



FONTES  **-Quellen und Dokumente zur Kunst 1350-1750**
Sources and Documents for the History of Art 1350-1750

STUDIES, BIBLIOGRAPHIES, AND REFERENCE PUBLICATIONS ABOUT SOURCES AND DOCUMENTS, 2
STUDIEN, BIBLIOGRAPHIEN UND NACHSCHLAG-PUBLIKATIONEN ZU QUELLENSCHRIFTEN, 2
STUDIES, NO. 2 / STUDIEN, NR. 2

CHARLES DAVIS

COSIMO BARTOLI AND MICHELANGELO

A Study of the Sources for Michelangelo by Bartoli with excerpts from the
RAGIONAMENTI ACCADEMICI DI COSIMO BARTOLI GENTIL' HUOMO ET ACCADEMICO FIORENTINO,
SOPRA ALCUNI LUOGHI DIFFICILI DI DANTE
(Venezia: de Franceschi, 1567)
and other works by Bartoli

FONTES 64

[15. January 2012]

Zitierfähige URL: [http://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/artdok/volltexte/2012/1825/
urn:nbn:de:bsz:16-artdok-18257](http://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/artdok/volltexte/2012/1825/urn:nbn:de:bsz:16-artdok-18257)

SOURCES AND DOCUMENTS FOR MICHELANGELO BUONARROTI – E-TEXTS, NO. 8
 QUELLEN UND DOKUMENTE ZU MICHELANGELO BUONARROTI – E-TEXTE, NR. 8

COSIMO BARTOLI AND MICHELANGELO

A Study of the Sources for Michelangelo by Bartoli with excerpts from the Rationamenti Accademici of Cosimo Bartoli (Venezia: Francesco de' Franceschi Senese, 1567) and other works by the same author



Digitized by Google

*Rationamenti Accademici di Cosimo Bartoli
 Gentil'huomo et Accademico Fiorentino,
 sopra alcuni luoghi difficili di Dante.
 Con alcune Inventioni & significati,
 & la Tavola di piu cose notabili,
 Venezia:
 Francesco de' Franceschi Senese,
 1567*

PORTRAIT OF THE AUTHOR AFTER A DRAWING BY VASARI.

FONTES 64

Bartoli's *Rationamenti accademici* (1567) is presently online and fully accessible („full view“/“vollständige Ansicht“) at GOOGLE BOOKS in a complete digital facsimile of the exemplar at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek and with a partially searchable, but textually very imperfect OCR full text.

CONTENTS

3 COSIMO BARTOLI AND MICHELANGELO:
A STUDY OF THE TEXTUAL SOURCES

17 NOTES

24 APPENDIX I:
THE *FINESTRE INGINOCCHIATE* IN 'IL MARTELLO,
OVER RAGIONAMENTO PRIMO'

31 APPENDIX II:
COSIMO BARTOLI ON MICHELANGELO'S «NUOVO ORDINE»

CHARLES DAVIS

COSIMO BARTOLI AND MICHELANGELO:
A STUDY OF THE TEXTUAL SOURCES

Family, friends, academicians, art history, architecture

«Io ho havuto sempre in venerazione le cose di Michelagnolo Buonarroti» – if this affirmation is not particularly remarkable, it is also not intrinsically illuminating, but it is what Cosimo Bartoli affirms in his book, the *Ragionamenti accademici*, a work first published in Venice in 1567, but for the most part certainly written much earlier.¹ Bartoli's statement deserves, if briefly, more consideration than it has received, for in reality, at the side of Leonbattista Alberti, Michelangelo formed the polestar – albeit a binary one – of the artistic universe of our «gentiluomo e accademico fiorentino».² In examining anew the connections between Cosimo Bartoli and Michelangelo, I wish to concentrate, in particular, on several components of this topic: firstly, the familial aspect, that is, the two families, the Bartoli and the Buonarroti; secondly, the personal aspect, the direct contacts between Cosimo Bartoli and Michelangelo Buonarroti, and, further, indirect contacts mediated by third parties.

Also to be considered are questions of an art historical character, both historiographic questions and ones pertaining to architectural criticism. A very relevant context is the academic one in Florence, in particular, that of the Accademia Fiorentina, which, in addition to Bartoli and Buonarroti, includes men such as Giovan Battista Gelli, Carlo Lenzoni, Pierfrancesco Giambullari, and members of the Martelli family, all friends of Bartoli, and others. But, as we shall see, unlike many of these figures Bartoli was not simply a literary intellectual. He was instead a man whose interests embraced mathematics, technology, music, art, architecture, and history.

To begin, let us consider the familial dimension of our theme, that is, the relationships between the Bartolis and the Buonarrotis. Despite the presence of class, of profession, trade, or craft, and perhaps even of neighbourhood, all as bases of social solidarity in Renaissance Florence, by the far the strongest social bond remained, as perhaps in all traditional societies, that of family, and in Florence this was probably true of all social strata, but certainly of the urban bourgeoisie. Not only was the family an important social institution, but it acquired social reality in an extended network of personal relationships. The biography of Michelangelo published by Ascanio Condivi in 1553 was inspired by the master himself to the extent that at some points it assumes an autobiographical character. Condivi's *vita* testifies amply to the centrality of the family Buonarroti, of its origins and of its honour, in the conceptual and personal world of Michelangelo. In the same way, endless letters by Michelangelo testify to his profound attachment to his family and its fortunes. Similar is the family pride of a Cosimo Bartoli in the «casa nostra» when he writes of «quei gradi che ci havevano lasciati i Nostri Antichi», and this in a letter that recalls, among the public offices that the Bartolis had held in Florence, the offices held by a grandfather and by a great-grandfather, in a perspective that looks back to a remote past that reaches the late Trecento.³ It was a view of the family in which time was an unbroken continuum, one in which distant ancestors were present now.

If we look more closely at Condivi's biography of Michelangelo, we may note the part played by the Buonarroti family at the moment when the young Michelangelo decided to embrace his artistic vocation, at first as a painter. At this time he encountered the opposition not simply of his father but of all the elders of the Buonarroti family, the opposition of his uncles assuming a particularly vehement form and expression. All of Michelangelo's biographers record this circumstance. This youthful humiliation left a deep mark in Michelangelo's psyche, one which lasted into his old age. Concerning the intention of the young Michelangelo, which took shape around 1488, to abandon the study of letters for that of painting, Condivi writes:

*Onde dal padre et dai fratelli del padre, i quali tal arte in odio avevano, ne fu mal voluto, et bene spesso stranamente battuto, ai quali, come imperiti dell'eccellenza e nobiltà del arte, pareva vergogna che ella in casa sua fusse. Il che avenga che dispiacer grandissimo gli porgesse, nondimeno non fu bastate à rivoltarlo in dietro, anzi, fatto più animoso, volse tentare d'adoperare i colori.*⁴

In 1564, in his funeral oration for Michelangelo, Benedetto Varchi returns to the same topic, including even the mistreatment of Michelangelo, still a boy, who was beaten by his father and his uncles – «i quali si sdegnavano di cotale arte, quasi il dipingere non fusse altro che scarabocchiare sulle mura».⁵ In 1568, Vasari follows the same line of interpretation: the family saw painting, or 'disegno' as unworthy, as a «cosa bassa e non degna della antica casa loro».⁶

Who were these uncles ('zii') of Michelangelo? Leaving aside the question of Michelangelo's maternal uncle,⁷ the bother of his deceased mother, who died in 1481, on his father's side, that of the Lodovico Buonarroti Simoni, Michelangelo had only one uncle, Francesco di Simoni, his father's brother, who died childless in 1508. At that time Francesco di Simone's wife, his second wife, was Cassandra di Cosimo Bartoli, born perhaps around 1450. Michelangelo doubtlessly knew her as a child. The father of our Cosimo Bartoli was Matteo di Cosimo di Matteo Bartoli, but he does not seem to have had a sister named Cassandra. The name Cosimo, which was a Medicean name, was found, however, in other branches of the Bartoli from around the mid-Quattrocento and, more precisely, in that of Tommaso Bartoli, the brother of the great-grandfather of our Cosimo, Matteo di Marco, with whose family this Matteo, owned property in common.⁸ But in the late Quattrocento and early Cinquecento it was not simply the nuclear family that was important: the extended family embracing even cousins twice and thrice removed retained a great importance, and this was especially true for a family whose position was consolidated, who had attained a certain measure of economic solidity, and who had lived over a number of generations in a relatively small centre such as Florence with its population of little more than 50,000 inhabitants and with a local urban life that spread little beyond the confines of the churches of Santissima Annunziata and Santo Spirito and those of the Ognissanti (the church of the Bartoli) and Santa Croce (the church of the Buonarroti). A condition comparable to modern social atomization would have been for the masses incomprehensible, although Cosimo Bartoli, in his *Ragionamenti accademici*, does identify one of its causes with respect to artists: unemployment and emigration.

