as a false similitudo and its demonic and phantasmatic associations, see Jean-Claude Schmitt, “Le maschere, il diavolo, i morti nell’Occidente medievale,” in Religione, folklore e società nell’Occidente medievale (Bari: Laterza, 1988), 206-238. See also Plaisance’s comment, that the Carnivals of 1513-1516 “had something affected and spectral about them that did not escape Giovanni Cambi, a chronicler from the middle bourgeoisie and a Savonarolan piagnone.” “Medici Carnivals,” 101.
Following his analogy of a masquerade, Cambi gives the following description of the festivities:

These two companies made triumphs; namely Lorenzo did the first of the first Four Ages, each well adorned with the likeness of that Age with a wagon, or rather, triumph, for one Age, and afterwards, three more triumphs, pulled with well-adorned oxen; the first triumph went the Sunday of Carnival, which was on the sixth of February, and cost 1700 florins. The other triumph of Giuliano, and his company, went the day of Carnival on the 8th of February 1513, from 2 o’clock at night even until 8 o’clock at night; each one of the said two triumphs had a song on the story of the triumph; they went singing to the houses of those who had had them done, or to their friends’.40

Cambi ascribes to Lorenzo the initial trionfo, which depicted the Ages of Man. Both Cerretani and Vasari, however, paired this subject with Giuliano, which suggests that Cambi likely transposed the two Medici parade floats. Regarding the number of Giuliano’s trionfi, and the songs which accompanied the parade, there are greater divergences between these sources. Vasari, for example, erroneously dated the Broncone and Diamante carri to the following year’s Carnival,41 then describes,

By the Company of the Diamante, then, a commission was given to M. Andrea Dazzi, who was then lecturing on Greek and Latin letters at the


41 Vasari-Bettarini/Bacocchi, 5:310: “Il carnovale del medesimo anno, essendo tutta Fiorenza in festa et in allegrezza per la creazione del detto Leone Decimo [i.e. after March 11, 1513], furono ordinate molte feste, e fra l’altre due bellissime e di grandissima spesa da due Compagnie di signori e gentiluomini della città; d’una delle quali, che era chiamata il Diamante....” Shearman argued for the February 1513 dating based on Cambi and Cerretani, and suggested that Vasari’s dating derived from Grazzini’s 1559 publication of Nardi’s canto with the heading “Trionfo della compagnia del Broncone, nella venuta di Papa Leone,” i.e. November 30, 1515, which Vasari confused with Leo’s election in 1513. “Pontormo and Andrea del Sarto, 1513,” 478n11.
Studio in Florence, to look to the invention of a triumphal procession; whereby he arranged one similar to those that the Romans used to have for their triumphs, with three very beautiful cars wrought in wood, and painted with rich and beautiful art. In the first was Boyhood [Puerizia], with a most beautiful array of boys. In the second was Manhood [Virilità], with many persons who had done great things in their manly prime. And in the third was Old Age [Senetūti], with many famous men who had performed great achievements in their last years. All these persons were very richly appareled, insomuch that it was thought that nothing better could be done. The architects of these cars were Raffaello delle Vivole, Il Carota the wood-carver, the painter Andrea di Cosimo, and [the Cazzuola’s] Andrea del Sarto; those who arranged and prepared the dresses of the figures were Ser Piero da Vinci, the father of Leonardo, and [the Cazzuola’s] Bernardino di Giordano, both men of beautiful ingenuity; and to Jacopo da Pontormo alone it fell to paint all the three cars, wherein he executed various scenes in chiaroscuro of the Transformations of the Gods into different forms, which are now in the possession of Pietro Paolo Galeotto, an excellent goldsmith. The first car bore, written in very clear characters, the word “Erimus,” the second “Sumus,” and the third “Fuimus” – that is, “We shall be,” “We are,” and “We have been.” The song began, “The years fly on....”

As a celebration of Medicean victory and magnificence, Giuliano’s Ages of Man is less unambiguously eulogistic than Lorenzo’s Triumph of the Golden Age. Vasari does not explicate Dazzi’s invention, and silently passes over Giuliano’s presumed place in the carro of virilità, even though at 33 years old, Giuliano would still have been considered an intemperate giovane, and would have required special dispensation to hold the city’s

---

highest office. The use of the Latin states of being, erimus, sumus, and fuimus, have previously been linked to Pythagoras’s discussion of Time in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (15.214-236), where he describes how the body changes between infancy, youth, middle age, and old age. Pythagoras’s schema culminates, however, not in the elderly’s lifetime of achievements, as per Vasari, but in the death and destruction of the body brought on by time. The pairing of inscriptions with floats is equally atypical; from the point of view of the mature male, “we are” (sumus), pueri describe what fuimus, and senes are the future state of what erimus. Instead, Vasari’s linking of childhood with “we shall be” and old age with “we have been” only rationalizes itself within a framework of cyclical time; the adult looks forward to his progeny and backward to his ancestors. In this conception,

---

43 In the descriptions of the Compagnia del Diamante, Giuliano and his companions (generally aged between 30 and 40) are both identified as giovani. See Cerretani, *Dialogo*, 47-48; Palagi, *Capitoli della Compagnia del Broncone*, 10; and Nerli, *Commentari*, 1:193. Regarding age categories, infanzia (infancy) referred to those under age 7. Puerizia or fanciullezza (childhood) ended between ages 14-17. Adolescenza (adolescence) fell between childhood and youth, and often indicated an age of around 20 years. A giovane (youth) was commonly a male under the age of 24, but could be applied up to ages 35 or 40; the term had negative associations of excess, particularly with regards to ardor and violence. See Ilaria Taddei, “Puerizia, adolescenza, and giovinezza: Images and Conceptions of Youth in Florentine Society during the Renaissance,” in *The Premodern Teenager: Youth in Society, 1150-1650*, ed. Konrad Eisenbichler (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2002), 15-26. See also Ciappelli, *Carnivale e Quaresima*, 235-242; Cécile Terreau-Scotto, *Les âges de la vie dans la pensée politique florentine (ca. 1480-1532)* (Geneva: Droz, 2015), 214-216; and Butters, *Governors and Government*, 183-184 and 207-208, who noted that eligibility for the gonfaloniere di giustizia began at age 40; 30 was typically the minimum age for other public offices. Virilità (manhood) was the era of the mature male of 35-50 years, and vecchiaia (Latin senectus, old age) of the 50-70 year old. See Ilaria Taddei, “Le età della vita,” in *Fanciulli e giovani: Crescere a Firenze nel Rinascimento* (Florence: Olschki, 2001), 13-34.


45 Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, trans. Frank Justus Miller (Cambridge: Harvard University Press,1916), 2:380-381, lines 234-236: “tempus edax rerum, tuque, invidiosa vetustas, omnia destructis vitiataque dentibus aevi paulatim lenta consumitis omnia morte!” “O Time, thou great devourer, and thou, envious Age, together you destroy all things; and, slowly gnawing with your teeth, you finally consume all things in lingering death!” Nor does the Pythagorean account fulfill Vasari’s statement that Pontormo paints the “transformation of the Gods into various forms.” As Shearman, in his attribution of two canvases of the story of Apollo and Daphne to Pontormo, noted, there seems to be no connection between Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* and the Three Ages of Man. “Pontormo and Andrea del Sarto, 1513,” 480.
as in the Golden Age of Lorenzo’s Broncone, the Medici line is never extinguished, but is continually reborn; the lineage literally re-generates by succeeding one age group with the next. Yet even with this generational emphasis, the macabre undertones inherent in the subject matter cannot be fully suppressed. After all, to be re-born, one must first die. The evocation of “we will be,” “we are,” and “we have been” is not so far removed from the famous distich of “What you are now, we have been; we are what you will be,” which is uttered by the Three Dead to the Three Living. Vanitas is inescapable within the imagery of the Triumph of Ages, as seen in the song Vasari specifies as accompanying Giuliano’s float, Antonio Alamanni’s Volon gli anni.

1. Volon gli anni e’ mesi e l’ore, The years, months and hours fly [by]
2. ogni cosa al fin po’ more: everything at the end then dies;
3. questa rota a tutte l’ore at all hours this wheel
4. va voltando et sempre gira, continually turns and always runs;
5. chi è lieto et chi sospira, who is happy and who sighs
6. ogni cosa al fin po’ more. everything at the end then dies.

7. Primo grado è puerizia, The first level is childhood,
8. semplicetta, dolze et pura: simple, sweet and pure;
9. rompe e straccia ogni pigrizia, it breaks and shreds all indolence,
10. tant’è bella suo figura; so beautiful is childhood’s figure;
11. non discorre e non misura; not flowing and not measured;
12. tanto è vago il suo bel frutto, so beautiful is its beautiful fruit,
13. che chi ’l segue, il core ha that the heart has melted who
strutto follows it,
14. per virtú di tanto amore. through virtue of so much love.

15. Vien l’étá d’amore ardendo, The age of burning love comes
16. c’ogni còr gentile invita: which every gentle heart invites;
17. gioventú, lieta, ridendo, youth, happy, laughing,
18. vien cantando e molto ardita. comes singing and very bold.
19. O che dolze e bella vita! O that sweet and beautiful life!
20. chi va a caccia e chi fa versi, Who goes hunting and who makes

21. chi d’amor non puó tenersi, who cannot keep himself from love,
22. tanto è vago il suo bel fiore, so lovely is his beautiful flower.
23. L’altro grado è ’l terzo segno: The other level is the third sign:
24. pien di fama e di vittoria, full of fame and victory,
25. questa qui guida ogni regno; this age here guides each ruler;
26. cerca al mondo onore e gloria; he searches the world for honor and glory;
27. fa perfetta la memoria, memory makes the prudent man
28. l’uom prudente e bene accorto, perfect and well observant,
29. purchè guidi il legno in porto, because he guides the boat into port,
30. come fa chi vuole onore. as does he who wants honor.
31. Cosí il tempo spezza e rompe Thus time passes and stops
32. questa nostra vita breve; this our brief life;
33. tante glorie et tante pompe so many glories and so much pomp
34. strugge il tempo piú che neve; time melts more than snow;
35. vien la morte oscura e greve, death comes dark and heavy,
36. con suo falce miete e taglia: with its sickle reaps and cuts;
37. non è guanto, piastra o maglia there is no glove, plate, or mesh
38. che non rompa il suo furore. that its fury cannot interrupt.
39. Risguardate, donne belle, Look again, beautiful ladies,
40. voi che siate in questo coro, you who are in this chorus,
41. vedovette e damigelle: young widows and bridesmaids:
42. non fu mai piú bel tesoro; there was never a more beautiful treasure;
43. ahimè, che forza d’oro alas, that force of gold
44. non racquista quel ch’è perso! does not recover that which is lost!
45. Quando il tempo è fatto avverso, When time is made hostile,
46. l’uom conosce il cieco errore. man knows the blind error.
47. Voi che siate in questa vita, You who are in this life,
48. non perdete il tempo invano: do not waste time in vain:
49. ogni gloria è poi finita, every glory is then over,
50. quando morti et spenti siánò; when they are dead and extinguished;
51. torna il monte spesso in piano; the mountain often turns flat;
52. e però chi ’l tempo perde and yet he who loses time
53. nell’età giovine e verde in the young and verdant age
54. poco dura e presto mòre. last but a little and soon dies.

---

47 Charles S. Singleton, ed., Canti carnascialeschi del Rinascimento (Bari: Laterza, 1936), 240-241. Manuscript sources are given in Joseph J. Gallucci, Jr., ed., Florentine Festival Music 1480-1520
Using the Ages of Man as a meditation on mortality, the song opens with a refrain on the inevitability of death (*ogni cosa al fin po' more*), and closes with the misspent youth’s early demise (*chi 'l tempo perde nell'età giovine e verde poco dura e presto mòre*). The macabre tone is perhaps why Vasari diplomatically reproduced only Alamanni’s first verse, even though the biographer printed Nardi’s entire first stanza for the Broncone’s Triumph. *Volon gli anni* chronicles a sweet and pure childhood which is followed by the burning desire of youth. Maturity brings fame, honor, and glory, which are then abjured in old age as mere vanities that will soon be obliterated by time. In the context of the *broncone* emblem, however, death is no longer final; it is merely the prerequisite for the (re)birth of a new, if ephemeral, shoot. By portraying the Ages of Man in terms of dynasty, in addition to the discrete phases of a single life, the individual’s death is bypassed through the continuity of the family. Thus *erimus* captions the *carro of puerti*, and restarts Alamanno’s Wheel of Time (v. 3). Troublesome *giovinezza* – the age of intemperate, ardent, and violent youth, and the demographic that comprised the Diamante and Broncone companies – is sidestepped by central position of *virilitas*. Even though Alamanni attends to the youthful “age of burning love,” in the float’s song, Giuliano was ostensibly instead among those in the successive age of prudent adulthood, which is “full of fame and victory” (v. 24). The song’s macabre overtones were perhaps why the Triumph’s *carri* were painted with scenes from Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*. Visual mutability, transformation, and rebirth from one form into another temper the aural emphasis of death as the finale of life. Pontormo’s depiction of the legend of Apollo and

(Madison: A-R Editions, 1981), xv; following Vasari, Gallucci incorrectly associated the triumph with Leo X’s election. A modern musical setting is given at 20-22, with the stanzas following the order in BNCF Banco Rari 230.
Daphne, which gives the origin of the laurel, the onomastic *impressa* of Lorenzo *il vecchio*, portrays the old age of Lorenzo reborn in the youthful age of his son Giuliano.\(^4\) The elder forbearer (*fuimus*) comes to fruition in his mature heir (*sumus*).

A small, four-folio, paper pamphlet held in the Palatine collection at Florence’s Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale appears to be a *memoria* of the 1513 Triumphs. The chapbook records three *canzone* which accompanied the Broncone and Diamante’s floats, a description of the seven cars comprising the Broncone’s Triumph, and a “Song of Death.” The frontispiece (fig. 84) reads:

- Canzona della Morte. Song of Death
- Canzona del bronchone. Song of the Severed-Bough
- Canzona del Diamante & della Chazuola. Song of the Diamond and of the Trowel.

Below is a woodcut, framed with crossed bones, of a skeletal Death with a scythe walking through decapitated heads. The text for the four songs follows, though not in the order given on the frontispiece. The *Canzona del bronchone*, Jacopo Nardi’s *Colui che dà le leggi alla natura*, is the final work instead of the second, and is the same song identified by Vasari for Lorenzo’s Triumph of the Age of Gold.\(^5\) The chapbook’s near-identical list of *carri* made for the Triumph also confirms Vasari’s account, and the

---

\(^{48}\) Shearman, “Pontormo and Andrea del Sarto, 1513,” 480.

\(^{49}\) BNCF, Palatino E.6.6.154.1.14. The pamphlet lacks an imprint. It measures 100 x 155 mm; although it has been cut down, no text has been lost. The order of the songs in the book does not follow that of the frontispiece, rather “Canzona della morte. / Perch ogni cosa elsuo proprio fin brama” (fols 1v-2r), “Lachanzona del diamante / Quel primo eterno amore somma” (fols. 2r-2v), “Rispotsa / Lagran memoria delleta passata” (fols. 2v-3r), “Septe Triomphi del secolo Do / ro … / Colui che da leleggi alla natura” (fols. 3r-4r). See the description in Carlo Angeleri, *Bibliografia delle stampe popolare a carattere profano dei secoli XVI e XVII conservate nella Biblioteca Nazionale di Firenze* (Florence: Sansoni, 1953), 147-148, no. 217.

\(^{50}\) Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:313: “La canzone che si cantava da quella mascherata, secondo che si costuma, fu composizione del detto Iacopo Nardi; e la prima stanza diceva così: / Colui che dà le leggi alla natura, / E i vari stati e secoli dispone, / D’ogni bene è cagione, / E il mal, quanto permette, al mondo dura: / Onde, questa figura / Contemplando, si vede / Come con certo piede / L’un secol dopo l’altro al mondo viene, / E muta il bene in male, e il male in bene.”
print’s heading for the song provides both the date and the setting: “Seven Triumphs of the Golden Age made by the Company of the Broncone the year 1512 [1513].” For the Diamante, Vasari gives the song as Antonio Alamanni’s *Volon gli anni*, while the print anonymously records *Quel primo eterno amor*, and its risposta, *La gran memoria dell’età passata*, as the *Canzona del Diamante e della Chazuola*. Composed by the Cazzuola-member and herald of the Signoria, Giovambattista dell’Ottonaio, the song of the Diamante construes the Ages of Man as birth, life, and death, and pairs each state with one of the three Fates, Clotho, Lachesis, and Atropos. The complementary imagery between Alamanni and Ottonaio’s songs suggests that both could have been sung as part of the Diamante triumph, as does Bartolomeo Cerretani’s *ricordo* of the Carnival, in which he credits the Compagnia della Cazzuola with Giuliano’s triumph.

On the 7th and 8th, which was Carnival, a company that called itself the Broncone, newly made by the son of Piero de’ Medici, called Lorenzo, made seven triumphs, namely Seven Joyous Ages, with more than 350 torches; a most beautiful thing costing 1500 florins.

On the day of Carnival, the Company of the Cazzuola, which was favored by Giuliano de’ Medici, sent out six triumphs, namely, Peace, with 400 torches, which was even more beautiful; in this way all Florence was lifted.

---

51 BNCF Palatino E.6.6.154.14, 3r: “Septe TriomPhi del secolo Do / ro Facti dalla compagnia del Bron / chon e Lanno. M.D.xii.” The text of *Colui che dà le leggi alla natura* follows, after which, on fol. 4r: “Triompho primo / Saturno Iano con.xii. Pastori / Numa Pompilio con.xii.Sacerdoti / Tito Mallio Torduato & Gaio Atti / lio Vulgo con xii.Senatori. / Agusto con.xii.Poet. / Tito & Vespasiano con.xii.Militi. / Traiano con.xii.huomini iusti. / Elsecol doro conla Pace.iustitia & Veri / ta.& Pieta. & Divinita. & Verecundia / & Innocantia.” As the Florentine calendar began the new year on March 25, the year can be read as indicating winter 1513 according to modern reckoning. For Nardi’s text, see Singleton, *Canti carnascialeschi*, 250-251; and Cummings, *Politicized Muse*, 23 and 26. A modern setting is given in ibid., 28-30. Gallucci, *Florentine Festival Music 1480-1520*, xv gives the sources for the text and the music, incorrectly dating them after Leo X’s election, and the musical score at 23-25.

52 The *Canzona della Chazuola, La gran memoria*, is attributed to Ottonaio only in Riccardiana 2731, which also indicates that *La gran memoria* (titled as *Secondo coro*) is the risposta to *Quel primo eterno amor* (titled as *Le tre Parche*). See Cummings, *Maecenas and the Madrigalist*, 252n53. As he noted, Singleton did not attribute *Quel primo eterno amor* or *La gran memoria* to Ottonaio as they do not appear in the edition prepared by Ottonaio’s brother Paolo. Ibid., 251n44. See Singleton, *Canti carnascialeschi*, 477.
in celebration, and there was shouting by everyone “palle palle” with no little displeasure to the Piagnoni whom with words and shouts were hunted and persecuted.\textsuperscript{53}

An additional source recovered by Tommaso Mozzati supports Cerretani’s assessment that the Cazzuola, as a corporate entity, organized Giuliano’s triumph. In a 1576 manuscript of \textit{canzoni}, the following notice is appended to \textit{La gran memoria}:

\begin{quote}
Masquerade of the three Fates with six triumphs for the Three Ages, thus Childhood, Youth, and Old Age, ordered by the Company of the Cazzuola in the year 1512 [1513] at the return of the most illustrious house of the Medici.\textsuperscript{54}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{53} Cerretani, \textit{Ricordi}, 299, editor’s brackets: “Addì 7 et otto, che fu il charnasc[i]ale, una compagnia che si chiamava del Bronchone fatta nuovamente dal figl[i]olo di Piero de’ Medici chiamato Lorenzzo fece sette trionphi, c[i]oè 7 età felice con più di 350 doppieri; spese di fiorini 1500, cosa bellissima.” A new paragraph follows: “Al di di charnovale la compagnia della Chazuola, la quale era favorita di G[i]uliano de’ Medici, mandò fuori 6 trionphi, c[i]oè la pace con 400 doppieri, che fu cosa bellissima più assai, in modo che tutto Firenze era sollevato in festa e gridavasi per tutto ‘palle palle’ chon non pocho dispiacere de’ piagnoni i quali con parole et grida erano ucellati et persequitati.” Cummings suggested that both Ottonaio and Alamanni’s songs were performed for the 1513 \textit{Diamante} Triumph, and/or, following Cambi, were sung at friends’ homes during Carnival. \textit{Maecenas and the Madrigalist}, 130-133. Mozzati concurred.

\textsuperscript{54} In a footnote giving the contemporary sources of Ottonaio’s \textit{Quel primo eterno amor}, Armando Petrini stated that the text is found in the Nazionale’s chapbook (Pal.E.6.6.154.14), which he noted was described and published by Singleton (\textit{Canti carnascialeschi}, 198-200 and 477), and in two manuscripts: Riccardiana 2731 and BNCF II.IV.395. He then published the note found in the latter. La “Signoria di madonna Finzione”: Teatro, attori e poetiche nel Rinascimento italiano (Genoa: Costa e Nolan, 1996), 81n15: “Mascherata delle tre Parche con sei Trionfi per le tre età cioè pueritia, gioventù e senetù, mandata per la Compagnia della Cazzuola l’anno 1512 alla tornata della Ill.ma casa de Med.ci.” Mozzati, \textit{Giovanfrancesco Rustici}, 293-294n11, then identified Riccardiana 2731 as the “Codice Riccardiano” and BNCF II.IV.385 as the “Codice Bracci” referenced by Rinaldo Maria Bracci in his edition of Antonfrancesco Grazzini, \textit{Tutti i trionfi carri, mascherate o canti carnascialeschi: Andati per Firenze del tempo del magnifico Lorenzo de’ Medici fino all’anno 1559}, ed. Rinaldo Maria Bracci, 2 vols., (Luca: Benedini, 1750). Bracci (alias Neri del Boccia) wrote in ibid., 1:xiii that he used a “Cod. Brac.,” which he owned, along with a “Codice Riccardiano” to correct “una quantità prodigiosa d’errori” in Grazzini’s 1559 \textit{Trionfi}, which Bracci then published in 1750. Bracci suggested Giovanni Maria Cecchi as the manuscript’s copyist, based on the inclusion of his name at the front of the book, and on the text’s consistent handwriting; Bracci also published the manuscript’s concluding note giving the dating. Ibid.: “Finito di copiare questo dì 18. Aprile 1576.” In main text, Bracci notes, but does not publish, Cecchi’s annotation, writing in the footnote for the \textit{Canto della pace}, 2:557: “Questo Canto, che nel Cod. Brac. apparse d’Autore anonimo, nel MS. Riccard. viene attribuito all’Araldo insieme col Trionfo delle tre Parche, posto a pag. 29, e si fa succedere unitamente allo stesso Trionfo col titolo di Secondo Coro; quantunque non abbia l’istesso metro, e stile, né sembri avere gran connessione col medesimo.” Without mention by either Mozzati or Petrini, Singleton, \textit{Canti carnascialeschi}, 462-464, had already identified Bracci’s “Codice Riccardiano” as Riccardiana 2731, but alternatively identified
As Vasari’s 1568 account fails to mention the three Fates or the Cazzuola in connection with the 1513 Triumphs, and Cerretani describes a Triumph of Peace, this later manuscript – likely in the hand of the famous poet-playwright Giovanni Maria Cecchi (1518-1587) – suggests independent knowledge of the event. Like the carri and Alamanno’s canto, Ottonaio’s paired songs thematize cyclical time through successive generations, emphasize virtue, and describe the reciprocal dependency between Florence and her citizens. Florence itself and the qualities of good governance are foregrounded in both texts, with Quel primo eterno amor opening with justice, and La gran memoria closing with peace.

1. Quel primo eterno amor, That first eternal love,  
   somma giustizia, absolute justice,  
2. Fiorenza, a te n’adduce Florence, on you it relies;  
   queste tre parche in cui these three Fates in whom  
   la puerizia, shines childhood,  
3. la gioventú e senettú riluce, youth and old age,  
   acciocché l’amicizia in order that the friendship  
4. di questa etá perfetta of that perfect age  
   conosca infino al cielo essere knows how to be accepted to  
   accetta. heaven.  
5. Quando fu posto in terra ordin When there was put on earth  
   e amore order and love  
6. dall’immensa bontá, by immense goodness,  
   per ch’ogni cosa nasce, vive because everything is born,  
   e mòre, lives and dies  
7. nacquon costoro della necessitá: they arose from necessity;  
   l’una dà vita al core, the one gives life to the heart  
8. l’altra ’l viver mantiene, the other keeps it to live,  
   l’ultimate è fine a nostro the last is to our ultimate  
   danno o bene. good or ill.
15. Però Lachesi il lino a rocca pone, However Lachesis lays the flax on the distaff,
16. che ci dá vita e forte;55 which gives us life and vigor;
17. Cloto, filando, dá la perfezione; Clotho, by spinning, gives life perfection;
18. Antropos tronca ’l fil quando vuol morte; Antropos cuts the wire when death wants;
19. e così ferma e forte is this law, and it is, 
20. che tutto nasca e viva e morto sia. that everyone is born and lives and is dead.
21. Noi, coll’età che ’l cielo benigno presta, We, with the age that the benign heaven lends,
22. vincián fortuna avversa; overcome adverse fortune;
23. la bianca puerizia aspira a this, 
24. senettú negra piange averla persa: black old age weeps having lost it;
25. orsú, tutti, con festa come on, all, with celebration 
26. onoriam Cloto nostra, we honor our Clotho,
27. che piú felice stato e ben ci mostra.56 who shows us a happier and better state.

The Canzona della Cazzuola responds:

29. La gran memoria dell’età passata The great memory of the past age 
30. dove sempre virtú e amor where there always grew virtue

---

55 Pal.E.6.6.154.14, 2v gives the last word of this verse as “forte” (strong, vigorous), while Singleton gives “sorte” (fate). Canti carnascialeschi, 198.

56 Noting the emendation given above, since the text given as the anonymous “Trionfo delle tre parche” in Singleton, Canti carnascialeschi, 198-199, renders that found in BNCF, Palatino E.6.6.154.1.14, 2r-2v, “Lachanzona del diamante,” with modernized spelling and punctuation, I have reproduced Singleton’s text for ease of readability. Singleton follows the lines above with an additional stanza, not found in the Palatine chapbook, which reads, ibid., 199: “E come ’l mezzo tien della natura, / del principio e del fine / cosi è ancora in noi quella alma pura / che presto impetra le grazie divine, / e questa etá futura, / per virtú, e presente; / ch’al passato e ’l venir pensa e ’l pendente.” “And how the middle holds of nature, of the beginning and of the end, so it is again in us that pure soul which soon implores the divine graces, and this future and present age through virtue, that ponders past, present, and future.” Gallucci gives the manuscript sources for text and music in Florentine Festival Music 1480-1520, xviii, with a modern setting at 85-87. In the synopsis of the text, Gallucci translated “parche” as “parks” rather than “Fates,” ibid, xxiv. For a modern setting, see also Masson, Chants de carnaval, 59-63. Mozzati, Giovanfrancesco Rustici, 297-298, transcribed “Lachanzona del diamante” and “Risposta” from BNCF, Palatino E.6.6.154.1.14, 2r-3r.
crebbe, and love,  
31. ci duole aver lasciata, we regret having left,  
32. perché perpetuarsi ognun because everyone wants to  
vorrebbe. perpetuate himself.  
33. Ma, poich’ell’ è dal ciel sí But, since she, so exalted, is  
esaltata, from heaven  
34. ciascun amar la vuole, each wants to love her,  
35. per restar vivo in sí splendida so to remain alive in such  
prole. splendid offspring.  
36. Però voi, parvoletti, in cui non But you, beloved child, in whom  
giace lies not  
37. ancor, siccome in noi, esperienza yet, as in us, experience  
38. correte a tanta pace run to so much peace  
39. per fare anchò trionfar in order to make Florence  
Fiorenza; triumph again;  
37 Singleton gives “per fare anchò trionfar Fiorenza.” *Canti carnascialeschi*, 199.  
57  
38 Singleton gives “noi” first then “voi.” Ibid.  
58  
39 Singleton gives “sopperisca il favore” (favor provides for). Ibid.  
59  
40 e voi e noi a cui lasciarla and we and you to whom it  
spiace, sorrows to leave her behind,  
58  
41 sofferisce il favore: favor suffered:  
59  
42 ché quella a tutti ancor porrá Because she will still love  
amore. everyone.  
43 Onora adunque, alma cittá, costei Honor, therefore, the city herself, she  
44 ch’è stata ed è fia la tua salute: who was, is, and will be your health;  
45 pensa or quel che tu sei think now on that which you are  
46 e quel che fusti senza suo and that which you were without  
virtute; her virtue;  
60  
47 e se mai festa e fé regnò in lei and if ever reigned in her  
celebration and faith,  
60  
48 con virtú, grazia e pace, with virtue, grace, and peace,  
49 saprallo il buon ché ’l ben always pleases good men.  
sempre al buon piace.  
61  
61 With the exceptions noted above, the text reproduced here is the “Secondo coro” in Singleton, *Canti carnascialeschi*, 199-200, which modernizes the spelling and punctuation of BNCF, Palatino E.6.6.154.I.14, 2v-3r. For a musical setting, see ibid., 2:168-172; Masson, *Chants de carnaval*, 64-68, as “Canto della pace;” and Cummings, *Maecenas and the Madrigalist*, 113-115. Mozzati, *Giovannfrancesco Rustici*, 298, transcribes BNCF, Palatino E.6.6.154.I.14, 2v-3r.
Like *Volon gli anni*, *La gran memoria* mitigates death imagery with the conceit of lineage; progeny ensure that one’s family line never dies (vv. 40 and 42). The more frequent motifs, however, are Florence and the symbiosis between city and citizen. While Alamanni uses the *topoi* of the Wheel of Fortune and of the fragility of life to encourage the seeking of eternal glory, Ottonaio emphasizes the importance of virtuous living, goodness, and the resulting rewards of personal salvation, as well as civic justice, victory and peace. Both could be read as the Medici recognizing the vicissitudes of fortune and fate, and humbly acknowledging the precariousness of their position in the state.\(^{62}\)

Ottonaio’s songs for the Diamante and the Cazzuola were not, however, his only contributions to this Carnival. The Palatine chapbook which records these songs and Nardi’s *Canzona del Broncone* opens with *Perch’ogni cosa il suo proprio fin brama* as a *Canzona della Morte*. Although anonymous in the booklet, the text is ascribed to Ottonaio and the music to Alessandro Coppini (c.1460-1527) in other sixteenth-century music manuscripts.\(^{63}\) Since it shares no specific imagery with either the Broncone’s, the

\(^{62}\) See Cummings, *Maecenas and the Madrigalist*, 110-111. Cox-Rearick linked Alamanni’s *canto* to Lorenzo *il vecchio’s* poetry, in which life and death are paired in imagery of Time, Fate, Fortune’s Wheel, and regeneration. *Dynasty and Destiny*, 17. Baker read in Alamanni’s song a Lenten admonishment of fleeting human affairs paired with a carnal invitation to seize the moment, and interpreted the Third Age of maturity as presenting the Medici as capable leaders. “Medicean Metamorphoses,” 499.

Diamante’s, or the Cazzuola’s songs, *Perch’ogni cosa* has yet to be understood as part of
the 1513 festivities, but has instead been interpreted as a generic *canto carnascialesco*
which was simply appended to the other songs in the chapbook.\(^{64}\) Other than the song’s
inclusion in the Palatine pamphlet, there is no indication that a *carro della morte* was
made for the 1513 Carnival, although Coppini’s setting does indicate that at some date
Ottonaio’s *canzona* was actually performed. Following Cambi,\(^{65}\) it could have been one
of many *canti carnascialeschi* sung during Carnival, particularly as Coppini’s music is
extant. It could equally have been composed at an earlier remove, and later chosen to
introduce the other Carnival songs completely independently of its original context. If
printed after March 17, 1516, the booklet could also be understood as looking back to
these past Triumphs in light of Giuliano’s unexpected demise.\(^{66}\) The Triumph of the
Golden Age and the Triumph of the Ages of Man became themselves overcome by a
Triumph of Death, whereby the Broncone is severed, the Wheel of Time is broken, and a
New Age was not born, but extinguished. Regardless of whether or not it was actually
performed during the 1513 Carnival, the song’s inclusion in the Palatine chapbook with
the songs of the Broncone, the Diamante, and the Cazzuola, and the text appended to the
Broncone’s verses stating that the Triumphs were made for Carnival in 1512 [1513],

\(^{64}\) For example, Mozzati noted that the *Canzona della morte* could be linked to one of many macabre floats
in Florence and Tuscany on different festive occasions, noting particularly Piero di Cosimo’s *carro
della morte* which he dated to 1511. *Giovanfrancesco Rustici*, 295 and n15.

\(^{65}\) See note 40 above.