When, in 1508, at the death of Michelangelo's uncle, Cassandra di Cosimo Bartoli sought to regain her dowry, she became very inconvenient for Michelangelo's immediate family, a fact which ultimately contributed to a complete reorganization of the familial patrimony, a reorganization in which Michelangelo assumed the ownership of the entire Buonarroti wealth and properties in recognition of his having assumed and satisfied the financial obligations of

the family.⁹ But for Michelangelo and his family, Cassandra Bartoli was nevertheless a *zia* of the master. This relation of kinship surely was a reason for all of the Bartolis to watch the precocious rise of the artist Michelangelo with particular attention and interest, because the fame of Michelangelo also reflected honour on their own family, the Bartoli.

Turning our attention now to the more personal aspects of the Bartoli-Buonarroti relationship, two circumstances, both already known, illuminate the relation of kinship which we have just examined. In his *Vite* of 1568, Giorgio Vasari proudly quotes an entire letter that Michelangelo had written to him from Rome on 18 December 1556.¹⁰ The letter begins: «Messer Giorgio amico caro. Io ho ricevuto il libretto di messer Cosimo che voi mi mandate, ed in questa sarà una di ringraziamento; pregovi che gliene diate: ed a quella mi raccomando».¹¹ The small book in question is the posthumous edition of Carlo Lenzoni's *Difesa della lingua fiorentina et di Dante*, a work which was published under the editorship of Cosimo Bartoli in the same year, 1556 (appresso Lorenzo Torrentino). Not only does Michelangelo send his regards to Bartoli, but he has included a now lost letter expressing his gratitude, addressed to Bartoli, and enclosed in his letter to Vasari, and, further, he mentions Bartoli in familiar terms, calling him «Messer Cosimo», adopting the almost affectionate formula of address which he often uses for «Messer Giorgio, amico caro», thus possibly indicating a measure of intimacy with Cosimo Bartoli and certainly a personal acquaintance with him, owing not only to kinship but also to mutual friendships. In any event, the letter printed by Vasari remains the sole concrete testimony to a direct and personal connection between Cosimo Bartoli and Michelangelo. It should not be neglected that this document makes clear that for Michelangelo the *libretto* in question was Bartoli's, and not that of Lenzoni or Giambullari (who signed the dedication to Michelangelo), both of whom were dead. It would have been further pleasing to the old master to read of himself compared to Dante Alighieri, pleasing to him as a poet and pleasing to him as the first artist, incomparable and unique, in the three arts of design, just as Dante was the first and true poet, with «con le tre scienze, Imitativa, Naturale, et Divina».¹² The letter of Michelangelo to Vasari for the book of Bartoli and the lost letter to Bartoli were not mere gestures of polite formality on the part of Michelangelo – whose intransigent epistolary silences were notorious –, for immediately following the arrival of the volume in Rome, Michelangelo charged Sebastiano Malenotti to write a letter to his nephew Lionardo Buonarroti in Florence: «Questa settimana gli [*a Michelangelo*] è stato mandato da Giorgio d'Arezzo un libro composto da Cosimo Bartoli et nuovamente stampato, il quale [*Michelangelo*] prima vuol vedere e dipoi risponderà del ricevuto. Sì che, occorrendo di sorte vedere il predetto messer Giorgio, datili nuova de l'havere havuto buon recapito».¹³ Thus we see that Michelangelo was eager that the receipt of the book be acknowledged, that he took pains to see that it was acknowledged immediately, and that he communicated that he would write when he had read it, as he did.

The year is 1556, but if we turn back nearly three decades, to 1518, another letter of Michelangelo may appear more significant. In this letter Michelangelo writes to Cardinal Giulio de' Medici, later Pope Clement VII, explaining that he has long looked in vain to find «una casa capace di farvi tutta questa opera» – and now: «Messer Matteo Bartoli a questi di mi ha trovato un sito mirabile e utile per farvi una stanza per simile opera, e questo è la piazza che è innanzi alla chiesa d'Ogni Santi». Here, it seems, the context is that of the project for the new façade of the Basilica of San Lorenzo and the matter is that of finding a place to establish a *stanzone* or *bottega* for the *cantiere*, where statues would be made, «figure di marmo e di bronzo».¹⁴ «Messer Matteo Bartoli» is the father of our Cosimo Bartoli, who lived with his family in the quarter of Santa Maria Novella and, more exactly, in the Borgo Ognissanti, between the piazza of the same name and the river Arno, in a street and a zone where were resident other members of the large Bartoli clan.¹⁵ Michelangelo's inspection visit

to the potential workshop site – «sito mirabile» – would have been the occasion for a possible and perhaps not first encounter between Michelangelo and the young Cosimo Bartoli, then an eighteen year old. The personal interest that his father, Matteo di Cosimo Bartoli, took in the affairs of Michelangelo is more readily understandable in the context of the familial relationships of the two families, Bartoli and Buonarroti, and it was not necessarily a function of a friendship (as sometimes assumed) between Michelangelo and Matteo Bartoli, a friendship for which there are no further indications.

Another circumstance, to which I have elsewhere drawn attention, suggests a special position of Cosimo Bartoli in relationship to matters involving Michelangelo. To think of Bartoli as an inside informant would be an exaggeration, but he does seem to be in an advantageous position as a witness, one who disposes over ample and direct information.¹⁶ To his 1550 translation of Leonbattista Alberti's *De architettura* Bartoli added numerous illustrations, *L'Architettura [...] Con l'aggiunta de disegni* (Firenze, Lorenzo Torrentino, 1550). Three large plates of the book show the raising of weights. In the woodcut on page 176 we see the statue of the so-called Apollo-David of Michelangelo, now in the Bargello Museum in Florence, which was originally made for Baccio Valori.¹⁷ In the image of the book the statue is suspended from a single rope, and it is shown in a mirror-image, reversed, that is, with respect to the original, because it was drawn directly on the wood block, without reversal, and thus became reversed in the printing of the image. This has concealed its otherwise fairly obvious source in Michelangelo, which escaped notice for four and one half centuries. The identity with Michelangelo's Apollo is further masked by the addition of wings and a bow in Bartoli's illustration, and thus we see Michelangelo's *Apolline* transformed into an Amor.

In 1550 the Apollo Valori was almost a 'secret' work of Michelangelo – Vasari, mentioning it in the first edition of the *Vite* in the same year, 1550, was not in a position to indicate its location. It was first three years later, when the Apollo entered the Medici collections, that its provenance becomes clear. Thus, once again, Bartoli is revealed as an uncommon *conoscitore* of Michelangelo's works, and he was able to procure an exact image of a Florentine work of the master, a work then little known in the city. It is again Bartoli, and only Bartoli, who knows the fact that «Michelangiolo aveva avuto gran voglia di dipingere le pareti della loggia dell'Orcagna», that is, the Loggia de' Lanzi in the Piazza Signoria. This, at least, is what Giovanni Papini writes about, what would have been almost a «Giudizio all'aperto». Trusting the testimony of Francesco Bocchi, Michelangelo wanted to continue the Loggia de' Lanzi all around the perimeter of the Piazza della Signoria.¹⁸ Without citing it, Papini has related the contents of a letter written by Cosimo Bartoli to Giorgio Vasari in the year 1571 in which Bartoli writes, «Vi ricordo, che Michelagnolo hebbe una gran voglia [a] un tratto, che se li porgesse occasione di dipinger la loggia di piazza; et era quel homo che sa Vostra Signoria» – a text that constitutes the single testimony to this project, which belongs to the grander ambitions of Michelangelo.¹⁹

Michelangelo's contemporaries hung on his words.²⁰ Having heard them, his friends were fond of remembering them and even attempted to collect his maxims and aphorisms. In the *Ragionamento infra M. Cosimo Bartoli e Giovan Batista Gelli sopra le difficoltà del mettere in regole la lingua nostra* of 1551, the author, Giovan Batista Gelli, quotes a *detto* of Michelangelo in a passage of the dialogue, a passage that in the fiction of the dialogue is spoken by Cosimo Bartoli. Responding to an observation of Gelli relating to the question of 'artificio', of, that is, of an art that conceals itself, by appearing unapparent and not calling attention to itself, Bartoli, in his role as an interlocutor, says: «Per questo soleva già dire il nostro Michelagnolo Buonarroti, quelle sole figure essere buone, delle quali era cavata la

fatica; cioè condotte con sì grande arte, che elle parevano cose naturali, e non di artificio».²¹ The author, of course, remains Gelli, but perhaps we may believe that Gelli did not impose uncongenial views on his friend. What Bartoli describes is the opposite to the artifice often attributed to Michelangelo by his detractors, who felt that his art was too much in the foreground in his works, that, in his works, nature was vanquished by art. For Lodovico Dolce it is the ‘facilità’ of Raphael that seems to some «troppo facile, e per conseguente non di tanto artificio; non sapendo che la facilità [...] è l’arte a nascondere l’arte».²² If Michelangelo actually said the words attributed to him, the concluding phrase («cioè condotte con sì grande arte, che elle parevano cose naturali, e non di artificio») is simply a gloss, and the same *sentenza* can be read in the *In difesa della lingua fiorentina* of Carlo Lenzone, which was printed *a cura di* Cosimo Bartoli in 1556: «Et come dice il divinissimo Buonarroti, non ne cava la fatica», a phrase which follows the words, «Ma sopra grosse et male abbozzate figure; alle quali non dà mai fine», and words which finish in, «et come dice il divinissimo Buonarroti, non ne cava la fatica».²³ This phrase refers, it would seem, to the numerous works left imperfect, incomplete, or unfinished by Michelangelo and thus a source of recrimination by his critics, words which constitute a kind of self-defence – a clever answer to those who beleaguered him with questions about his unfinished works, a matter which has equally perplexed modern critics. In the last account it is not easy to say if Bartoli is relating accurately the actual words of the master or if he is relating second-hand news, deformed by repeating, words that circulated on the academic circuit. It should not be forgotten that among the members of the Accademia Fiorentina there also numbered Michelangelo, and, on paper at least, his membership lasted almost twenty-five years.²⁴ And, if his membership, did not include active participation, the attention the Academy paid to him and to his poetic accomplishments was not unwelcome.

Whether this dictum is one deriving from Michelangelo or is merely Michelangelesque, it takes us into the arena of art historical questions. But before turning to such matters, let us consider one further personal reflection of the great «venerazione» in which Cosimo Bartoli held, «sempre», the «cose di Michelagnolo Buonarroti». We have arrived at the last years of Bartoli, and find him in Venice, three years before his death. The year is 1569, in the summer. In a long letter to «Messer Giorgio», Bartoli announces the discovery near Padua of an unknown and solitary student («scolaro») of Michelangelo, «un messer Giambattista Zabacco, prete, di mia età», who has made «un Giudizio a modo di Michelangelo». Bartoli adds, «io per uno ne son rimasto tanto e siffattamente maravigliato che non ve lo saprei dire». The verbal evocation by Bartoli of the ‘Last Judgement’ of Zabacco – «un cartone di matita nera» – closely recalls that of the Roman, papal, and universal *Giudizio* by Michelangelo. Its words apply almost equally to both works: «tanto bello, con tanti belli ignudi, con tante belle attitudini, con tanti belli scorci, con tanti vari gruppi di maschi, di femmine, di putti, di giovani, di vecchi, di angeli, di diavoli, di santi d’ogni sorte [...]»²⁵

As a minor footnote to this incident, it may be noted that «Zabacco» does not seem to be a proper Italian surname (*cognomen*); at least it is not to be found in the large UTET lexicon of the *Cognomi d’Italia*, or in other similar works, and it is a family name presently unknown in any other land, with a single exception, to the most used internet search engines. Thus we might ask if Karl Frey’s transcription of Bartoli’s letter in the Vasari *Nachlass* does not perhaps contain a minimal error. If he has read a letter ‘l’, mistakenly, for a letter ‘z’, a not inconceivable mistake, Zabacco may have been named ‘Labacco’, or even ‘Abacco’. Antonio Labacco’s grandson was named Giovan Battista (di Mario), to mention only one hypothetically possible indication that might be investigated.

And, finally, in a last letter by Bartoli, of 1571, addressed again to his beloved friend («amico quasi fratello») Giorgio Vasari, Bartoli could not propose to his friend as a model for Vasari's approaching late period of work in Rome for Pope Pius V anyone other than Michelangelo. «Il voler Sua Santità, che voi lo inverno stiate in Roma et habbiate la cura delle muraglie *intra et extra urbem* è cosa tanto honorata, quanto sapete, da che diviene vostra, la cura et la autorità che haveva il divino Buonarroti».²⁶ On the one hand it is not entirely clear exactly what tasks messer Giorgio would have to confront in the Winter of 1571-1572 in order that he might acquire in Rome «la cura e l'autorità» that formerly belonged to Michelangelo. On the other hand Bartoli does not specify what was the «cura» that Michelangelo had had («aveva»). Nevertheless, the apparently authoritative words of Bartoli lend support to the hypothesis, one advanced in the past more than once, that Michelangelo was involved in the urbanistic projects of Pope Pius IV in 1561.²⁷ Such interpretations see the Porta Pia as part of a more extensive urbanistic programme which includes the *mura* of the city. In this context the presence of Cosimo Bartoli in Rome and in the service of the very young Cardinal Giovanni de' Medici (1543-1562; cardinal 1560) at this time is not of negligible interest.²⁸ We are in the first half of 1560, in the months in which Vasari, also a part of the company of the adolescent cardinal, often consulted with Michelangelo,²⁹ and also when Giovanni de' Medici laid the foundation stone of the church of San Giovanni dei Fiorentini (28 May 1560), for, that is, a construction built on the designs of Michelangelo and with the explicit approval of Duke Cosimo I de' Medici, the father of Giovanni. This constitutes a further instance in which Cosimo Bartoli is the sole witness for a still obscure chapter in the life of Michelangelo, a chapter perhaps adumbrated by Vasari when, having mentioned the Porta Pia, he writes: «e visto l'umor del papa, perché dovessi restaurare le altre porte di Roma, gli fece molti altri disegni» (G. II, 770).

All the considerations thus far advanced might be considered as little more than a preamble to the examination of the binomial Bartoli-Buonarroti from an artistic and art historical point of view. But there has emerged a picture richer in details than might have been awaited at the outset, although, admittedly, it is a highly fragmentary one. Attempting a summation, the following observations may be made:

(1) Bartoli and Buonarroti: a relation of kinship, by marriage, a kinship recognized by both families, and thus Cosimo and Michelangelo belonged to a single familial grouping that was not without social significance and cohesion.

(2) Did Cosimo Bartoli and Michelangelo Buonarroti know each other directly? The answer is clearly yes, and most probably they knew each other at least from the time when Bartoli was a youth. Thus there seems to have been a certain familiarity, which, while it was not a close friendship, nevertheless entailed a bond that Michelangelo did not deny.

(3) It seems also clear that Bartoli attentively followed the works of Michelangelo and the events of his artistic life. His interest is in Michelangelo as an artist, as is his interest in many other artists as artists. Nevertheless, Alberti and Michelangelo were his two heroes, and they occupied a special position in Bartoli's world of art.

(4) The observations of Bartoli about Michelangelo are not simply the usual commonplaces of the type, 'divino Michelangelo'. They offer instead more than a few glimpses of scarcely known aspects of the world of Michelangelo, ones that are unexpected and ones which do not repeat information transmitted by other sources.

(5) And, finally, are not to be forgotten the close friendships of Cosimo Bartoli in the circle of the Accademia degli Umidi in Florence, which soon became the Accademia Fiorentina. Here Bartoli clearly belonged to the Gelli-Lenzoni-Giambullari-Norchiati faction, all of these men having a distinct interest in Michelangelo. Pierfrancesco Giambullari and Giovanni Norchiati were both canons of the Basilica of San Lorenzo, and the latter named, Norchiati, was an ‘amico’ of Michelangelo, according to Vasari, at least from around 1520, when Norchiati acted as an intermediary in negotiating the return to Michelangelo of drawings which had been ‘stolen’ from his Florentine workshop by the youths, Nanni di Baccio Bigio and Bartolomeo Ammannati.³⁰ Norchiati was also directly involved in the *cantieri buonarrotiani* at San Lorenzo, where he was able to insert his nephew, the *frate* Giovan Angelo Montorsoli.³¹ In 1532 Norchiati shared his Vitruvian studies with Michelangelo, who concerned himself with the ancient text for a period of time dating from 1520.³² Norchiati was also interested in the words and specific linguistic formulations used by artisans and artists and for the instruments they used, and their names. He planned a vocabulary of such terms.³³ These interests are analogous to those of Bartoli. Through the medium of these two canons of San Lorenzo, with both of whom he was befriended, Bartoli had the possibility of learning something about the architectural thought of Michelangelo. It was Norchiati who wrote to Michelangelo in December of 1532, requesting new consultations with Michelangelo concerning the translation of Vitruvius’s *De Architectura*, in which he had arrived at the seventh book: «ma avrei bisogno di avervi appresso, così ancora con l’occhio – that is, together with the eye of Michelangelo – vedere certe cose delle antiche».³⁴

In the field of art Bartoli did not simply occupy himself devising pictorial *concetti*, he was also an amateur architect, although ‘dilettante’ seems almost a misnomer when applied to Bartoli. As an architect he was quite clearly a *michelangiolo*. Moreover, Bartoli was also a technical expert; and, if he was not previously expert in technical matters, he became so through his Italian translation of Alberti’s *De Re Aedificatoria*, which was completed and published in 1550. Thereby he inevitably acquired a profound knowledge of architecture. Alberti’s is a work that, as few others, goes deeply into detail about the matter of architecture, seemingly in all of its aspects, perhaps even more than its Vitruvian model, which Alberti carefully revised. The multiplicity of themes meant that, through the understanding that the process of translation demands, our dilettante was transformed into a professional.

Rather than offering a detailed and exhaustive examination of all the written texts by Cosimo Bartoli of a more general art historical character, it has seemed more important to delineate first a picture of the documented historical circumstances, offered above, which provide elements that may guide the interpretation of these texts, and not to attempt, as has been done, to contextualize them with reference to a real, or perhaps an only *post festum* and half-imagined *Kunstdiskurs* or *dibattito critico* concerning art or architecture. Often it is mainly a question of debates ‘*mai nati*’ and only artificially constructed by art historians. Thus I propose initially to look at Bartoli’s texts as autonomous discourses that propose their own truths. This is not to suggest that there was not a very large quantity of spoken and written discourse about art and architecture – and indeed Bartoli’s text explicitly refers to it – but simply to stress the opposite side of the coin, the fragmentary and discontinuous character of this phenomenon, which appears in greater relief once compared to the much more substantial corpus of Renaissance literary criticism.³⁵ Here is given only a general indication of the various themes and relevant texts.