\(^{66}\) Following Shearman’s remark that Alamanni’s *Volon gli anni* “is a curiously pessimistic contrast to
Nardi’s [song] for the Broncone,” (“Pontormo and Andrea del Sarto,” 479), Mozzati noted the prescient
quality of the Diamante triumph: “quello strano trionfo, che scegliendo a tema le tre età dell’uomo,
sembra figurare, con due anni d’anticipo, il malinconico, precoce e lento dileguarsi della figura di
Giuliano dalla scena fiorentina così come da quella della vita: un saturino compianto sull’umana
caducità, la festa voluta dal figlio del Magnifico, assume nelle parole di encomio rivolte alle tre Parche,
il tono della lode di un’ età di perfezione di fronte ai tempi - acerbi o maturi, comunque incompleti -
della nascita e della morte.” *Giovanfrancesco Rustici*, 296-297.
suggest that even if the pamphlet itself was compiled and printed some years later, all
four of these songs and the paired parade floats should be interpreted together. The

_Canzona della Morte_ reads:

1. Perch’ogni cosa il suo proprio fin brama, Because everything craves its own end,
2. il fin dell’uomo è sol d’esser beato, the end of man is only of being blessed,
3. poiché ’l mondo, e chi l’ama, since the world and those who love it
   sta sempre in guerra, affanni, is always in war,
e ‘n dubbio stato:
4. ciaschedun di noi chiama each one of us call
   la fedel morte a cui virtú c’invita faithful death, to whom virtue invites us,
7. per ir morendo a piú sicura vita. through dying, to more secure life.
8. Ma questi che ’l lor fine han posto in terra, But these who have put
   cercon con un piacere morte fuggire: their end on earth,⁶⁷
9.ché chi piú nel mondo erra, seek to flee death with
   piú duole a quello in ogni etá ’l morire. pleasure,
10. Ma lei, ch’ognuno atterra, because who errs more in the world
11. segue chi fugge e chi la chiama sprezza, hurts more than the one dying
12. perché nessuno sperì in giovinezza. in any age.
13. Quei vecchi, involti ne’ vivi e nell’oro, Those old men, wrapped up
16. fuggon la morte ancor con piú paura; in living and in gold,
17. e dal mal viver loro and from their bad way of living,
18. è guasto il mondo e tutta la natura: the world failed and all nature;
19. ma chi, come costoro, but whoever, like them,
20. da noi prende onestá, fede e takes from us honesty, faith and
   e moralità.

---

⁶⁷ I.e. those already dead and buried.
⁶⁸ Singleton gives “cercon con van piacer morte fuggire” (search with vain pleasure to flee death). *Canti carnascialeschi*, 313.
⁶⁹ Singleton gives “vizi” (vices) in place of “vivi” (living). Ibid.
amore,
21. vive contento e piú contento
muore.

love,
lives happily and even more
happily dies.

22. Giovani, misurate l’etá vostra,
Youths, measure your age,
23. aprite gli occhi a tanti vizi
and deceptions,
e inganni,
because our time
24. perché la stanza nostra
to remain here numbers only a
25. ha esser qua un numer
few years:
di pochi anni:
and even if it shows you
26. e se pur vi dimostra
the world of pleasure, the
27. il mondo gaudio, il fin
end is always sad;
sempre è poi mesto:
and who loves it more, often
di pochi anni:
dies even sooner.

28. e chi piú l’ama, spesso
muor piú presto.
29. Vòlti dunque la speme
Turn, therefore, to the hope of
al ciel chi vuole
heaven, he who wants
30. bramar d’uscir della
mortal prison;
31. ché a chi la morte duole,
because, to whom death pains,
32. e perch’e gli ha di qua
he has too much
troppa affezione,
affection for it here,
33. vuolsi in fatti e ’n parole
wanting in deeds and words
34. seguir sol le virtú del ciel le
to follow only the virtues given
porte,
them of heaven,
35. e temer la giustizia e non
and to fear justice and not death.
la morte.  

The macabre imagery of the Triumph of Age is given full force in Ottonaio’s Song of Death. Both Alamanni and Ottonaio opened their songs for Giuliano’s Triumph with death soon coming to everything, then thematized death’s inevitability, and closed by admonishing the youth to not waste time. As in Ottonaio’s songs for the Diamante and the Cazzuola, Alamanni invoked cyclical time through the Ages of Man from childhood through youth to maturity and death, while also suggesting generational renewal between

70 With the exceptions of the variants found in BNCF, Palatino E.6.6.154.1.14, 1v-2r noted above, the text given here follows Singleton, Canti carnascialeschi, 312-313. Penultimate stanza translation from Prizer, “Reading Carnival,” 211.
these categories. *Perch’ogni cosa*, however, presents a more bleak perspective. Ottonaio portrays death as an escape from the warfare, troubles and insecurity of the world (vv. 3-4). Death is a desired state, even a blessing (vv. 1-2). In contrast, Alamanni, even while warning against squandering time in youth’s verdant age (vv. 52-54), highlights the joyful state of *gioventù*, which is amorous, happy, and unconcerned (vv. 15-22). In *Perch’ogni cosa*, Ottonaio presents a similar conception of the transience of youth, and that the pleasures associated with it lead to a premature and bad end (vv. 22-28), but offers no positive characterizations of that state; even youthfulness provides no escape from death (v. 14). The achievements of maturity are recast in Ottonaio’s *canto* as the vanities of the aged, which lead to a fear of death (v. 16). Whereas Alamanni chronicles life, whose finite duration reminds the living to spend their time well, Ottonaio instead chronicles death, and contrasts the failures of vice with the virtues of heaven. In *Perch’ogni cosa*, Ottonaio takes the macabre qualities inherent in the Ages of Man and exploits them. He undercuts a reading that focuses on beginnings, regeneration, and rebirth, by instead emphasizing death and burial (vv. 8 and 12), which are inescapable even in youth (v. 14). In place of the desire in *La gran memoria* for perpetuating oneself through offspring (vv. 32 and 35), one’s own end is craved in *Perch’ogni cosa* (v. 1).

A pointed critique of the 1513 festivities is likely seen in the penultimate stanza of the *Canzona della Morte*, where *giovani* are implored to “open your eyes to vices and deceptions:” a particularly resonant message for Carnival masquerades that recalls Cambi’s similar evaluation of the Triumphs.\(^7\)\(^1\) The song’s ending, to “fear justice and not death” similarly alters a reading of the chapbook’s *Canzona del Broncone*, which

\(^7\)\(^1\) See note 38 above.
emphasizes the return of truth, peace, and justice. Instead of cyclic ages turning from one to the next, the *Song of Death* reminds the listener that he exists only in the current era; instead of Nardi’s rejoicing at the restoration of justice and peace, Ottonaio states that the world is always warring, troubled, and insecure, and that justice is to be feared more than death itself (vv. 3-4 and 35). Within the song’s penitential context, the final line, “e temer la giustizia e non la morte” refers to the divine justice found after death; namely, the particular judgment of the soul’s eternal dwelling, and more specifically, the Last Judgment, when all will account for their deeds. Within the context of the 1513 Carnival, however, it is secular justice that should be feared.

The return of the Golden Age of Lorenzo was not merely the re-establishment of public festivals with lavish spectacles, but also the return of ruthless policies of fear and reprisal. Bartolommeo Cerretani evoked this double-edged quality in the discussion on the Carnival celebrations found in his *Dialogue on the Transformation of Florence*. After describing Florentines’ hostility to the Medici, which was provoked by the dissolution of the Great Council, by the Medici’s use of an unofficial government established in their family palace, and by the citizens’ deprivation of armaments, Cerretani’s Giovanni Rucellai states,

On Carnival, the 8th of February, a masquerade was done by Giuliano’s Company of the Diamond; there were more than 500 torches with cars, which was a most beautiful thing. Similarly Lorenzo, on another night, sent out a company with several triumphs and more than 400 torches; it was of such quality that it seemed to the popolo that, regarding the

---

72 BNCF, Palatino E.6.6.154.I.14, 3v-4r: “per che tu uedrai / fiorir queste uirtu dentro al tuo seno / che dal sito terreno / hauien fatto partita / lauerita smarrita / la Pace, & la iustitia hor quella hor questa / t[l’]inuiton liete insieme & ti fan festa.” The fourth stanza of Nardi’s *Colui che dà le leggi alla natura* is found in Singleton, *Canti carnascialeschi*, 251. For an English translation of the song, see Cummings, *Maecenas and the Madrigalist*, 129.
festivals, the times of Lorenzo the elder had returned, and the people were happy, filled with disregard for everything. At this point it was made known to Giuliano that some were conspiring to deprive them of life and state. [A description of the arrest, interrogation, and punishment of the conspirators follows, wherein the Archbishop of Florence, Cosimo de’ Pazzi, was implicated] ...it was not missed that many advised that the Pazzi be removed from Florence, and that these same things happened at an earlier time. Thus some others of them were confined, several to the countryside, and given fines.\(^\text{73}\)

Carnival pageantry was not the only masquerade to return from the previous Laurentian age. If the earlier Lorenzo, who likewise kept the populous content and pacified through public _feste_, was resurrected, so too were the Pazzi conspirators reincarnated in Pietro Paolo Boscoli and Agostino Capponi, who plotted to assassinate this next generation of Lorenzo and Giuliano de’ Medici.

_Terror and Reprisals: The Medicean Macabre_

Just over a week after Giuliano and Lorenzo’s triumphal displays, a conspiracy was uncovered to assassinate the Medici youths as well as the older Giovanni. A list of some twenty names composed by Pietro Paolo Boscoli (1481-1513) and Agostino Capponi (1471-1513) was misplaced and delivered to the Otto di Guardia.\(^\text{74}\) Recognizing

\(^{73}\) _Dialogo_, 52, in the voice of Giovanni Rucellai: “Il carnovale era suto alli otto dì di febbraio, et erasi per la compagnia del Diamante di Giuliano fatto una compagnia di maschere, dove fu piu che 500 torchi con carri, che fu cosa bellissima. Similmente Lorenzo un’altra notte ne mandò fuori una con alquanti trionfi e piu che 400 torchi, di qualità che il popolo / gli pareva che fussin tornati e tempi di Lorenzo Vecchio circa le feste, et stavasi allegramente quando trabocava di negligentia ogni cosa. Nel qual punto fu fatto intendere a Giuliano che alcuni si erano conguirati per torre loro la vita et lo stato.” Ibid., 53: “Nientedimanco stette cheto e non lo [Archbishop Cosimo de’ Pazzi] referì, di che hebbe gran carico; et non mancava che molti consigliavano che si levasi e Pazzi da Firenze, e che gli erano que’ medesimi del tempo passato. Così alcuni altri di loro furo confinati, alquanti in contado, et posesi fine.”

\(^{74}\) Nardi wrote that Boscoli lost the list of around 19 or 20 youths, _Istorie di Firenze_, 2:26, while Nerli stated that Capponi did so. _Commentari_, 1:196. See also Cerretani, _Dialogo_, 52-53; Cerretani, _Ricordi_, 299-300; Luca della Robbia, “Narrazione del caso di Pietro Paolo Boscoli e di Agostino Capponi (1513),” ed. Filippo Luigi Polidori, _Archivio storico italiano_ 1 (1842): 273-309; Cambi, _Istorie_, 3:5; Capponi, _Storia_, 2:311-312; Piti, _Istoria_, 117; and _Ricordanze di Bartolomeo Masi calderaiio fiorentino dal 1478 al 1526_, ed. Giuseppe Odoardo Corazzini (Florence: Sansoni, 1906), 117-118.
a collection of men closely associated with the previous Republican regime, and suspected of hostility to Medici rule, the Eight had more than a dozen citizens arrested during the night of February 18, 1513. Under torture, both Boscoli and Capponi confessed to plotting to kill the Medici, but contended that the conspiracy did not extend beyond them; the found list had names of those whom they thought might by sympathetic to their cause, only two of which – Niccolò Valori (1464-1526) and Giovanni Folchi (1475-1524) – were approached, and both firmly refused to be involved. Nonetheless, all those listed were arrested and tortured, including Niccolò Machiavelli (1469-1527). The day after the arrests, Giuliano de’ Medici wrote to Piero Dovizi da Bibbiena that the plot had little order, foundation, or end, and posed little danger to the state; furthermore, the conspirators, though of good families, were of little account and without followers.

---


76 Marino Sanudo copied Giuliano’s letter of February 19, 1513 to Dovizi in Venice. _I diarii_, vol. 15, cols. 573-574: “ Questa è per significarvi come, per gratia di Dio, essendomi pervenuto a notitia una certa pratica di alcuni maligni cittadini, che haveano di far violentia a me et a qualche cosa nostra, heri dal magistrato de magnifici signori otto furon presi, e capi e quasi tutti li altri suspicti, et per ancora non si è ritracito se non una mala intentione con poco ordine, senza fondamento o coda, et senza pericolo de lo Stato, quando fusse ben loro reuscito el disegno, che haveamo pensato fussi in su la morte di Nostro Signor et ne la absentia del reverendissimo Legato. Le qualità de li huomini di questa intelligentia sono, benchè nobili, di poco conto et men seguito; et le cose son procedute senza alteratione publica o privata, et più presto da poterne trar fructo che danno, atteso la universal unione e concorso de la cità, e maxime de’ primi parenti de’ delinquenti. Procederassi con diligentia di intender bene tutto, et assicurar lo stato de la cità et nostro, con la gratia de lo Altissimo, et di quello seguirà ne darò adviso.” The letter is followed by 12 names – “Nicolò Valori, Agostino Capponi, Pietro Paolo Boscoli, Giovanni Folchi, Lodovico de Nobili, Francesco Serragli, Nicolò de missier Bernardo Machiavelli, Andrea Marsuppini, Piero Orlandini, Daniele Stroz[zi], Cechotto Tosinghi, El prete de’ Martini” – presumably the dozen men arrested by the Otto referred to in Lippomano’s accompanying report, ibid., col. 573. Giuliano’s subsequent letter to Dovizi of March 7th reaffirms the unorganized, inchoate nature of the “conspiracy.” Ibid., vol. 16, col. 26: “Erano i capi di questa intelligentia Agostino Capponi e Pietro Pagolo Boscoli, giovani, benchè di buona casa, senza reputatione o seguito, o facoltà, et havien conferito più volte insieme di levare da terra, consentito et deputato el luogo et facto una lista di parecchi giovani che credevano fussin malcontenti di noi, et andaronli tentandoli.” Both letters are reproduced in in Villari, _Niccolò Machiavelli_, 2:553-556, docs. XVIII-XIX.
Nonetheless, Boscoli and Capponi were beheaded on February 23rd. Valori, condemned to a two-year imprisonment in Volterra’s dungeons, followed by lifetime exile to Città di Castello, described his sentence as “a most cruel and iniquitous judgment.” Of the remaining suspects, those found to have had some participation in the conspiracy were confined to the state, while those found innocent were released from prison with a fine.

Particularly relevant for the men of the Cazzuola was the experience of their affiliate Machiavelli in this affair. The seventh name on the Boscoli-Capponi list, friend

77 Valori writes in his ricordanze, “Et dua ne furono decapitati cioè Pietropaolo Boscoli et Agostino Capponi. Di me si fece uno crudelissimo et iniquo iudicio che per dua anni fui confinato nel fondo della torre di Volterra et per sempre a Città di Castello.” Cited in Catherine M. Kovesi, “Niccolò Valori and the Medici Restoration of 1512: Politics, Eulogies and the Preservation of a Family Myth,” Rinascimento 27 (1987): 314. Valori, along with the surviving conspirators, had his sentence commuted on April 4, 1513 as part of the general amnesty given upon the election of Giovanni de’ Medici as Pope Leo X. Although Piero Parenti named Valori as one of the heads of the conspiracy, along with Boscoli and Capponi, Valori escaped their fate through the intercession of his nephew Bartolomeo, who played a key role the downfall of the Soderini government, and of Luca della Robbia, who arranged to have the sections of Boscoli’s confession implicating Valori redacted. See Nardi, Istorie, 2:27-28. See also Jurdjevic, Guardians of Republicanism, 96-123.

78 In Giuliano’s letter to Dovizi of March 7, 1513, he wrote that Capponi and Boscoli were executed; Valori and Folchi were imprisoned in Volterra for two years; and “Alcuni altri per aver qualche partecipazione, come Francesco Seragli, Pandolpho Biliotti, Dutio [Buccio] Adimari, Ubertino Bonciani, son confinati per parecchi anni nel contado in diversi luogi; li altri, che non erano in dolo, son relassati a buon sodamento.” Sanudo, I diarii, vol. 16, col. 26. Nerli stated that Valori and Folchi were confined to the tower of Volterra; Machiavelli was imprisoned in Florence; Piero Orlandini, Daniele Strozzi, Buccio Adimari, Andrea Marsuppini and “gli altri disegnati e scritti sulla lista del Capponi e del Boscoli senza loro scienza per valersene nell’esecuzione della loro congiura, furono licenziati, aspettando nel resto il ritorno di Roma del Cardinale, per poter poi, occurrendo, meglio ritrovare i fondamenti della congiura sopradetta.” Commentari, 1:197. Cerretani stated that Boscoli and Capponi were killed; Valori and Folchi were confined to the tower in Volterra; Adimari, Giovanni de’ Nobili, and Serragli were exiled; Machiavelli was jailed in the Stinche; and that others were also jailed, presumably Orlandini, Strozzi, and Marsuppini. Ricordi, 299.

79 Although Vasari did not name Machiavelli as one of the company’s members, his affiliation with the group is suggested by the multiple, overlapping points of contact with several of the Trowel’s cohort, as well as by the Cazzuola’s staging of the inaugural performance of Machiavelli’s Clizia in the home of his friend, Jacopo di Filippo Falconetti, in 1525, and by the group’s performance of his Mandragola at the residence of the Cazzuola’s Bernardino di Giordano c. 1524/1525. See Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:395, Life of Aristotile da San Gallo, and 5:486, Life of Giovanfrancesco Rustici. Through one of Falconetti’s dinner parties, Machiavelli met Barbara Raffacani Salutati, his mistress, whose portrait was painted by the Paiuolo’s Domenico Puligo, who also painted two teste for Falconetti in 1524. See Louis Alexander Waldman, “Puligo and Jacopo di Filippo Fornaciaio: Two Unrecorded Paintings of 1524,” Source 18, (1999): 25-27. Rustici, who belonged to both the Cazzuola and to the Paiuolo, rented to a courtesan called “Barbara” who was likely Salutati. See Waldman, “The Date of Rustici’s ‘Madonna’
to Valori and Folchi, and the former Secretary of the Signoria in the Soderini Republic, Machiavelli was imprisoned for 22 days and endured six drops on the strappado: the torture device for dislocating and rending limbs favored by the Florentines.\(^8\) Under similar conditions, Folchi revealed the reason for such treatment: “...[Machiavelli] said that it appeared to him that this regime would not be governed without difficulty, because it lacked someone to stand at the tiller, as Lorenzo de’ Medici had properly done so.”\(^8\)

Machiavelli’s experience was not unique; letters and chronicles of the period are replete with examples of the arrests, torture, and executions of those who publically disparaged or criticized the Medici. In his entry prior to the arrest of the supposed Boscoli-Capponi conspirators, Luca Landucci recorded that on January 24, 1513, the Otto banished Piero, a mace-bearer, for 5 years to Livorno, after depriving him of office and torturing him on the rack, “because he was supposed to have spoken ill of the government, and that is possible, for he was a foolish man, and apt to chatter

---


thoughtlessly, criticizing the citizens without intending any harm.”82 Along with Piero, Alessandro d’Andrea di Manetto, Martino di Francesco dello Scarfa, and six minor officials of government ceremonial were likewise exiled for “certain words said against the state.”83 In September 1513, Francesco del Pugliese was likewise banished for 10 years, “for having used some disrespectful words about the house of Medici;”84 namely for calling the young Lorenzo de’ Medici, instead of “Lorenzo the Magnificent,” a “Magnificent Shit.”85 In 1516, Goro Gheri advocated that an example be made of


83 Landucci records Scarfa along with Piero. Ibid., 334. Cerretani, Ricordi, 298, editor’s parentheses: “Gl’otto per certte parole dicte contro a lo stato confinorno Martino di Franc(es)c(o) Scharffi per cinque anni nella podesteria d’Empoli et Montelupo et condannorollo in fiorini 3 mila paghandone fiorini 1500; et confinorno Alessandro d’Andrea di Manetto nella podesteria di Barberino per cinque anni et amunito per dieci et tornare colle otto fave, et chassossi uno mazziere et 6 tavollacini.” Scarfa was freed in the general amnesty given after the election of Leo X. Ibid., 301. According to David Rosenthal, a tavolaccino is “uno dei donzelli da cerimonia del governo, era essenzialmente composto di lavoratori tessili.” “Il carnevale e le politiche di pace nella Firenze del Cinquecento,” in Collection de l’Ecole française de Rome 404 (2008): 161-162.

84 Landucci, Diary, 271. Landucci, Diario, 341: “E a di 18 di settenbre í 1513, fu confinato Francesco Del Pugliese per 10 anni, che non potessi appressarsi a Firenze a due miglia, perchè aveva isparlato della Casa de’ Medici, d’alcune parole.” See also Cerretani, Ricordi, 310, editor’s brackets and parentheses: “Fessi la nuova signoria, ghonfaloniere Averaddo di Bern(ardo) de Medici, et fessi gl’otto di balìa e quali confinorno Franc(es)c(o) del Pugl[i]ese per 10 anni, per havere sparlato dello stato, con non potere tornare se non con otto fave nere.” Additional examples are given in Stephens, Fall of the Florentine Republic, 119: Francesco del Pugliese and Francesco di Marco Marchi (1513), Bartolomeo di Pandolfino (1514), Larione Buonguglielmi (1515), Giovanni Buoncompagni (1517), and the tinker Andrea di Simone (after 1512). This is not to mention the reprisals against proponents of Savonarola, or against preachers of renovation prophecies. See Ibid., 77-79.

Giovanni Rinuccini, who would refer to 1512, the year of the Medici return, as “the year I died.”

When understood as a retrospective counter-narrative, the Palatine chapbook’s integration of Ottonaiò’s *Canzona della Morte* gives a deadly re-reading of the narratives of renewal and regeneration found in the subsequent texts for the Medici’s *trionfi*. Instead of a return of the era of peace, justice, and virtue promised by the Medici’s Triumphs, the swift and brutal retaliation meted out to murmurers against the regime in the immediate aftermath of the Carnival’s *feste* characterizes a returned era of fear, suspicion, and distrust. Albeit more obliquely than Vasari’s bald parenthetical of the baker’s boy, Ottonaiò’s *canto* recasts the Medici’s heroic self-fashioning by associating dynasty with death, destiny with imposition, and Fate with fraud. In the banquets hosted by the Companies of the Cauldron and of the Trowel, the macabre similarly comprises a poetics of dissent.

*The Company of the Cauldron*

In 1568, Giorgio Vasari published his revised and expanded *Lives of the Most Eminent Architects, Painters, and Sculptors*, in which the *Vita* of sculptor Giovanfrancesco Rustici newly appeared. Near the end of the biography, Vasari included an *excursus* on the antics of two brigades of *galantuomini*: the Companies of the Cauldron (Paiuolo), and of the Trowel (Cazzuola). The Compagnia del Paiuolo, “whose numbers were limited to twelve,” created lavish dinners and entertainments structured

---

around a central theme. Vasari’s narrative begins with the Paiuolo’s membership, which was comprised of a single merchant and 11 artists. They are: the sculptor Giovanfrancesco di Bartolommeo di Marco Rustici (1475-1554); his apprentice, the painter and sculptor Lorenzo Naldini, “il Guzzetto” (d. 1568), who accompanied the sculptor to France in 1528; Rustici’s “disciple,” the painter Ruberto di Filippo Lippi (1500-1574), who was the company’s administrator (proveditore); Rustici’s “dearest friend, who managed all his affairs,” the merchant Niccolò di Piero Boni (1490-1566), whose father was the natural-born son of the Florentine patrician Bernardo di Ambruogi; his painter friends Francesco di Pellegrino (d. 1552) and Andrea del Sarto (1486-1530); Sarto’s brother, the painter Francesco d’Agnolo Lanfranchi, “il Spillo” (1492-1558); Sarto’s student, Antonio di Giovanni da Settignano, “il Solosmeo” (fl. 1517-1540); the painter Domenico di Bartolomeo di Domenico degli Ubaldini, “il Puligo” (1492-1527); the goldsmith, sculptor, and engraver Cristofano di Girolamo del Ruchetta, “il Robetta;” the architect, painter, and set-designer Bastiano di Lorenzo d’Antonio da San Gallo, “il

87 Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:481: “Si ragunava nelle sue stanze della Sapienza una brigata di galantuomini che si chiamavano la compagnia del Paiuolo, e non potevano essere più che dodici: e questi erano esso Giovanfrancesco, Andrea del Sarto, Spillo pittore, Domenico Puligo, il Robetta orafa, Aristotile da San Gallo, Francesco di Pellegrino, Niccolò Boni, Domenico Baccelli, che sonava e cantava ottimamente, il Solosmeo scultore, Lorenzo detto Guazzetto e Ruberto di Filippo Lippi pittore, il quale era loro proveditore; ciascuno de’ quali dodici a certe loro cene e passatempi poteva menare quattro e non più. E l’ordine delle cene era questo (il che racconto volentieri, perché è quasi del tutto dismesso l’uso di queste Compagnie), che ciascuno si portasse alcuna cosa da cena, fatta con qualche bella invenzione, la quale, giunto al luogo, presentava al signore, che sempre era un di loro, il quale la dava a chi più gli piaceva, scambiando la cena d’uno con quella dell’altro. Quando erano poi a tavola, presentandosi l’un l’altro, ciascuno avea d’ogni cosa, e chi si fusse riscontrato nell’invenzione della sua cena con un altro, e fatto una cosa medesima, era condennato.” For Franciabigio’s likely membership in the Paiuolo, see Wellen, “La Guerra de’ Topi e de’ Ranocchi,” 181-132. Mozzati dated the founding to c. 1511 when Andrea del Sarto moved his workshop into the Sapienza. Giovanfrancesco Rustici, 221.

88 For his dates, see Alessandro Nesi, Francesco d’Agnolo Lanfranchi detto Ser Spillo (1492-1558), fratello di Andrea del Sarto (Florence: Maniera, 2016), 7, where he also gives the identification of this Spillo with the Francesco d’Agnolo di Francesco sarto born August 24, 1492 in the parish of Santa Maria Novella, and 16 for the notice of his death on February 8, 1558 and burial in San Giovanni dei Fiorentini, Rome.
Aristotile” (1481-1551); and the woodworker Domenico di Francesco Baccelli (fl. 1517-1521), “who played and sang divinely.”

Vasari next recounts a feast presided over by Rustici, for which each member was required to bring a dish complementing the onomastic cauldron.

One evening, then, when Giovanfrancesco gave a supper to that Company of the Cauldron, he arranged that there should serve as a table an immense cauldron made with a vat, within which they all sat, and it appeared as if they were in the water of the cauldron, in the centre of which came the viands arranged in a circle; and the handle of the cauldron, which curved like a crescent above them, gave out a most beautiful light from the centre, so that, looking round, they all saw each other face to face. Now, when they were all seated at table in the cauldron, which was most beautifully contrived, there issued from the centre a tree with many branches, which set before them the supper, that is, the first course of viands, two to each plate. This done, it descended once more below, where there were persons who played music, and in a short time came up again and presented the second course, and then the third, and so on in due order, while all around were servants who poured out the choicest wines. The invention of the cauldron, which was beautifully adorned with hangings and pictures, was much extolled by the men of that company.
The Aretine then described five of the culinary inventions. The first, by Rustici, demonstrated the use of a cauldron: a capon-Ulysses plunged his father into the pastry-pot in order to reinvigorate him. Next, Andrea del Sarto re-imagined the cauldron as an architectural space. The artist conceptually doubled the large vessel as both an octagonal baptistery and as a centralized choir in which he placed a chorus of poultry singers. The final three creations all revolved around the kettle’s continued upkeep. Spillo presented a smith “to mend the cauldron,” which was fashioned out of a goose. Domenico Puligo created a scullery-maid out of pig, “to scour the cauldron;” and Robetta offered an anvil “for maintenance of the cauldron” which he fabricated from a calf’s head.91 Vasari then ends his commentary on the Paiuolo by praising Robetta’s anvil “which was very fine and very beautiful, as were also all the other contributions; not to enumerate one by one all the dishes of that supper and of many others that they gave.”92

These dishes were ingenious and humorous elaborations of amiable and highly talented artists, and demonstrations of their makers’ skill, wit, and inventiveness. The first two offerings distinguished themselves from the others’ more utilitarian themes by taking a poetic approach to the cauldron as the site of physical and spiritual renewal; Rustici presented an all’antica rejuvenation, while Sarto’s Baptistry associated the cauldron with the sacrament.

Vasari records the first dish created for the Paiuolo’s supper as:

91 Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:482: “Spillo presentò per la sua cena un magnano, il quale avea fatto d’una grande oca, o altro uccello simile, con tutti gl’instrumenti da potere racconciare, bisogna, il paiuolo. Domenico Puligo d’una porchetta cotta fece una fante con la rocca da filare allato, la quale guardava una covata di pulcini, et aveva a servire per rigovernare il paiuolo. Il Robetta per conservare il paiuolo fece d’una testa di vitella, con acconcime d’altri untumi, un’incudine, che fu molto bello e buono....”
92 Vasari-De Vere, 8:120. Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:482: “…come anche furono gl’altri presenti, per non dire di tutti a uno a uno di quella cena e di molte altre che ne feciono.”
For that evening the contribution of Rustici was a cauldron in the form of a pie, in which Ulysses was immersing his father in order to make him young again; which two figures were boiled capons that had the form of men, so well were the limbs arranged, and all with various things good to eat.93

The rejuvenation of Laertes is twice described by Homer in his *Odyssey*, and is accomplished in both instances through the agency of Pallas Athena. The goddess’s first intervention came shortly after Ulysses revealed himself to his father. While Ulysses prepares a feast with Telemachus, Laertes is bathed by his Sicilian maid who anointed him with oil and wrapped him in a cloak. Athena then renews his limbs, making Laertes appear wider and taller, which causes his son to wonder at Laertes’s godlike form.94 Shortly thereafter, Athena enabled Laertes to defend his son and grandson against the attacking fathers of Penelope’s slain suitors by breathing “great might into Laertes.”95 Rustici specifically eschews the classical prototype in order to craft a novel invention of the liquid-filled cauldron as both a means of renewing the body and of denaturing its flesh.

Rustici’s classical figures and their material composition demonstrate the cauldron’s dual roles. Laertes, whose aging form was ostensibly being rejuvenated in the

---

93 Vasari-De Vere, 8:120. Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:481-482: “In questa tornata, il presente del Rustico fu una caldaia fatta di pasticcio, dentro alla quale Ulisse tuffava il padre per farlo ringiovanire: le quali due figure erano capponi lessi che avevano forma d’uomini, si bene erano acconci le membra et il tutto con diverse cose tutte buone a mangiare.”

94 Homer, *Odisssea*, trans. Raffaele Maffei (Rome: Giacomo Mazzocchi, 1510), unpaginated, 24.365-374: “Tunc Laertem suae domi sicula famula lauit, ac oleo unxit, laena deinde pulchra induit: Minerua uero prope adstans membra corpusque illi reconcinuait ac curauit, procerioraque ac latiora ut apparerent efficit. Ex lauacro itaque processit quem filius euntem ac Dis adspectu similem existentem admirans sic est allocutus, O pater te certe deorum aliquis et forma et magnitudine maiorem uideri dedit.” Both the Greek and the Latin translation are clear that Athena restored Laertes after he had left the water and clothed himself. The bath scene was identified by Sénéchal as the source for Rustici’s invention. *Giovan Francesco Rustici*, 134.

vat, was fashioned out of poached (*lessi*) capons, which had therefore simmered in a similar *paiuolo*. The diners themselves also doubled this play between cooked meat and restored flesh. In a seemingly theatrical re-enactment of Laertes’s reinvigoration, the Paiuolo guests sat inside a large pot, “as if they were in the water of the cauldron.”

While seemingly immersed, the diners consumed and became the very invention they reprised through dismembering and eating the capon-figures of Laertes and Ulysses. Poultry was butchered, blanched, and given the form of men; this avian flesh was then rent anew by the Paiuolo’s companions who masticated human-shaped viands while they themselves were being fictively boiled. The supper guests themselves can therefore be considered both stewed meats, and, through their partaking of the nourishing foodstuffs, also re-invigorated. Unlike Laertes, however, the source of the diners’ revitalization was not their immersion, but their cannibalistic consumption. A similarly transgressive doubling also features in Sarto’s subsequent invention:

Andrea del Sarto presented an octagonal temple, similar to that of S. Giovanni, but raised upon columns. The pavement was a vast plate of jelly, with a pattern of mosaic in various colours; the columns, which had the appearance of porphyry, were sausages, long and thick; the socles and capitals were of Parmesan cheese; the cornices of sugar, and the tribune was made of sections of marchpane. In the centre was a choir-desk made of cold veal, with a book of lasagne that had the letters and notes of the music made of pepper-corns; and the singers at the desk were cooked thrushes standing with their beaks open, and with certain little shirts after the manner of surplices, made of fine cauls of pigs, and behind them, for the basses, were two fat young pigeons, with six ortolans that sang the soprano.

---

96 Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:481: “...dentro al quale stavano tutti, e pareva che fussino nell’acqua della caldaia.” Perhaps of interest is a 1502-1504 inventory, in which a cauldron is listed in among the props owned by the Confraternity of the Purification for use in staging *sacre rappresentazioni*, though it cannot be associated with any of the Purification’s surviving plays. Polizzotto, *Children of the Promise*, 81n83.

97 Vasari-De Vere, 8:120. Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:482: “Andrea del Sarto presentò un tempio a otto
Sarto’s conceptualization of the cauldron as the Baptistery’s round choir reflects on and ennobles the function of the humble cooking pot. A round receptacle containing liquid which nourishes the body is not unlike the baptismal font, whose holy waters refresh the soul. Sarto’s sacral invention also rivals Rustici’s classical offering; while Rustici’s cauldron gives physical revivification, Sarto’s baptistery provides spiritual, and hence an eternal, rebirth.

This is not to say that Sarto’s sacramental subject is without satire, however. By creating an edible San Giovanni, Andrea alludes to baptism while parodying its divine associations. Unlike catechumens, Sarto’s priests were not reborn, but rather redressed and consumed. His edible representations of the Baptistery’s renowned professional singers further heighten the invention’s mordant wit, as two of their performers, the soprano Ser Raffaello del Beccaio and the contralto Ser Bernardo Pisano, were Sarto’s companions in the Compagnia della Cazzuola, and perhaps, even invited guests at the Piauolo’s banquet.

---


99 Raffaello is listed among the singers of San Giovanni in 1510. See ibid., 9, and 39-40, doc. 5. See also the biography in Mozzati, *Giovanfrancesco Rustici*, 388-389. Raffaello was also likely the singer, who, along with “il Giocondo” and a Ser Cecchino, who was perhaps the Cazzuola’s Ser Cecchino de’ Profumi, sang in Filippo Strozzi’s *mascherata* of *Dovizia* for Carnival in 1506. See D’Accone, “Alessandro Coppini and Bartolomeo degli Organi,” 52 and 76, doc. 12; and Prizer, “Reading Carnival,” 200. From the fall of 1511 until roughly 1513, Bernardo was a singer in the chapels of the Duomo, where he became master of the chapel by October 22, 1512, and of the Baptistery. See Frank A. D’Accone, “Bernardo Pisano: An Introduction to his Life and Works,” *Musica disciplina* 17 (1963): 146.
The subversive quality of Sarto’s invention is reinforced by his choice of construction material; the columnar sausage is the same meat which spurred a literary genre of burlesque poetry “in praise of the sausage.” Wolf-Dietrich Löhr and Sanne Wellen have rightly linked Sarto’s Baptistery invention to the poetic parodies of Francesco Berni and his Roman circle in the 1530s, and to those of the Florentine Antonfrancesco Grazzini, whose satirical *Lezione di maestro Niccodemo sopra il Capitolo della salsiccia* (1539-1545) describes a purported painting by Masaccio of Carnival crowned with liver and garlanded with sausage that Sarto supposedly copied.100 When read in a burlesque register, Sarto’s invention offers a decidedly carnal resurrection of the flesh. The genre’s equivocal language of birds and sausages, as well as of parmesan, gelatin, and veal, as sexual euphemisms also applies to the *paiuolo*, whose rounded form recalls the buttocks. As a container for liquid, the cauldron was also associated with female genitals.101 In a burlesque key, the spiritual regeneration of baptism and the physical rejuvenation of Ulysses’s cauldron are scurrilously recast in

120-121. Vasari stated that each Paiuolo member could invite up to four guests. Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:481: “ciascuno de’ quali dodici a certe loro cene e passatempi poteva menare quattro e non più.”


101 Jean Toscan, *Carnaval du langage: Le lexique érotique des poètes de l’équivoque de Burchiello à Marino (XVe-XVIIe siècles)* (Lille: Presse de l’Université de Lille, 1981), 3:1414-1415. See also Valter Boggione and Giovanni Casalegno, eds., *Dizionario storico del lessico erotico italiano: Metafore, eufemismi, oscenità, doppi sensi, parole dotte e parole basse in otto secoli di letteratura italiana* (Milan: Longanesi, 1996), 530 for the buttocks in Michele da Prato’s “Canzonà d’acconciatori di catini, secchioni, padelle e paiuoli,” and 383 for examples of *paiuoli* as female genitals. For gelatin and veal, see ibid., 565 and 453. For birds as sexual euphemisms, see also Allen J. Grieco, “From Roosters to Cocks: Italian Renaissance Fowl and Sexuality,” in *Erotic Cultures of Renaissance Italy*, ed. Sara F. Matthews-Grieco (Burlington: Ashgate, 2010), 89-140.
terms of sexual pleasure in an irreverent humor which will be repeated in the Company of the Trowel’s own ribald feasts.

Poetics of the Paiuolo

Vasari’s careful detailing of the transformed foodstuffs in the Paiuolo’s dishes reveals a clever play between the material ingredients and their representations. To create singers, Sarto used songbirds, with thrushes serving as tenors, basses formed of low-cooing pigeons, and sopranos from tiny, high-pitched ortolans. The male homunculi were all created from poultry, which was both a relatively expensive and refined meat, as well as a euphemism for the male sex organ (uccello). The only female figure at the banquet, Puligo’s scullery maid, was fashioned out of a piglet, whose base flesh reflected her servile status and her gender. Pork was the lowest of the meats in terms of price and epistemology, and was well below the waterfowl which formed Spillo’s goose-smith. The choice of viands also mirrors Vasari’s own evaluation of the artists. Rustici and Sarto’s inventions receive the longest descriptions and praise in the Vita, while Spillo, Puligo, and Robetta are each accorded a single sentence of brief description. Similarly, Rustici and Sarto receive individual biographies in the Lives, in which Sarto’s is among

102 See Allen J. Greco, “Food and Social Classes in Late Medieval and Renaissance Italy,” in Food: A Culinary History from Antiquity to the Present, eds. Jean-Louis Flandrin and Massimo Montanari (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 302-312, who argued that foodstuffs were hierarchically ordered based on the “Great Chain of Being,” in which flying birds are nobler than earth-bound quadrupeds, whose terrestrial habitat makes them in turn more refined than water-dwelling fish. Thus for the 1466 marriage of Nannina de’ Medici to Bernardo Rucellai, poultry was reserved for the most important guests, while veal was given to those visiting from their country properties. Social status was likewise demonstrated by a Florentine notary’s response to a rich merchant’s gift of partridges; the birds, which were required victuals at the table of the officials of Florence’s Signoria, were inappropriately lavish when he is no longer in office. Ibid., 311 and 305.

103 Pork was the cheapest meat and the one most associated with the lower classes, especially the peasant. See ibid., 311. In humoral theory, pork and women are both considered humid. Pork was also particularly associated with gluttony. See Ken Albala, Eating Right in the Renaissance (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 181 and 68.
the lengthiest, while Spillo and Robetta are mentioned only in the Paiuolo dinner’s few lines. Although Puligo receives an independent biography, Vasari uses the painter as a negative exemplar. He condemns Puligo’s merry lifestyle, and, in particular, his amorous activities to which Vasari ascribes the painter’s death, having “caught the plague at the house of his mistress.”104 Puligo’s pork-maid, which presents crude meat in female form, and which salaciously serves to “rejuvenate” the cauldron (*aveva a servire per rigovernare il paiuolo*), thus both suggests and reproaches the painter’s insatiable lust.

This mirroring between the artist and his creation characterizes the entire banquet. In its primary function, the *paiuolo* is a cooking vessel, which leeches the vigor and vitality of raw ingredients with heat. Rustici and Sarto ironically reversed this purpose with inventions which notionally revitalize and rejuvenate flesh and spirit, but which also equate the diners with the very foodstuffs they are about to consume. Rustici’s capon—“Ulysses” and “Laertes,” Sarto’s avian choir, and Puligo’s pork serving-girl were all dismembered anew; the artists masticated these avatars even as they themselves reduced into cooked meat, which was the raw material for their confections.

The conceit of the cauldron also carries an infernal quality. In addition to evoking bawdy humor and cannibalistic horror, the stewing diners also re-enacted the punishment of hell. As seen, for example, in Fra Angelico’s *Last Judgment* for Santa Maria degli

---

104 Vasari-De Vere, 4:283. Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 4:252, 1568 edition: “...per che praticando con persone allegre e di buon tempo e con musici e con femmine, seguitando certi suoi amori, si mori d’anni cinquantadue, l’anno MDXXVII, per avere presa la peste in casa d’una sua innamorata.” This later edition adds “persone di buon tempo” – perhaps his fellow Paiuolo members – among the happy folk, musicians, and women who proved to be his downfall. The 1550 edition instead reads, “...praticava con persone allegre e con musici, alcune femmine e certi suoi amori seguendo. E però venendo la peste l’anno MDXXVII, praticando in casa alcune sue innamorate, da esse ne guadagnò la peste e la morte; e da uno amico poi questo distico: ESSE ANIMUM NOBIS COELESTI E SEMINE ET AURA / HIC PINGENS, PASSIM CREDITA, VERA DOCET.” Ibid., 4:252. For Vasari’s critical portrayal of Puligo, see Wellen, “Andrea del Sarto in Vasari’s Lives,” 149.
Angeli (c. 1432-1433, now in San Marco, figs. 85-86), the damned, like meats they consumed in life, are consigned to hell’s cook pot. In his engraving after the altarpiece (c. 1470-1485, figs. 87-88), Francesco Rosselli specifies that the seething *paiuolo* is reserved for the sin of envy (*invidia*).\(^{105}\) Rustici’s placement of his fellow artists in envy’s cauldron further reveals the macabre humor of a company whose festivities were based on rivalry and competition, as their “ordine” condemned whomever repeated the same invention as another member’s.\(^{106}\)

The cauldron, which is simultaneously both an instrument of rejuvenation and a tool of denaturation, recalls the similar paradox of both life and death instantiated in the regenerative skulls found on Soderini’s tomb. The similar poetics used to counter the Medici’s 1513 Carnival *trionfi* suggests that among the targets of the Paiuolo’s parody were the Medici. Macabre themes were further developed in banquets given by the brotherhood of the Trowel, which Vasari subsequently narrated, and for which the Paiuolo’s transgressive feast served as an ominous forbearer.

*The Company of the Trowel*

Similar feasts to the Paiuolo’s were held by the Compagnia della Cazzuola, whose origins in a juvenile practical joke are recorded by Vasari.

---


\(^{106}\) Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:481: “E l’ordine delle cene era questo (il che racconto volentieri, perché è quasi del tutto dismesso l’uso di queste Compagnie), che ciascuno si portasse alcuna cosa da cena, fatta con qualche bella invenzione, la quale, giunto al luogo, presentava al signore, che sempre era un di loro, il quale la dava a chi più gli piaceva, scambiando la cena d’uno con quella dell’altro. Quando erano poi a tavola, presentandosi l’un l’altro, ciascuno avea d’ogni cosa, e chi si fusse riscontrato nell’invenzione della sua cena con un altro, e fatto una cosa medesima, era condennato.”
The Company of the Cazzuola, which was similar to the other [the Paiuolo], and to which Giovan Francesco belonged, had its origin in the following manner. One evening in the year 1512 there were at supper in the garden that Feo d’Agnolo the hunchback, a fife-player and a very merry fellow, had in the Campaccio, with Feo himself, Ser Bastiano Sagginati, Ser Raffaello del Beccaiio, Ser Cecchino de’ Profumi, Girolamo del Giocondo, and Il Baia, and, while they were eating their ricotta, the eyes of Baia fell on a heap of lime with the trowel sticking in it, just as the mason had left it the day before, by the side of the table in a corner of the garden. Whereupon, taking some of the lime with that trowel, or rather, mason’s trowel, he dropped it all into the mouth of Feo, who was waiting with gaping jaws for a great mouthful of ricotta from another of the company. Which seeing, they all began to shout: “A Trowel, a Trowel!” That Company being then formed by reason of that incident, it was ordained that its members should be in all twenty-four, twelve of those who, as the phrase was in those times, were “going for the Great,” and twelve of those who were “going for the Less;” and that its emblem should be a trowel, to which they added afterwards those little black tadpoles that have a large head and a tail, which are called in Tuscany, “cazzuole.”

Much of the humor of the company’s foundation centers on the sexual euphemism created by ambivalent language. The double signification of cazzuola as both a mason’s trowel and a soup ladle registers the company’s blend of artistic and culinary endeavors. The cazzuola, whether as a ladle or a trowel, was also a euphemism for the penis, which thereby originates the Company of the Trowel in an obscene prank. The group’s

107 Vasari-De Vere, 8:121. Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:482-483: “La Compagnia poi della Cazzuola, che fu simile a questa e della quale fu Giovanfrancesco, ebbe principio in questo modo. Essendo l’anno 1512 una sera a cena, nell’orto che aveva nel Campaccio Feo d’Agnolo gobbo, sonatore di pifferi e persona molto piacevole, esso Feo, ser Bastiano Sagginati, ser Raffaello del Beccaiio, ser Cecchino de’ Profumi, Girolamo del Giocondo et il Baia, venne veduto, mentre che si mangiavano le ricotte, al Baia in un canto dell’orto appresso alla tavola un monticello di calcina, dentrovi la cazzuola, secondo che il giorno inanzi l’aveva quivi lasciata un muratore. Per che preso con quella mestola overo cazzuola alquanto di quella calcina, la cacciò tutta in bocca a Feo, che da un altro aspettava a bocca aperta un gran boccone di ricotta; il che vedendo la brigata, si cominciò a gridare: ‘Cazzuola, cazzuola!’ Creandosi dunque per questo accidente la detta Compagnia, fu ordinato che in tutto gl’uomini di quella fussero ventiquattro: dodici di quelli che andavano, come in que’ tempi si diceva, per la maggiore, e dodici per la minore; e che l’insegna di quella fusse una cazzuola, alla quale aggiunsero poi quelle botticine nere che hanno il capo grosso e la coda, le quali si chiamano in Toscana cazzuole.”

ongoing appreciation for this erotic and transgressive humor is demonstrated in the Cazzuola’s second banquet, which can equally be read in a burlesque key.

After describing the Cazzuola’s membership and inaugural masquerade, both of which are analyzed below, Vasari narrates the feast of the masons, performed under the auspices of Giuliano Bugiardini and of Giovanfrancesco Rustici.

At another repast, which was arranged by the same Bugiardini and by Giovanfrancesco Rustici, the men of the Company appeared, as the master had commanded, all in the dress of masons and their labourers; that is, those who were “going for the Great” had the trowel with the cutting edge and hammer in their girdles, and those “going for the Less” were dressed as labourers with the hod, the levers for moving weights, and in their girdles the ordinary trowel. When all had arrived in the first room, the lord of the feast showed them the ground-plan of an edifice that had to be built by the company, and placed the master-masons at table around it; and then the labourers began to carry up the materials for making the foundations – hods full of cooked lasagne and ricotta prepared with sugar for mortar, sand made of cheese, spices, and pepper mixed together, and for gravel large sweetmeats and pieces of berlingozzo. The wall-bricks, paving-bricks, and tiles, which were brought in baskets and hand-barrowes, were loaves of bread and flat cakes. A basement having then come up, it appeared to the stone-cutters that it had not been executed and put together well enough, and they judged that it would be a good thing to break it and take it to pieces; whereupon, having set upon it and found it all composed of pastry, pieces of liver, and other suchlike things, they feasted on these, which were placed before them by the labourers. Next, the same labourers having come on the scene with a great column swathed with the cooked tripe of calves, it was taken to pieces, and after distributing the boiled veal, capons, and other things of which it was composed, they eat the base of Parmesan cheese and the capital, which was made in a marvellous manner of pieces carved from roasted capons and slices of veal, with a crown of tongues. But why do I dally over describing all the details? After the column, there was brought up on a car a very ingenious piece of architrave with frieze and cornice, composed in like manner so well and of so many different viands, that to attempt to describe them all would make too long a story. Enough that when the time came to break up, after many peals of thunder an artificial rain began to fall, and all left the work and fled, each one going to his own house.109

109 Vasari-De Vere, 8:123. Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:483-484: “A un altro pasto, che fu ordinato dal
At the banquet, the scurrilous humor which characterized the company’s founding is reiterated. As also seen in the Paiuolo inventions, foodstuffs and kitchen implements frequently feature in the coded language of burlesque verse. Bugiardini and Rustici’s invention is itself the subject of Cazzuola-member Jacopo da Bientina’s Carnival song, *Canto de’ muratori*, where both workman’s tools – trowel (*cazzuola*) and hammer (*martellina*) – and actions – plugging cracks (*turando ogni fesso*) – are given sexual subtexts. As Tommaso Mozzati argued, the close parallels between Bientina’s *canto* and Vasari’s text, including the differentiation of masons (*muratori*) and laborers (*manovali*) through their work and tools, and the removal of broken building fragments, suggest that Bientina’s song derived from the dinner’s invention, and was perhaps
detto Bugiardino e da Giovanfrancesco Rustici, comparsero gl’uomini della Compagnia, si come avea il signor ordinato, tutti in abito di muratori e manovali: cioè, quelli che andavano per la maggiore, con la cazzuola che tagliasse et il martello a cintola, e quegli che per la minore vestiti da manovali col vassoio e manovelle da far lieva, e la cazzuola sola a cintola. Et arrivati tutti nella prima stanza, avendo loro mostrato il signore la pianta d’uno edificio che si aveva da murare per la Compagnia, e dintorno a quello messo a tavola i maestri, i manovali cominciarono a portare le materie per fare il fondamento: cioè vassoi pieni di lasagne cotte, per calcina, e ricotte acconce col zucchero; rena fatta di cacio, spezie e pepe mescolati; e per ghiataia confetti grossi e spicchi di berlingozzi; i quadrucci, mezzane e pianelle, che erano portate ne’ corbelli e con le barelle, erano pane e stiacciate. Venuto poi uno imbasamento, perché non pareva dagli scarpellini stato così ben condotto e lavorato, fu giudicato che fusse ben fatto spezzarlo e romperlo; per che datovi dentro e trovatolo tutto composto di torte, fegategli et altre cose simili, se le goderono, essendo loro poste innanzi dai manovali. Dopo, venuti i medesimi in campo con una gran colonnina di filettino di cintola, e quella disfatta, e dato il pesco di vitella e capone et altro di che era composta, si mangiarono la basa di cacio parmigiano et il capitello acconcio maravigliosamente con intagli di caponi arrosto, fette di vitella e con la cimasa di lingue. Ma perché sto a contare tutti i particolari? Dopo la colonna fu portato sopra un carro un pezzo di molto artificioso architrave con fregio et cornicion, in simile maniera tanto bene et di tante diverse vivande composto, che troppo lunga storia sarebbe voler dirne l’intero; basta che quando fu tempo di svegliare, venendo una pioggia finta dopo molti tuoni, tutti lasciarono il lavoro e si furono, et andò ciascuno a casa sua.”

performed during the meal.\textsuperscript{111} The \textit{Song of the Masons} can be equally interpreted as Bientina’s reprisal of the feast in a burlesque register. The banquet’s invention already presented an ironic play of material and form, illusion and representation; by using comestibles as building-blocks, architecture no longer renders enduring structures, but has literally become a consumable good. Bientina overlays this whimsical paradox with erotic signification by recasting the Cazzuola’s dining festivities as a gluttonous orgy. This transgressive re-presentation recalls the similar re-reading of the 1513 Carnival parades, discussed above, that inserted the Medici’s Triumphs of the Golden Age and of the Ages of Man into a macabre framework.

The feast’s invention would initially suggest an inversion of high and low, where lords become craftsmen. As Vasari indicates, however, the relative social status of the diners was carefully maintained. Those belonging to the greater guilds were dressed as the master masons, and wore hammers and sharp-bladed trowels. The lesser guildsmen comprised the manual laborers, who were visually signaled by the builders’ trough, levers, and “ordinary” trowel. While the “master-masons” sat at the table with the building plans (\textit{pianta}), the artisans both built the edifice and served its dismantled fragments. Vasari’s clever separation between the “greater” masters and the “lesser” laborers based on the \textit{disegno} found in the blueprints both elevates the status of art as a

\footnote{Mozzati, \textit{Giovanfrancesco Rustici}, 299-303. He further argued that the address to \textit{donna} in Bientina’s song could indicate that women attended the Cazzuola banquets, though Vasari makes no mention of this. This feast is perhaps also commemorated in the \textit{impressa} of a trowel, hammer, plumb line, brush, and set square with the inscription “\textit{Fiuniunt pariter renovantuque labores}” found in Antonfrancesco Doni’s \textit{Una nuova opinione}, which he identifies with the “Compagnia della Cazzuola,” which he also calls an “Accademia.” For Doni’s text and the \textit{impressa} drawing, see Sonia Maffei, “Giovio’s \textit{Dialogo delle imprese militari e amorose} and the Museum,” in \textit{The Italian Emblem: A Collection of Essays}, eds. Donato Mansueto and Elena Laura Calogero (Geneva: Droz, 2007), 44-47, esp. 45n54.}
mental, rather than a manual, craft, and elides the artists with their patrician patrons. The invention also reflects the organization of the sodality.

**The Membership**

The Cazzuola’s six founders – the fife-player Giovanni di Benedetto Fei, “il Feo gobbo;” the patrician wool merchant Girolamo d’Antonio di Zanobi del Giocondo (1475-1551); San Lorenzo’s chaplain, Ser Bastiano Sagginati (d. 1530); the singer and brother-in-law of Heinrich Issac, Ser Raffaello di Pietro Cortesi del Beccai (doc. 1501-1525); Ser Cecchino de’ Profumi; and the bombardier, Jacopo di Bonaccorso, “il Baia” (d. 1515) – separated the sodality’s initial enrollment of 23 members into two groups modeled after the Florentine Guilds’ prestigious Arti maggiori and the artisan Arti minori. Those “going for the Great” are: Jacopo di ser Francesco di Jacopo Bottegari (b. 1476); the silk-merchant brothers Francesco (1485-1546) and Domenico di Girolamo di Filippo Rucellai (1486-1525); the merchant Giovambattista di Tommaso di Zanobi Ginori (1488-1556); Girolamo del Giocondo, one of the Cazzuola’s founders; Giovanni di Jacopo di Giovanni Miniati; Niccolò di Bernardo di Niccolò del Barbigia (1486-1527);

---

112 Mozzati, Giovanfrancesco Rustici, 378 followed Giuseppe Pallanti, *Mona Lisa Revealed: The True Identity of Leonardo’s Model* (Milan: Skira, 2006), 51, who corrected Girolamo’s birthdate found in the Carte Sebregondi (July 26, 1485) to that found in the Tratte (July 28, 1475). Mozzati also noted the transfer of tax to Girolamo’s sons on October 13, 1552, which indicates that he must have died just prior.

113 Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 6:483: “I primi di questa Compagnia, che andavano per la maggiore, furono Jacopo Bottegai, Francesco Rucellai, Domenico suo fratello, Giovambatista Ginori, Girolamo del Giocondo, Giovanni Miniati, Niccolò del Barbigia, Mezzabotte suo fratello, Cosimo da Panzano, Matteo suo fratello, Marco Iacopi, Pieraccino Bartoli; e per la minore, ser Bastiano Sagginotti, ser Raffaello del Beccai, ser Cecchino de’ Profumi, Giuliano Bugiardini pittore, Francesco Granacci pittore, Giovanfrancesco Rustici, Feo gobbo, il Talina sonatore suo compagno, Pierino piffero, Giovanni trombone, e il Baia bombardiere.” Like the “maggiori,” the “minori” were meant to have 12 members, but Vasari only lists 11. For the identifications and dates which follow, and for fuller biographical details, see Mozzati, *Giovanfrancesco Rustici*, 357-394; and Sénéchal, *Giovan Francesco Rustici*, 124-126.
his brother, “Mezzabotte;”\textsuperscript{114} the bankers Cosimo (1474-before 1532) and Matteo di Luca di Fruoso da Panzano (1478-after 1532);\textsuperscript{115} Marco di Bernardo di Giovanni Jacopi; and Piero di Lionardo di Giovanni Bartoli, “Pieraccino” (b. 1485).\textsuperscript{116} “Going for the Less” are the other five founders, plus the painters Giuliano Bugiardini (1476-1554) and Francesco Granacci (1469/1470-1543), the father-in-law of the Paiuolo’s Ruberto Lippi; the Paiuolo’s Giovanfrancesco Rustici; Feo’s fellow Signoria musician, the tambourine-player Michele di Bastiano, “il Talina;” Pierino \textit{piffero}, who was likely Piero di Niccolò di Giovanni da Volterra (fl. 1515-1521), the impudent pupil of Benvenuto Cellini’s father;\textsuperscript{117} and Giovanni \textit{trombone}, who was probably the musician in service to the Signoria in 1513 and in 1520.\textsuperscript{118}

\textsuperscript{114} A nickname meaning “half-barrel,” who was either Giovambattista (b. 1497), Ridolfo (b. 1494), or Francesco (b. 1490). See Mozzati, \textit{Giovanfrancesco Rustici}, 361-361; and Sénéchal, \textit{Giovan Francesco Rustici}, 125, who rightly gave Niccolò’s death from the plague in 1527, but, without knowing his birth date on September 30, 1486, incorrectly placed him in the 1480 Balia. Francesco’s birth on October 13, 1490 is found in David Herlihy et al., eds., \textit{Florentine Renaissance Resources, Online Tratte of Office Holders}, 1282-1532, machine readable data file (Florentine Renaissance Resources/STG: Brown University, Providence, RI, 2002), http://cds.library.brown.edu/projects/tratte/ (last accessed December 1, 2016). For Francesco’s role as \textit{cassiere} in the Strozzi bank, see Federigo Melis, “Di alcune girate cambiarie dell’inizio del Cinquecento rinvenute a Firenze,” \textit{Moneta e credito} 6 (1953): 111n91 and 112. Wellen associated “Mezzabotte” with the “Gobo del Barbiglia” found in an April 19, 1544 letter of Migliore Visino to Giovambattista della Fonte. “Identification of the Painter Visino,” 502 and 503n10.

\textsuperscript{115} For the births of Matteo on May 26, 1478 and of Cosimo on April 27, 1474, see Herlihy et al., \textit{Online Tratte}. For their census and tax records, see Mozzati, \textit{Giovanfrancesco Rustici}, 385-386, who noted that Cosimo must have died prior to 1532 when Matteo was newly registered with a cousin, Alessandro di Fruosino di Fruosino, in the Decima granducale.

\textsuperscript{116} I identify Vasari’s “Pieraccino Bartoli” based on his inclusion, with this nickname, among those whom Giovanni Cambi writes accompanied Lorenzo, Duke of Urbino, to France in 1517 for the baptism of Francis I’s son. \textit{Istorie}, 2:134: “Andò con Lorenzo ancora, de’ Fiorentini, Filippo di Filippo Strozzi suo cognato, et Gherardo di Bartolomeo Bartolini suo Texoliere, et Piero di Lionardo Bartoli vocato Peraccino.” Piero was born on August 16, 1485 in the quarter of Santa Maria Novella, \textit{gonfalone} Unicorno. Herlihy et al, \textit{Online Tratte}. Based on Luigi Passerini’s genealogical tree, without notice of Cambi, Sénéchal gave the same identification. \textit{Giovan Francesco Rustici}, 125. Mozzati alternatively identified Piero di Matteo di Marco di Tommaso Bartoli (1500-1568), the older brother of the more well-known Cosimo (1503-1572), and suggested that the diminutive suffix could have been based on Piero’s young age when joining the company. \textit{Giovanfrancesco Rustici}, 363-364.

\textsuperscript{117} Mozzati, \textit{Giovanfrancesco Rustici}, 386-387; and Mozzati, “L’educazione musicale di Benvenuto Cellini: Alcuni pagamenti dei Capitani di Parte Guelfa e una condanna degli Otto di Guardia,” \textit{Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz} 50 (2007): 201-213. See also Cummings,
Nearly all those initially comprising the Cazzuola’s Arte maggiore were in their mid-twenties to late thirties in 1512, the year of the Company’s foundation and of the Medici’s return to Florence. Only three, the Rucellai brothers and Giovambattista Ginori, were from the upper echelons of the Florentine patriciate with long, established traditions of office holding. The del Barbigia and del Giocondo, in contrast, became eligible for the priorate only in the second half of the fifteenth century, and the da Panzano appear to owe their new-found appearances in the Tre maggiore to the Medici. 119 Giovanni Miniati, in contrast, served in the Buonomini (1507) and the in Priori (1509) during the Soderini Republic, when he was also a confederate of Jacopo Salviati in the Ottanta, but apparently held no civic position after the Medici’s return. 120

---

118 Cummings, *Politicized Muse*, 178-179n22, following Keith Polk, “Civic Patronage and Instrumental Ensembles in Renaissance Florence,” *Augsburger Jahrbuch für Musikwissenschaft* 3 (1986): 51-68. Sénéchal concurred, *Giovan Francesco Rustici*, 126. Mozzati tentatively proposed that the same Giovanni trombone is perhaps Giovanni di Giusto, who was paid by Santissima Annunziata for tinning work, and who was also identified in the military registry as the Giovanni “trombone che fa lo stagno,” and is perhaps as well the same Giovanni trombone who made tin glasses for Jacopo Salviati in 1526. *Giovanfrancesco Rustici*, 377.

119 For the del Giocondo, see Pallanti, *Mona Lisa Revealed*, 52. Niccolò di Giovanni di Sandro del Barbigia, the grandfather of the Cazzuola’s namesake, and his son Bernardo were routinely seated among the consuls of the Arte dei Fabbri in Florentine guild elections. See Herlihy et al., *Online Tratte*. Bernardo appears to be the first of Sandro’s line to be elected to the Tre maggiore; on April 28, 1486, he was seated from the Arti minori, quarter of San Giovanni, for the Priori. Upward social mobility is also suggested in Alison Luchs’s study of the Cestello church, where Bernardo held patronage rights to one of the chapels. She noted that Giovanni Cambi identified Bernardo as “andava per l’arte minore,” but also that the wealthy Bernardo commissioned a portrait medal commemorating his marriage to a Nonina (Giovanna) Strozzi. “Cestello: A Cistercian Church of the Florentine Renaissance” (PhD diss., Johns Hopkins University, 1976), 145n33 and 174n50. If the 1489 date on the medal marks the year of their marriage, Strozzi cannot have been the mother of Niccolò, who was born in 1486. For the Bartoli, who were “neither of the old magnate class nor yet of the upper echelons of the bourgeois patriciate” in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, see Judith Bryce, *Cosimo Bartoli (1503-1572): The Career of a Florentine Polymath* (Geneva: Droz, 1983), 20.

The Cazzuola’s supplement of seven associates (aderenti)\textsuperscript{121} swelled the musician-dominated ranks of its Arte minore with figures well-versed in creating theatrical spectacles, which suggests a date around mid-November 1512, when preparations for Giuliano de’ Medici’s 1513 Triumph of Age, executed by the Cazzuola, began. The brocade-weaver Bernardino di Giordano collaborated with Leonardo da Vinci’s father to create the costumes for this Triumph, a role he would reprise for the 1518 celebrations of Lorenzo de’ Medici’s marriage, and hosted the c. 1524/1525 performance of Niccolò Machiavelli’s Mandragola, which was also staged by the Cazzuola.\textsuperscript{122} The Signoria’s heralds, Masters Jacopo di Niccolò del Polta da Bientina (1473-1539) and Giovambattista di Cristofano dell’Ottonaio (1472-1527) were both playwrights and authors of canti carnascialeschi; as discussed above, Ottonaio’s canti were performed for the Medici’s 1513 Carnival trionfi. In addition to his duties as a town crier (banditore), Domenico Barlacchi (1483-1554) was also a noted actor and improviser. Unfortunately, the remaining three adherents, for whom Vasari only gives the sobriquets “il Talano,” “il Caiano,” and “Buon Pocci,” have yet to be identified.

The Cazzuola’s final subscription, after “not many years passed,” “made” (fatti)\textsuperscript{123} Giuliano de’ Medici (1479-1516); Ottagnolo di Lorenzo di Mariotto Benvenuti

\textsuperscript{121} Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:483: “Gl’aderenti furono Bernardino di Giordano, il Talano, il Caiano, maestro Iacopo del Bientina e messer Giovambatista di Cristofano ottonaio; araldi, ambidue della Signoria, Buon Pocci e Domenico Barlacchi.”

\textsuperscript{122} For the Mandragola, see Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:395, \textit{Life of Aristotile da San Gallo}; for the 1513 Triumph, see ibid., 311, \textit{Life of Pontormo}. For the December 1, 1518 payment “per havere vestito 34 persone in su li carri triomfali,” see Petrini, “Signoria di madonna Finzione,” 69-70. For Bernardino, see Antonfrancesco Doni’s description in \textit{Una nuova opinione}, cited in Maffei, “Giovio’s Dialogo delle imprese militari e amorose and the Museum,” 45n54. See also Sénéchal, Giovan Francesco Rustici, 125; and Mozzati, Giovanfrancesco Rustici, 366-367, who noted Bernardino’s appearance in Doni’s I Marmi (1552).

\textsuperscript{123} Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:483: “E non passarono molti anni (tanto andò crescendo in nome), facendo
(1474-before 1518); the wealthy Medicean parenti, Giovanni di Matteo di Giovanni Canigiani (1484-1533) and Giovanni d’Antonio Serristori (1496-1531),\(^{124}\) the future dean of the apostolic camera, Giovanni di Taddeo d’Angelo Gaddi (1493-1542); Filippo Strozzi’s “lance,” Alessandro Giovanni di Pierantonio Bandini (1498-1568);\(^{125}\) the silk merchants Luigi di Luigi Martelli (1494-1580)\(^{126}\) and Paolo di ser Giovanni di ser Tommaso da Romena (1490-1553); and the hunchback (gobbo) Filippo di Battista di Pandolfo Pandolfini (1497-1559); “and together with these, at one and the same time, as associates” (aderenti) are: the Paiuolo’s Andrea del Sarto; a Bartolomeo trombone, who was likely the Veronese composer Bartolomeo Tromboncino (c. 1470-after 1535);\(^{127}\) Ser Bernardo Pisanello, whom Anthony Cummings and Frank D’Accone identified as the singer and composer Bernardo di Benedetto di Piero di ser Lorenzo Pagoli, “il Pisano” (1490-1548);\(^{128}\) a Piero the cloth-shearer (cimatore), whom Tommaso Mozzati identified

---

\(^{124}\) In 1503, Giovanni Canigiani married Costanza d’Alamanno d’Averado d’Alamanno Salviati, whose cousin, Jacopo di Giovanni d’Alamanno (1461-1533) married Lucrezia di Lorenzo di Piero de’ Medici (1470-1553) in 1486. The Salviati cousins were also themselves descendants of Averado de’ Medici (1314-1434), as were Cosimo di Giovanni d’Averado (1389-1464) and his progeny. In 1516, Giovanni Serristori betrothed his only child Costanza to Alamanno di Jacopo di Giovanni Salviati (1510-1571), the son of Lucrezia de’ Medici, and the brother of Maria Salviati (1499-1543), who herself shortly became the mother of Cosimo I de’ Medici (1519-1574).


\(^{126}\) Cummings alternatively and improbably identified the Cazzuola’s Luigi Martelli as Ludovico di Lorenzo Martelli. Maecenas and the Madrigalist, 103.