Let us call the first topic simply ‘Michelangelo and Sculpture’. The «lodi di Michelangelo» in Cosimo Bartoli’s *Ragionamenti accademici*, in so far as they concern the art of sculpture, award the *primato* unequivocally to Michelangelo: it was Michelangelo who recognized the «buono», before others and to a higher degree than others. Thus he is «unico» and «solo» in sculpture, and, if it is possible, one may maintain that he has surpassed even the sculptors of antiquity. He merits the epithets «sopranaturale» and «divino» because he has «in questa età aperto gli occhi» of everyone, enabling them to «conoscere il buono, et la verità di questa arte».³⁶

Thus Michelangelo attains not only the *primato* in sculpture, but he is also the motor of progress in the sculpture of his time. And it is further «mercè di Michelangelo» that the *scuola fiorentina di scultura* had been able to affirm itself in all of Italy and in the world, if we follow the introduction and conclusion of a notable passage in the *Ragionamenti accademici* about the sculptors of the Florentine school, about Ammannati, Bandinelli, Cellini, Sansovino, Montorsoli and others.³⁷ «Hoggi la scultura sia in colmo», thanks to Michelangelo, who «ha aperti gli occhi a questa età di maniera, che hora mai per molti non si hà più invidia agli Antichi». As often happened among the learned men of his day, Bartoli equivocates, proposing the possibility that Michelangelo might have surpassed the ancients, without affirming that he has actually done so, apparently not wanting to risk going beyond terms such as «uguagliare» or «equiparare». It is also worth noting that the *primato* of Buonarroti in sculpture is also a Florentine *primato*, in line with Bartoli’s publicistic praises of the Florentine school of sculpture, which are also parallel to and in harmony with the well-known preference of the Florentine *lingua volgare* on the part of Bartoli and his friends in the Accademia Fiorentina. But Bartoli’s remarks on the «Scuola fiorentina» are also a lament: in Florence sculptors have not found adequate support in local patronage, and thus there is an implicit appeal that local artists find more occasions for work in Florence, a presentation that is nearly turned on its head in the description made by Bartoli of Medici and Ducal Florence and presented in the dedication to Cosimo I, in 1564, of his *Modo di misurare*:

*Appariscono in varii luoghi per lo Stato di Vostra Eccellenza le lodatissime imprese delle muraglie, delle Sculture, et delle Picature [sic], et molti altri esercizi, che sono quasi infinite, che dalla honoratissima Scuola de virtuosi nutritisi, et esercitatatisi sotto l’ombra di Vostra Eccellenza Illustrissima hanno fatto, et continuamente fanno, non solamente honore, et utile al presente Secolo; ma giovamento, et lume grandissimo al futuro.*³⁸

The date of the dedication, «il dì decimo di agosto 1559», is long prior to the publication of the book in Venice in 1564.

Bartoli dedicated his Italian translation of Leonbattista Alberti’s brief treatise *De Statua*, to the Florentine sculptor Bartolomeo Ammannati. This treatise was included in Bartoli’s edition of smaller works by Alberti under the title *Opuscoli morali* in Venice in 1568.³⁹ The dedication to Ammannati contains an art historical definition of the artistic conquests of Buonarroti which merits a closer examination: the demise of sculpture in Italy, «mediante le inondazioni dei Barbari»; the attempt of Alberti, through his treatise, to reopen a path leading to new achievements; Donatello, and, after him, Michelangelo. Alberti shows how in sculpture it is possible to «bene operare con regole ferme, et stabili». «Forse buona ragione, che in processo di tempo, si avessi in detta arte, a fare progressi tali, quali si veghono essersi fatti. Poi che in questo nostro secolo non si ha ad avere invidia alle bellissime statue de lodatissimi scultori antichi Romani» – the proof of this is the Piazza della Signoria, with its statues, among them, «il maravigliosissimo Colosso del Davitte» by the «sempre divino Michel Agnolo Buonarroti». The civic centre of Florence constitutes the epicentre of the renaissance and perfection of sculpture.

Similar historiographical conceptions are found in the third dialogue of the *Ragionamenti accademici*.⁴⁰ This dialogue is well known to historians of music owing to its numerous references to musicians alive in the years before 1550 circa. Johannes Ockeghem (ca. 1410-1497) and Josquin des Prez (ca. 1450-1521) are likened to Donatello and Michelangelo as the ideators, or initiators of their respective arts (Ockeghem; Donatello) and as the agents of bringing their arts to perfection (Josquin; Michelangelo).⁴¹ Donatello in his time «ritrovò la Scultura»; Josquin was «un mostro della natura». As a Michelangelo was «sopranaturale», Josquin was «unico» and without rivals, «senza compagno», just as «nostro Michielagnolo Buonarroti», «nella Architettura, Pittura e Scultura». «Et l'uno et l'altro di loro ha aperti gli occhi a tutti coloro che di queste arti si diletmano, o si diletteranno per lo avvenire».⁴²

For the criticism of architecture and its history, the citations in the *Ragionamenti accademici* of Michelangelo's architectural invention of the *finestra inghinocchiata* for the Palazzo Medici in Via Larga are of interest. Bartoli describes his imitation of just this invention in the façade of the casa of Giovanni Battista Ricasoli, then the Vescovo di Cortona, in the Via Sangallo in Florence.⁴³ Here *finestre inghinocchiate* were quite unusually combined on the façade with an order of columns – orders were usually avoided on Florentine Renaissance palace fronts –, a Doric order, to «fare la muraglia [...] quanto piu rilevata io poteva».

THE ORDINE NUOVO

For the history of architecture and for Michelangelo as an architect by far the most significant text written by Bartoli is that about the «ordine nuovo» of the Biblioteca Laurenziana, a text that is, again, found in the *Ragionamenti accademici*. After its republication in 1975, this document has received renewed attention in recent years. Re-reading the text has suggested that there remain some unresolved questions and recent readings have raised new problems and these are not without errors that beg correction.

In the present text I wish mainly to indicate what the open questions are, without attempting to answer them exhaustively. It would be a mistake to believe, as sometimes assumed, that the mental codification of the classical architectural orders took place only toward 1540 with the publication of Serlio's book on the orders. Serlio's work recapitulates earlier research accomplished already by or in the *anni venti* of the Cinquecento, an investigation scarcely owed to Serlio alone. Nor did Serlio's prescriptions result in a definitive codification and put an end to the matter. In 1527, immediately following the Sack of Rome, Serlio applied to the Venetian Senate for copyright privileges for his engraved illustrations of the orders.⁴⁴ Thus the Laurentian works of Michelangelo cannot be accurately described as anterior to this phase of architectural investigation. On the contrary, the Laurentian works correspond to a very active phase of it. And it is also certainly a mistake to believe that Michelangelo would not have seen his architecture as deviating or diverging from ancient rules.⁴⁵ He was not oblivious to what he saw around him. Michelangelo's 'ordine nuovo' of the Laurenziana is seen by Bartoli as a modification of the Doric order. This is an acute observation on Bartoli's part. Unless I have overlooked a text in the vast literature about Michelangelo, the next architectural critic or commentator, with the possible exception of Giuseppe Richa,⁴⁶ to have perceived this was the architect Paolo Portoghesi (born 1931), who, now long ago, in 1964, arrived independently at much the same conclusion as Bartoli. Portoghesi showed how little the order of the Laurenziana, identified by Vasari as an «ordine composto», has in common with the Roman composite order and noted its Doric derivation.⁴⁷ Portoghesi offered an extensive architectural reading of the order in his address at the

International Congress for the History of Art in Bonn in this year.⁴⁸ In an article of 1975, in which Bartoli's observations on Michelangelo's «nuovo ordine» were published in their entirety in an Appendix, the present writer pointed again to the Doric character of the order and discussed some of Michelangelo's 'Corinthian' modifications in his formulations of the «ordine nuovo» in the Laurenziana.