\(^{127}\) See Mozzati, Giovanfrancesco Rustici, 364-365; and Cummings, Politicized Muse, 178n22.

with a homonymic innkeeper and composer of *canti carnascialeschi*; a Gemma the mercer (*mercaio*), whom Mozzati named as Bernardo di Giovanni di Benedetto Perini, and a Maestro Manente da San Giovanni who was likely the physician Manente di Ugolino di Leontino da San Giovanni.

With this third subscription, the Cazzuola expanded its base of *feste* fabricators with three skilled musician-composers and an equally talented painter. The Trowel might also be seen to “rejuvenate” and to ennoble itself through its enrollment of young *ottimati*. In 1512, five of the nine newly-made members were teenagers, and, at 28 and 22, respectively, the giovani Giovanni Canigiani and Paolo da Romena were not yet old enough to hold the higher civic offices. At 33, Giuliano de’ Medici was himself barely past his majority, and still not of age to be *gonfaloniere di giustizia*. In contrast to the Cazzuola’s initial dozen *maggiori*, most of whom were relative new-comers to the office-holding class, all but Paolo da Romena, who was the son of the respected notary ser

---

131 Manente was one of Lorenzo de’ Medici’s doctors and a member of his household. See Emanuela Ferretti’s entry in Baldini and Betti, *Nello splendore mediceo*, 602-603, cat. 131. He was also the victim of Lorenzo de’ Medici’s *beffa* in the last novella of Antonfrancesco Grazzini’s *Cene*. See the discussion in this dissertation’s conclusion, as well as Tommaso Mozzati, “Le *Cene* di Lasca, il party più esclusivo: La tradizione festiva a Firenze nel Cinquecento, tra allestimenti d’artista e memorie letterarie,” in *Raccolta di scritti per Andrea Gareffi*, eds. Rino Caputo and Nicola Longo (Rome: Edizioni Nuova Cultura, 2013), 197-220. For Manente’s doctorate and university matriculation, see Armando F. Verde, *Lo studio fiorentino 1473-1503: Ricerche e documenti*, vol. 3, *Studenti: “Fanciulli a scuola” nel 1480* (Florence: Istituto nazionale di studi sul Rinascimento, 1977), pt. 2, 619-620. For Machiavelli’s mention of the Medici’s promotion of Manente, see Stella Larossa, “Nota su ‘Maestro Manente,’” *Interpres* 23 (2004): 259-264. See also note 135 below.
132 Sénéchal also noted the youthful demographic of the group’s approximately 20 patrician members, which he alternatively identified with a wider pro-Medici faction of giovani. *Giovan Francesco Rustici*, 129-130. See note 134 below.
Giovanni di ser Marco, and who married the patrician daughter of Nero di Francesco del Nero in 1522, were from established and prominent lineages in the Florentine state.

In his analysis of the Cazzuola, Philippe Sénéchal interpreted the significance of the group’s youthful demographic as the sodality wanting “to closely unite the giovani, that moving and pro-Medicean faction of the Florentine oligarchy.” In the 1510s-1520s, however, the partisanship of these individuals was neither fixed nor necessarily evident. Only two should be considered familiari of Lorenzo de’ Medici: Maestro Manente, his personal physician and confidant, and Pieraccino Bartoli, whom Giovanni Cambi notably states accompanied Lorenzo to France in 1517 along with Filippo Strozzi, Lorenzo’s cousin, and Gherardo di Bartolomeo Bartolini, the Medici’s

---

133 For Paolo da Romena, see Mozzati, Giovanfrancesco Rustici, 389-390; and Sénéchal, Giovan Francesco Rustici, 128. For his patronage at the Medicean foundation of Santa Maria del Cestello, see Luchs, “Cestello,” 48, 69, 102-103, 118, and 167n31. Paolo purchased the rights to the Boni chapel in 1525, and commissioned the altarpiece Madonna and Child with Saints John the Baptist, Bernard, Matthew, Peter, Paul, and Catherine from the Paiuolo’s Domenico Puligo. For the altarpiece, see also Elena Capretti in Cecchi and Natali, L’officina della maniera, 246-247, cat. 81. As Mozzati and Sénéchal have noted, the Cistercian convent was patronized by several of the Cazzuola: Bernardo del Barbigia, the father of the Trowel’s Niccolò and “Mezzabotte,” founded the cappella maggiore; and the silk merchant Giovanni di Bernardo Jacopi, whose wife was a Serristori, and whose brother was the Cazzuola’s Marco, acquired the former Mascalzoni chapel in 1503. Marco’s brothers commissioned Sarto’s Madonna della Scala. See Cecchi, “Profili di amici e committenti,” 34-37. The Benvenuti joined the priorate for the first time in the second half of the fourteenth century. See Lauro Martines, The Social World of Florentine Humanists, 1390-1460 (Princeton: Princeton University Press: 1963), 325.

134 Giovan Francesco Rustici, 129: “Il apparaît donc que la confrérie voulait associer de façon étroite les giovani, cette fraction remuante et philo-médicéenne de l’oligarchie florentine.”

135 Lorenzo apparently confided his plans regarding his unlawful appointment as the Captain of Florence’s militia to Manente in May 1515, to the annoyance of Lorenzo’s Roman manager, Benedetto Buondelmonti. See Buondelmonti’s letter to Filippo Strozzi in Alceste Giorgetti, “Lorenzo de’ Medici Capitano Generale della Repubblica fiorentina,” Archivio storico italiano, ser. 4, 11 (1883): 206-207n3. In 1518, Manente was living in Lorenzo’s Roman palace, where Ottaviano Petrucci attempted to serve him a lawsuit regarding the printing of Marco Fabio Colvo’s translation of Hippocrates. See Stanley Boorman, Ottaviano Petrucci: A Catalogue Raisonné (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 238-240. See also Manente’s appearance in the expense account book for Lorenzo’s travel to France in 1517, as noted by Ferretti, in Baldini and Bietti, Nello splendore mediceo, 602-603, cat. 131. See also Larossa, “Nota su ‘maestro Manente,’ ” 259-264, in which she discussed Machiavelli’s notice of Manente’s being made eligible to hold public office through the intervention of Giuliano.
treasurer. By 1529, Bernardo Pisano, a favored composer and singer of Leo X, also seems to have been closely identified with the Medici, as when he visited Florence from Rome, where he sang in the papal choir, Pisano was arrested and tortured “in order to learn the purpose of his visit.”

Giovanni Canigiani’s multiple posts in Florentine territories during the war-torn second and third decades of the sixteenth century likely testify to his importance in the regime, as do his later roles in the Balìa (1530), the Quarantotto (1532) and as an accoppiatore (1532). Even though he was one of the youths to depose Soderini in 1512, only in 1524, however, was the thirty-nine-year-old Francesco Rucellai, the signore of two of the Cazzuola’s banquets, trusted as one of the Otto di Practica.

On the other hand, opposition to the Medici is evidenced by Filippo Pandolfini, who fled first to Pisa then Lucca during the siege of Florence, and was subsequently exiled for life by the Medici upon their return in 1530. In an act that has gone nearly unnoticed in scholarship, Giuliano Bugiardini notably participated in anti-Medicean iconoclasm in 1527, when he and two others pulled down the wax votive of Clement VII

---


138 For Leo X’s 1513 instructions to Lorenzo on the importance of this magistracy, which controlled external affairs, as well as internal provisioning of grain and enforcing the order to remove arms from citizens, see Bullard, Filippo Strozzi, 39.

139 See Sénéchal, Giovan Francesco Rustici, 128-129; and Mozzati, Giovanfrancesco Rustici, 384-385, who noted that Pandolfini refused the Republic’s order to return to Florence during the siege.
in San Piero del Murrone. Instead of a consortium of Medici affiliates, the Cazzuola might better be thought of as members of the office-holding class whom the Medici sought to woo to their cause. That they were largely successful should not diminish the political uncertainty facing Florentines in the 1510s; the Medici were neither secure in their position as heads of state, nor were they guaranteed the citizens’ support.

**Bugiardini’s Masquerade**

In the Cazzuola’s inaugural banquet, the social stratification found in the membership’s organization and in Rustici and Bugiardini’s later feast was purposefully interrupted. Vasari writes,

---

140 Lettere di Giovambattista Busini a Benedetto Varchi sopra l’assedio di Firenze, ed. Gaetano Milanesi (Florence: Le Monnier, 1861), 32-33, lettera V: “Risponderò ora a quelle cose che mi domandate diffusamente. Circa alle Immagini, voi avete a sapere che Giovambatista Boni, detto il Gorzarino, trovandosi in San Piero del Murrone col Bugiardino e Batista Nelli, veduta un papa Chimenti, e infurato corse non so dove, con uno spedile o ronca, e gli dette addosso e tirò giù.” When Benedetto Varchi reprised the event, he shielded the still-living painter from political reprisal by portraying Bugiardini as the hapless follower of Boni and Nelli. Storia fiorentina, 1:257-258: “Questo esempio, se non nasce da quello che ora dirò, fu cagione che Giovambatista Boni, detto del Gorzerino, trovandosi in San Piero del Murrone con Batista Nelli e Giuliano Bugiardini dipintore, uomo semplice e tutto cattolico e dato alle profezie, veggendone una statua di papa Clemente, corse per uno spedile, e gli tirò tanto che la fece cadere: e non furono né gli uni né gli altri, non che puniti, accusati; anzi piacque cotal atto a molti, e grandemente (come coloro che avessero, in quella maniera che potevano, o grande amore verso la libertà, o singolare odio contro i Medici dimostrato) commendati ne furono; onde nacque per avventura il bando mandato da’ signori Otto di guardia e balì, che tutte l’arme de’ Medici che dal dodici infino al ventisette erano state o dipinte o scolpite, o nelle chiese o per le case, così dentro come fuori della città, si scancellassero e levassero.” Milanesi, who edited the above works and Vasari’s Lives, referenced this iconoclasm only in the Life of Fra Giovanni Angelo Montorsoli, where, in a note appended to the friar’s remaking of the wax votives of the Medici which had been destroyed in 1527, Milanesi refers the reader to Varchi and Busini, and identified Bugiardini along with the other culpable youths. Le opere di Giorgio Vasari, ed. Gaetano Milanesi (Florence: Sansoni, 1906), 6:632n1 (hereafter cited as Vasari-Milanesi). Laura Pagnotta, Norman Land, and Mozzati each excerpted Varchi’s description of Bugiardini’s character (“uomo semplice e tutto cattolico e dato alle profezie”) without mention of its iconoclastic context, and none refer to Busini’s letter. See Pagnotta, Giuliano Bugiardini (Turin: Allemandi, 1987), 13n1; Land, “Michelangelo’s Shadow: Giuliano Bugiardini,” Explorations in Renaissance Culture 31 (2005): 16n5; and Mozzati, Giovanfrancesco Rustici, 371-372. Sénéchal makes no mention of Varchi or Busini’s texts. Bugiardini’s destructive actions have only been recently resurrected in Paolo Simoneelli’s study of the construction and control of historical memory in Vasari’s Lives. “Un esempio semplice: Giuliano Bugiardini e le reticenze politiche di Vasari,” in Antimedicci nelle “Vite” vasarine, 1:9-40.
The first given by the Cazzuola, which was arranged by Giuliano Bugiardini, was held at a place called the Aia, at S. Maria Nuova, where, as we have already said, the gates of S. Giovanni were cast in bronze. There, I say, the master of the Company having commanded that every man should present himself dressed in whatever costume he pleased, on condition that those who might resemble one another in their manner of dress by being clothed in the same fashion, should pay a penalty, at the appointed hour there appeared the most beautiful, bizarre, and extravagant costumes that could be imagined. Then, the hour of supper having come, they were placed at table according to the quality of their clothes—those who were dressed as Princes in the first places, the rich and noble after them, and those dressed as poor persons in the last and lowest places. And whether they had games and merrymaking after supper, it is better to leave that to everyone to imagine for himself than to say anything about it.  

Under the auspices of the Bugiardini, the “little liar” (bugiardo), social hierarchy becomes merely a deceptive masquerade.

These initial two dinners are the only examples of the eight banquets recorded by Vasari that were presided over entirely by artists. Bugiardini’s primacy as signore of both is intentional. In Bugiardini’s biography, Vasari presents the painter as a hapless buffoon, and in Life of Domenico Puligo, the Aretine explicitly registers disdain for such “gay spirits and lovers of good cheer.” An equally negative assessment forms the subtext of

---

141 Vasari-De Vere, 8:122. Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:483: “La prima della Cazzuola, la quale fu ordinata da Giuliano Bugiardini, si fece in un luogo detto l’Aia da Santa Maria Nuova, dove dicemo di sopra che furono gettate di bronzo le porte di San Giovanni. Quivi, dico, avendo il signor della Compagnia comandato che ognuno dovesse trovarsi vestito in che abito gli piaceva, con questo, che coloro che si scontrassero nella maniera del vestire et avessero una medesima foggia, fussero condennati, comparsero all’ora deputata le più belle e più bizzarre stravaganze d’abiti che si possano immaginare. Venuta poi l’ora di cena, furon posti a tavola secondo le qualità de’ vestimenti: chi aveva abiti da principi ne’ primi luoghi, i ricchi e gentiluomini appresso, et i vestiti da poveri negl’ultimi e più bassi gradi. Ma se dopo cena si fecero delle feste e de’ giuochi, meglio è lasciare che altri se lo pensi, che dirne alcuna cosa.”

142 One of the ways Vasari registers disdain for Bugiardini is through the position of the painter’s biography in the Lives. In his discussion of Vasari’s negative portrayal of Baccio Bandinelli, Andrew Ladis perceptively noted that “…Vasari’s ‘life’ of Bandinelli, the greatest liar, is followed by Bugiardini, whose name means little liars.” Victims and Villains in Vasari’s Lives (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 123.

143 Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:279-285, Life of Bugiardini. Ibid., 4:252, Life of Puligo: “per che praticando con persone allegre e di buon tempo e con musici e con femmine, seguendo certi suoi amori, si morì d’anni cinquantadue, l’anno MDXXVII, per avere presa la peste in casa d’una sua innamorata.”
Rustici’s Life, in which the sodalities of the Cauldron and the Trowel serve as the flawed predecessors of the Accademia del Disegno, whose foundation is narrated in the Vite’s subsequent Life of Fra Giovanni Angelo Montorsoli.  

The third dinner narrated by Vasari introduces significant shifts in the company’s festivities. Vernacular comedies, newly penned by leading playwrights, were performed following the themed meal. The signore directing the banquet is now one of the maggiori, rather than a painter or a sculptor. In fact, visual artists are not mentioned by Vasari at all until Giovanni Gaddi’s penultimate feast on Tantalus in hell. The third feast also features infernal torments, which were previously re-enacted by the Paiuolo, and marks the appearance of an explicitly macabre theme, which will dominate the subsequent subject matter. The advent of these changes, to which Vasari dedicates his longest description – nearly double the text given to any other repast – is the Cazzuola’s third spectacle: Matteo da Panzano’s descent into hell.

144 For devout friar Monrosoli’s biography as a “vita parallela” to Rustici, whom Vasari states “attese anco alle cose di negromanzia,” and for the sacral framework around the Accademia del Disegno’s foundation, see Mario Pozzi and Enrico Mattioda, Giorgio Vasari: Storico e critico (Florence: Olschki, 2006), 379-381.

145 Mozzati rather inexplicably bars artists from this position of authority. Based on the post’s being filled in Vasari’s subsequent feasts by “notables” Matteo da Panzano, Francesco and Domenico Rucellai, and Luigi Martelli, he concluded that the role was only assigned to the more prestigious, and wealthy, members. Giovanfrancesco Rustici, 230 and n244. Vasari’s language, however, is clear; in the inaugural masquerade, Bugiardini ordered the feast (“La prima della Cazzuola, la quale fu ordinata da Giuliano Bugiardini”), and he is implied as the lord who also commanded the dress code (“Quivi, dico, avendo il signor della Compagnia comandato”). Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:483. The second repast “fu ordinato dal detto Bugiardino e da Giovanfrancesco Rustici,” with the companions costumed as “avea il signor ordinato.” Ibid., 483-484. Vasari is equally explicit regarding the Paiuolo’s banquet. The lord must be one of their members, and thus, with the exception of Niccolò Boni, a craftsman. Rustici is equally indicated as the signore of the feast, who ordinò the menu’s theme. Ibid., 481. Mozzati ascribed all agency for the feasts to the (patrician) signori, with the artists serving only as allestitori. Giovanfrancesco Rustici, 252n382.

146 Matteo da Panzano’s descent into hell occupies 56 lines, and his subsequent hospital feast has the second longest description at 30 lines. For the infernal meal, see Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:484, line 30 to 486, line 6. For da Panzano’s second banquet, see ibid., 486, lines 6-36.
Another time, when the master of the same Company was Matteo da Panzano, the banquet was arranged in the following manner. Ceres, seeking Proserpine her daughter, who had been carried off by Pluto, entered the room where the men of the Cazzuola were assembled, and, coming before their master, besought him that they should accompany her to the infernal regions. To which request consenting after much discussion, they went after her, and so, entering into a somewhat darkened room, they saw in place of a door a vast mouth of a serpent, the head of which took up the whole wall. Round which door all crowding together, while Cerberus barked, Ceres called out asking whether her lost daughter were in there, and, a voice having answered Yes, she added that she desired to have her back. But Pluto replied that he would not give her up, and invited Ceres with all the company to the nuptials that were being prepared; and the invitation was accepted. Whereupon, all having entered through that mouth, which was full of teeth, and which, being hung on hinges, opened to each couple of men that entered, and then shut again, they found themselves at last in a great room of a round shape, which had no light but a very little one in the centre, which burned so dim that they could scarcely see one another. There, having been pushed into their seats with a great fork by a most hideous Devil who was in the middle, beside the tables, which were draped in black, Pluto commanded that in honour of his nuptials the pains of Hell should cease for as long as those guests remained there; and so it was done. Now in that room were painted all the chasms of the regions of the damned, with their pains and torments; and, fire being put to a match of tow, in a flash a light was kindled at each chasm, thus revealing in the picture in what manner and with what pains those who were in it were tormented. The viands of that infernal supper were all animals vile and most hideous in appearance; but nevertheless within, under the loathly covering and the shape of the pastry, were most delicate meats of many kinds. The skin, I say, on the outer side, made it appear as if they were serpents, grass-snakes, lizards large and small, tarantulas, toads, frogs, scorpions, bats, and other suchlike animals; but within all were composed of the choicest viands. And these were placed on the tables before every man with a shovel, under the direction of the Devil, who was in the middle, while a companion poured out exquisite wines from a horn of glass, ugly and monstrous in shape, into glazed crucibles, which served as drinking-glasses. These first viands finished, which formed a sort of relish, dead men’s bones were set all the way down the table in place of fruits and sweetmeats, as if the supper, which was scarcely begun, were finished; which reliquary fruits were of sugar. That done, Pluto, who proclaimed that he wished to go to his repose with his Proserpine, commanded that the pains should return to torment the
damned; and in a moment all the lights that have been mentioned were blown out by a sort of wind, on every side were heard rumbles, voices, and cries, awesome and horrible, and in the middle of that darkness, with a little light, was seen the image of Baia the bombardier, who was one of the guests, as has been related – condemned to Hell by Pluto for having always chosen as the subjects and inventions of his girandole and other fireworks the seven mortal sins and the things of Hell. While all were occupied in gazing on that spectacle and listening to various sounds of lamentation, the mournful and funereal table was taken away, and in place of it, lights being kindled, was seen a very rich and regal feast, with splendid servants who brought the rest of the supper, which was handsome and magnificent. At the end of the supper came a ship full of various confections, and the crew of the ship, pretending to remove their merchandise, little by little brought the men of the Company into the upper rooms, where, a very rich scenic setting having been already prepared, there was performed a comedy called the *Filogenia*, which was much extolled; and at dawn, the play finished, every man went happily home.\footnote{Vasari-De Vere, 8:124-125. Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:484-486: “Un’altra volta, essendo nella medesima Compagnia signore Matteo da Panzano, il convito fu ordinato in questa maniera. Cerere, cercando Proserpina sua figliuola, la quale avea rapita Plutone, entrata dove erano ragunati gli uomini della Cazzuola dinanzi al loro signore, gli pregò che volessi accompagnarla all’inferno; alla quale dimanda dopo molte dispute essi acconsentendo, le andarono dietro. E così entrati in una stanza alquanto oscura, videro in cambio d’una porta una grandissima bocca di serpente, la cui testa teneva tutta la facciata; alla quale porta d’intorno accostandosi tutti, mentre Cerbero abaiava, dimandò Cerere se là entro fusse la perduta figliuola; et essendole risposto di sì, ella soggiunse che disiderava di riaverla. Ma avendo risposto Plutone non voler renderla, et invitata con tutta la compagnia alle nozze che s’apparecchiavano, fu accettato l’invito. Per che entrati tutti per quella bocca piena di denti, che, essendo gangherata, s’apra a ciascuna coppia d’uomini che entrava e poi si chiudeva, si trovarono in ultimo in una gran stanza di forma tonda, la quale non aveva altro che un assai piccolo lumicino nel mezzo, il quale si poco risplendeva, che a fatica si scorgevano. Quivi essendo da un bruttissimo diavolo, che era nel mezzo con un forcone, messi a sedere dove erano le tavole apparecchiate di nero, comandò Plutone che per onore di quelle sue nozze cessassero, per insino a che quivi dimoravano, le pene dell’inferno; e così fu fatto. E perché erano in quella stanza tutte dipinte le bolge del regno de’ dannati e le loro pene e tormenti, dato fuoco a uno stopino, in un baleno fu acceso a ciascuna bolgia un lume, che mostrava nella sua pittura in chemodo e con quali pene fussero quelli che erano in essa tormentati. Le vivande di quella infernal cena furono tutti animali schifi e bruttissimi in apparenza, ma però dentro, sotto la forma del pasticcio e coperta abominevole, erano cibi delicatissimi e di più sorti. La scorza, dico, et il difuori mostrava che fussero serpenti, bisce, ramarri, lucertole, botte, ranocchi, scorpioni, pipistrelli et altri simili animali, et il didentro era composizione d’ottime vivande. E queste furono poste in tavola con una pala, e dinanzi a ciascuno e con ordine, dal diavolo che era nel mezzo; un compagno del quale mesceva con un corno di vetro, ma di fuori brutto e spiacevole, preziosi vini in coregguioli da fondere invetriati, che servivano per bicchieri. Finite queste prime vivande, che furono quasi un antipasto, furono messe per frutte, fingendo che la cena, auflatica non cominciatasi, fusse finita, in cambio di frutte e confezioni, ossa di morti giù giù per tutta la tavola: la quali frutte e reliquie erano di zucchero. Ciò fatto, comandando Plutone, che disse voler andare a riposarsi con Proserpina sua, che le pene tornassero a tormentare i dannati, furono da certi venti in un attimo spenti tutti i già detti lumi; e uditi infiniti romori, grida e voci orribili e spaventose, e’ fu veduta nel mezzo di quelle tenebre, con un}
The banquet’s conceit notionally derived from classical literature; Ceres’s sojourn to find her missing daughter can be found in multiple sources, perhaps most accessibly in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (5.462-571) and *Fasti* (4.55-620). Proserpine’s marriage to the god of the underworld, and the concomitant intermission of hell’s punishments, are described in Claudian’s *De raptu Proserpinae* (2.326-360). Ceres’s infernal descent, however, has no place in the antique sources. Instead of recapitulating the classical myth, the Cazzuola intentionally creates a novel poetic invention, whereby Ceres’s presence is a device to initiate the guests’ descent into the realm of Hades, whose torments become the focus of the evening’s festivities.

Rather than being merely passive witnesses to the unfolding spectacle, the guests took part in the harrowing events; they were chomped and swallowed in the serpent’s maw-come-hell-mouth, then poked and prodded by a devil to take their seats in a dark room. The only illumination revealed images of torture and pain, while their own foodstuffs were lit just enough to identify the repulsive ingredients, which were creatures associated with death and putrefaction. Using a trowel as eating utensil, the diners could not escape being subsumed into the feast; they finished the meal with sweets fashioned as dead men’s bones, which both evokes cannibalism, and reminds the diners of their own mortality. Their eternal – and infernal – dwelling is also alluded to in the feasting. Like

lumicino, l’immagine del Baia bombardiere, che era uno de’ circostanti, come s’è detto, condannato da Plutone all’inferno, per avere nelle sue girandole e macchine di fuoco avuto sempre per soggetto et invenzione i sette peccati mortali e cose d’inferno. Mentre che a vedere ciò et a udire diverse lamentevoli voci s’attendeva, fu levato via il doloroso e funesto apparato, e venendo i lumi, veduto in cambio di quello un apparecchio reale e ricchissimo, e con orrevoli serventi che portarono il rimanente della cena, che fu magnifica et onorata. Al fine della quale venendo una nave piena di varie confezioni, i padroni di quella, mostrando di levar mercanzie, condussero a poco a poco gli’uomini della Compagnia nelle stanze di sopra, dove essendo una scena et apparato ricchissimo, fu recitata una commedia intitolata Filogenia, che fu molto lodata; e quella finita, all’alba ognuno si tornò lietissimo a casa.”

168
Proserpine, these unwitting guests ate the victuals of hell. While the daughter of Ceres ingested only seven pomegranate seeds, which allowed her to spend half the year in the terrestrial realm, the mortals consumed a main course as well as desert, and thereby presumably sealed their fates.

“Entertainment” was provided by the torture of the shade of their companion Baia, presumably played by an actor, accompanied by sounds of pain and anguish. Baia’s torment becomes a disquieting portent which adds even further somber overtones to feast. The bombardier would shortly become a true ghost when, in preparation for Leo X’s 1515 *entrata* to Florence, he died from the shrapnel of an exploding firework. Medicean spectacles were even more deadly in 1513, when da Panzano’s feast was likely to have taken place. The gilded baker’s boy died of poisoning from the Medici’s “Age of Gold” Carnival float, and the San Giovanni celebrations were described by Giovanni Cambi as a “festa diabolicha,” in part because of fatalities among its spectators.

Reference to contemporary Medici spectacle is also found in the comedy which followed the Cazzuola’s infernal feast and concluded the evening’s festivities. Ottonai’s *Filogenia* is a parodic re-working of Jacopo Nardi’s *Due felici rivali*, which was written

---

148 Baia dictated his testament on November 29, 1515, and died on December 7, 1515. See Minucci del Rosso, “Di alcuni personaggi,” 480-481; and Ilaria Ciseri, *L’ingresso trionfale di Leone X in Firenze nel 1515* (Florence: Olschki, 1990), 79-80 and 177. Baia’s death is discussed further below.

149 Baia also appears in Matteo’s next feast, which Vasari writes occurred two years later. See Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:486. If Baia’s death serves as the *terminus ante quem* for the later feast, the earlier hell banquet must be between 1512, which Vasari gives as the company’s founding, and 1513.

150 Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:313.

151 Cambi, *Istorie*, 3:23-25, noting the mock combat which injured the Florentine soldiers, the *girandola* that was “una finzione di Sodoma et Ghamurra,” and the deaths of two prostitutes, a priest, and a notary, who, wanting the women to be seen, made a balcony on the facade of the Bargello which collapsed. According to Landucci, both the platform collapse and the combat were fatal; on the 26th, he prefaced the injuries resulting from the bull fight with notice of two suicides, one attempted and one successful, by drowning in the Arno. *Diario*, 340-341.
and performed for the Medici as part of the 1513 Carnival festivities. Both plays adopt a plot from Boccaccio’s *Decamerone* (5.5) of two friends competing for the love of the same woman; when one of them is discovered to be her brother, the other is free to marry her. Consistent with the Cazzuola’s transgressive dining thematics, Ottonaio invents a banquet as the means by which Panfilo seduces Filogenia, whom he later learns is his sister. Although the Cazzuola guests have left Plato’s abode, and ascended into “upper rooms” for the theatrical event, the notional “heavenly” banquet at the center of the play carries equally dark overtones; incest has replaced the inferno.

When read against the coeval Medici-sponsored celebrations in 1513, the torture, hellfire, terror, and vile foodstuffs found in da Panzano’s underworld feast recall the hellish conditions that Savonarola sympathizers Luca Landucci and Giovanni Cambi, for example, found in the San Giovanni spectacles, and that they also consistently juxtaposed with Medici *feste*. The torture, exile, and executions that the Medici used to silence...
dissent in the weeks and months surrounding Carnival, as discussed above – and which for Landucci entirely replace any description of the Broncone or Diamante’s parade floats – are merely one example of the disjunction Florentines registered between the Medici’s spectacular message and the reality of living under their rule.  

When news reached Florence on March 11th that Cardinal Giovanni de’ Medici was elected Pope Leo X, Landucci describes how the celebratory bonfires quickly turned into riots.

If there had been bonfire and rejoicings before [earlier that day when Giovanni’s election was a rumor], they were redoubled now, and in a different spirit...and the people not yet being content, ran all over Florence to pull down the wood roofs above the shops and everywhere, burning up everything. They put the whole city in great danger, and if the “Eight” had not made a proclamation that no more roofs were to be pulled down and that the Piagnoni were no longer to be insulted, on pain of the gallows, even the tiled roofs would have been destroyed and the shops looted.

After detailing the bonfires, smoke, and cannon fire that continued throughout the next three days, he concluded his long narrative of chaos and disorder with a notice of the parade triumph staged by the Medici: “And in addition to this, they made several triumphal cars, and every evening set light to one in front of the house of the Medici in their honour; one was of discord, war, and fear, whilst another was of peace, and this latter they did not burn, as if to express that there was an end of all passions, and peace

---

See his Ricordi, 299.

156 Cambi, Istorie, 3:2-5. Landucci, Diario, 334-335. The contemporary account of Bartolomeo Masi also describes the 1513 conspiracy without mention of the Carnival Triumphs, although he includes subsequent feste and ceremonies, in which the Medici are generally evaluated in positive terms.

157 Landucci, Florentine Diary, 267. Landucci, Diario, 336: “...e se prima s’era fatto fuochi e festa, si fece altrimenti e d’altra voglia, per modo che s’arse innumerabili fastella di scope e frasconi, corbegli, barili e ciò che s’aveva in casa ogni povero uomo; e per tutte le minime vie della città, sanza niuna masserizia; e non sendo contento il populo, corsono per tutto Firenze a rovinare tutti e tetti d’asse che trovavano alle botteghe e in ogni luogo, ardevano ogni cosa. Pericolorono tutta la città con danno grandissimo; e se non fusi gli Otto mandorono un bando che non si rovinassì più tetti e che non si dicessì più ingiuria a’ piagnioni, a pena delle forche, arebbono rovinato quegli degli enbrici e messo mano a rubare le botteghe.”
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remained triumphant.”\textsuperscript{158} The preponderance of celebratory bonfires, which “if seen from overhead,” appeared as though “Florence is burning down the whole city,”\textsuperscript{159} suggests that the Medicean celebrations were perhaps as dangerous for the city as were discord, war, or fear.

Cambi also took a skeptical view of the Medici’s self-promotion. He begins by describing the mobs which gathered in the piazza della Signoria and in front of the palazzo Medici when the new pope was announced:

...even though the Medici were not allowing entrance there except to their citizen friends, for fear of looting, as is the custom in Rome [when a new pope is elected]; in order to not be pillaged, the shops opened which [were closed because] it was Lent. They began to burn roof tiles and planking such that not a single one remains in Florence that was not burned.\textsuperscript{160}

Cambi next described the response to this arson the subsequent morning, when barrels were set out with burnable goods,\textsuperscript{161} and concluded with the evening’s illumination. He then turned to the events at casa Medici, which he framed as a response to the conflagration.

The next morning, the shops burned brooms, baskets, barrels, and whatever came into their hands. On Saturday evening, the whole city – the Signoria, the magistracies, and the entire city – puts a star made out of

\textsuperscript{158} Landucci, \textit{Florentine Diary}, 268. Landucci, \textit{Diario}, 337: “E più feciono più trionfi, e ogni sera n’ardeva uno a casa e’ Medici a loro proposito; che fu uno la discordia, la guerra, la paura; uno altro ne feciono della pacie, e questo non arse, come se fussi posto fine alle passioni, e che si rimanessi in pace e trionfi.” Landucci makes no mention of the Medici parenti’s offerings of coin, food, and cloth.

\textsuperscript{159} Landucci, \textit{Florentine Diary}, 267. Landucci, \textit{Diario}, 336-337: “E durò questa pestilenzia tutto venerdì e ’l sabato a fare fuochi e panegli in Palagio, in su la cupola, alle porte e per tutto, con tanti colpi d’artiglierie, senpre gridando \textit{Palle, Papa Lione}, che pareva ch’andassi sotto sopra la città, e chi fusi stato alto arebbe detto: Firenze arde tutta la città, tanto era le grida e’ fuochi e ’l fumo e gli scopietti, e piccoli e grossi; e poi la domenica quel medesimo, e ’l lunedì poi via peggio che mai.”

\textsuperscript{160} Cambi, \textit{Istorie}, 3:7: “...essi chominciò assonare in Palazzo subito, e dipoi tutte le Chiese, et il popolo corse in Piazza, et a chasa e’ Medici, benchè in chasa e’ Medici non vi lasciavano entrare se non ciptadini amici loro, per paura di non andare a sacco, chome si sostuma a Roma, et per non essere a quel’ otta aperte le botteghe, chera di Quarezima. Chominciorono a ardere gli asiti, e tetti dasse, che none rimase nessuno in Firenze non fussi arso.”

\textsuperscript{161} See Landucci, \textit{Diario}, 337.
brush in each house, and lights in all of the bell towers, and at the top of the cupola, which never have flammable rags lit there anymore. At the Medici house, the Pope and Giuliano de’ Medici threw cloaks, caps, and hats from the windows because the door was shut, and when they were at the windows to see, they were throwing some fabric, each to the other, for magnificence.\footnote{Cambi, \textit{Istorie}, 3:7: “Dipoi la mattina, le botteghe arsano schope, chorbelli, botte, e ciò che veniva loro alle mani, e sabato sera, la Ciptà tutta, la Signoria, e’ Magistrati, e tutta la Ciptà fastella di scope a ogni chasa, et lumiere per tutti e’ canpanili, et insulla chupola, che mai piú vi si fe’ panelli; et a chasa el Papa, Giuliano de’ Medici giptorono dalle finestre mantelli, e chapucci, berette, perchè la porta stava serata, e quando stavano alle finestre a vedere, giptavano e’ panni luno al’ altro per magnifienzia.”}

Earlier on Saturday – following Friday evening’s rampant arson – the Medici threw coin from their house; they also offered bread and wine at San Lorenzo, as did their allies and relatives at the homes of Giovanni Tornabuoni, Jacopo Salviati, and Bernardo Rucellai.\footnote{Cambi, \textit{Istorie}, 3:7-8: “Dipoi el dì del sabato giptorono fiorini d’oro, et battesimi, et grossoni, et gratie per parechi cintinaia di fiorini; e alla Chiesa di S. Lorenzo pane, e vino a ognuomo, el simile la chasa di Gio. Tornabuoni, et Iachopo Salviati, e molte altre chase di ciaptadini parenti, e amici della Ciptà in buono numero davano pane, e vino a hognuomo...” Masi wrote that coins were thrown on three successive days after each of the triumphs was performed, and that multiple members of the Medici family participated in the disbursements. He claimed that a value of more than 10,000 ducats were distributed each day, in addition to the clothing that was likewise thrown from the windows, and the caskets of wine – both red and white – which were placed in the street both night and day, as well as bread. In addition to the Medici, Masi recorded that the Salviati, Bernardo Rucellai, and unspecified others also gave money, clothing, confections, drink, and food to any who wanted it. \textit{Ricordanze}, 121-122. Bartolomeo Cerretani valued the coin dispensed at 1,000 florins per day. \textit{Ricordi}, 301.}

Cambi made no mention of the \textit{carri}, but instead emphasized the Medici’s justifiable fear of mob violence, and characterized the “magnificence” of their house and of their equally vulnerable and wealthy \textit{parenti} as self-preservation from the hordes which were massing in the streets. For the shopkeeper who had just lost his roof, if not the building and its contents as well, or the assaulted Piagnone, a hat or a gold florin might have seemed insufficient recompense; particularly as festivities marking Giulio de’ Medici’s investment as Archbishop of Florence just over a month later resulted in burned buildings at the back of the archbishop’s palace and in loss of life.\footnote{Masi, \textit{Ricordanze}, 125-127, stated that the baker Chima left a lamp burning when he left to attend the \textit{festa} at the palazzo Medici; during the evening, the lamp fell on some brooms and set the bakery ablaze.} The previous archbishop
might also be thought of as a casualty of the Medici. Bartolomeo Cerretani wrote that Cosimo de’ Pazzi, who was implicated in the Boscoli conspiracy, and whose death made the archbishopric available for Giulio, was no friend of his Medici cousins “because he desired their return not as lords (signori), but as citizens.” After the failed Boscoli conspiracy, “It was the opinion of some that he could have died of grief because the grandness of the Medici did not please him.” A similar objection to the Medici’s grandezza characterizes Matteo da Panzano’s next feast.

“To Be Eaten Alive”: Da Panzano and Saint Andrew

If Matteo’s earlier banquet parodied Medicean restoration as infernal damnation, his later dinner, which is consecutively described in Rustici’s Life, adopts a pious framework to expose costs of magnificence.

Two years afterwards, it being the turn of the same man, after many feasts and comedies, to be master of the Company another time, he, in order to reprove some of that Company who had spent too much on certain feasts and banquets (only, as the saying goes, to be themselves eaten alive), had his banquet arranged in the following manner. At the Aia, where they were wont to assemble, there were first painted on the wall without the door some of those figures that are generally painted on the walls and porticoes of hospitals, such as the director of the hospital, with gestures full of charity, inviting and receiving beggars and pilgrims. This picture being uncovered late on the evening of the feast, there began to arrive the men of the Company, who, after knocking and being received at the entrance by the director of the hospital, made their way into a great room arranged in the manner of a hospital, with the beds at the sides and other suchlike things. In the middle of that room, round a great fire, were Bientina,
Battista dell’Ottonaio, Barlacchi, Baia, and other merry spirits, dressed after the manner of beggars, wastrels, and gallows-birds, who, pretending not to be seen by those who came in from time to time and gathered into a circle, and conversing of the men of the Company and also of themselves, said the hardest things in the world about those who had thrown away their all and spent on suppers and feasts much more than was right. Which discourse finished, when it was seen that all who were to be there had arrived, in came S. Andrew, their Patron Saint, who, leading them out of the hospital, took them into another room, magnificently furnished, where they sat down to table and had a joyous supper. Then the Saint pleasantly commanded them that, in order not to be too wasteful with their superfluous expenses, so that they might keep well away from hospitals, they should be contented with one feast, a grand and excellent affair, every year; after which he went his way. And they obeyed him, holding a most beautiful supper, with a comedy, every year over a long period of time; and thus there were performed at various times, as was related in the Life of Aristotile da San Gallo, the Calandra of M. Bernardo, Cardinal of Bibbiena, the Suppositi and the Cassaria of Ariosto, and the Clizia and Mandragola of Machiavelli, with many others.167

The meal’s conceit is a tongue-in-cheek admonishment which combined an appeal for charity with a reminder of mortality; the diners may soon become the hospital’s ill residents or impoverished poor, particularly if they squander wealth on ephemeral luxury.

---

167 Translation adapted from Vasari-De Vere, 8:125-126. Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:486: “In capo a due anni toccando, dopo molte feste e comedie, al medesimo a essere un’altra volta signore, per tassare alcuni della Compagnia che troppo avevano speso in certe feste e conviti (per essere mangiati, come si dice, vivi), fece ordinare il convito suo in questa maniera. All’Aia, dove erano soliti ragunarsi, furono primieramente fuori della porta, nella facciata, dipinte alcune figure di quelle che ordinariamente si fanno nelle facciate e ne’ portici degli spedali, cioè lo spedalingo che in atti tutti pieni di carità invita e riceve i poveri e’ peregrini. La quale pittura scopertasi la sera della festa al tardi, cominciarono a comparire gl’uomini della Compagnia, i quali bussando, poi che all’entrare erano dallo spedalingo stati ricevuti, pervenivano a una gran stanza accocca a uso di spedale, con le sue letta dagli lati et altre cose simiglianti; nel mezzo della quale, dintorno a un gran fuoco, erano vestiti a uso di poltronieri, furfanti e poveracci, il Bientina, Battista dell’Ottonaio, il Barlacchi, il Baia et altri così fatti uomini piacevoli, i quali fingendo di non esser veduti da coloro che di mano in mano entravano e facevano cerchio, e discorrendo sopra gli’uomini della Compagnia e sopra loro stessi, dicevano le più ladre cose del mondo di coloro che avevano gettato via il loro e speso in cene e in feste troppo più che non conviene. Il quale discorso finito, poi che si videro esser giunti tutti quelli che vi avevono a essere, venne Santo Andrea loro avvocato, il quale, cavandogli dello spedale, gli condusse in un’aletta stanza magnificamente apparecchiata, dove, messi a tavola, cenarono allegramente; e dopo il Santo comandò loro piacevolmente che per non soprabondare in spese superflue et avere a stare lontano dagli spedali, si contentassero d’una festa l’anno, principale e solenne, e si partì: et essi l’ubidirono, facendo per ispazio di molti anni ogni anno una bellissima cena e commedia; onde recitarono in diversi tempi, come si disse nella Vita d’Aristotile da San Gallo, la Calandra di messer Bernardo cardinale di Bibbiena, i Suppositi e la Cassaria dell’Ariosto, e la Clizia e Mandragola del Machiavello, con altre molte.”
Part of the humor lies in the identities of the interlocutors; the “affable men” (uomini piacevoli), Bientina, Ottonaio, Barlacchia, and Baia, who say “the worst things in the world” (literally “wolf things,” ladre cose del mondo) about profligate spending on dinners and on festivities (in cene e in feste) made their living through such lavish spectacles. Jacopo da Bientina and Giovambattista dell’Ottonaio were playwrights and composers of scurrilous canti carnascialeschi whom would be later employed by the Signoria as heralds to entertain the priors during meals and to record civic ceremonial.\textsuperscript{168} Barlacchi was a famous, or perhaps notorious, actor and improviser who regularly provided amusement for public and private feste; he was also appointed a town crier (banditore) in 1509.\textsuperscript{169} As a professional bombardiere, Baia loaded and charged artillery. His skills in munitions and woodworking also made him a sought-after craftsman of girandole, the pyrotechnic displays akin to fireworks which were often lit during festive events.\textsuperscript{170}

Their castigation underscores the irreverent humor of the Cazzuola, whose foundation originated in a puerile prank executed by Baia. Rustici’s compagnie di piacere were axiomatically farcical inversions of religious confraternities; instead of performing

\textsuperscript{168} For the duties of the herald, see the discussion in Francesco Filarete and Angelo Manfidi, The Libro cerimoniale of the Florentine Republic, ed. Richard C. Trexler (Geneva: Droz, 1978), 34-36; for Ottonaio’s appointment by Lorenzo de’ Medici on February 25, 1517, see ibid., 126. For Bientina’s likely appointment in 1527 following the death of Ottonaio, see Mozzati, Giovanfrancesco Rustici, 369. For biographical details of both, see ibid., 369-370 (Bientina) and 376-377 (Ottonaio) with bibliography. For their comedies, see also Ventrone, “‘Civic Performance’ in Renaissance Florence,” 153-169.


\textsuperscript{170} See Mozzati, Giovanfrancesco Rustici, 357-359. For his munitions and a Compagnacci plot, see Lorenzo Violi, Le giornate, ed. Gian Carlo Garfagnini (Florence: Olschki, 1986), 73-74. Baia identified himself as both a bombardiere and a legnaiuolo in his testament of November 29, 1515. See Minucci del Rosso, “Di alcuni personaggi,” 480-481.
good works, the dining sodalities were dedicated to amusing pleasures. Nonetheless, however facetious the self-parodying invective might have been, the moral critique is legitimated when the company carried out the command of their avvocato, St. Andrew, to limit the banquets to an annual splendid feast.

The inclusion of St. Andrew in Matteo’s invention and his admonishing role also carry a political valence. Philippe Sénéchal argued that the appeal of the patron of fishermen, fishmongers, rope-makers, butchers, mariners, and miners to a company of artists, musicians, and merchants likely resides in the saint’s feast day on November 30th, which would commemorate the Florentine entrata of the new Medici pope, Leo X, in 1515. If Sénéchal is correct, Matteo’s feast must have taken place between October 5th, when the date of Leo X’s entry in Florence was decided, and November 29th, when Baia was mortally wounded. Much as Matteo’s previous setting, which located Baia in an

---

171 See, for example, Niccolò Machiavelli’s satirical Capitoli per una compagnia di piacere, in Opere, 3:243-247. These statues have been associated with the Cazzuola by Wellen, “Andrea del Sarto,” 119-120. For the compagnie di piacere, including a 1527 “compagnia de’ piaceri di stendardo” in Santa Croce as parodies of religious confraternities, see John Henderson, Piety and Charity in Late Medieval Florence (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), 436-437. Mozzati, in contrast, identified the Paiuolo and the Cazzuola as festive, but nonetheless religious, lay compagnie di stendardo analogous to the Compagnia del Broncone, the latter of whose members, for example, were obligated to celebrate mass together on St. Lawrence’s feast day. See Giovanfrancesco Rustici, 193-194 and 229-232. For the Broncone statues, see Palagi, I capitoli. That the Paiuolo was instead a parody of the lay confraternity is suggested by the appointment of its youngest member, Lippi – who was 11 years old in 1511 when Mozzati dates the company’s founding – as the proveditore, and the only named office-holder.

172 Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:486 : “...dopo il Santo comandò loro piacevolmente che per non sopravondare in spese superflue et avere a stare lontano dagli spedali, si contentassero d’une festa l’anno, principale e solenne, e si partì: et essi l’ubidirono, facendo per ispazio di molti anni ogni anno una bellissima cena e comedia; onde recitarono in diversi tempi, come si disse nella Vita d’Aristotile da San Gallo, la Calandra di messer Bernardo cardinale di Bibbiena, i Suppositi e la Cassaria dell’Ariosto, e la Clizia e Mandragola del Machiavello, con altre molte.” As he discussed, several of the Cazzuola members created the decorations for or otherwise participated in Leo’s entry, for which, see below. Giovan Francesco Rustici, 130. Mozzati alternatively theorized that the company was founded on the saint’s day, November 30, in 1512. Giovanfrancesco Rustici, 217n190.

173 John Shearman noted that the November 30th date for the entry was decided on October 5, 1515. “The Florentine Entrata of Leo X, 1515,” Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, 38 (1975):
infernal afterlife, the hospital created by the Cazzuola at Santa Maria Nuova’s Aia also presages the bombardier’s grim end. Jacopo del Bonaccorso died in the Camaldolite infirmary on December 7th, and was buried in the adjoining cemetery.\textsuperscript{175} In a morbid twist on the invention’s own parody, the very same extravagant expenditure which Baia excoriates in Matteo’s feast ultimately killed him.\textsuperscript{176}

As Baia’s experience reveals, when St. Andrew’s evocation of Leo X and of the ephemera created for his \textit{entrata} is read in the context of a banquet whose underlying conceit is excessive spending on \textit{cene} and \textit{feste}, Matteo’s banquet becomes an indictment of papal magnificence. In an echo of the chatter of the Cazzuola’s \textit{uomini piacevoli}, Luca Landucci acknowledges the benefit of Leo’s \textit{entrata} to the city’s artisans, while also finding the expense morally questionable.

And you must know that I have not written the tenth part of what might be said; when you think that we had more than 2 thousand men at work, as it was estimated, for more than a month, belonging to various trades: carpenters, stone-masons, painters, carters, porters, sawyers, etc., and a cost of 70 thousand florins or more was mentioned, all for things of no duration; when a splendid temple might have been built in honour of God and to the glory of the city. Certainly, however, the money that was scattered in this way added to the earnings of the poor workmen.\textsuperscript{177}

\textsuperscript{148}n37. This would also accord with Vasari’s statement that this feast occurred “two years after” Matteo’s hell banquet. Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5: 486. For Baia’s testament, dictated on November 29, 1515, see the following note.
\textsuperscript{175} Minucci del Rosso, “Di alcuni personaggi,” 480-481, publishes extracts from Baia’s November 29, 1515 testament and the notice of his death on December 7th, which was appended to Santa Maria Nuova’s copy of the will.
\textsuperscript{176} See Buonarotto Buonarroti’s letter to his brother Michelangelo on December 30, 1515, in which he described Baia’s tragic end and censured the festivities. Published in Ciseri, \textit{L’ingresso trionfale}, 177, doc. III: “e chosi e’ legionaiuoli e dipintori anno vendegniato bene, salvo che il povero Baia che, esendo in piazza, perchè avevono fatto un archo fra lui e l’Sanghalo, e stando li a parlare chon uno amicho e tirando l’artiglieria, usci una bietta di fero d’uno di queli charri, detegli sotto el ginochio, spezò la gamba afato ed ebesi a sechare, tanto che infr a 4 giorni si morì. Questo è stato quanto male s’è fato in questa festa.”
\textsuperscript{177} Landucci, \textit{Diario}, 285. Landucci, \textit{Diario}, 359: “E sappi ch’io non n’ò scritto delle 10 parte una di quello che si potrebbe dire, e vedi, e pensa che aveamo più di 2 milia uomini a lavorare, che così si stimava,
Several of Landucci’s “poor workmen” were members of the Cazzuola. Andrea del Sarto, Francesco Granacci, Giuliano Bugiardini, Giovanfrancesco Rustici, and Baia are known to have been employed in connection with the pope’s entry, and the involvement of Lorenzo Naldini, Spillo, Manente, and the musicians Pierino piffero and Giovanni trombone is extremely likely. By choosing Andrew for the company’s patron saint, the Cazzuola could have been paying homage to their own Medici patron. However, given the retrenchment of feste commanded by the saint, whose adoption by the Cazzuola was likely predicated on the lavish spectacles celebrating Leo’s visit, Andrew might also condemn Medici excess. Like Landucci, the sodality, whose artist-members were simultaneously creating the hospital staging and the very decor which its banquet critiques, might similarly have found an inappropriate ostentation in Leo’s pageantry, or at the very least an overabundance worthy of satire. Andrew’s injunction can also be read

178 Jacopo Sansovino, who created the Cazzuola’s feast of Tantalus in hell with Sarto and Rustici, and the Païuolo’s Aristotile da San Gallo were also employed for the 1515 entrata. See Ilaria Ciseri, “‘Con tanto grandissimo e trionfante onore’,” 39n88 and 117. Mozzati suggested that the “Francesco d’Agnolo” who was paid on November 6, 1515 for decoration in San Lorenzo, was Spillo. Giovanfrancesco Rustici, 355-356.

179 Ciseri proposed that the “Lorenzo scultore” who created the triumphal arch dedicated to Temperance was Naldini. “Con tanto grandissimo e trionfante onore,” 241. She also argued that the “Maestro Manente” who directed the interior decoration of the Duomo was the Cazzuola’s physician-member. L’ingresso trionfale, 39n88 and 117. Mozzati suggested that the “Francesco d’Agnolo” who was paid on November 6, 1515 for decoration in San Lorenzo, was Spillo. Giovanfrancesco Rustici, 355-356. Given the musical fanfare during the event, Sénéchal noted that the participation of Pierino and Giovanni is also highly probable. Giovan Francesco Rustici, 130.

180 See Sénéchal, Giovan Francesco Rustici, 130.

181 Mozzati alternatively proposed that the retrenchment was a consequence of Giuliano’s death in 1515; without their “patron,” the Cazzuola was forced to economize. Giovanfrancesco Rustici, 220: “Si potrebbe ipotizzare che la dilazione delle cene fosse una conseguenza anche della morte di Giuliano, avvenuta del 1515. I compagni furono forse spinti ad una meno frequente ostentazione di lusso sia dal rispetto del lutto per la scomparsa del loro fratello più prestigioso che dall volontà di non irritare una dirigenza, come quella medicea, che aveva in tal modo perso il suo controllo diretto sulla Compagnia.”
as Matteo’s own appeal for economy and reflective of the banker’s diminished financial circumstances.

By 1515, Matteo’s fortunes seem to have taken a turn for the worse. After the death of his father, Luca di Fruosino di Luca da Panzano (1432-1512/1513), sometime after December 30, 1511 and before May 28, 1513, Matteo and his brothers inherited the da Panzano bank. As Götz-Rüdiger Tewes demonstrated, the da Panzano bank was part of the clandestine network created by Lorenzo de’ Medici in the aftermath of the 1478 Pazzi conspiracy to conceal and to protect Medici assets, as well as to embezzle state funds. In collussion with Bartolomeo di Leonardo Bartolini (1444-1507), Filippo di Piero da Gagliano (b. 1452), and Francesco di Ser Jacopo Bottegari (b. 1448) – whose son Jacopo (b. 1476) was one of the Cazzuola’s members – Lorenzo established the Bartolini bank as a front for the Medici’s own commercial and banking enterprises. Using the international branches of the Bartolini bank, as well as the collaboration of allied banks in Florence and abroad – including that of Luca da Panzano and of Taddeo

---

182 His birth is registered in the Tratte as November 16, 1432, in the quarter of Santo Spirito, gonfalone Ferza. Herlihy et al., *Online Tratte*. This is confirmed by his 1480 catasto where he states he is 48 years old. See Verde, *Lo studio fiorentino*, 1037. In his Giornale (1506-1511), Filippo Strozzi consistently named the company using only Luca’s name, as in Archivio di Stato, Florence (hereafter ASF), Carte Strozziani, Serie V, 90, 21 [left], December 30, 1511: “Da Lorenzo e Filippo Strozzi propri lire quattrocentosei soldi 2 d’oro largo, per loro da Lucha da Panzano e compagnia e per me a Taddeo Gaddi e compagnia sono per resto di lire 775 d’oro di camera, promessi loro per madonna Alfonsina Orsina de’ Medici a 2 ½ percento meglio.” In his account book of 1508-1515, Federigo Strozzi identified the bank as “Luca da Pamzano [sic] e compagnia” on July 13, 1507, but as “Rede di Lucha da Panzano e compagnia” on May 28, 1513 and thereafter, which suggests that Luca’s heirs were then running the company. See these latter examples in Federigo Melis, *La banca pisana e le origini della banca moderna*, ed. Marco Spallanzani (Florence: Le Monnier, 1987), 32-33.


184 For Filippo da Gagliano, see also Brown, “Lorenzo de’ Medici’s New Men and their Mores,” in *Medicean and Savonarolan Florence*, 28-31 and 37.

185 Tewes, *Kampf um Florenz*, 1098-1099, who noted his birth on October 4, 1448, his public offices held between 1470 and 1493, but not later, and that already in 1479 he appeared in the records of Filippo da Gagliano in the context of the Medici and the Bartolini Bank.
d’Agnolo Gaddi, the father of the Cazzuola’s Giovanni – the Medici were able to preserve and to access their wealth, even after being expelled from the city in 1494. During the family’s exile from Florence, Luca ran one of the Medici banks under his own name, and Matteo held a coded account through which several thousand scudi were transferred between Lyons and Florence from 1506 to 1508.\(^{186}\) The da Panzano bank served as the “house bank” of the Medici functionaries Giuliano and Filippo da Gagliano,\(^ {187}\) and was also favored by the Strozzi, the del Giocondo, and the Pandolfini syndicate members, including Antonio di Zanobi del Giocondo and Battista Pandolfini, whose sons were companions of the Cazzuola.\(^ {188}\)

These connections likely facilitated the expansion of Cosimo (1474-before 1532),\(^ {189}\) Matteo’s brother and fellow Cazzuola companion, into international commerce. In 1508, he resided in Valencia, where he was involved in a slavery dispute.\(^ {190}\) By at least

\(^{186}\) Tewes, *Kampf um Florenz*, 119n79: “Hervorzuheben ist schließlich, daß sich Filippo da Gagliano und die Bartolini-Bank bei allen Monte-Geschäften (ebenso wie bei Schiffversicherungen) des Maklers (sensale) Luca di Fruosino da Panzano bedienten, der ganz klar den Medici zugeordnet werden muß und unter dessen Namen nach der Exilierung der Medici eine den Medici dienende Florentiner Bank lief, die in ihrer Struktur der des früheren Kassiers der Bartolini-Bank Giovanni d’Ambra geähnelt haben müßte.” For Luca, see also 108 and 646. For Matteo’s secret account and Domenico Perini, see 98n17 and 646.

\(^{187}\) Ibid., 646.

\(^{188}\) For Federigo di Lorenzo di Francesco Strozzi and the da Panzano, see Melis, *La banca pisana*, 14n41 and 21. It should also be noted that the land Matteo and Cosimo obtained in 1515 and renounced two years later was acquired from Federigo. For the property, see Mozzati, *Giovanfrancesco Rustici*, 385. For the del Giocondo and the da Panzano bank, see Pallanti, *Mona Lisa Revealed*, 51. For Antonio’s role in the Monte and the Medici syndicate, see Tewes, *Kampf um Florenz*, 225 and 837. For Battista di Pandolfo Pandolfini and payments to Benedetto da Rovezzano through the da Panzano bank, see Eugenio Luporini, “Battista Pandolfini e Benedetto da Rovezzano nella Badia fiorentina: Documenti per la datazione,” Prospettiva 33 (1983): 121. For Pandolfini’s roles in the Monte and in the Medici syndicate, see Tewes, *Kampf um Florenz*, 221-228.

\(^{189}\) Cosimo’s birth is recorded in the Tratte as April 27, 1474, in the quarter of Santo Spirito, gonfalone Ferza. See Herlihy et al., *Online Tratte*; and Verde, *Lo studio fiorentino*, 1037. Mozzati noted that Cosimo’s absence in the 1532 Decima granducale likely indicates his death by this date. *Giovanfrancesco Rustici*, 386.

1516, Cosimo incorporated with the Florentine Jacopo Fantoni, who succeeded Piero Rondinelli as the Medici agent in Seville and took over the Rondinelli trade in slaves, textiles, sugar, books, and paper after the latter’s death in 1514.\(^{191}\) Cosimo also benefited from Fantoni’s partnerships with other key Andalusian traders, including Jacopo Botti, Giovanni Morelli, and Zanboi Guidacci; these companies in turn formed part of a larger network of allied Florentine corporations, such as those of the Medici, Gondi, Strozzi, Capponi, Borghini, Corsini, Rondinelli and Marchioni, each of which had a subsidiary branch in Seville.\(^{192}\) Likely through this network, the company of Fantoni and Panzano secured the lucrative papal account in 1518 and 1519, when they traded in wheat and salt on behalf of Leo X.\(^{193}\) The partnership was successful enough to have established branches in Cadiz and Seville by 1520.\(^{194}\) In Florence, Cosimo added to the da Panzano’s honor when he was elected to the twelve Buonomini on December 12, 1517.\(^{195}\)

Matteo, in contrast, appears to have benefited less from his connections with the Medici syndicate. Unlike his brothers, for example, Matteo does not appear to have been drawn for any public office. The financial difficulties which ultimately bankrupted the da


\(^{194}\) Tognetti, *I Gondi di Lione*, 77-78.

\(^{195}\) Herlihy et al., *Online Tratte*. 182
Panzano bank in 1520 might have already been evident in 1514, when Fruosino, the eldest brother and first of Luca’s line to be drawn for significant civic office, was declared ineligible due to tax arrears.\textsuperscript{196} The land purchased by Matteo and Cosimo in 1515, which they then repudiated in 1517, might also signal overextended finances.\textsuperscript{197} When Giovanni Cambi described the failure of the da Panzano bank on December 29, 1520, he cites the ignobility of Luca’s line and its lack of an established tradition of holding high civic offices, then faults Luca’s sons, Fruosino, Matteo, and Cosimo, for bankrupting themselves “by wanting to be like the rich and to spend more than they earned....”\textsuperscript{198} Although Cambi is incorrect regarding their civic offices, since both Cosimo (1517) and Fruosino (1516) were seated for the twelve Buonomini, his identification of

\textsuperscript{196} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{197} Mozzati, \textit{Giovanfrancesco Rustici}, 385-386.

\textsuperscript{198} Cambi, \textit{Istorie}, 3:176-177: “Addì 29. di Dicembre fallì Fruoxino, Matteo, e Choximo fratelli, e figliuoli di Luca da Panzano, che facevano banco in mercato nuovo sotto la casa de’ Cavalcanti, erano ignobili nella Ciptà. Questo Luca loro padre era Sensale di Monte, e di fare sicurtà, e non avea benifitio agli Ufici di Firenze, né nessuno de’ sua, ned era consorto de’ Panzani del Quart. di S. Croce, ma andava per Quart. di S. Spirito, e cominciò detto Luca loro padre aprire un banco a questi sua figliuoli, e per essere stato da 40. anni Sensale, e stato uomo veritiere nell’arte sua, avea grande amicizia co’ Merchatanti, e Canbiatori in Firenze per conto delle sicurtà, chessi facevano in Firenze, el forte per le sua mane, per modo, che apendo questo banco cominciò a poco a poco a crescere le faccende, perche non ci era in quel tempo altro, che tre banchi, che tenessino tavolello fuori, e facessino facende di botteghai, e quaxi simile allui, e morendo questo Luca, questi tre sua figliuoli rimaseno insul lavimento, per modo faceva più facende, che bancho di mercato; e cominciorono anvari, e volere stare come ricchi, e a spendere più non guadagnavano, che feciono come il fioralixo, che viene presto, e vassene presto, e saran forzati a ritornare nel loro stato primaio del Sensale, chessi fa colle parole, e feciono accordo di rendere soldi 15. danari 6. per lira sellosserveranno, lanno 1520.” In an odd note regarding a da Panzano workhand who killed his family and livestock, then burned his house in 1523, however, Cambi states that the bank failed the year prior. Ibid., 235-236: “In questo medesimo giorno, o notte de’ di 2. di Giugno 1523, fu un contadino lavoratore de’ figliuoli di Lucha di Fruoxino da Panzano, Sensale di monte, e dipoi divenono banchieri, e fallirono lanno passato, ed ebono sindachato. Questo loro lavoratore a S. Maria Inproneta amazzò detta notte la moglie, et dipoi e’ figliuoli, e dipoi un bue, e un afino, e da 16. pecore, e dipoi cacciò fuoco in casa, acciò si consumassì ogni cosa, et andossi con Dio.” Mozzati published the former notice, but found the failure of the bank a “coincidenza singolare,” and did not link Cambi’s notice with Vasari’s proverb. Instead he viewed the Cazzuola as analogous to Lorenzo de’ Medici’s Compagnia del Broncone: a festival \textit{compagnia di stendardo}, which likewise served to pacify and to entertain Florence’s citizens, while enabling social promotion. He used Cambi to underscores the Cazzuola as a mechanism of social advancement. \textit{Giovanfrancesco Rustici}, 252 and n384, and 385-386.
the da Panzano’s ignobility and their lack of beneficiati is likely accurate, since both Cosimo and Fruosino were notably drawn for the Buonomini from the purse of the Arti minori – even though they belonged to the greater Arte del Cambio – and since Luca appears to have held no higher offices than minor guild positions.\textsuperscript{199} Cambi’s larger assessment of the sons’ desire for social advancement suggests that Matteo’s extravagant hell banquet was likely an attempt to rival the magnificence of the Cazzuola’s patrician members, and that his subsequent hospital feast served to rein in his over-expenditures while maintaining an elevated social profile. His feasts could equally and concurrently express disgruntlement that his own service to the Medici had not been commensurately rewarded after the Medici’s restoration. For Matteo, who protected Medici interests during their exile, including the secret transfer of funds, to have to curtail his own festive displays at the very time that Florence sees such ostentatious spectacles for the Medici, might have galled. The Medici’s return might even be seen to have been a detriment to Matteo. The arson which followed Leo X’s election targeted the Silk Guild and the banks in the Mercato Nuovo, and most likely damaged the da Panzano establishment, which was one of the three counters located outside.\textsuperscript{200} The bank’s failure was itself also likely

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{199} Cosimo was drawn for the Buonomini on December 12, 1517 from the quarter of Santo Spirito and the purse of the minor guilds. Fruosino was drawn for the Buonomini on September 12, 1514 (\textit{in speculo}) and on September 12, 1516, from the quarter of Santo Spirito and the purse of the minor guilds. This lesser guild was likely the Vinattieri (wine merchants), as Fruosino was drawn in their 1494 guild elections (\textit{in speculo}), as was Luca (1486, 1492, and 1497), who does not appear to have held any of the city’s highest offices (Tre Maggiori). Among Luca’s grandsons, only Luca di Fruosino di Luca (b.1495) was drawn for public office; on December 12, 1524, the minor was “seen” for the Buonomini. See Herlihy et al., \textit{Online Tratte}. For the benefits the da Panzano would enjoy following Fruosino’s 1514 election as one of the “veduti e seduti ai Tre Maggiori,” see Kent, \textit{Household and Lineage}, 79-80. For the fourth brother, Raffaele (c. 1473-1504), who made his profession in the convent of San Marco as Fra Angelo in 1493, see Pandolfo Rucellai, \textit{Epistolario di Fra Santi Rucellai}, eds. Armando F. Verde and Elettra Giaconi (Pistoia: Provincia Romana dei Frati Predicatori, 2004), 124.
\item \textsuperscript{200} Masi, \textit{Ricordanze}, 119: “Et in detta sera [March 11, 1513], cominciorno cierti giovani, in Mercato Nuovo, a dare in quegli assiti e in que’ tetti d’asse d’abeto di quelle arte di seta e banchi, a spezzargli e
precipitated by the repayment of Medici debt, as Jacopo Salviati drew 1,000 scudi from the da Panzano bank on July 18, 1520, in order to settle Giovanni delle Bande Nere’s account with the Ospedale di Santa Maria Nuova. The increased costs of comestibles which accompanied the announcement of Leo’s Florentine visit further exacerbated the expense of Matteo’s own convivialities. By framing a needed economizing as moral uprightness, Matteo both safeguards his own reputation while implicitly castigating the Medici’s concurrent ostentation.

The hypocrisy and transgressiveness of Matteo’s feast is signaled by Vasari. The Aretine writes that Matteo chose the theme “in order to tax (tassare) some of the Company who had spent too much on certain festivities and feasts (for being eaten, as one says, alive), he lays out his feast in this fashion.” Vasari, who would have known of the da Panzano’s fiscal precariousness full well through his friendship with Francesco Rucellai, the convivial companion and friend of Cosimo da Panzano, combined

farne fuoco in sul mezzo del Mercato Nuovo; in modo che, inanzi che la mattina fussi dí, non era rimasto, né in Porzanta Maria né in Vacchereccia né in Calimala né in Mercato Nuovo, tetto né assito che non fussi stato fracassato et arso.” For the da Panzano bank in the Mercato, see Cambi, Istorie, 3:100.


For the rising costs, see below.

Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:486: “In capo a due anni toccando, dopo molte feste e comedie, al medesimo a essere un’altra volta signore, per tassare alcuni della Compagnia che troppo avevano speso in certe feste e conviti (per essere mangiati, come si dice, vivi), fece ordinare il convito suo in questa maniera.”

See Vasari’s 1536 letter to Francesco Rucellai in Vasari-Milanesi, 8:261-262; and Vasari’s mention of Rucellai in a 1533 letter to Carlo Guasconi in ibid., 8:243-244.