In reality, the order of the Laurenziana bears no relationship to Vitruvius's *Tuscanicae Dispositiones*, a term which refers to something entirely different. This phrase occurs in Vitruvius's description of the Tuscan Temple (IV, 6), and it has to do with projects for the Temple, both plans and other arrangements of the parts. In any event, the «ordine nuovo» of the Laurenziana, that of Bartoli as well as of Buonarroti, appears to be a revision of the Doric order, in the direction of the Corinthian (through lengthening the shaft and through the addition of Corinthian details) and certainly not a Tuscanising resolution, which would have inevitably implied a contraction in proportions and a reduction in the elaboration of profiles, *i.e.*, a simplification, precisely the opposite of what happened.⁴⁹

In an ambitious article undertaking to explain Michelangelo's Florentine architectural language, Caroline Elam proposes that Michelangelo thought of the orders of the Laurentian Library as both Tuscan and Doric, «with a composed admixture of elements from other orders», meaning elements taken from three or more different orders. This interpretation seems fundamentally wrong. For the idea to obtain it must be demonstrated that there were at the minimum some unequivocally Tuscan elements in the order of the Laurentian Library mixed with the Doric elements. This is not the case. The problem with the argument thus emerges when we attempt to answer the simple question, «Where is the Tuscan?». The order of the Laurentian Library was almost certainly intended by Michelangelo to be understood as Doric. The bases are not quite Attic, in that, above, they include a torus above a scotia, then a *gola* above a plinth, not a torus, as though the *gola* from the bases of the ground-floor of the Colosseum had inserted themselves into an Attic base, usurping the place of the lower torus.⁵⁰ The capitals include a *tondino* and small *listello* below the echinus, a combination used elsewhere for Doric by Cinquecento architects, but not, apparently, for Tuscan.⁵¹

The echinus is also of interest, since its profile is not a *cavetto* in the usual manner, but consists of another *gola*, as though the *gola* below the echinus of the capitals of the ground floor of the Colosseum had inflated itself into an echinus. If it is right to suspect that these cymas are taken by the architect from the similar elements of the Colosseum, then one wonders what Michelangelo thought the order of the *pianterreno* of the Colosseum was – Tuscan or Doric; but that we do not know and cannot safely deduce from his use of them in the Laurentian Library. But the final element, the contracted entablature of which the frieze has gone missing, is particularly striking; it is not a straightforward descendant of Giuliano da Sangallo's reconstruction of the Crypta Balbi since no guttae are left stuck to the architrave. Instead Michelangelo leaves mutules in the soffit of the cornice – these go unmentioned – which include mutule blocks with 2 x 5 guttae, varying the usual 6 x 3 presented, for example, by the soffit of the cornice of the Doric ground-floor of the Theatre of Marcellus, the model copied most by Cinquecento architects. There also seems no reason to see the door inside the library leading to the *ricetto* as anything but Doric, since the bases are normal Attic, and the capitals of the columns, though complicated, do not have decisively Tuscan features. Overall then, the impression is that Michelangelo only intended to present a sophisticated play on the Doric; it seems very doubtful that it can be called anything else.

In this context it may be well to recall the considerable development that Doric architectural forms enjoyed in the architecture of Michelangelo. This elaboration extends

from the drawings after the Codex Corner, which reveal Michelangelo's liking for the robust and abrupt plasticity of specific Doric forms, which he emphasised by adding contrasts of light and shadow, through the *edicola* for Leo X and his Laurentine architecture, to the *opere minori fiorentine* (e.g., the lateral north portal of San Lorenzo), to the 'Doric' portals of the Campidoglio, to Doric detailing of the exterior niches of the apse of San Pietro, and again at the Palazzo Farnese, and ultimately to the Doric phantasmagoria that is the Porta Pia.

In the vestibule the capitals of the great double columns are inscrutably bare, as though Corinthian *campane* had been denuded of their leaves – although Michelangelo blank capital has a nearly completely straight vertical lateral profile. The abacuses are certainly Corinthian in origin.⁵² The bases, with two astragals between two scotias in the middle are variants on the Pantheon type, where they are used with Corinthian capitals, except that Michelangelo decides to add a *listello* above the upper torus. By contrast, the standard variant on the Pantheon bases in the Cinquecento, introduced by Antonio da Sangallo at S. Peter's, for example, included a *tondino* rather than a *listello* above the upper torus.⁵³ But the blocks of guttae included in the celebrated tabernacles are of Doric derivation, and the ornaments of these hermaic niches transmit a cryptic but clear Doric message. In the case of the vestibule, then, it is perhaps correct to believe that Michelangelo mixes the orders not in the sense of inserting decisively alien elements into the main order, but by building a nearly Corinthian major order and a Doric minor order above, both subject to his beautiful and wilful adjustments of form.⁵⁴ It might be observed that if the two orders of the vestibule are considered not in terms of the specific architectural forms employed but in terms of their proportions – and Portoghesi illustrated that it is difficult to speak of a proportional system⁵⁵ – it may be worth noting that in the vestibule the proportions of the inferior and superior orders are nearly identical when viewed in terms of the column diameter at the base: (1) *inferior order*: shaft 1: 7 $\frac{3}{4}$; column 1: 9; (2) *superior order*: shaft 1: 7 $\frac{3}{4}$; column: 1: 9+.⁵⁶ At all events, these are very narrow proportions, and the very slightly greater stretching of the superior order may simply be an optical correction. Also noteworthy, and especially in the inferior order, is that entasis and other modifications in profile from an ideal perpendicular are markedly restrained. This must be a conscious choice, and it is true of the unusually high neck of the capital and equally true of the bases, where a line drawn tangentially to the elaborately differentiated ringed profiles deviates very much less than 10° from the perpendicular. This pronounced geometric verticality contributes to the austere abstraction of the design. The marked lengthening of the order also implied changes in the capital and base: with the capital enlarged vertically as was the base, through a multiplication of elements that are articulated with finer divisions.⁵⁷ In light of these observations, we cannot very well speak of the orders of the library and *ricetto* as Tuscan and Doric, «with a composed admixture of elements from other orders». They are not that complicated. A Tuscan component is missing entirely. To identify a «Composed Tuscan Doric» here is tantamount to speaking of a Composite Tuscan Doric, which is little more than a meaningless and contradictory compromise formulation.

The question that remains open is to what extent does the architectural analysis of Bartoli correspond to the architectural thought of Michelangelo.⁵⁸ Attempts to reconstruct Michelangelo's theory of architecture or conception of and thoughts about architecture from written texts have been notably disappointing and inconclusive.⁵⁹ But the results of his thought are embodied in his architectural works, and they offer eloquent testimonies, if we can but read them 'correctly'. Certainly Bartoli was in direct contact with persons very close to the *cantieri* at San Lorenzo. Of more basic importance is Michelangelo's deep relationship with the classical architectural orders. This was an inevitable prerequisite to the practice of architecture in an age when the classical language of architecture reigned. Michelangelo's buildings are fully articulated with classicizing columns and pilasters. This is not to claim that

his architectural discourse exhausts itself in the classical orders, but simply to state the obvious, that they are present and play a leading role from beginning to end in his architectural works and drawings. Even the Julius Monument, as it was finished, retains the structure and syntax of the orders, although the columns have disappeared, and by the time of the late Porta Pia, it is still the underlying system of orders, unconsciously present in the eye of the beholder, that allows the functioning of the astonishingly bold design, one in which the order has been subjected to a drastic process of alienation. Even if Michelangelo modifies orders with cool nonchalance, he rarely dispenses with them. Thus it is mistaken to think that we are seeing a break with the orders in an absolute sense, with a dismantling of the entire system, even if it is obvious that Michelangelo uses completely new forms and introduces new general effects of abstraction as well as new abstract forms into his architecture.

As I observed some years ago, the form of Bartoli's discourse finds formal analogies with contemporary discussions concerning the «questione della lingua», but on the level of content the points of contact are confined largely to the concept of imitation.⁶⁰ There is no mention of a new Tuscan architecture, which, as a parallel to the literary Florentine vulgate – in reality a kind of refined and purified *Hochflorentinish*, as a rival to *latinità* –, might rival, or replace, the classical orders. In the formulation of Bartoli, Michelangelo did not want to observe the Doric order exactly as did the ancients – this amounts simply to an aversion to stringent rules –, but he wanted to modify it, and, by subtracting weight from its gravity, make it more agile and slender, altering the measurements and proportions as well as the forms. In modern terms he wanted to redesign the order just as the bodies of automobiles are remodelled or redesigned in successive years. The words Bartoli uses are «variato», «varia», «variò», «variando»; the verb is «variare», that is to 'change' or 'modify',⁶¹ but at the same time maintaining the proportionality of the order and, without major transgressions, giving it a «bella proporzione alquanto più lungo allo ordine Dorico». In this Michelangelo proceeded as did the ancients, «quando andarono investigando et variando l'una per l'altra». All of this is contained in an analysis that conforms in a number of points to the architectural treatise of Alberti in the Italian translation by Cosimo Bartoli.

In the *vita* of Brunelleschi written by Giovan Battista Gelli, which remained in manuscript form, we read the words Michelangelo spoke about the lantern of Brunelleschi above the Sagrestia Vecchia of San Lorenzo in Florence, when he was to make the model for a corresponding lantern for the Sagrestia Nuova. Michelangelo was asked, with reference to Filippo Brunelleschi's lantern, about his model for the lantern of the Sagrestia Nuova – «se ingeniassi di variare da quella di Pippo?» Michelangelo answered: «Variare si potrebbe, ma far meglio no, perché Pippo ha occupato il primo luogo».⁶²

Already in 1964 Portoghesi was able to demonstrate that the order of the Laurentiana was not at all similar to the «ordine composito» of ancient architecture – the order that joins the Ionic to the Corinthian. The Laurentine order is instead, as Portoghesi demonstrated, a derivation of the Doric order, as testify numerous details. This does not imply a rejection of the classical system of the orders outright, but an open-mind about the possibilities of imitation and invention. Alberti had favoured the imitation of diverse models.⁶³ This is not to suggest that Michelangelo did not introduce new formal and expressive context foreign or at least extraneous to the art of antiquity, but even conservative classicists of the Renaissance were far from perfect imitators, and there were elements of classical art that did not appeal to them or eluded them completely. If the question of the order, of the «ordine nuovo», does not completely account for the novelty of Michelangelo's Laurentine architecture, it deserves to be underlined that the analysis of Bartoli is formulated on a purely architectural level and that it is without linguistic or political valences. Bartoli's analogous analysis of *finestre*

inginocchiate of own his design, but imitating Michelangelo's, for a building in the via San Gallo makes very clear how Bartoli's architectural thought was articulated and how it proceeded.