Between 1500 and 1523, Francesco, for example, deposited his own woolen cloth as surety for Cosimo’s account with the used-goods dealer, and the da Panzano’s neighbor, Domenico del Commandatore. See Ann Matchette, “Credit and Credbility: Used Goods and Social Relations in Sixteenth-Century Florence,” in The Material Renaissance, eds. Michelle O’Malley and Evelyn S.
fiscal and digestive language to wittily expose Matteo’s “tax” as his own undoing. Redolent of Cambi’s equally supercilious assessment, Vasari indicates that through his conspicuous display of consumption, Matteo was himself consumed. Vasari’s use of an autophagic metaphor to align the body with monetary equity also underscores the leitmotif of cannibalism which underlies the Paiuolo’s and several of Cazzuola’s banquets. The Cazzuola’s subsequent three inventions, all of which revolved around the purity of foodstuffs, suggest that the Rucellai brothers and Giovanni Gaddi were likely equally expressing dissatisfaction with the Medici regime.

_starvation and satire: the rucellai and gaddi banquets_

Vasari follows Matteo’s infernal and infirmary dinners with those produced by the da Panzano’s friends and neighbors:

Francesco and Domenico Rucellai, for the feast that it fell to them to give when they were masters of the Company, performed first the Arpie of Fineo, and the second time, after a disputation of philosophers on the Trinity, they caused to be represented S. Andrew throwing open a Heaven with all the choirs of the Angels, which was in truth a very rare spectacle.206

In the first invention, “Phineus’s harpies” are the creatures who stole and befouled the victuals of the blind seer-king of Thrace. A vivid description of their torment is voiced by Phineus in Valerius Flaccus’s _Argonautica_: 

_The Harpies ever watch my food; never, alas! can I elude them; straightway they all swoop down like the black cloud of a whirling hurricane, already by the sound of her wings I know Celaeno from afar; they ravage and sweep away my banquet, and befoul and upset the cups,_

---

206 Vasari-De Vere, 8:126. Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:486-487: “Francesco e Domenico Rucellai, nella festa che toccò a far loro quando furono signori, fecero una volta l’Arpie di Fineo, e l’altra, dopo una disputa di filosofi sopra la Trinità, fecero mostrare da Santo Andrea un cielo aperto con tutti i cori degli’Angeli, che fu cosa veramente rarissima....”
there is a violent stench and a sorry battle arises, for the monsters are as famished as I. What all have scorned or polluted with their touch, or what has fallen from their filthy claws, helps me to linger thus among the living. Nor may I break fate’s bond by death: by nourishment is my cruel need prolonged.207

A plague of harpies who devour one’s sustenance and who pollute what little they left behind could serve as an apt analogy for the Florentines’ experience of the papal court. Both Landucci and Lapini record that as soon as Leo X’s visit to Florence was announced on October 21, 1515, “all kinds of provisions” rose in cost, citing particularly oil, grains, and wine.208 In addition to bearing the steep prices, citizens were also forced to house and to feed the visiting dignitaries and their retinues. Piero Parenti wrote that this mandated billeting was “universally displeasing,” and recorded the vituperative graffiti that was scrawled on the houses hosting the courtiers.209 When the pope returned to Florence


208 Landucci, *Diario*, 351, October 21, 1515: “E in questi di si diceva che verrebbe in Firenze el Re e ’l Papa, in modo che si cominciò a rincarare ogni cosa di camangiare e vettovaglie e andò el barile dell’olio a lire 18, el grano andò a soldi 30, el vino a un mezzo ducato el barile, e lire 4 el meno.”

209 Parenti, *Storia*, cited in Ciseri, *L’ingresso trionfale*, 314: “Nella venuta qui del pontefice, per poterlo ricevere insieme colla chorte commodamente, si feciono segnare molte case di cittadini per ordine della Signoria. La qual cosa dispiaceva allo universale, dovendo patire il disagio senza fructo. Etiam lo spenderisi grossamente in fare ornamenti per il giorno della sua giunta doleva: rispetto al pensarsi che tale spendio del comune converrebbe poi sopplirlo colle gravezze il perché tale venuta del pontefice non fu molto grata. Mostrossene lo effecto nello incontrarlo e’ cittadini e’ quali furono pochissimi et fuggirono la spesa el più che poterono benché fussino comandati dalla Signoria et dipoi da madonna Alfonisina. In effecto pensandosi che tale venuta dovesi essere in proficco della città nostra, si cominciò a conoscere che riusciva in opposito. Avvenne etiam un caso in via maggio, che sotto alla nocte, di quelli per chi si piglavano le case, fu scripto, non ci vogliamo più pazi: maxime a quelle dove doveano alloggiare i sanesi con il loro cardinale. Della qual cosa li octo feciono grandissimo chonto, et mandorono che chi si notificava li sarebbe tenuto segreto et inoltrre harebbe 25 ducati d’oro, ma passato el dato termine li sarebbono confiscati e’ beni et taglato la testa.” See also Butters, *Governors and Government*, 273-275; and Polizzotto, *Elect Nation*, 362-363. The Otto di Guardia’s response to this anonymous tagging suggests the equivocal appeal of the macabre for the Cazzuola’s members as a
following his negotiations with Francis I, his lengthy stay of December 22, 1515 to February 19, 1516 generated increasing privation and growing antagonism among Florentines. Landucci stated that the price of corn quadrupled in a few days, and that “everything was raised in value.” In addition to the rising cost of comestibles, wood, which was burned as the primary source of heat to stave off the cold in these particularly harsh winter months, became ever more costly; so much so, “that the poor suffered much. It was expected the Pope would cause foreign corn to be brought, but nothing was done. Everyone was amazed to see the quantity of food consumed by the strangers in the following of the papal court.”

The hostility against the ravenous foreigners soon built to the point that Leo X was forced to curtail his visit and to return to Rome, “on account of the harm caused to the citizens by the price of corn.”

An analogy with thieving harpies could equally characterize the Medici’s use of the feasts given in September 1518 to celebrate Lorenzo de’ Medici’s marriage to Madeleine de la Tour d’Auvergne. Although the commune and its territories contributed vast quantities of comestibles to the nuptial meals, according to Cerretani, neither citizens nor magistrates were honored in the feasts, but were instead displaced by the Medici’s

medium of expressing dissent.

210 Landucci, *Diary*, 287. Landucci, *Diario*, 361, February 10, 1516: “E in questo tenpo rincarò el grano in pochi di più di soldi 10 lo staio, andò insino a soldi 40, in modo che non si lavorando, è valendo ogni cosa. Vino valeva lire 5 el barile, l’olio andò a lire 18 el barile, la carne del proco a soldi 2, denari 4 la libra; e tutte carne care e pesci. E pesci d’Arno fu venduto soldi 16 la libbra, e altri pesci cari, e lengne molto care. In modo ch’è’ poveri furono molto adolorati. Aspettavano dal Papa facessì venire grano forestiero, non ne fece nulla. Si sbigotti ognuno vedendo consumare la roba alla gente ch’era drieto alla Corte del Papa di forestieri.” It should be noted that much of the increased cost was due to price gouging by the patrician’s that controlled much of the supply of foodstuffs into the city; some of the Cazzuola’s more elite youths, therefore, likely materially benefited from these artificially inflated costs.

211 Landucci, *Diary*, 287. Landucci, *Diario*, 362: “E a dì 19 di febraio, si partì el Papa di Firenze, e andò abergo a Santa Maria Inpruneta; e partissì a ore 18 in martedì, e partissì di mala voglia, per conto de’ mali cittadini che facevano rincarare el grano, e così se n’andò.”
retainers and relations. Although the Rucellai’s invention cannot be definitively linked with specific Medici feste, by portraying a classical myth involving the pilfering and defilement of foodstuffs, they likely register the anti-Medicean discord in the city and within the regime that similarly underlies Cerretani’s detailing of the Medici’s inordinate consumption. The Rucellai’s offering also carries infernal overtones. Seneca, for example, locates the harpies’ torment of Phineus in the underworld. Like Matteo da Panzano’s hell banquet, the Rucellai’s harpies likely expressed a sentiment similar to that of San Marco’s chronicler, who described Leo’s surprise visit to the Dominican convent on January 6, 1516 as a “great hell” for the friars.

In an ironic reversal of their earlier banquet, the Rucellai brothers’ subsequent feast opposes the pagan myth of despoiled food as infernal punishment with a Christian model of divine and salvific nourishment. In place of the lower bowels of Tartarus, the company follows St. Andrew through heaven’s open gates. Instead of an unholy meal, the Eucharist is implicated in the “disputation of philosophers on the Trinity.”

---

212 Ricordi, 353: “Ogni cióta terra castello chomunità e Siena Luchcha presentorno più cose da mang[i]are, che altro non volono.... Ma la masseritia di madonna [Alfonsina Orsini] oltre agli’altre disordini ghiaustò assai e non si presenttò né ministri né ciptadini, solo e sui gentili homini soldati. Fatta la festa madonna era di chontinuo corteggiata da due cardinal, c[i]oè Cibo e Rossi sui parenti. Tutti e signori malsatisfati si partirmo, parlando pocho honorevole del ducha nostro, et veramente da quello si nascessi fu fredda festa.” The brackets identifying Orsini are mine; the textual emendations are the editor’s.

213 Ricordi, 355: “E veramente che gl’erano questi Medici in disordine ghrandissimo perché tenevano una spesa intollerabile e da non potere reggere, perché quello palazzo v’era 6 chucine et 6 tinelli, e la donna, el ducha e la madre e messer Ghoro e tentili homini ognuno haveva dispensa chucina tavola di per sè, sanzza le provisioni delle lance spezzata, gentilomini, soldati e altri, e chavalli e moltitudine di chani falchioni sparvieri e altro.”

214 Seneca, Hercules 739. See also Propertius, Elegiae 3.5.42 where Phineus is tormented by hunger in the underworld, although without mention of the harpies. The editiones principes are Ferrara, 1478 (Tragoediae) and Venice, 1472 (Elegiae).

215 Cited in Polizzotto, Elect Nation, 364n42: “Magnus infernus extitit nobis illa dies.”

216 Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:486-487: “e l’altra, dopo una disputa di filosofi sopra la Trinità, fecero mostrare da Santo Andrea un cielo aperto con tutti i cori degli’Angeli, che fu cosa veramente rarissima....”
the Eucharist in the Rucellai’s invention is perhaps indicated in Andrea del Sarto’s coeval altarpiece (c. 1517, fig. 89) for the Augustinian convent of San Gallo, which Vasari identified as “four figures standing, engaged in a disputation about the Trinity.” As Antonio Natali observed, Sarto’s painting influences, and is influenced by, the Cazzuola’s spectacles.

Noting the absence of the Holy Spirit’s conventional representation as a dove, Natali argued that the third Person of the Trinity is manifest in the tumultuous clouds which surround the Father and the Son. He also linked Sarto’s dark nimbus with Augustine’s atmospheric description “of clouds, of voices, of thunderbolts, of the trumpet, of the smoke from Mt. Sinai” when God appeared to Moses with similar imagery found in Revelation 9:1-11 and with the “recently revived Savonarolan spirituality” of street preachers prophesying an immanent apocalypse, to infer that Sarto’s altarpiece and the Cazzuola’s infernal banquets register a similarly heightened eschatological fervor to that which was proscribed by the Fifth Lateran Council in 1517. Sarto’s turbulent sky more likely recalls the conditions of Pentecost than the Apocalypse, and when understood within the context of the mass, the altarpiece more readily reveals Sarto’s demonstration of the presence of the Trinity in the Eucharist.

Sarto’s circular placement of the four standing and two kneeling saints solves the compositional challenge of depicting six adult figures in a narrow space. The format also

---

217 Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:364: “Erano state fatte in San Gallo fuor della Porta nelle cappelle della chiesa, oltre alle due tavole d’Andrea, molte altre, le quali non paragonano le sue; onde avendosene ad allogare un’altra, operarono que’ frati col padrone della capella ch’ella si desse ad Andrea; il quale cominciandola subito, fece in quella quattro figure ritte che disputano della Trinità...”

218 Andrea del Sarto (New York: Abbeville Press, 1999), 79.

219 Ibid., 83, 89-93. See also, although without mention of the Cazzuola, Natali, “Firenze 1517,” in Chiarini, Andrea del Sarto, 1486-1530, 26-41.
serves liturgical and doctrinal functions. The gap between Saints Sebastian and Mary Magdalene, as well as the central void framed by the gesticulating and book-wielding hands of the standing saints, is the very space in which the elevated host would be transformed into the body of Christ through the invocation of the Trinity. The vertical axis created by the priest standing in front of the altar, holding aloft the raised host, the Crucifix, and God the Father, to which the Trinitarian theologian Augustine points, visually instantiates the purpose and the promise of the Eucharist. The broken and crucified body of Christ depicted at the top of the altarpiece is physically present in the consecrated bread below; through the consumption of the Eucharist, Christ’s redemptive sacrifice on the cross is remembered and re-enacted. The host also unifies, as well as physically and spiritually embodies, the triune God whose three Persons are distinguished in Sarto’s painting.

In the context of the Rucellai’s banquet, the Eucharist’s holy feast antithesizes Phineus’s pagan fast. The physical starvation caused by the harpies is replaced by spiritual sustenance. Instead of defiled foods as divine punishment, the Eucharist’s divine feast brings salvation.

Much like Matteo da Panzano’s similarly paired spectacles of a pagan and infernal myth supplanted by a Christian allegory, the Rucellai’s sacral subject does not preclude a satirical reading, particularly as the Trinity was deliberately deployed in blandishments of the Medici pope during his pontificate. Perhaps the most publicized example was the

---

220 For the transformation of the species following the Trinity’s invocation, see Cyril of Jerusalem, Catecheses 19.7.
221 For the harpies as divine punishment, see Ovid, Metamorphoses 7.1-7; Apollodorus, Bibliotheca 1.9.21-22; and Apollonius, Argonautica 2.179-300.
Vadiscus sive Trias Romana (1520) by Ulrich von Hutten (1488-1523). In a series of 58 pithy triads which excoriate the Roman church, Hutten’s integration of dogma and syntax exposes and condemns Roman behaviors which profaned the Trinity.\textsuperscript{222} In one of his sharp barbs, Hutten condenses a section on Leo X’s corruption from his longer dialogue: “Three things are grievously endured: that the wicked faction of Florentines rules in the city; that his flatterers advise the pontiff to be regarded as God, and that he himself usurps too freely the benefit of indulgences and the punishment of excommunication.”\textsuperscript{223} In light of Hutten’s criticism, St. Andrew’s “throwing open Heaven” (mostrare da Santo Andrea un cielo aperto) could be seen to mock the Pope who enriched himself by “freely usurping” indulgences and excommunication.

Trinitarian metaphors also featured in Italian satires of the Medici Pope. In his Diaries, Marino Sanudo recorded the summary of a letter written in Rome to ser Justinian Contarini on the election of Pope Adrian VI, which includes the notice of a sardonic epigram affixed to Leo’s tomb:

> An epitaph was written on the sepulcher of Pope Leo and quickly removed, and I was told that the gist was that the passerby should not marvel at the large size of the sepulcher, that is, of the tomb, because it is

\textsuperscript{222} The Vadiscus dialogue contains within it the 58 triune epigrams, which are also excerpted and appended to the end of the dialogue in list form (Trias Romana qui liber Vadisco adscribitur). The work was first published in Latin in 1520 (Mainz), and translated into German in 1521 (Strasbourg). Leo was so incensed by the dialogue that in his instructions of July 16, 1520 to the anti-Lutheran bull Exsurge Domine, he directed his legate, Hieronymus Aleander, to burn all copies of the Vadiscus, and that Hutten was to be arrested and sent to Rome. See Miriam Usher Chrisman, Conflicting Visions of Reform: German Lay Propaganda Pamphlets, 1519-1530 (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1996), 71. For Hutten’s “Trinitarian meta-scheme,” as a linguistic strategy with dogmatic implications, see Knut Martin Stünkel, “Frangatis ei dentes, quia theologicus: Ulrich von Hutten’s Contribution to the Emergence of Religious Language in the Reformation Period,” Medievalia et Humanistica 42 (2016): 79-80.

\textsuperscript{223} Ulrich von Hutten, Opera quae reperiri potuerunt omnia, ed. Eduard Böcking, (Leipzig: Teubner, 1860), 4:263: “Tria sunt graviter ferenda: quod pessima factio Florentinorum in urbe dominetur, quod pro Deo habendum Pontificem adsentatorem sui monent, quodque nimium licenter usurpat ille sibi veniarum beneficium et anathematis poenam.” For the dialogue, see ibid., 250-251.
small compared with the grandeur of Leo. For never had a pope so closely resembled the Trinity as Leo, and this because he had disbursed the funds of three papacies, namely those of [his predecessor] Julius, who at his death left a balance of 600,000 ducats; his own; and those of his successor, who [will] rise [to heaven] before he will have paid Pope Leo’s debt. I do not believe I can get hold of this epitaph, which is beautiful and is no lie.224

Redolent of St. Andrew’s admonition in Matteo’s second banquet, these examples demonstrate how a “disputation” on the Trinity was likely shrewdly employed by the Rucellai to reprove Leo’s lavishness.

Although these examples suggest how the Rucellai’s banquet could be interpreted as a political allegory, their invention equally and concurrently elaborates the Cazzuola’s recurring thematic of transgressive consumption. The Eucharist, whose bread and wine become the actual body and blood of Christ at the invocation of the Trinity, is an increasingly contentious site of theological disputation in the second and third decades of the sixteenth century.225 In 1525, Ulrich Zwingli (1484-1531), for example, revived accusations of cannibalism made against the sacral meal when he derided

---


transubstantiation as “not only impious, but also foolish and monstrous, unless, perhaps, you live among anthropophagites.”

The cannibalistic undercurrent in da Panzano and Rucellai’s feasts is brought to the forefront Giovanni Gaddi’s invention, which Vasari subsequently narrates:

And Giovanni Gaddi, with the help of Jacopo Sansovino, Andrea del Sarto, and Giovan Francesco Rustici, represented a Tantalus in Hell, who gave a feast to all the men of the Company clothed in the dress of various Gods; with all the rest of the fable, and many fanciful inventions of gardens, scenes of Paradise, fireworks, and other things, to recount which would make our story too long.

The meal which Tantalus served to the gods, and which the Cazzuola’s company reprised, is human flesh. Tantalus further compounded his treacherous offering by combining cannibalism with infanticide, as the taboo meat he offered was his own butchered and cooked son. For his perfidious feast, Tantalus was banished to the depths of the netherworld, where he was eternally taunted with unattainable foodstuffs and tormented by never-ending hunger and unquenchable thirst.

The related themes of infernal torture, impure victuals, death, and transgressive consumption found in the Paiuolo, da Panzano, and Rucellai banquets are here integrated and amplified. Gaddi’s invention also

---


227 Vasari-De Vere, 8:126-127. Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:487: “Giovanni Gaddi, con l’aiuto di Iacopo Sansovino, d’Andrea del Sarto e di Giovanfrancesco Rustici, rappresentò un Tantalo nell’inferno, che diede mangiare a tutti gli uomini della Compagnia, vestiti in abiti di diversi Dii, con tutto il rimanente della favola e con molte capricciose invenzioni di giardini, paradisi, fuochi lavorati, et altre cose che troppo, raccontandole, farebbero lunga la nostra storia.”

228 See Seneca, Thyestes 145-152.

194
responded to St. Andrew’s admonishing “tax” for overspending on comestibles featured in Matteo da Panzano’s earlier repast. Beginning with Horace’s *Satires* (1.1.64-70), Tantalus is cited as an example of avarice. Marius Servius, for example, quotes the Roman poet when he moralizes the myth. After narrating Tantalus’s sordid banquet and his infernal punishment, Servius concluded that, “By this avarice is signified, so that even Horace [writes], ‘The thirsty Tantalus catches at the streams, which elude his lips. What are you laughing about? A change in the name and the story is about you.’” Giovanni Boccaccio follows Fabius Planciades Fulgentius by similarly underscoring the giant’s perpetual thirst and hunger as a fitting retribution for parsimony. In Giovanni Bonsignori’s moralized translation of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, Pelops’s murder is

---


231 Boccaccio cited Fulgentius in *Genealogie deorum gentilium libri*, ed. Vincenzio Romano (Bari: Laterza, 1951), 2:579, 12.1: “Supplicium autem huius hostent liquido avari hominis detestabilem vitam. Dicit enim Fulgentius Tantalum interpretari visionem volentem; quod optime unicoque competit avaro, non enim aurum et amplam supellectilem congregat, ut eis utatur, quin immo ut illam intueatur, et cum pati non possit sibi, quid boni ex congestis divitiis facere eis immixtus fame periclitetur et siti.” See also ibid., 1:45, 1.14: “Per Tantalum autem inter undas et poma fame pereunt, avarorum hominum curas et angores circa infamem parsimoniam intelligere debemus.”
attributed to Tantalus’s miserliness: “he was so stingy that, not wanting to spend money for meat, he went and killed his son and set him to cook,…” Instead of piety, Matteo’s advocacy of economy is presented as a covetous hoarding of wealth.

Matteo was not, however, the only figure ridiculed by analogy to Tantalus. Gaddi’s dinner could equally mock Leo X, who was described as “alter Tantalus” in a pasquinade penned shortly after his death. In the poem attached to the pope’s tomb, the anonymous verse judges the giant’s alimentary deprivations as deserving punishments for the gluttonous pope.

Who lies here? 
Fraud, treacheries, fear, dark desire. 
I don’t believe it. 
You will believe if you read. 
Look, I’m reading it. 
The fame of Leo is buried in this mound with his body; the one who ill-fed the sheep now well-feeds the ground. Ha, ha, ha. He is the tenth Leo; let him be another Tantalus, I pray; this punishment is proper, [because] he was a glutton. Hitherto he was imitating a sheep, and made a lion by his name; he was in truth a fox, and at the same time, he perished like dogs.

Rather like the Cazzuola’s macabre banquets, the Roman satire uses death to expose and to invert the Medici pope’s leonine self-fashioning. Instead of a divine shepherd who nourished his flock with spiritual sustenance, Leo pastoral role is fulfilled by his cold

---

232 Ovidio methamorphoseos vulgare, trans. Giovanni Bonsignore (Venice: Giovanni Rosso for Lucantonio Giunta, 1497), Lr: “loue uno di conuito tutti li de, e comando a lo spenditor che comprasse carne in abondancia per manzare. Costui hauia nome Tantalo, et era tanto auaro che non uolendo spender gli denari per la carne; ando e uccise lo figliolo et miselo a cocere; et essendo gli dei a mensa se afirmarono in lo mangiare uedendo cota la carne humana cussi mangiando gli dei la dea Ceres non sene era adueduta; percio che era piu giota et ulontarosa a mangiar che gli altri.” The allegory reaffirms Tantalus’s miserliness, condemning him for valuing material riches over the true wealth of his offspring. Ceres is equally disparaged as gluttonous and as devouring the entire world.

233 Fernando Silenzi and Renato Silenzi, Pasquino: Cinquecento pasquinate (Milan: Bompiani, 1932), 215-216: “Quis iacet hic? / Fraus, insidiae, metus, atra libido. / Non credo. / Credes, si legis. / Ecce lego. / Obruta in hoc tumulo est cum corpore fama Leonis. / Qui male pavit oves, nunc bene paseit humum. / Ha, ha, he. Decimus Leo is ille est; Tantalus alter / Sit, precor: haec par est pena, gulosus erat. / Jam simulabat ovem, factus Leo nomine, vulpes / Re fuit et simul ut canis interiit.”
corpse, which feeds the earth (qui male pavit oves nunc bene pascit humum). Although he feigned being an ovine simpleton (simulabat ovem) and names himself a lion, his nature is that of the crafty fox (vulpes), and in death, he simulates the servile dog (simul ut canis interiit). Death, once again, subverts and reveals the Medici’s aggrandizing masquerade.

Whether through da Panzano’s vile foodstuffs, the Rucellai’s perfidious harpies, or Gaddi’s cannibalistic Tantalus, the emphasis on tainted or polluted victuals in the Cazzuola’s banquets recasts the Medici’s food-laden celebrations as hellish, revolting, and gluttonous spectacles. The transgressive meals thematized by Gaddi and the Rucellai are particularly significant, as they demonstrate that the younger patricians at the edges of the regime were as critical of the Medici as many of the regime’s older, established, and central core of ottimati, such as Antonio Seristori, who in 1515, said that if things did not go well for the Medici, he would be among the first to go to the piazza to cry “popolo,” not in the least because he had spent money on the Medici’s behalf without return.234

Until the mid-1520s, neither of the Rucellai brothers nor Gaddi would likely have been considered significant or especially trusted figures in the regime. Although he took part in the 1512 coup, only in April 1515, two months shy of his legal eligibility, was Francesco (1485-1547) elected to the fairly menial office of the Gonfalonieri di Compagnia, where he was one of sixteen Captains of the Milita.235 Domenico (1486-

---

234 As reported in the September 7, 1515 letter from Alfonsina Orsini to Lorenzo de’ Medici. ASF, Medici avanti il Principato (MAP) 137, doc. 669v: “Scripsiti piú di sono che Antonio Seristori haveva usate certe parole non molto conveniente, dipoi a qualche di per un altra via in tesi el simile che gl’usava dire che pregassimo idio che le cose andassino bene, et che quando andassino altrimenti che lui saria de primi andare in piaza a gridar’ popolo et che non haveva mai have niente da noi, e che la tornata nostra li era nociuta, e che haveva speso...” See also the discussion in Butters, *Governors and Government*, 271-272.

235 His birthday fell on June 30th and he was elected on April 28, 1515. See Herlihy et al., *Online Tratte*. In contrast, seven of his fellow giovani who deposed Soderini were habilitated for all public magistracies
1525) was not seated until 1518, when he served as one of twelve Buonomini, which appears to have been the only civic position he held prior to his death at 39 years of age.\textsuperscript{236} Francesco only held significant offices eight years later, when he was one of the Priori in 1523, followed by his significant positions as one of the Otto di Practica in 1524, and the Castellano of San Leo in 1525.\textsuperscript{237}

Giovanni Gaddi, who was 19 years old when the Medici returned to Florence in 1512, was drawn for the Priori in 1524 (\textit{divieto}), and seated for the Gonfalonieri di Compagnia in 1525.\textsuperscript{238} Only during Clement VII’s papacy (1523-1534) did Giovanni appear to be an intimate of the Medici, as by 1527, he had taken holy orders and was made a cleric of the Apostolic Camera.\textsuperscript{239} Thereafter, he was primarily found in Rome, where Gaddi perpetuated the Cazzuola’s scurrilous and satirical festivities through the

---

\textsuperscript{236} Mozzati, \textit{Giovonfrancesco Rustici}, 391.

\textsuperscript{237} As Rosemary Devonshire Jones demonstrated, the “elections” were decided ahead of time in the Medici palace. “Lorenzo de’ Medici, Duca d’Urbino ‘Signore’ of Florence?,” \textit{Studies on Machiavelli}, ed. Myron Gilmore (Florence: Sansoni, 1972), 299-315. For these offices, see Luigi Passerini, \textit{Genealogia e storia della famiglia Rucellai} (Florence: Cellini, 1861), 59, which includes Francesco’s positions after the Medici’s 1530 restoration: Duecento (1530), Vicario di Mugello (1535), Otto di Pratica (1537 and 1546), Senato dei Quarantotto (1544). Mozzati added that he was one of five Consiglieri del Supremo Magistrato in 1545 and in 1546. \textit{Giovanfrancesco Rustici}, 391. The Castellano di San Leo reference is found in Raffaella Maria Zaccaria, ed., \textit{Carteggi delle magistrature dell’età repubblicana: Otto di Pratica}, vol. 2, \textit{Missive} (Florence: Olschki, 1996), 926.

\textsuperscript{238} Herlihy et al., \textit{Online Tratte}.

\textsuperscript{239} After his house was burned in 1527, Benedetto Varchi describes leaving Florence accompanied by Antonio dell’Allegretto and “con messer Giovanni Gaddi, che fu poi cherico di Camera, refugio dei virtuosi; dove trattenutosi certo tempo, ritornò a città l’anno 1528....” \textit{Storia fiorentina}, 1:24. According to Vanna Arrighi, in 1527, Giovanni’s elder brother Niccolò was made a cardinal by Clement VII in return for the Gaddi bank’s 40,000 scudi subsidy of the papacy; she also suggests that Giovanni probably purchased his position in the Apostolic Camera, but does not provide a date. “Gaddi, Giovanni,” in \textit{Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani} (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1998), 51:156.
Accademia dei Virtuosi (c. 1530-1540), and additionally maintained ties with the Cazzuola’s Bugiardini. Like Vasari, Gaddi was also found in the circle of Cardinal Ippolito de’ Medici (1511-1535). Particularly after Clement VII’s death in 1534, Giovanni and his brother Niccolò championed Ippolito over Alessandro (1510-1537) for the governance of the Florentine state; when the Cardinal died in 1535, the Gaddi, along with Filippo Strozzi and Cardinals Giovanni Salviati and Niccolò Ridolfi, attempted to replace the Medicean Duchy with an oligarchic Republic.

In addition to finding the Medici’s self-fashioning ripe for satire, these young patricians might well have felt that they had been disserved by the Medici, particularly in the 1510s. Certainly their banquets transformed the images of beneficence and generosity

240 Like the Paiuolo, the Virtuosi had a “king” who hosted a feast for which the “vassals,” contributed an after-dinner speech in competition with each other, often in a burlesque or parodic mode. Complementing the analysis offered here, Ambra Moroncini has provocatively argued that at least some of the Virtuosi authors advocated for religious reform through their burlesque satires. “The Accademia della Virtù and Religious Dissent,” in Everson, Reidy, and Sampson, Italian Academies, 88-101. For the Academy, see also Danilo Romei, Da Leone X a Clemente VII: Scrittori toscani nella Roma dei papati medicei (1513-1534) (Manziana: Vecchiarelli, 2007), 205-266; and Paola Cosentino, L’Accademia della Virtù: Dicerie e cicalate di Annibal Caro e di altri Virtuosi,” in Cum notibusse et commentariibus: L’esegesi parodistica e giocosa del Cinquecento, eds. Antonio Corsaro and Paolo Procaccioli (Manziana: Vecchiarelli, 2002), 177-192.

241 In 1528, Bugiardini and the Paiuolo’s Solosmeo witnessed a document drafted in Giovanni Gaddi’s Florentine residence. See Andrew Butterfield and David Franklin, “A Documented Episode in the History of Renaissance ‘Terracruda’ Sculpture,” Burlington Magazine, 140 (1998): 822n20. In a 1532 letter to Michelangelo, Gaddi asks the sculptor to give his regards to Bugiardini. See Il carteggio di Michelangelo, eds. Paola Barocchi and Renzo Ristori (Florence: Sansoni, 1973), 3:367-368; Bugiardini mentions a debt owed him by Gaddi in his 1532 missive to Michelangelo. See ibid, 443-445. Gaddi also maintained links with Niccolò Machiavelli and Jacopo Sansovino, who were associated with the Cazzuola’s festivities, but not identified by Vasari as members; Gaddi was instrumental in the posthumous publications of Machiavelli’s Discorsi and Principe, and Sansovino was one of his favored sculptors. See Cecchi, “Profili di amici e committenti,” 47-50; and Mozzati, Giovanfrancesco Rustici, 374-375. For Gaddi’s patronage of Sarto and Sansovino, see Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 4:355, Life of Andrea del Sarto, particularly referencing Sarto’s Madonna and Child with John the Baptist now in the Galleria Borghese (c. 1517-1518). For Gaddi’s biography, see also Cummings, Maecenas and the Madrigalist, 190-191.

242 For Vasari, who additionally knew several of the Virtuosi, which was also patronized by Ippolito, see Patricia Lee Rubin, Giorgio Vasari: Art and History (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 92-99. For Gaddi, see Domenico Chiolo and Rossana Sodano, Le muse sediziose: Un volto ignorato del petrarchismo (Milan: Angeli, 2012), 168, 176-180.
promoted by the Medici through disbursements of cash, comestibles, and clothing during *feste* into representations of avarice and gluttonous consumption. Violence is next appended this counter-narrative in the final dinner described by Vasari.

*Luigi Martelli and Cruel Mars*

Notwithstanding his 1512 marriage to Margherita di Messer Giovanvettorio di Messer Tommaso Soderini, Luigi di Luigi Martelli (1494-1580) appears to have been fully integrated into the Medici regime.\(^\text{243}\) In 1519, the minor was “seen” for the Priori, and, although still underage, was one of the Gonfalonieri di Compagnia in 1522.\(^\text{244}\) In 1526, the 32-year-old Luigi was the Podestà of Borgo San Lorenzo, and subsequently served in the Buonomini (1530), the Balìa (1531), and numerous posts during the Medici principate.\(^\text{245}\) As the Cazzuola’s *signore*, Martelli departed from his companions’ thematization of illicit foodstuffs in favor of adultery and bloody warfare. With the offering of “his dearest friend” Luigi’s feast, Vasari concludes his narration of the company’s events.\(^\text{246}\)

\(^{243}\) Luigi was named Giovanni at his birth and rechristened Luigi after his father’s death in 1503. See John Kent Lydecker, “The Domestic Setting of the Arts in Renaissance Florence” (PhD diss., Johns Hopkins University, 1987), 195. Martelli’s acceptance into the regime was doubtless facilitated through the 1517 marriage of Margherita’s sister Giovanna (Anna) to Luigi di Piero Ridolfi, Leo X’s nephew. Varchi describes Martelli as the “lancia di Luigi Ridolfi suo cognato” in 1527. *Storia fiorentina*, 363. For the Ridolfi-Soderini alliance, see Lowe, *Church and Politics*, 97-98; and Butters, *Governors and Government*, 285.

\(^{244}\) For the 1519 priorate, see Herlihy et al., *Online Tratte*. His 1522 election is not found in the Tratte, but is included in the list of held offices that Luigi recorded in his *libro segreto*. See Vanni Bramanti, “Ritratto di Ugolino Martelli (1519-1592),” *Schede umanistiche* 2 (1999): 8.