Bartoli's text concerning the «ordine nuovo» has, first of all explicative ambitions. It is not conceived primarily as a defence of Michelangelo,⁶⁴ but is instead a text «*in lode*» of the master, an encomium in which the detractors of Michelangelo play but a marginal part, and further an encomium based not simply on epideictic formulas, but on a considered observation of the architecture that Bartoli saw before him. If Bartoli's text does not read the «ordine nuovo» as a well-wrought urn, his result – his penetrating Doric diagnosis –, can only have resulted from a close reading in architectural terms, based on an autopsy of the architectural forms. One index that supports this interpretation is the fact that there is no attempt to assimilate the *architettura nuova* of Michelangelo into a Vitruvian context as might be expected of a literary intellectual such as Bartoli. Instead we read an affirmation of the potentiality of architecture to develop and change, an affirmation that retraces the position of Alberti, as we read it in Bartoli's translation:

*Percioche, o il repugnare alla consuetudine toglie il più delle volte la grazia, o lo acconsentire arreca guadagno et fa bene: conciosia che gli altri approvattissimi Architettori, perche habbino con il fatto acconsentito, che questo sompartimento, o Dorico, o Ionico, o Corinzio, o Toscano, sia più di tutti gli altri commodissimo; non che quasi forzati da leggi doviamo sforzarci (ammaestrati da loro) di mettere innanzi nuove cose trovate da noi, per vedere se gli si può acquistar' pari, o maggiori lodi di loro.*⁶⁵

Alberti writes further that there are found «un numero infinito di capitelli varii et che non si somigliano», a testimony to the fact that the ancients «si sono ingegnati di ritrovare sempre cose nuove».⁶⁶ Variation or the recombination of elements from more than one order is exactly what Vitruvius and Alberti describe when they discuss the evolution of the orders.

In conclusion, in order to underline the enduring validity of Bartoli's analysis, which has been in the broadest sense confirmed by modern scholars and critics (although with relatively minor divergences from Bartoli and among themselves, and both with and without knowledge of Bartoli's text), let us reread the central concluding sentence of Bartoli's analysis of Michelangelo's «nuovo ordine»:

*Anzi mostrando la grandezza del bello ingegno suo, esaminate diligentemente le cose degli Antichi, ingegnandosi non solamente di volergli imitare, cercò con la prontezza del suo divino ingegno di trovare un nuovo ordine; e perciò con maestà, con grandezza, con leggiadria, e con sodisfazione universale, diede una conveniente, e bella proporzione alquanto più lunga allo ordine Dorico, non meno lodevole invenzione, che si fussi alcuna di quelle degli Antichi, quando andarono investigando et variando l'una per l'altra.*⁶⁷

Perhaps it should also be mentioned that one might also take a view of Michelangelo's approach to the orders that is quite different from Bartoli's. Pellegrino Tibaldi did many years later, when he wrote:

*Michelangelo nel Campidoglio et in altri luoghi non ha osservato alcuna cosa che abbiano fatto gli antichi, per quello che io mi sono potuto accorgere, ma ha fatto a suo modo; ben ha mostrato ancor ivi essere grande e grato inventore. [...] Ha poi ricercato tutte le altre cose con studio de invenzione nuove e molto laudate, come si vede nelle opere sue tanto egregie.*⁶⁸

That said, even if Michelangelo did do everything *a modo suo* (his way, the way he wanted to),⁶⁹ as he may well have done, he did not create architectural designs *ex nihilo*. The study of classical architecture and the classical orders belonged to the substratum of his art of architecture.

«Esaminate diligentemente le cose degli Antichi», writes Bartoli, and Michelangelo's architecture reflects many concrete instances of this study. An artist approaches the classical orders with formal preferences. It is the possibility of variation and re-elaboration that made the orders a flexible and fruitful system of architectural design. This is simply to say that the system of the orders leaves room for choices, where individual artistic preferences come into play. Bartoli's description of his ten kneeling windows on façade of the Casa Ricasoli in Florence contains one clear expression of an aesthetic preference that guided his design, and doubtless Michelangelo's designs were guided by analogous preferences.⁷⁰ When Angelo Della Stufa asks Messer Cosimo what kind of architrave he has given to his windows, Bartoli replies: «egli non mi piacque mai lo andare (per dir così) cincischiando le membra, anzi il vederle quasi che di un pezzo, e sode, pur che elle sieno ben lavorate».⁷¹ Bartoli's windows imitated, he writes, Michelangelo's kneeling windows at the Palazzo Medici, where a similar taste may be observed.

Here we have considered the means of Michelangelo's architectural invention, but not the ends of so much *maestà*, *grandezza*, and *leggiadria*, the purposes of such an astonishing display of architecture, the ends of which can scarcely have been purely functional. One answer is given by Giorgio Vasari in his *Ragionamenti*: «[...] che fu il lassare de' suoi posterì al mondo l'eterna memoria per l'opera immortale che [fece] Clemente VII nel fare edificare la maravigliosa sagrestia nuova di S. Lorenzo di Fiorenza [...]; e così come nel Ianiculo furon messi i libri di Numa Pompilio, così fece Sua Santità mettere nella libreria regia di mano del Buonarroti in quel luogo, con ogni superbo adornamento di pietre, di legnami ed intaglio, *per onorare tutti i libri rari latini e greci, stati ab antiquo di casa sua*, de' quali, fuorché quelli, non se ne vede se non questi scritti dai propri autori; che non è in tutta Europa sì onorata ed utile cosa».⁷²

NOTES:

Note to the text annotations:

An ever increasing quantity of relevant information is to be found rapidly in the Internet by using currently standard internet search engines. Internet addresses are often unstable, but it will be possible to locate similar and other sources in the future using 'key word' searches. Here sources with 'permanent' URLs and URNs are cited. References to the two editions of Giorgio Vasari's *Vite* of artists (1550, 1568): These texts are presently found in the Internet both as digital facsimiles and in full text form. They are cited here as follows: T. = Torrentiniana (*Le vite de' più eccellenti architetti, pittori, et scultori da Cimabue insino a' tempi nostri*, Firenze: Lorenzo Torrentino, 1550), e.g., T. 947 (pagination is continuous in the two volumes); G. = Giuntina, e.g., G. I, 83 (*Le vite de' più eccellenti Pittori, Scultori e Architettori, scritte da M. Giorgio Vasari Pittore et Architetto Aretino di nuovo ampliate, con i ritratti loro, et con l'aggiunta delle Vite de' vivi et de' morti, dall'anno 1550 insino al 1567*, Firenze: Giunti, 1568). The original pagination is given in the textually reliable modern editions published by Einaudi (1986), by Club del Libro/De Agostini (1962-1966; 1967), and by Sansoni/SPES (1966-1994 [...]). In general, academic print publishing has made few adjustments to account for the radically changed research environment in which it finds itself with the advent of the immense information retrieval potential of the Internet. The need for explicit documentation of readily verifiable statements is greatly diminished, while the fullest possible bibliographic description of cited texts has become increasingly desirable to enhance their online retrieval. These factors have been considered in compiling the annotations to the text. I am grateful to Margaret Daly Davis, Richard Schofield, and other readers for useful suggestions and corrections.

¹ COSIMO BARTOLI, *Ragionamenti accademici di Cosimo Bartoli gentil'huomo et Accademico Fiorentino, sopra alcuni luoghi difficili di Dante. Con alcune inventioni et significati, et la tavola di piu cose notabili*, Venezia: Francesco Franceschi Senese, 1567, p. 2 a. The work is a dialogue and conceivably might propose a consistently retro-dated fictional time, as dialogues sometimes do, but the book is scarcely a masterpiece of Italian literature, and it reads as a compilation of heterogeneous elements. It would be a mistake to attribute a large measure of literary artifice to the book. As nearly all the other works that Bartoli published in Venice with Francesco Franceschi *senese*, this work was composed in Florence. Bartoli may have made changes and additions for the printing at various points in time, with a discrete amount of inconsistent updating. The basic text must have been established in the earlier 1550s. The publicistic and favorable mentions of artists, both singly and collectively, in the text make little sense in the context of the later 1560s. These are essentially brief advertisements that the often spontaneous and generous Bartoli makes for his friends, and they are directed toward a potential patronal audience in a world of clientelage where nearly everyone was dependent on favours, or believed that they were.

The topic 'Bartoli and Michelangelo' scarcely exists in the older literature about Michelangelo: Bartoli is mentioned only once in the Steinmann-Wittkower Michelangelo bibliography and not at all in Thode's *Kritische Untersuchungen*. Even in Paola Barocchi's *La Vita di Michelangelo nelle redazioni del 1550 e del 1568* (1962), with its very extensive '*commento secolare*', Bartoli receives only three passing references, in addition to Vasari's single mention of him in the *vita* of Michelangelo. This situation has in the meantime changed. In early January 2012 a search at Google ('Michelangelo' + 'Cosimo Bartoli') produced 5,700 results; at Google books, 2,210 results; at Google scholar, 376 results.

² Treatments of Bartoli and Michelangelo: GIOVANNI PAPINI, *Vita di Michelangiolo nella vita del suo tempo*, Milano: Garzanti, 1950, pp. 580-582 («*Il prete scolaro*»); CHARLES DAVIS, *Cosimo Bartoli and the Portal of Sant'Apollonia by Michelangelo*, in «*Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz*», XIX, 2 (1975), pp. 261-276; see also note 37 *infra*.

³ JUDITH BRYCE, *Cosimo Bartoli (1503-1572): The Career of a Florentine Polymath*, Genève: Libraire Droz, 1983, p. 19. The book is based on a Ph.D. thesis of 1976 (University of Aberdeen), and later literature is only partially taken into account. See the review of this work by ERIC COCHRANE, in «*Renaissance Quarterly*», XXXVII, 3 (1984), pp. 422-424.

⁴ ASCANIO CONDIVI, *Vita di Michelagnolo Buonarroti*, Roma: Antonio Blado, 1553, p. 3 *recto* (FONTES 34, 2009: www.arthistoricum.net/epublishing/fontes).

⁵ *Orazione funerale di Messer Benedetto Varchi fatta, e recitata da lui pubblicamente nell'esequie di Michelagnolo Buonarroti in Firenze nella Chiesa di San Lorenzo*, Firenze: Giunti, 1564 (FONTES 23, 2008: www.arthistoricum.net/epublishing/fontes): «quasi che il dipignere non fusse altro; che schichirillare le mure, sgridato, e battuto piu volte indarno».

⁶ GIORGIO VASARI, *Vite*, 1568: G. II, 716.

⁷ As late as 1523, one of the arbiters (or perhaps guarantors) of a financial settlement between Michelangelo and his father's family (whereby Michelangelo became the sole owner of his father's estate, and thus of his family's patrimony) who witnessed the agreement was his mother's brother, «Andreas olim Nerii del Sera» (*Andrea Del Sera*:

RAB HATFIELD, *The Wealth of Michelangelo*, Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2002, pp. 91, 474). The brother of Michelangelo's stepmother, «Rafael olim Antonii de Hubaldinis de Ghagliano» (*Raffaello Ubaldini da Gagliano*: HATFIELD, *The Wealth of Michelangelo*, pp. 91, 74) might also have been considered a step-uncle. The presence of these two men probably reflects potential dowry obligations. They are called arbiters of and mediators of the settlement, but they probably should be seen more as merely consenting parties, who obliged themselves not to make future claims.

⁸ JUDITH BRYCE, *Cosimo Bartoli*, pp. 22, 36. See the genealogical diagram of the «Bartoli of Santa Maria Novella» after page 159.

⁹ For Cassandra di Cosimo Bartoli, wife and widow of Francesco Simoni, see R. HATFIELD, *The Wealth of Michelangelo*, pp. 26, 28, 42-43, 87-88, 90-92, 188, 195, 474-477, with references to Michelangelo's *Carteggio*. Further: GIORGIO VASARI, *Le vite di Michelangelo nelle redazioni del 1550 e del 1568*, ed. Paola Barocchi, 5 vol., Milano-Napoli: Ricciardi, 1962, IV, pp. 1622, 1882, 2048, 2144, 2155, 2223.

¹⁰ GIORGIO VASARI, *Vite*, 1568: G. II, 761-762. Vasari assigns the date 18 September 1556 to the letter.

¹¹ VASARI, *loc. cit.*; cf. *Il carteggio di Michelangelo*, 5 vol., ed. Paola Barocchi and Renzo Ristori, Firenze: Sansoni-SPES, 1965-1983, V, 1983, p. 76, no. 1237 (the original is in the Archivio Vasariano, Arezzo, 12, fol. 21, dated 18 December 1556).

¹² Just as Dante was the first and true poet, with «con le tre scienze, Imitativa, Naturale, et Divina»: CARLO LENZONI, *Difesa della lingua fiorentina et di Dante*, Firenze: Torrentino, 1556, p. 5 (dedication to Michelangelo by Pierfrancesco Giambullari).

¹³ *Il carteggio di Michelangelo*, V, no. 296, pp. 87-88: Sebastiano Malenotti in Rome to Leonardo Buonarroti in Florence, 12 December 1556.

¹⁴ The «una casa capace da farvi tutta questa opera, cioè le figure di marmo e di bronzo» seems to correspond best to the façade of San Lorenzo. The attempt to associate this event with the New Sacristy and to date the letter to 1521 seems less plausible than the older dating to 1518, also followed in the more recent edition of the Michelangelo *Carteggio*, II, 1967, pp. 109-110, no. 366. Cf. *The Letters of Michelangelo*, 2 vol., ed. E. H. Ramsden, London: Peter Owen, 1963, I, pp. 278-279.

¹⁵ See J. BRYCE, *Cosimo Bartoli*, pp. 19 ff. *et passim*; cf. *I Fiorentini nel 1562: Descrizione delle Bocche della città e stato di Fiorenza fatto l'anno 1562*, ed. Silvia Meloni Trkulja, Firenze: Bruschi, 1991, fol. 60r, 62v, 68r, 69r-v, 70v, 76, 81r, 83r.

¹⁶ See also Bartoli's reports about Michelangelo's influential rôle in securing the sculptural part of the Cappella Del Monte for Bartolomeo Ammanati (which differs greatly from what Vasari writes in G. II, 835):

Il giudizio che il Buonarroti hà fatto di lui, perche volendo Papa Iulio far fare in Roma una Capella in San Pietro a Montorio, dentrovi la sepoltura del Padre, e quella del Reverendissimo di Monte suo Zio, dove andavano, et Pitture et Sculture, Michelangelo confortò sua Santità che per pittura si servisse di Giorgio Vasari da Arezzo, et per scultura di questo Bartolomeo, sì che si può vedere quanto gran conto faccia Michelangelo della virtù di questo Giovane (COSIMO BARTOLI, *Ragionamenti accademici*, p. 19 b).

Cf. Bartoli's letter to Vasari of 5 April 1550 offering the services of Francesco Camilliani for the sculpture of the chapel (*Der literarische Nachlass Giorgio Vasaris*, 3 vol., ed. Karl Frey, München: Müller, 1923-40, I, pp. 281-283).

¹⁷ CHARLES DAVIS, *Michelangelo: figura serpentinata, bellezza del corpo, potentissima virtù immaginativa*, in: *Festschrift Karl Möseneder*, ed. Christian Hecht, Berlin: Matthes & Seiz, 2009, pp. 145-163: 155-156, figs. 5-6; CHARLES DAVIS, *La fortuna di Giorgio Vasari nell'incisione: l'Architettura di Leon Battista Alberti del 1565 e altre vicende*, in: *Festschrift Richard Harprath*, ed. Wolfgang Liebenwein and Anchise Tempestini, München: Deutsche Kunstverlag, 1998, pp. 105-118: 108, 116, note 22.

¹⁸ GIOVANNI CINELLI, in: FRANCESCO BOCCHI, *Le bellezze della città di Firenze*, ed. Giovanni Cinelli, Firenze: Gugliantini, 1677, p. 71; cf. CARLO MILANESI, *Quale autorità storica abbia il detto di Michelangiolo intorno al continuare la Loggia dell'Orcagna*, in: «*Archivio Storico Italiano*», n.s., XIII, 2 (1861), pp. 71-73 (online at Google books); cf. the annotations to Bottari's edition of Vasari (1759), *vita* of Orcagna.

¹⁹ GIOVANNI PAPINI, *Vita di Michelangiolo nella vita del suo tempo*, Milano: Garzanti 1950 (many editions), p. 581. The publishing house omitted the numerous footnotes that the author intended to accompany his book (preface; cf. GIOVANNI PAPINI, *Dante e Michelangiolo*, Milano: Mondadori, 1961). The letter («Di Venetia il di 8 di Settembre 1571»), in: *Der literarische Nachlass Giorgio Vasaris*, II, pp. 602-603, no. 814.

²⁰ See the subject indices (*Sachregister*) of the Michelangelo bibliographies of Steinmann-Wittkower and Dussler (*Michelangelos Arbeitsweise, Kunstanschauung und Aussprüche über Kunst: Aussprüche*).

²¹ GIOVAN BATTISTA GELLI, *Dialoghi*, ed. Roberto Tissoni, Bari: Laterza, 1967, pp. 308-309 (*Ragionamento sulla lingua*); cf. GIOVAN BATTISTA GELLI, in: *Scritti d'arte del Cinquecento*, 3 vol., ed. Paola Barocchi, Milano-Napoli: Ricciardi, 1971-1977, I, p. 289; see also: GIOVAN BATTISTA GELLI, *Venti vite di artisti*, ed. Girolamo Mancini, in «*Archivio storico italiano*», XVII (1896), pp. 32-62.