\(^{245}\) For the 1530 Buonomini, see Herlihy et al., *Online Tratte*. For the 1531 Balìa, see Cambi, *Istorie*, 4:102. For Martelli’s later offices, see Bramanti, “Ritratto di Ugolino Martelli,” 8. For Martelli, see also Sénéchal, *Giov Francesco Rustici*, 128; and Mozzati, *Giovanfrancesco Rustici*, 382-383.

\(^{246}\) In his discussion of the altarpiece Vasari painted for the Martelli chapel in San Lorenzo, the biographer writes, “Luigi e Pandolfo Martelli, insieme con messer Cosimo Bartoli, miei amicissimi, mi ricercarono che io facesi la detta tavola.” Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 6:395. For Martelli’s residency in Empoli from 1513 to 1516, giving a *terminus post quem* for his banquet, see Lydecker, “Domestic Setting of the Arts,” 197.
A very beautiful invention, also, was that of Luigi Martelli, when, being master of the Company, he gave them supper in the house of Giuliano Scali at the Porta Pinti; for he represented Mars all smeared with blood, to signify his cruelty, in a room full of bloody human limbs; in another room he showed Mars and Venus naked in a bed, and a little farther on Vulcan, who, having covered them with the net, was calling all the Gods to see the outrage done to him by Mars and by his sorry spouse.\footnote{Vasari-De Vere, 8:127. Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi, 5:487: “Fu anche bellissima invenzione quella di Luigi Martelli, quando, essendo signor della Compagnia, le diede cena in casa di Giuliano Scali alla Porta Pinti: perciò che rappresentò Marte per la crudeltà tutto di sangue imbrattato, in una stanza piena di membra umane sanguinose; in un’altra stanza mostrò Marte e Venere nudi in un letto, e poco appresso Vulcano che, avendogli coperti sotto la rete, chiama tutti gli Dii a vedere l’oltraggio fattogli da Marte e dalla trista moglie.” For the Florentine chancellor’s son, Giuliano di Bartolomeo Scala, See Alison Brown, Bartolomeo Scala, 1430-1497, Chancellor of Florence: The Humanist as Bureaucrat (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979), 248-249.}

Although the Medici proclaimed the end of “War, Discord, and Fear” by burning these triumphal \textit{carri} in 1513,\footnote{Landucci, \textit{Diario}, 337: “E più feciono più trionfi, e ogni sera n’ardeva uno a casa e’ Medici a loro proposito; che fu uno la discordia, la guerra, la paura; uno altro ne feciono della pacie, e questo non arse, come se fussi posto fine alle passioni, e che si rimanessi in pace e trionfi.” Translated in Ovid, \textit{Metamorphoses}, 1:191. \textit{Ovidii Metamorphosis}, fol. XXIXv, 4.186-189: “...illi iacuere ligati / Turpiter, atque alquis deidis non tristibus optat / Sic fieri turpis. Superi risere, diuque / Haec fuit in toto notissima fabula caelo.”} Luigi’s display of dismembered limbs and a bloody, “cruel” Mars demonstrates the failure of the regime’s propaganda. Martelli emphasizes not the Goddess of Love who disarms the God of War, but the adulterous wife who makes a mockery of her husband. Vulcan, whom Vasari states calls upon “all the Gods to see the outrage done to him by Mars and by his sorry spouse” \textit{(chiama tutti gli Dii a vedere l’oltraggio fattogli da Marte e dalla trista moglie)} is not a figure of sympathy, but of derision. According to Ovid, for example, the divine blacksmith became the laughingstock of Olympus for exposing his wife’s deceit. Upon seeing the ensnared and entangled couple, “one of the merry gods prayed that he might be so disgraced. The gods laughed, and for a long time this story was the talk of heaven.”\footnote{Translated in Ovid, \textit{Metamorphoses}, 1:191. \textit{Ovidii Metamorphosis}, fol. XXIXv, 4.186-189: “...illi iacuere ligati / Turpiter, atque alquis deidis non tristibus optat / Sic fieri turpis. Superi risere, diuque / Haec fuit in toto notissima fabula caelo.”} Martelli’s invention
indicates that the Medici’s own spectacles similarly backfired; instead of demonstrating the family’s magnificence and dominion, like Vulcan, the Medici became figures of fun.

The Macabre and Poetics of Opposition

Through reading the Cazzuola’s feasts against the Medici’s spectacles, and in conjunction with contemporary criticism of the Medici and their pageantry, I have argued that the meals’ macabre themes and sardonic humor reveal the disparity between the Medici’s own mythopoesis and the often brutal reality of the Medici state. In particular, the repetition of vile, polluted, or taboo foodstuffs in the inventions of Rustici, da Panzano, the Rucellai, and Gaddi transcends generic parody of the princely table to become polemically political when understood in concert with the privations resulting from the Medici’s feste. Cene, passatempi, and serious political critique are not mutually exclusive, but reinforcing. The inclusion of the Canzona della morte in the pamphlet “ricordo” of the Medici’s 1513 Carnival trionfi further indicates how the Cazzuola, even while fabricating the Medici’s propaganda, was also actively subverting this same mythology by creating counter-narratives in a macabre key. Far from solidifying or supporting the Medicean regime, the Cazzuola’s entertainments demonstrate its limits and fragility. The similar blending of infernal and cannibalistic subjects by the Cazzuola and the Paiuolo further reveals that dissent was not the privilege of the patriciate, but that artists were equally vocal, invested, and inventive.
Conclusion

Whether through the animate, foliated skulls depicted on Soderini’s cenotaph, its monumental death’s head crowned with a satire of his adversaries’ *imprese*, or the hellish *feste* produced by the Paiuolo and the Cazzuola, the macabre proved an ideal alternative to, and subversion of, the Medici’s self-fashioning. In concluding this study, I propose that indirect evidence for this thesis can be found in the continued legacy of the gonfalonier’s cenotaph and of the companies’ transgressive festivities in the sixteenth century. I first examine the ways in which the Soderini sepulcher’s unraveling of a heroic Medicean mythopoesis is paralleled in San Lorenzo’s Medici Chapel by Piero’s close friend Michelangelo Buonarroti (1475-1564), who was notably asked by the exiled Soderini to design a reliquary tabernacle and two sepulchers for the ex-gonfaloniere at Rome’s San Silvestro in Capite in 1518.¹ I will then discuss the last *novella* within Antonfrancesco Grazzini’s cycle of dinner stories, the *Cene*, which features a Cazzuola member as its protagonist-victim of a horrific *beffa* perpetrated by Lorenzo de’ Medici. These “afterlives” indicate that not only did the macabre have an enduring appeal as a language of dissent throughout the sixteenth century, but also that contemporaries saw

---

¹ For the San Silvestro commissions, and the precarious position in which Soderini’s request placed Michelangelo, who was at that time engaged with San Lorenzo’s facade for the Medici in Florence, see Wallace, “Friends and Relics,” 419-439. For the lasting and close friendship between Piero and Michelangelo, who was godfather to Piero’s nephew Niccolò, see also Wallace, “Michelangelo in and out of Florence,” 55-88. Michelangelo would have also known his contemporary Benedetto da Rovezzano well: his bronze *David* (lost) was cast by Benedetto in 1508; he was solicited by Benedetto’s father for work in Rome in 1515; and he employed Benedetto along two others at an unspecified date, perhaps in relation to San Lorenzo’s facade. See Louis Alexander Waldman, “Benedetto da Rovezzano in England and After: New Research on the Artist, his Collaborators, and his Family,” in Sicca and Waldman, *Anglo-Florentine Renaissance*, 81-84. Michelangelo would also have been well-informed regarding the Paiuolo and the Cazzuola’s festivities, given his lifelong friendships with Granacci, Bugiardini, and Aristotile, for which see Wallace, “Michelangelo’s Assistants in the Sistine Chapel,” in *Michelangelo, Selected Scholarship in English*, ed. William E. Wallace, vol. 2, *The Sistine Chapel* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1995), 327-340.
these earlier examples as effective counterpoints to the Medici’s own narratives.

**The Macabre and the Medici Chapel’s Multiple Poetics**

The disturbing presence found in Benedetto’s animated and foliated skulls at Santa Maria del Carmine is shared by the ubiquitous masks found in Michelangelo’s unfinished mausoleum for Giuliano and Lorenzo de’ Medici (1519-1534, fig. 90). The effect of these ornamental faces has been vividly described by Charles Dempsey, who wrote of the Medici Chapel as being “literally haunted, aombrata, the frieze carved round its walls (fig. 91), and architectural details such as the decorations on the capitals (fig. 92), being filled with hundreds of mocking masks, or larve.”² Like the skulls closest to the Carmine sarcophagus (figs. 6-12), the friezes of dynamic faces (fig. 91) carved by Silvio Cosini (c. 1495-1549) address the viewer with gaping mouths which are arrested in eternal screams.³

---

² *Inventing the Renaissance Putto*, 222. Masks are also carved on the altar’s candelabra. For Dempsey, larve signify not literal ghosts, but function “metaphorically, standing for the empty bogeys, or childishly panicked dreams of mortal desire.” “Lorenzo’s ombra,” in Garfagnini, *Lorenzo il magnifico e il suo mondo*, 352n34. He also noted that the carver of the mask-frieze, Cosini “was accused of dabbling in black magic because of his compelling, and even obsessive images of demons in the form of larve.” *Inventing the Renaissance Putto*, 267n50. For a recent overview of the Medici Chapel, see Emanuela Ferretti and Tommaso Mozzati, “I Capitani, Michelangelo e la Sagrestia Nuova,” in Baldini and Bietti, *Nello splendore mediceo*, 295-309.

³ It should be noted that foliated, grimacing faces with round, open mouths are also found on the bases of Benedetto’s two architectural niches from the palazzo Portinari-Salviati, now in Florence’s Bargello Museum. See Luporini, *Benedetto da Rovezzano*, 122-123; and Emanuele Barletti, “Marmi antichi e moderni di palazzo Portinari Salviati nell’Ottocento,” *Paragone* 45 (1994): 299-306. In addition to the stylistic affinities, the attribution of the New Sacristy masks to Cosini is largely based on the praise Vasari added to the 1568 edition of the *Life of Andrea da Fiesole* (Andrea Ferrucci). Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi 4:259, editor’s brackets: “E Silvio poi...seguitò l’arte della scultura con fierezza straordinaria, onde ha poi molte cose lavorato leggiadramente e con bella maniera, et ha passato infiniti, e massimamente in bizzar[r]ia di cose alla grottesca, come si può vedere nella sagrestia di Michelagnolo Buonarroti in alcuni capitelli di marmo intagliati sopra i pilastri delle sepolture, con alcune mascherine tanto bene strarotate che non è possibile veder meglio. Nel medesimo luogo fece alcune fregiature di maschere che gridano, molto belle. Per che, veduto il Buonarotto l’ingegno e la pratica di Silvio, gli fece cominciare alcuni trofei per fine di quelle sepolture: ma rimaseno imperfetti insieme con altre cose per l’assedio di Firenze.” Citing Michelangelo’s description with his October 1, 1524 payment “A Franc(esc)o da Sangallo darete uno duchato e mezo; e questo perché tose a fare in chottimo, a dua
Whether at the Carmine or at San Lorenzo, these garrulous heads voice a subversive commentary on Medici’s dynastic self-fashioning. As I argued above, by investing human skulls with Soderini heraldry (figs. 29-30), Benedetto populates the tomb with the Soderini’s holy dead; the curved, foliated “antlers,” while previously discussed in terms of a crown, might additionally be seen as imitating a round halo. By applying the Medici’s regenerative metaphor to the larval Soderini, Benedetto reverses the Medici’s forward-looking dynastic orientation to characterize the Soderini’s sanctified dead as vibrantly alive and eternally renewing. While the Medici promoted their terrestrial destiny as the divinely ordained rulers of Florence, Benedetto instead markedly locates the Soderini’s divine destiny among the saints in Paradise. The future of the Soderini is found not in the perpetuation of lineage, but in the worthiness of the family’s present and future dead. This framing of a Soderini “dynasty” in terms of heavenly continuity not only upholds the piety of the Soderini, but also implicitly demeans the Medici’s own poetics, which focus on lineage’s earthly endurance. While the Soderini are acclaimed as righteous and devout, the Medici are simultaneously derided as vainglorious coveters of worldly power.
The masks which populate the Medici Chapel offer a complementary and critical assessment of the dynastic ambitions that were thwarted when the unexpected death of Giuliano, Duke of Nemours, in 1516 was shortly followed by that of Lorenzo, Duke of Urbino, on May 4, 1519. The anticipated ennoblement of the family by the first Medici to hold sovereign titles and to marry into royal houses turned to ash. If Benedetto’s foliated skulls, which transform Piero’s own childless branch of the Soderini lineage into a celebration of the family’s eternal inheritance, deride the Medici’s worldly focus, the effective extinction of Cosimo il vecchio’s line is given ironic commentary by Silvio Cosini’s larval masks on the architectural elements surrounding the Medici Dukes. The Medici’s vaunted aspirations were interred with their dead, and their mythology of an endlessly renewable lineage is exposed as a false dream. Upon the demise of the young Dukes, the future of the lineage then rested with their natural-born sons, Ippolito di Giuliano (b. 1511), who was quickly legitimated upon Lorenzo’s death, and Alessandro di Lorenzo (b. 1511/1512), who was relegated to the shadowy periphery of the Medici house by his mother’s low birth. Legitimate heirs were precluded from Cosimo’s prelate

---


5 The natural son of Giuliano and Pacifica Brandano was apparently abandoned after his birth in Urbino, where he was baptized on April 19, 1511 as Pasqualino. By 1513, Giuliano acknowledged paternity and
great-grandsons, Leo X, and Cardinal Giulio, whose own illegitimate birth haunted his ecclesiastical career. As Leo X, who was buried in Rome’s Santa Maria sopra Minerva after his death on December 1, 1521, would never again return to Florence, the only legitimate, male, patrilineal descendants of Cosimo to be found in the city were those eternally housed in San Lorenzo. The Medici became a dynasty of shades.

Voracious Time

Michelangelo inverts the temporal aspect of the Medici’s mythography, which combined the metaphor of cyclic renewal with Florentine naming conventions to fashion the elder Lorenzo and Giuliano di Piero being “re-made” in Lorenzo’s son and grandson, proceeded to secure his son’s prospects; in that year, Ippolito was taken to Rome, where he was educated in the court of Leo X, and in 1514, Giuliano petitioned Leo to obtain property near Parma for Ippolito. After Giuliano’s death, Leo promoted the youth’s interests by granting him ecclesiastical and lay income-generating offices. On May 4, 1519, Ippolito was legitimated by Cardinal Franceschetto Cibo. See Guido Rebecchini, “Un altro Lorenzo: ‘Ippolito de’ Medici tra Firenze e Roma (1511-1535)” (Venice: Marsilio, 2010), 19-54. In contrast, no mention is made of Alessandro, the unacknowledged son of Lorenzo and the dark-skinned Simunetta, who was either a peasant, a servant, or a slave, until after Lorenzo’s death. He was subsequently educated in the Roman household his grandmother, Alfonsina, and made Duke of Penne in 1522. He is included in a late seventeenth-century list of legitimated Florentines, although when this took place is unknown. Following his death, the Florentine exiles in Rome began circulating the alternative genealogy that he was the son of Clement VII. See Catherine Fletcher, The Black Prince of Florence: The Spectacular Life and Treacherous World of Alessandro de’ Medici (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 11-25.

Since canon law forbade illegitimates from taking holy orders or receiving benefices, ecclesiastical dispensation was likely purchased for Giulio prior to his being made Prior of Capua in 1510 or 1512. After being appointed Archbishop of Florence by his cousin, the newly-created Leo X, Giulio’s illegitimate birth was again given dispensation on May 9, 1513. See Joseph Hergenröther, Leonis X: Pontificis maximi regesta (Freiberg im Breisgau: Herder, 1884), 148, nos. 2514-2524. Days prior to Giulio’s being made Cardinal, Leo invented a clandestine marriage between Giuliano and a “Fioretta di Antonio” before the former’s death in 1478 in order to declare their offspring Giulio legitimate. See ibid., 281, no. 4598, September 19-20, 1513: “Constitutioe consistoriali declarat, Julium Medicis legitimo thoroe esse natum, cum inter Julianum ejus patrem et Floretam Antonii verum matrimonium constiterit...et redarguit varias calumnias in fratrem suum patruelum sparsas.” This charade fooled no one; for these decrees and the continued and increasing dispersions towards, and scandal of, the base-born Giulio’s elevation in the church hierarchy, see Sheryl E. Reiss, “Cardinal Giulio de’ Medici as a Patron of Art, 1513-1523” (PhD diss., Princeton University, 1992), 105-107, 140-142, 147, 244n37, and 290n216, particularly the remarks by Giovanni Cambi contained therein. For illegitimacy, dispensation, and legitimation, see Thomas Kuehn, Illegitimacy in Renaissance Florence (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002).
all four of whom were intended to be commemorated and deposited in the New Sacristy.\textsuperscript{7}

The role of Time in chapel, which includes bound personifications of the Times of Day atop the Dukes’ sarcophagi, is indirectly articulated by Michelangelo through his biographer Ascanio Condivi. Writing in 1553, Condivi states that, “Impelled more by fear than by love, in a few months [Michelangelo] made all those statues which appear in the sacristy of S. Lorenzo.”\textsuperscript{8} After addressing sculptures’ lack of finish and their variety of poses and attitudes, he then turns to the meaning of the allegorical figures.

The tombs are placed in certain chapels and on their covers recline two great figures more than life-size, a man and a woman, representing Day and Night and, collectively, Time which consumes all.... And to signify Time, he meant to carve a mouse, for which he left a little bit of marble on the work, but then he was prevented and did not do it; because this little creature is forever gnawing and consuming just as time devours all things.\textsuperscript{9}


\textsuperscript{8} Ascanio Condivi, \textit{The Life of Michelangelo}, trans. Alice Sedgwick Wohl, ed. Hellmut Wohl (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1976), 67. Condivi, \textit{Vita di Michelangelo Buonarroti} (Rome: Antonio Blado, 1553), 30r: “...in pochi mesi fece tutte quelle statue, che nella sagrestia di San Lorenzo si veggiono spinto piu dalla paura che dal’amore.” Note that while Michelangelo was engaged on the Medici Chapel, the memory of the Soderini Republic was still vibrant; the \textit{popolo} and Michelangelo had asked that he be allowed to carve a pendant to his \textit{David} in 1525, but Clement VII allocated the marble block (originally intended by Soderini for Michelangelo) instead to Baccio Bandinelli, so as not to interrupt work on the Medici’s mausoleum. See Keizer, “History, Origins, Recovery,” 257-266.

In Michelangelo’s conception, Time brings not new life, but death; rebirth is replaced with destruction. He reiterates Time’s grim harvest in the lines penned above a drawing for the chapel where, redolent of Silvio’s masks, architectural stonework is transformed into a schematic face (fig. 93).

Day and Night are speaking and saying, we have with our swift course led the duke Giuliano to his death. It is quite just that he should take revenge on us as he does, and the revenge is this: that we, having killed him, he thus dead has taken the light from us and with his closed eyes has shut ours so that they may no more shine forth over the earth. What would he have done with us, then, had he lived?10

Though Michelangelo pairs Day with Night in the poem and on the tomb, he does not adopt a conventional trope of diurnal time that aligns Day and life arising out of Night and death, but instead has both temporal figures collaborate to kill Giuliano. Having blinded Day and Night,11 new light will not dawn on Giuliano or on his progeny. Only when Time itself dies will the Medici be resurrected and made anew.12 Paralleling Benedetto’s reversal of the Medici’s poesis of perennial renewal to re-present the Medici

---

10 Citation and translation in Dempsey, “Lorenzo’s ombra,” 352 and n35. The drawing is Florence’s Casa Buonarroti, 10A.
11 For the interpretation that the poem’s deadly Day and Night are specifically Giuliano’s days and nights, which have led him to a premature death, and subsequently are themselves, like the blind statues in the New Sacristy, blinded, see Dempsey, Inventing the Renaissance Putto, 223-228. See also the discussion in Leonard Barkan, Michelangelo: A Life on Paper (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011), 30-34. Gunther Neufeld alternatively argued that, seated in their protective niches, the ducal effigies have vanquished Time, which lies bound below them. “Michelangelo’s Times of Day: A Study of their Genesis,” Art Bulletin 48 (1966): 281-283.
12 Anny Popp first argued that a fresco of Christ’s Resurrection, to which the chapel was dedicated, was intended for the lunette above the elder Medici’s tombs. See Die Medici-Kapelle Michelangelos (Munich: Recht, 1922), 158-167. For the shift from a return of terrestrial power to the resurrection of the dead in the Medici’s temporal mythologizing following death of Duke Lorenzo, see Cox-Rearick, Dynasty and Destiny, 42-43.
as revenants, Michelangelo’s portrayal of a cyclical Time, which inexorably declines instead of endlessly renewing, implies that the Medici house is not destined to rule or to endure, but like the bones entombed in the chapel, only to die. Within Time, the living die, the corpse turns to ash, and fame perishes; regeneration is merely an empty phantasm.  

A Macabre Masquerade

The foregrounding of artifice in the Medici Chapel further enables an ambivalent representation of Medici ambitions. Whereas Benedetto uses foliage in the Carmine tomb’s play between inert stone and dead-yet-animate bony skulls to endow the death’s heads with nature’s generative force, Silvio’s stylized metamorphosis between face and stone on the San Lorenzo wall friezes underscores that only artifice, not nature, vivifies these masks. The stone itself comes alive in San Lorenzo’s furrowed faces of furore by transforming from the petrine curls carved next to the ornamental darts into fleshy and emotive visages. These silently screaming larve, as well as those that are also found on Giuliano’s cuirass (fig. 94), on Lorenzo’s helm and on the box supporting his elbow (fig. 95), as well as the mask beside Night (fig. 96), have been discussed by Stephen Campbell  

---

13 See also the ambiguous lines Michelangelo penned on his drawing for the elder Medici’s tombs in the British Museum (inv. 1859,0625.543): “La fama tiene gli epitafi a giacere non ua ne inanzi ne indietro / perché son morti e el loro operare e fermo.” Fame “goes neither forward nor backward” (non va né inanzi né indietro), and the epitaphs lie in the repose typically assumed by the dead (giacare), whose own “work is stilled” (son morti e el loro operare é fermo). The Medici’s deeds are as defunct as their bodies, and both are subject to all-consuming Time. See the discussion in Dempsey, Inventing the Renaissance Putto, 228-231; Barkan, Michelangelo: A Life on Paper, 26-34; and Creighton E. Gilbert, “Texts and Contexts of the Medici Chapel,” Art Quarterly 34 (1971): 391-409.  

as “phantasmatic simulation[s]” which proclaim sculpture “to be an art of ambiguous surfaces;” in his analysis, through Michelangelo’s subordination of representation to simulation and replication, “Medici history and Medici portraiture have been supplanted by an uncanny, disquieting, more-present-than-life simulation of bodily surface and the illusion of animate life.”\textsuperscript{15} The trope at work here is not the divine resurrection of Christian eschatology, but a false, illusory, and phantasmatic parody of that divinely-created (after)life.

The deceptive illusion represented in the dukes’ armorial masks can also be seen further to reprise the Soderini cenotaph’s critical recasting of the Medici’s devotion to magnificence as idolatrous vainglory. Dempsey has already interpreted Lorenzo’s “cash-box” as “denoting the empty \textit{larva} of earthly riches,” and those on the figures’ armor as “the larvate insignia of military prowess and ambition never to be fulfilled.”\textsuperscript{16} The latter masks further parody the martial careers of the two Medici as not only unrealized and vain desires, but also as fraudulent masquerades. Leo X himself acknowledged as much when, upon confirming their appointments, he ruefully remarked, “I have made two Captains who have no experience at all, and they hold the positions of professionals; when the time comes, I don’t know how they will do it.”\textsuperscript{17} In as much as the \textit{all’antica

\textsuperscript{15}”\textit{(Un)divinity of Art},” 609.
\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Inventing the Renaissance Putto}, 222-223. Luca Giuliani has recently and persuasively argued that the rectangular object under Lorenzo’s elbow is not a box, but a block of marble, which references the material of the statue and the work of sculptor to transform stone into the subject of his art; instead of being an attribute of Lorenzo, the ashlar block alludes to artistic process of Michelangelo. See his “Kästchen oder Quader? Zur Sitzstatue des Lorenzo de’ Medici in der Sagrestia Nuova und zum Problem der Materialität in den Skulpturen Michelangelos,” \textit{Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz} 55 (2013): 334-357; and “Michelangelos Quader: Ein Nachtrag,” \textit{Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz} 58 (2016): 108-116.
\textsuperscript{17} Giorgetti, “Lorenzo de’ Medici Capitano Generale,” 210-211: “Io ho facto due Capitani che non hanno esperienza alcuna et occupano i posti degli uomini pratichi; et venendo un bisogno non so come la
parade armor depicted on the sculpted effigies is a conventional feature of the prince and the condottiere’s public images, it is equally a fictive costume donned by callow youths with little knowledge of warcraft. Particularly for the sixteenth-century Florentine, whose life, livelihood, and city were repeatedly endangered by the Medici Captains’ territorial ambitions, the figures’ prominently masked theatrical garb might have been understood as an ironic recognition of the their martial rank, and equally as deriding the counterfeit warriors.

Masquerade is also enacted on a literal level, since the faces worn by the sculpted effigies are not the Medici’s own. Their constructed fictiveness is acknowledged by Michelangelo, who is reported to have said that, “A thousand years from now, no will know that they looked otherwise.” Aside from expressing the topos of ars longa, vita brevis, Michelangelo’s comments assert the primacy of the artist’s ingegno over a mimetic naturalism. Apparently his decoupling of likeness and identity in the context of

---

19 For the hostility generated by Medicean policies which embroiled the commune in warfare of little or no value to the Florentine state, see, for example, Guicciardini, Le lettere, 2:79, 105, 399-400, and 409-410.
20 Reported in Martelli’s letter to Domenico Rugasso, chancellor of Orazio Farnese, dated July 28, 1544, published in Niccolò Martelli, Il primo libro delle lettere (Florence: Niccolò Martelli, 1546), 49r: “dicendo che di qui à mille anni nessuno non ne potea dar cognizione che fossero altrimenti....”
21 For the tension between likeness and poetic license in portraiture, with reference to Michelangelo’s statement, see Eike D. Schmidt, “La ritrattistica nella scultura fiorentina tra Michelangelo e Pietro Tacca,” in Pietro Tacca: Carrara, la Toscana, le grandi corti europee, ed. Franca Falletti (Florence: Mandragora, 2007), 41-54. The anxiety over a perceived breakdown between representation and referent is also addressed by Joost Keizer in regards to fifteenth-century portraiture in “Portrait and Imprint in Fifteenth-Century Italy,” Art History 38 (2015): 10-37. Richard C. Trexler and Mary Elizabeth Lewis’s argument that the baton-bearing effigy was actually carved as Lorenzo is intriguing from the point of view of the chapel as masquerade; however their hypothesis rests on the untenable assumption that neither the effigies nor the sepulchers were installed prior to 1537. “Two Captains and Three Kings: New Light on the Medici Chapel,” Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History 4 (1981): 93-177. For the installation of the Dukes and the tombs prior to 1537, see Rosenberg, Beschreibungen
portraiture was not without controversy, as Niccolò Martelli, who recorded the sculptor’s statement in a 1544 letter, softens Michelangelo’s assessment as not depriving nature, but adding honor to the figures. In “thinking about making an eternal simulacrum for the ages,” Martelli answers “those who say that poets are sycophants and liars,” by citing the Medici effigies at San Lorenzo.

Michel’agnolo alone is unique in the world at the library of San Lorenzo of the city of Florence; having in that place sculpted the illustrious Lords of the most fortunate house of the Medici, he has not taken [tolse] the model from Duke Lorenzo, nor from Lord Giuliano exactly as nature portrayed and composed them, but gave to them a grandeur, a proportion, a respectability, a grace, and a splendor that seemed to him would bring them more praise, saying that a thousand years hence, no one will know that they were any different, with the result that people looking at the effigies would in themselves become stupefied. So that if famous writers sometimes add to the truth, they do it to render their subjects admirable to future ages, and not to flatter them....

If the stupefying results (rimarrebbero stupefatti) of Michelangelo’s sculptures demonstrate a triumph of artifice over nature, the letter’s larger defense of poetic embellishment suggests just what was masked in Michelangelo’s portrayal.

Like the famous writers who “sometimes add to the truth” (i famosi scrittori aggiungono tavolta al vero), Michelangelo intentionally represents the Medici with
idealized bodies, knowing full well that his images will shape their future reputation
(dicendo che di qui a mille anni). Martelli’s framing comments, that while poets might be liars (bugiardi), they are not sycophants (adulatori), since their goal is not to flatter their subjects’ person (non per adularli), but to honor the dignity of their offices (una reverenza al decoro della grandezza loro), strongly imply that Michelangelo must give the Medici Captains the praiseworthy qualities nature did not (una grandezza, una proporsione, etc.) because Giuliano and Lorenzo were in themselves unworthy of the respect due to Signori. In Martelli’s construction, artifice exposes the artist’s own virtue while simultaneously obscuring the absence of such in the subjects of his art. Thus if Michelangelo solo è unico al mondo, his idealized Medici effigies are instead empty simulacra, merely deceptive masks that hide an inner void with an external illusion of virtue. Like the masks which proliferate around the Captains, Michelangelo’s own equivocal portraits of the Medici perhaps reveal as much as they conceal. Although silent, the chapel’s screaming larval faces were not unheard; regardless of how the Medici masqueraded themselves, their deception fooled neither the living, nor the larval dead.

Medici deceptions and trickery are equally at the heart of Antonfrancesco Grazzini’s conclusion to his collection of dinner stories, the Cene. The plot relates how a “Lorenzo vecchio de’ Medici” abducted a “Doctor Manente,” and then deceives the public into believing the physician has died. After releasing Manente a year later,

---

23 The letter continues, ibid., 49r: “ma se uoi hauete consumato la miglior parte di uoi stesso in seruire Signori, non sapete uoi come è son fatti, che bisogna piu ragionarne fieno a lor’ modo, e come è uolgiano, so ben che gia quando si uedeua un Cardinale pareua altrui di uedere un Dio e si serraua insino alle Botteghe; hora se passasse il Papa non è che si leuasse da sedere per uederlo: giudicate uoi nel mondo è bello, s’eglie galante, quando non s’ossierua piu una reverenzia al decoro della grandezza loro, merce della auaritia che tiene in essi il principato....”
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Lorenzo explicates his “miraculous” return by staging a fraudulent exorcism. Throughout his account of the *beffa*, Grazzini portrays the Medici ruler as having absolute control over the life and death of the city’s citizens, and ultimately exposes that the true victim of Lorenzo’s machinations is not Manente, but all of Florence.

*Lasca, the Cazzuola, and the Cene*

In the 1540s, Antonfrancesco di ser Grazzino Grazzini (1505-1584), who was known as “il Lasca” (“Roach,” a type of fish), began writing the thirty *novelle* that comprise the *Cene*.24 In imitation of the *Decameron*, Lasca frames the work as a collection of stories told by ten youths who gathered for supper in the weeks leading up to Lent. While waiting for dinner to be served, Lasca’s interlocutors warm themselves by the fire at the home of the noble widow Amaranta. When one of the men suggests that they read tales from the *Decameron*, Amaranta decrees that they should instead amuse themselves by telling their own stories, which if not as good as Boccaccio’s, will nonetheless provide pleasure and instruction through their novelty and variety.25 She proposes that each of their number give a tale that evening and on the subsequent two Thursdays, with the length increasing each week, whereby “each one of us...will be able

---

24 Some of the *novelle* were already written by 1549, and while Grazzini noted a completed manuscript of the *Cene* in 1556, only 21 stories are extant. The collection was first published in Paris in 1753. For a general overview of the *Cene*, see Robert J. Rodini, *Antonfrancesco Grazzini: Poet, Dramatist, and Novelliere 1503-1584* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1970), 147-161.

25 Antonfrancesco Grazzini, *Le Cene*, ed. Riccardo Bruscagli (Rome: Salerno, 1976), 10-11: “Ma intanto che l’ora ne venga del cenare, ho io pensato, quando vi piaccia, come passare allegramente il tempo; e questo sarà, non leggendo le favole scritte del Boccaccio, ancora che né piú belle né piú gioconde né piú sentenziose se ne possono ritrovare; ma, trovandone e dicendone da noi, sèguite ogni uno la sua; le quali, se non saranno né tanto belle né tanto buone, non saranno anche né tanto viste né tanto udite, e per la novità e varietà ne doverranno porgere, per una volta, con qualche utilità non poco piace e contento; sendo tra noi delle persone ingegnose, soffistiche, astratte e capricciose.” For the relationship between the *Decameron* and the *Cene*, as well as the larger structure of the latter, see Giorgio Bárberi Squarotti, “Struttura e tecnica delle novelle del Grazzini,” *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 138 (1961): 497-521.
to prove himself” by narrating a short, a medium, and a long tale. The twenty stories told on the first two days are still extant, but only one, that of Doctor Manente, survives intact from the third.

Lasca’s stories, in contrast to Boccaccio’s lighthearted, comic novelle, are characterized by extreme, often sexual, violence, as well as by an emphasis on vicious beffe against figures of the establishment, which are frequently enabled through superstitious and magical beliefs. As Tommaso Mozzati noted, fully seventeen of the extant twenty-one novelle revolve around a cruel hoax, while only the seventh and eighth day of the Decameron are devoted to this particularly Florentine humor. The brutality in the Cene also serves a polemic function relating to literary culture and to the newly burgeoning “Academies” in the increasingly absolutist Ducal state.

On November 1, 1540, Lasca and eleven friends founded the Accademia degli

26 Grazzini, Le Cene, 11-12: “…perciò che stasera, non avendo tempo a pensare, le nostre favole saranno piccole; ma queste altre due sere, avendo una settimana di tempo, mi parrebbe che nell’una si dovessero dir mezzane, e nell’altra, che sarà la sera di Berlingaccio, grandi. E così ciascheduno di noi, dicendone una piccola, una mezzana e una grande, farà di sé prova nelle tre guise: oltre che il numero ternario è tra gli altri perfettissimo, richiudendo in sé principio, mezzo e fine.” On the order of the novelle and their increasing elaboration and length, see Giovanni Grazzini, “L’ ‘Occhiolino’ del Lasca,” Nuova antologia 479 (1960): 204-208.


28 “Le Cene del Lasca,” 204. Adriana Mauriello contrasted the beffe of the Decamerone, which are often language-based demonstrations of witty improvisational skills, with those of the Cene, which result from careful organization and often end in irreversible physical consequences or otherwise indelibly mark the existence of the victim. “Artisti e beffe in alcune novelle del ‘500 (Lasca, Doni, Fortini),” Letteratura e arte 3 (2005): 84. Zanrè also demonstrated the extreme cruelty, vindictiveness, and graphic violence of the beffe in Lasca’s Cene in comparison to Boccaccio’s Decamerone, “Alterity and Sexual Transgression,” 170-174. For Florence as the “capital” of the beffa, see Anna Fontes-Baratto, “Le theme de la beffa dans le Décaméron,” in Formes et significations de la “beffa” dans la littérature italienne de la Renaissance, ed. André Rochon (Paris: Université de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, 1972), 27-28.
Umidi (Humid Ones’ Academy), “as a pastime” to read Petrarch and to write poetry. Over the next few months, its roster more than doubled, and a series of ever-restrictive rules and strictures were introduced to curtail the production and performance of poetry in favor of translation, and to create an increasingly hierarchical and homogeneous membership. Over the objections of the Umidi’s original founders, and under the aegis of Cosimo I, on February 11, 1541, the company adopted a new name, a new orientation, and a new leadership. The rechristened Accademia Fiorentina marked the end of the informal sodality of poets, and signaled the subordination of the literary academy to the state. Lasca, who vociferously and publically opposed the reforms, was expelled in the 1547 purge of the Fiorentina’s dissenting membership, along with most of the Academy’s artists, including Agnolo Bronzino, Battista del Tasso, Niccolò Tribolo, Benvenuto Cellini, Francesco Salviati, Baccio Bandinelli, Francesco da San Gallo, the painter and merciaio Migliore Visino, and the perfumer and uomo capriccioso Ciano.

As Domenico Zanrè detailed, Lasca explicitly underscores the Cene as a polemic

---


response to the Fiorentina by setting the action on January 31, 1541, the very date the academicians met to elect the reformers who ultimately abolished the Umidi.31 Zanrè further interpreted the emphasis on “sexual transgression and the often violent beffè” in the Cene as Lasca’s expression of resentment at his isolation and marginalization from official literary culture, as well as a subversive attack on the authorities of the regime.32 To voice this critique, Grazzini exploits the macabre and thematizes necromancy. Reinforcing the interpretation argued here, that the Cazzuola’s macabre entertainment should be seen as resisting the cultural program advocated by the Medici in the 1510s-1520s, is Lasca’s employment of the Trowel’s Doctor Manente as the protagonist-victim of Lorenzo de’ Medici.

_Amaranta’s Story_

On the tenth tale of the third day, Amaranta narrates how “Lorenzo vecchio de’ Medici,” being angered at the “presumption and insolence” of his doctor, “Manente dalla Pieve a Santo Stefano,” who habitually invited himself to dine with the magnifico, determines to punish and reprove the physician by means of a cruel beffè.33 One evening,

31 See Ibid., 169. Grazzini, _Le Cene_, 3-4: “Avevano già gli anni della fruttifera incarnazione dell’altissimo figliuol di Maria Vergine il termine passato del M-D-XXXX...là nell’ultimo di gennaio, un giorno di festa doppo desinare....” Brusagli, however interpreted “nell’ultimo di gennaio” as “verso la fine di gennaio.” Ibid., 4n2.
32 Zanrè, “Alterity and Sexual Transgression,” 169 and 174-175. Plaisance gave a psychoanalytic reading of the Cene’s often homosexual and sadomasochistic beffè as indicating Lasca’s castration complex. See his “La structure de la beffè” and “Les personnages victimes dans le théàtre de Lasca,” in Antonfrancesco Grazzini, 135-189 and 211-234, respectively. Zanrè instead read the sexually violent beffè in allegorical terms as indicative of the destructive, ungenerative strictures of Cinquecento society. See Cultural Non-Conformity, 71.
33 Grazzini, _Le Cene_, 327: “Lorenzo vecchio de’ Medici, senza che altro ve ne dica, dovete certo sapere che di quanti uomini eccellenti, non pure virtuosi, ma amatori e premiatori delle virtù furono giannai nel mondo gloriosi, egli fu uno veramente, e forse il primo. Ne’ tempi suoi dunque si ritrovava in Firenze un medico, chiamato maestro Manente dalla Pieve a Santo Stefano, fisico e cerusico, ma più per pratica che per scienza dotto, uomo nel vero piacevole molto e faceto, ma tanto insolente e prosontuoso che
upon being informed that the inebriated doctor is asleep outside of his favorite bar, the Osteria delle Bertuce, Lorenzo has his masked henchmen transport and confine the unconscious Manente to the Medici palace. Taking advantage of Manente’s wife’s retreat to their villa in the Mugello, Lorenzo counterfeit Manente’s death through an elaborate ruse involving the vocal talents of Monaco, who, pretending to be Manente, stays in the doctor’s house, wears his clothes, and mimicking his voice, tells visitors he is sick with the plague. Lorenzo and his goons then find a fresh plague corpse, dress it like Manente, hold a funeral for the doctor, and bury the body. Meanwhile Manente, ignorant of these proceedings, is kept in a locked room of the palazzo Medici, where he is fed twice daily by silent staff wearing Carnival masks and the white habit of friars. He is shortly transferred to the more remote hermitage of the Camaldolites outside of Florence, where two lay brothers follow the same protocol. Called away on “matters of state,” Lorenzo soon leaves Florence and quickly forgets about Manente, leaving the doctor sequestered in the windowless room of the monastery for more than a year. During this time, the

---

34 Grazzini, Le Cene, 333: “Lorenzo in questo mentre avea ordinato ciò che di fare intendeva, e segretamente i due staffieri travestiti con due abiti da frati di quei bianchi infino in terra, e in testa messo un capone per uno, di quelli della via de’ Servi, che par che ridino, il quale dava loro infino in su le spalle, cavati con le vesti da frati di guardaroba, dove erano infinti altri abiti di più varie sorti, e così delle maschere ancora, che avevano servito per le feste del Carnesciale; e l’uno aveva una spada ignuda dalla mano destra, e dalla sinistra una gran torcia bianca accesa; e l’altro portato avea seco due fiaschi di buon vino, e in una tovagliuola rinvolte due coppie di pane, e due grassi capponi freddi, e un pezzo di vitella arrosto, e frutte, secondo che richiedeva la stagione; e fecegli andar chetamente alla camera nella quale era rinchiuso il medico.” The capone was “una maschera che copre tutta la testa, e si infila per il collo, e viene a riposar sulla spalla di chi se la mette;” della via de’ Servi likely alludes to one of the workshops along the street leading to Santissima Annunziata. See ibid., 333n1.

35 Grazzini, Le Cene, 342-343. “In questo mezzo accadde a Lorenzo, per certe faccende di grandissima
doctor’s wife returns to Florence and remarries Michelangelo, a local goldsmith, and becomes pregnant with their son. Lorenzo then returns to Florence, where, upon seeing a Camaldolite monk, remembers having left Manente in their confinement, and has him released. The doctor is left tied to a tree near La Verna, from whence he ultimately made his way to his house in the city. Unrecognized by neither friends – including the Cazzuola’s Feo gobbo – nor family, with his own wife Brigida taking him for a spirit (anima) or a revenant (un morto risuscitare), Manente is ultimately identified in the Bertucce tavern from his manner of eating by his boon drinking companion Burchiello. Only Burchiello, the famed satirical poet and progenitor of a burlesque genre, sees Lorenzo’s hand behind these events; all others attribute Manente’s return to witchcraft. When Manente appeals to the courts for the return of his property and his wife, his case is remanded to Lorenzo. In the culmination of his ruthless hoax, Lorenzo orchestrates a sham exorcism. He hires the stregone e maliardo Nepo da Galatrona for the performance, who proceeds to beat Manente in the guise of removing the evil spirit. Claiming that Manente had never died, but was only kept in an enchanted palace, Nepo sends the crowd to examine the buried corpse, which was conveniently replaced ahead of time by a black dove. When the bird flies out of the tomb, the crowd is amazed, calling it a miracolo.
Seeing as Manente had never died, Lorenzo then rules that Brigida must return to Manente, but that her son can be claimed and raised by Michelangelo.

**Lasca, Manente, and Lorenzo**

Though a literary fiction, Grazzini’s characters were well known to their fellow Florentines. “Maestro Manente” is Manente di Ugolino Leontini, Duke Lorenzo’s personal physician, confidant, and familiare.\(^{38}\) His close affiliation with the Duke, as indicated by Manente’s public, zealous, and perhaps impolitic, or at least certainly precipitous, promotion of Lorenzo’s illicit captaincy of Florence,\(^ {39}\) suggests that Lasca’s

---

\(^{38}\) Angelo Maria Bandini identified the Manente who translated Hippocrates with Lasca’s Manente. *Catalogus codicum latinarum Bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae* (Florence: Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 1776), vol. 3, cols. 31-32. Augusto Campana then identified the “Manente Leonzio,” who translated Hippocrates (with a manuscript dedicated to Leo X) and was the friend of Marco Fabio Calvo, with the physician Manente, who matriculated into the Arte dei medici e speciali on August 3, 1507 and was favored by Duke Lorenzo, but stopped short of identifying this Manente as the victim of Lorenzo’s *beffa*, partially because he identified the *Magnifico* in Lasca’s tale as Lorenzo di Piero di Cosimo (d. 1492). “Manente Leontini Fiorentino, medico e traduttore di Medici greci,” *La Rinascita* 4 (1941): 512. Verde affirmed the translator and doctor as the same person, documenting M. Manente di Ugolino di Leontino da Castro San Giovanni as receiving a doctorate in arts and medicine in Florence on October 10, 1504, and as likely being a student from 1498-1504. He pointed to Campana’s documentation of Manente’s 1507 guild matriculation as evidence that the translator and the doctor are one and the same. Verde also published letters between Manente and Giovanni Iacopo from 1505-1507. *Lo studio fiorentino*, 619-620. Larossa reviewed the above literature and added the Machiavelli-Vettori letters to the documents relating to Manente, which reference Giuliano de’ Medici’s intervention in having Manente made eligible to hold public office in Florence. “Nota su ‘Maestro Manente,’ ” 259-264. Mozzati confirmed that Lasca’s Manente and the Cazzuola doctor are one and the same, and suggested that Lasca’s identification of Manente dal Pieve Santo Stefano instead of da San Giovanni is a corruption of the two city centers in the Valdarno. “Le Cene del Lasca,” 210. For Manente as part of Lorenzo’s entourage to France in 1517, see Ferretti, in Baldini and Bietti, *Nello splendore mediceo*, 602-603, cat. 131. For Manente’s usual residence at Lorenzo’s Roman palace in 1518, and the lawsuit against him for breech of contract in financing Marco Fabio Calvo’s translation of Hippocrates, see Boorman, *Ottaviano Petrucci*, 238-240.

\(^{39}\) See Benedetto Buondelmonti’s letter to Filippo Strozzi in Florence of May 19-20, 1515, found in Giorgetti, “Lorenzo de’ Medici Capitano Generale,” 206-207n3: “...Qui da molti, anzi universalmente, se ne parla per tutti quelli della natione e per genovesi, romani et vinitiani; da chi io sono stato domandato e da chi m’è stato detto chose che io ne sono suto maravigliato; chè quando pure fussino per essere, o in disegno, non crederei dovessino essere chomune a voi, che siete in quello grado che siete col Magnifico, non che elle sieno note a’ forestieri, come sono; avvisandovi che Magistro Manente ha detto uno particolare che io ne sto meravigliato. Narra prima tutto quello che io vi dico di sopra; poi soggiunge che il Magnifico disegna tenere costi suo Luogotenente e dice uno di casa Orsina et il nome, che io non me ricordo, ma mostra che sia stretto parente o fratello di Madonna Alfonsina, cugino o
“Lorenzo vecchio de’ Medici” refers not necessarily only to the fifteenth-century Lorenzo di Piero di Cosimo, but also to his grandson, Lorenzo di Piero di Lorenzo, Duke of Urbino, the “trickster” who is celebrated in verse for a *burla* on Fra Mariano Fetti.\(^\text{40}\)

The initial justification for Lorenzo’s *beffa* is Manente’s over-familiarity with the Duke, and the penalty for his “impertinence” (*improntitudine*) and “insolence” (*insolenza*) is considerable.\(^\text{41}\) Kidnapped, effectively imprisoned for a year, then abandoned in the wilderness, Manente returns to city and a society that no longer recognizes him. His house was barred against him, and his wife has become an unwitting adulteress. Lorenzo’s complete control of events and institutions – particularly the church and the courts – enable his grand hoax to be perpetrated not merely on Manente, but on Florence as well.\(^\text{42}\) As Michel Plaisance articulated, only Burchiello (c. 1404-1447/1449),

---


\(^\text{41}\) Grazzini, *Le Cene*, 327: “E fra l’altre cose gli piaceva straordinariamente il vino, e faceva professione d’intendersene, e di bevitore; e spesse volte, senz’essere invitato, se n’andava a desinare e cena col Magnifico; a cui era venuto per la sua improntitudine e insolenza tanto in fastidio e noia, che non poteva patire di vederlo, e seco stesso deliberato aveva di fargli una beffa rilevata, in modo che egli per un pezzo non avesse, e forse mai piú, a capitarli innanzi.” Manente’s “insolence” also recalls the similar behavior reproved by Vasari in the *Life* of the Paiuolo’s Aristotile da San Gallo. Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi 5:400-401. See also Mauriello on Vasari’s disdain for the artist *beffatore* versus Lasca’s acclamation, which she links to Lasca’s marginalization from official literary culture under Cosimo I. “Artisti e beffe,” 86-87.

\(^\text{42}\) As Paul Barolsky noted, “Lasca’s story is thus about more than Lorenzo’s tricky art; it is also about his ability to control the beliefs of Florentines with his artful illusions.” *The Faun in the Garden: Michelangelo and the Poetic Origins of Italian Renaissance Art* (University Park: Pennsylvania State Press, 1994), 116. Gallucci also related Grazzini’s conception of the tyrant to that of Savonarola, who similarly identified the tyrant’s use of coercion, fear, and superstition to control the populace. “Politics of Witchcraft,” 1-20. The correspondence with Savonarola was previously noted by Michel Plaisance, “La structure de la *beffa*,” 180n130; and “Le Laurent de Lasca,” in *Antonfrancesco Grazzini*, 207.
the truth-telling poet, has the perspicacity to see through the deception and to identify the hand of Lorenzo at work.\textsuperscript{43} What everyone else attributed to witchcraft, evil, and enchantment, Burchiello explicates as a clever plot; citing Lorenzo’s determination, which he notably describes using a metaphor of artistic process, he then characterizes Lorenzo’s combination of knowledge, power, and desire, through which Lorenzo is able to control the life, death, and resurrection of Manente, not as divine, but as diabolic.\textsuperscript{44}

According to Burchiello, the devilish plot of Lorenzo, who “has never made a drawing that he has not colored,” is recompense for an unspecified “rudeness” (\textit{villania}) done to Lorenzo by Manente during their joint poetic improvisation at the Medici’s villa in Careggi.\textsuperscript{45} While Manente defends himself by appealing to the freedom granted by the Muses, Burchiello’s reprimand demonstrates the limits of the poet’s truth-telling privilege.\textsuperscript{46} Burchiello’s statement that “princes are princes, and they often do such things to the likes of us when we take familiarities with them,” not only reveals Lorenzo’s seigniorial aspirations, but also his role in the \textit{Cene} as substitute for Florence’s later

\textsuperscript{43} “La structure de la \textit{beffa},” 181. See also Gallucci, “Politics of Witchcraft,” 7; Bruscagli, \textit{Le Cene}, 325n8; and Adelin Charles Fiorato, “Les obscurs repas de maître Manente,” in \textit{La table et ses dessous: Culture, alimentation et convivialité en Italie (XIV\textsuperscript{e}-XVI\textsuperscript{e} siècle)}, eds. Adelin Charles Fiorato and Anna Fontes Baratto (Paris: Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, 1999), 215. Grazzini edited the 1552 publication of Burchiello’s \textit{Sonetti}, which was reprinted in 1568.

\textsuperscript{44} Grazzini, \textit{Le Cene}, 359: “[Burchiello:] ‘Questa è stata trama del Magnifico Lorenzo.’ Coloro tutti si contrapponevano, dicendo ciò esserli avvenuto per via di streghe e di malía e per forza d’incanti. Ma Burchiello, stando nel suo proposito, diceva pure: ‘Ognuno non conosce quel cervello: non sapete voi ch’egli non comincia impresa che egli non finisca, e non ha mai fatto disegno che egli non abbia colorito? E non gli venne mai voglia che e’ non se la cavasse? Egli è il diavolo l’aver a far con chi sa, può e vuole.’ ” Fiorato linked Burchiello’s theological association of knowledge, power, and desire to that attributed by Dante to divinity, citing Virgil’s reprimand to Charon at the entrance to Hell: “Vuolsi così colà dove si puote / ciò che si vuole, e più non dimandare.” “Les obscurs repas,” 217.

\textsuperscript{45} Grazzini, \textit{Le Cene}, 359-360: “E seguitò, rivolto a maestro Manente: ‘Io me l’indovinai sempre, perché egli ti avessi a fare una burla simile, d’allora in qua, che dicendo seco improvviso a Careggi, tu li facesti quella villania: maestro Manente, i principi son principi, e fanno di così fatte cose spesso a’ nostri pari, quando vogliamo stare con esso loro a tu per tu.’ ” For the drawing metaphor, see the previous note.

\textsuperscript{46} Grazzini, \textit{Le Cene}, 360: “Il medico si scusava con dire che le Muse hanno il campo libero, e che aveva mille ragioni; ma, considerando la cosa in sé e le parole di Burchiello, ne venne a dubitare, e crederle un certo che.” See Plaisance, “Le Laurent de Lasca,” 205.
prince, Cosimo I. Like Lorenzo, Cosimo I maintained control of the state through the use of terror, a network of spies and informants, and the subversion of sacred and secular courts. The silencing of opposition through abduction, indefinite imprisonment for unknown crimes, judicial control, as well as the manipulation of belief and superstition, are all represented as enduring features of the Medicean state, whether in the 1480s, the 1510s or the 1540s. As Michael Plaisance argued, just as Lorenzo serves as mask for Cosimo I, so does Burchiello stand in for Lasca himself. Lasca’s anachronistic interpolation of the barber-poet, whose satiric style defines a genre of burlesque poetry, also implicates style as a polemic tool of political critique. Compositions alla burchia carried a transgressive political valence in 1540s Florence, and were used specifically to deride and to counter the Petrarchan style promoted by the Accademia Fiorentina. Lasca further identified with both Manente and Burchiello as victims of the state who were punished for failure to conform; Lasca and the Manente persona were alienated and isolated on the whims of the prince, while Burchiello was exiled by Cosimo il vecchio in 1434 for his poems attacking the Medici. Lorenzo il vecchio’s own poetry also features in the novella, where its Golden Age rhetoric is juxtaposed against the injustices of the Medicean state.

While imprisoned by the Camaldolites, Manente was permitted the use of a lamp; in gratitude for the indulgence of being able to see his meals, Manente performs for his

---

47 For the quotation, see the note 45 above. For Lorenzo as Cosimo I, see ibid; Gallucci, “Politics of Witchcraft,” 12-15; and Fiorato, “Les obscurs repas,” 217-218. For contemporaries’ assumption that Lorenzo’s election as the Captain of Florence in 1515 signaled his intention to become signore of Florence, see Devonshire Jones, “Lorenzo de’ Medici.”
captors little songs he used to sing with his drinking companions, as well as improvised verse. Additionally,

And because he had a beautiful voice and good pronunciation, he was often reciting certain verses by Lorenzo, which were newly published, called Selve d’amore; from this the lay brothers and the guardian, who were only able to hear him, took wondrous pleasure and satisfaction. And in this way, Manente held on as best he could, nearly having lost all hope of ever again being able to see the sun.

Manente’s unwitting performance of the poetry of his captor has previously been discussed in terms of genre by Michel Plaisance, who observed that Lasca locates Lorenzo’s lyrical verse of the Selve in prison, while the burlesque, embodied by Burchiello, serves to liberate Manente by unmasking Lorenzo’s deceptions. Manente’s ironic recitation can also be read in terms of the Medici’s sixteenth-century self-fashioning. As the scholar justly observed, in the 1540s, just as Lasca was writing the Cene, “Lorenzo became, thanks to the propaganda of the Medici, the great ancestor that the family needed.” As I have argued above, a core conceit in this mythopoesis was the renewal of the Golden Age, which, not coincidentally, is one of the primary subjects of

---

51 Grazzini, Le Cene, 343-344: “E cosí avendo fatto bucare il palco di sopra, gli fece accocciare una lampanetta, che di e notte sempre stava accesa, di maniera che rendeva la stanza alquanto luminosa. Laonde il medico scorgeva quello che egli mangiava e ciò che egli faceva, tanto che, per rimeritare in parte coloro che gli facevano quel comodo, ancora che non sapesse chi egli si fossero, cantava sovente certe canzonette che egli era solito cantare a desco molle in compagnia de’ suoi beoni, e diceva qualche volta improvviso.”

52 Ibid., 344: “E perché egli aveva bella voce e buona pronunzia, recitava spesso certe stanze di Lorenzo, che nuovamente erano uscite fora, chiamate Selve d’Amore; di che pigliavano i conversi e ’l guardiano, che solamente poteano udirlo, maraviglioso piacere e contento. E così in questa guisa s’andava trattenendo il meglio che egli poteva, quasi affatto perduta la speranza di aver mai piú a rivedere il sole.”

53 See “Le Laurent de Lasca,” 206-208. Fiorato alternatively read Manente’s recitation of the Selve as ironically recounting the life, love, nature, etc. that Manente is lacking, and as creating an affinity between “le dupeur,” who is a true poet, and “la dupe,” who is merely an improviser; ultimately, he viewed the reference as an hommage to Lorenzo. “Les obsurs repas,” 213.

54 Plaisance, “La structure de la beffa,” 179: “Au moment où Lascà écrit sa nouvelle Laurent est devenu, grâce à la propagande des Médicis, le grand ancêtre dont la famille avait besoin.”
Lorenzo’s *Selva*.

If Cosimo’s rule remakes a golden Laurentian age, as Manente’s experiences demonstrated, it is one of terror, violence, and caprice, rather than prosperity, peace, and law. Further deepening the *novella*’s unmasking of Medicean rhetoric is Manente’s use of Lorenzo’s lyrics to stave off despair. Lasca’s statement, “And in this way, he held on as best he could, nearly having lost all hope of ever again being able to see the sun” (*E cosí in questa guisa s’andava trattenendo il meglio che egli poteva, quasi affatto perduta la speranza di aver mai più a rivedere il sole*) parodies Lorenzo’s *Selva prima*, which opens with the poet’s lament of the absence of his beloved, whom he later personifies as the “Sun,” and the “false hope” that keeps her in his thoughts.

What for Lorenzo is a poetic conceit to express heartache, is for Manente, who is trapped in a windowless room, where his solitude is broken only by the masked specters who delivered his meals, physical privation. The Medici’s amorous poetics of longing have become the horrific experience of incarceration.

*The Cazzuola and the Cene*

Whether in Lasca or the Cazzuola’s *cene*, burlesque humor is blended with a

---

55 See esp. 2.35 and 2.84-96, although it should be noted that Lorenzo did not himself use the Golden Age in the *Selve* as a metaphor for Medicean renewal; nonetheless, as Anthony Cummings discussed, after the Medici’s return to Florence in 1512, verses such as “Lasso a me! or nel loco alto e silvestre / Ove dolente e triste lei si trova / d’oro è l’età, paradiso terrestre, / e quivi il primo secol si rinnuova” (*Selve* 1.22) were echoed in explicitly dynastic contexts, such as by Jacopo Nardi in his verses for the Medici’s 1513 Carnival festivities. *Politicized Muse*, 36.

56 Lorenzo de’ Medici, *Opere*, ed. Tiziano Zanato (Turin: Einaudi, 1992), 447, 1.1: “Dopo tanti sospiri e tanti omei / ancor non veggo quel bel viso adorno; / dopo tanti dolori e pianti rei / non fanno, omè!, quei belli occhi ritorno. / O fallace Speranza, o pensier’ miei, / tenuti tanto già di giorno in giorno! / Quando sarà che quei belli occhi guardi? / Non so: sia quando vuol, che sarà tardi.” For the beloved as the Sun, see stanzas 46-47.

57 For Manente’s room, see Grazzini, *Le Cene*, 340: “…una anticameretta, e d’indi d’uno scrittoio in un salottino, dove il guardiano aveva fatto rimuovere la finestra e mettere un letticciuolo e una tavoletta con un deschetto. Eravi per sorte il cammino e il necessario, e riusciva questa stanza sotto una ripa profondissima e diserta, dove non capitavano mai né uomini né animali, posta nella più remota parte del convento....” For his jailer’s garb, see note 34 above.
**gusto macabro** to affect a political critique of the Medici. In either’s gathering of **giovani**, both of which centered on communal meals that carried political commentary, foodstuffs served complementary roles. Dining also holds a pivotal role in Amaranta’s final novella; Manente’s liberal consumption of Lorenzo’s food and drink serves as the notional cause for the vindictive **beffa**, and equally, the doctor’s table manners are the means by which Burchiello discerned his true identity. Lorenzo’s predation was also enabled by Manente’s habitual intoxication. As I have argued above, the Medici’s displays of magnificence, which often included public distributions of food and drink, and which also proved both financially and physically costly to Florentines, are satirized in the Cazzuola’s banquets which often inflect feasting with infernal themes, false masquerades, or other deceptions.58 In the Cene, Lasca also plays with the concept of masquerade, both literally, through the kidnappers who hide behind Carnival masks, and figuratively, though the character Lorenzo, who serves as a mask for Lorenzo il vecchio, Duke Lorenzo, and ultimately, Cosimo I, and who exposes the rule of the state as nothing more than a theatrical performance. In Lasca’s Dinners, the sorcerer Nepo, who assaults Manente, deceives the populous, and escapes without repercussion, serves as the surrogate for Lorenzo; in the Cazzuola’s meals, the god of the underworld, perfidious harpies, Tantalus, and bloody Mars are all used as figurations of the Medici. Whether through analogies to witchcraft or to infernal torment, the Medici’s vaunted virtue is exposed as vice, and their rule as despotic exploitation of their fellow citizens.

58 Mozzati, in contrast, associated the beffa played on Manente with the fictive torture experienced by Baia during Matteo da Panzano’s feast, and stated that both “end happily;” the Trowel’s diners followed the hell banquet with the performance of the Filogenia, and Manente was ultimately reunited with his wife. “Le Cene del Lasca,” 212.
The parallel use of the macabre to subvert the Medici’s public fashioning in both the final novella of the Cene and in the Cazzuola’s feste is not coincidental, but intentional. Lasca was undoubtedly familiar with the Company’s festivities; in the prologue to his farce Il Frate, which was performed during a dinner party at the house of Maria da Prato on Epiphany, 1540, Lasca referred to the Cazzuola’s performance of Machiavelli’s Mandragola.\(^5^9\) He was close to the Cazzuola’s Domenico Barlacchi, whose greetings he sent to Benedetto Varchi in a letter of 1542, in which he also testifies to his friendship with Ugolino Martelli, the son of the Trowel’s Luigi.\(^6^0\) Lasca could have known Giovanni Gaddi, Varchi’s benefactor and the clerk of the Apostolic Camera who joined the Accademia Fiorentina on February 11, 1541.\(^6^1\) Lasca was additionally a distant relation of Giovanfrancesco Rustici.\(^6^2\) If not necessarily an intimate of other Cazzuola

\(^5^9\) Antonfrancesco Grazzini, *Teatro*, ed. Giovanni Grazzini (Bari: Laterza 1953), 525: “E se voi non ci vedete così osservato lo stil comico (appunto come condurre in scena un frate), non ne pigliate troppa ammirazione, ancora che questo non sia così grave peccato come molti lo fanno; perciocché nella Mandragola recitatisi dalla Cazzuola venne in scena un fra Timoteo de’ Servi che confortò santamente a ingravidar la moglie di M. Nicia....” The prologue gives the setting at the home of Maria da Prato and the date. For the Cazzuola’s performances of the Mandragola, see Vasari-Bettarini/Barocchi 5:395, Life of Aristotile, in the house of Bernardino di Giordano, and 5:486, Life of Rustici. See also Mozzati, Giovanfrancesco Rustici, 265-268.


\(^6^2\) The genealogy given by Milanesi is incorrect on this point. Vasari-Milanesi, 6:623. Lasca is not Rustici’s first cousin once removed; rather, the Zanobi Grazzini who married the sculptor’s cousin, Maria di Girolamo di Marco Rustici, is from a different branch of the Grazzini than the poet Antonfrancesco. See Michel Plaisance, “Espace et politique dans les comédies florentines des années 1539-1551,” in *Espace, idéologie et société au XVIe siècle*, ed. José Luis Alonso Hernández (Grenoble: Presses universitaires de Grenoble, 1975), 112-113.
companions, Lasca was well versed with many of the individual members’ literary and visual works. Andrea del Sarto was the subject of an epitaph, and in his *Lezione di maestro Niccodemo sopra il Capitolo della salsiccia* (1539-1545), Grazzini invented a portrait by Sarto of a figure wearing a sausage necklace and a liver crown. In his 1559 publication of *canti carnascialeschi*, Lasca included those of the Cazzuola’s Piero cimatore, Jacopo da Bientina, and, notoriously, Giovambattista dell’Ottonaio, whose brother Paolo accused Grazzini of corrupting Giovambattista’s verses, and subsequently published his own corrected edition of Giovambattista’s *canti*. As Elizabeth Pilliod, Sanne Wellen, and Philippe Sénéchal have shown, the continuity between the between the Compagnia della Cazzuola and the early Accademia degli Umidi is also attested to by the burlesque humor shared between the two groups, the socially diverse memberships, as well as the similar practices of communal dining and performance of plays and poetry, including the staging of spectacles for public *feste*. Political dissent might also be considered a lasting inheritance of the Cazzuola in the Umidi. As the final tale concluding the *Cene*, Lasca’s story of Doctor Manente offers a caustic characterization of

---

63 For both, see Sanne Wellen, “*La Guerra de’ Topi,*” 217-221; she posited that Lasca’s description refers to a now-unknown and untraced painting executed by Sarto; but given the satirical nature of the *Lezione*, it is more likely that Lasca invented the portrait, particularly as he described the highly profitable sale of the painting to a “Giansimone Quadro,” or “Giansimone Blockhead.”

64 For the controversy between Lasca and Ottonaio, see Rodini, *Antonfrancesco Grazzini*, 24-25. Bientina also features in Lasca’s verse; see *Le rime burlesche*, 27, 150, and 520. 

65 Pilliod, *Pontormo, Bronzino, Allori*, 84-85; she also pointed to the links between the Cazzuola and the lay confraternities of San Sebastiano and Santa Cicilia. Wellen, “*La Guerra de’ Topi,*” 207-232; “Identification of the Painter Visino,” 484-504; and “Andrea del Sarto in Vasari’s *Lives,*” 145-151; she emphasized the *tornatelle* held by the Umidi’s original founders, where after supper in the home of Giovanni Mazzuoli (Stradino), the company performed their own poetic or theatrical compositions, as continuing the practices of the Cazzuola and perhaps of the Pauolo. Sénéchal, *Giovan Francesco Rustici*, 135. Each of these authors additionally discussed the Umidi as the inheritor of these compagnie di piacere. The transgressiveness of the Pauolo and of the Cazzuola is explicitly acknowledged by Alison Brown, who stated, “Described by Vasari in evocative detail, these performances [the Pauolo and Cazzuola’s banquets] provided the pattern for the ambiguous shadow theater and double-level discourse of the later academies.” “Defining the Place of Academies,” 27.
Medici rule, and suggests that resistance to Medicean self-fashioning is a continuing heritage of informal sodalities of poets, musicians, artists, and actors. Instead of the Medici’s own self-promotion in the language of antique triumph, as in their 1513 Carnival masques and in Leo X’s 1515 entrata, Lasca frames Lorenzo’s actions in terms of autocracy and necromancy. Like the Cazzuola’s macabre dinners, which peeled back the deceptive facade of the Medici’s supposed “Age of Gold,” Lasca reveals the tyranny and oppression at the heart of the Medicean regime. As presented here, the macabre might be seen to echo Piero Soderini’s reversal of the Medici’s Golden Age poetics in his speech before the Grand Council in 1512, when, with Spanish troops camped some 15 miles outside of Florence, the Viceroy was demanding the removal of the gonfaloniere a vita and the Medici’s reinstatement to Florence as citizens. “I wanted to say this to those who preach about the time and rule of Lorenzo the Magnificent. For, although conditions were hard then and there was a tyranny (although milder than many others), by comparison with this [a restored Medici regime], Lorenzo’s rule would be an age of gold.”

Death, destruction, and tyranny were the legacies of the Medici for Soderini, and their previous regime could be idealized only in comparison to their present and future depredations. Whether for Soderini and Benedetto da Rovezzano, Michelangelo Buonarroti and Silvio Cosini, the Cazzuola’s signori, or Antonfrancesco Grazzini, the macabre was the language of choice to invert Medici mythmaking.

---
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