²² LODOVICO DOLCE, in MARK ROSKILL, *Dolce's Aretino and Venetian Art Theory of the Cinquecento*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000, p. 90 (first edition: New York: New York University Press, 1968). The text quoted above from Gelli's *Dialoghi* is preceded by the following:

Gelli: [...] Il che ha operato in essa, come chiaramente può apparire a chi la considera, lo stesso effetto che il liscio e gli accidentali e mendicati ornamenti in una donna che naturalmente sia bella per se medesima; imperò che, ricoprendo o velando tutto quel bello che in lei era di natura, e scoprendo lo artificiale, le tolgono molto più grazia che glie la accreschino: essendo sempre tanto più bella una cosa, ancora che artificziata, quanto vi si scuopre men l'arte.

²³ Cf. G. PAPINI, *Vita di Michelangiolo nella vita del suo tempo*, pp. 324-326 (*La scultura senza fatica*).

²⁴ See *The Letters of Michelangelo*, ed. Ramsden, II, pp. 275-277: «Michelangelo and the Proceedings of the Accademia Fiorentina» (online at Google books).

²⁵ The letter («Di Venetia alli XII di Giugno 1569»), in: *Der literarische Nachlass Giorgio Vasaris*, II, pp. 433-434, no. 668. See also: G. PAPINI, *Vita di Michelangiolo nella vita del suo tempo*, pp. 580-582.

²⁶ The letter («Di Venetia alli 14 di Luglio 1571»), in: *Der literarische Nachlass Giorgio Vasaris*, II, pp. 589-591, no. 799.

²⁷ Cf. GIORGIO VASARI, *Le Vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori ed architettori scritte da Giorgio Vasari pittore aretino con nuove annotazioni e commenti di Gaetano Milanesi*, ed. Gaetano Milanesi, 9 vol., Firenze: Sansoni, 1878-1885, VII, pp. 260-261 (Vasari, *Vite*, 1568, G. II, 770).

²⁸ J. BRYCE, *Cosimo Bartoli*, pp. 73-78.

²⁹ GIORGIO VASARI, *Le Vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori*, ed. Milanesi, VII, pp. 258 ff. (Vasari, *Vite*, 1568, G. II, 669).

³⁰ CHARLES DAVIS, *The Tomb of Mario Nari for the SS. Annunziata in Florence: The Sculptor Bartolomeo Ammannati until 1544*, in: «*Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz*», XXI, 1 (1977), pp. 69, 89, note 11; GIORGIO VASARI, *La vita di Michelangelo nelle redazioni del 1550 e del 1568*, ed. Barocchi, IV, pp. 1565-1566.

³¹ G. PAPINI, *Vita di Michelangiolo nella vita del suo tempo*, pp. 260-261, 553.

³² ALESSANDRO PARRONCHI, *Michelangelo e Vitruvio*, in: *Opere giovanili di Michelangelo*, III, *Miscellanea michelangiolesca*, Firenze: Olschki, 1981, p. 51 («*La Nazione*» (14 April 1972), p. 12); CHARLES DAVIS, *Cosimo Bartoli and the portal of Sant'Apollonia*, p. 275; CAROLINE ELAM, *Tuscan Dispositions: Michelangelo's Florentine architectural vocabulary and its reception*, in: «*Renaissance Studies*», XIX (2005), pp. 46-82: 48 (see note 45).

³³ J. BRYCE, *Cosimo Bartoli*, p. 188.

³⁴ *Il carteggio di Michelangelo*, III, pp. 441-442, n. 896 («Di Firenze a dì 7 di dicembre 1532»).

³⁵ See, for example, BERNARD WEINBERG, *A History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance*, 2 vol., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961; *Trattati di poetica e retorica del Cinquecento*, 4 vol., ed. Bernard Weinberg, Bari: Laterza, 1970-1974. Weinberg first analyses entire texts, before considering relationships with other texts, in line with the tenets of the Chicago School of literary criticism.

³⁶ COSIMO BARTOLI, *Ragionamenti accademici*, p. 19 b.

³⁷ See CHARLES DAVIS, *Benvenuto Cellini and the Scuola Fiorentina*, Raleigh: North Carolina Museum of Art, 1976 («*NCMA Bulletin*», XIII, 4 (1976), pp. 1-70).

³⁸ COSIMO BARTOLI, *Modo di misurare*, Venezia: Francesco Franceschi, 1564, dedication to Cosimo de' Medici Duca di Firenze et di Siena, dated 10 August 1559:

Quanto la Eccell. V. Illust. habbi sempre con il favorire coloro, che hanno dato opera alle virtuti, porta occasione a tutti gli huomini di esercitarsi, et nelle arti, et nelle scienze, non è nessuno, che chiaramente non lo conosca. Veggoni i frutti del celebratissimo studio Pisano già molti, et molti anni sono, sparsi per tutta Italia. Appariscono in varii luoghi per lo Stato di V. E. le lodatissime imprese delle muraglie, delle Sculture, et delle Picature [sic], et molti altri esercizi, che sono quasi infinite, che dalla honoratissima Scuola de virtuosi nutritisi, et esercitatati sotto l'ombra di V. Eccell. Illust. hanno fatto, et continuamente fanno, non solamente honore, et utile al presente Secolo; ma giovamento, et lume grandissimo al futuro. La onde si puo facilissimamente giudicare, che V. Eccell. havendo conosciuto fino da primi anni, mediante il suo purgatissimo giudizio essere vero il detto di Socrate, che si come la Ignoranza, è il sommo male degli huomini, cosi la Scienza si trova essere il sommo bene, habbi voluto con havere in protezione, et amare tutti i virtuosi, esortando, et instigando quelli, che attendono alle arti, con dar' loro occasione di mettere in atto le lodevoli invenzioni, de belli ingegni loro, et premiando et accarezzando quelli altri, che Padroni delle scienze, possono insegnandole giovare a molti; purgare il mondo dalla ignoranza, et riempiendolo

di bellissime arti, et sacrosante scienze, ridurre gli huomini al sommo bene. Esempio veramente di lodatissimo et grandissimo Prencipe, che immitando il Creatore del tutto si ingegni di sompartire, et per se stesso, et per le seconde cause ancora, piu largamente, et piu universalmente, che ei puo i doni delle grazie sue [...].

Here is a presentation of the state of art sponsorship and patronage very different from that found in the *Ragionamenti accademici*, an account which was there tendentious and aimed at bringing about change. It is a conception which by 1559 is clearly out of date in light of the increase in Medici commissions from around the mid-1550s. Similarly, Bartoli's reference to the tomb of Mario Nari as a 'visiting card' for Bartolomeo Ammannati is very dated by the 1560s (COSIMO BARTOLI, *Ragionamenti accademici*, p. 19 b); cf. note 39 *infra* («Nettuno»).

³⁹ *Opuscoli morali di Leon Batista Alberti Gentil'huomo Firentino [sic]: Ne' quali si contengono molti ammaestramenti, necessarij al viver de l'huomo, cosi posto in dignita, come privato. Tradotti, et parte corretti da M. Cosimo Bartoli, In Venetia, appresso Francesco Franceschi Sanese, 1568, p. 289:*

Io so bene virtuosissimo mio M. Bartolomeo che a voi che hoggi siate eccellentissimo et esercitissimo, et nella Architettura et nella scultura, non fa mestierio degli ammaestramenti che della statua diede ne tempi suoi il giuditiosissimo LEONBATTISTA Alberti, ma io ho giudicato che non vi habbi a diaspiacere, che tali ammaestramenti venghino indiritti a voi, come a ottimo giudice del bello ingegno del detto LEONBATTISTA, il quale in quei tempi, ne quali si haveva nulla o poca notitia della scultura, per essersi in Italia annichilate anzi a fatto spente, mediante le indonazioni de Barbari, quasi tutte le buone arti et discipline, si ingegnò con il purgatissimo suo giuditio, di aprire una strada facile et sicura, a giovani che inesperti si dilettauano di questa nobilissima arte, et di svegliargli a bene operare in essa con regole ferme, et stabili. Forse buona cagione, che in processo di tempo, si havessi in detta arte, a fare progressi tali, quali si veghono essersi fatti. Poi che in questo nostro secolo non si ha ad havere invidia alle bellissime statue de lodatissimi scultori antichi Romani. Come già dimostrò il nostro Donato, et non molti anni sono ha di mostro il sempre divino Michel Agnolo Buonarroti, et doppo lui, Baccio Bandinegli, Benvenuto Cellini, et ultimamente voi. In maniera che oltre molte altre statue che di tutti voi si ritruovavano si veggono non senza gran maraviglia degli huomini, in su la piazza del Regale Palazzo di loro altezze, la bellissima Giudetta, il maravigliosissimo Colosso del Davitte, il robustisissimo et fiero Hercole, il Maestrevolisissimo Perseo con i lodatisissimi suoi adornamenti, et il vostro piu di tutti gli altri grandissimo Nettuno, cavato insieme con le altre tre statue con si maestrevole arte di uno solo stesso pezzo di marmo, che non solo fanno maravigliare chi attentamente gli riguarda, ma rimanere quasi che stupidi, considerando, lo ingegno, la arte, la industria, la diligentia, lo amore, et la non mai lodata a bastanza maestria di tutti voi altri. Contentatevi adunque che questi tali ammaestramenti, qualunque ei si siano, da dover pure essere utili alla inesperta gioventù, eschino sotto nome vostro delle tenebre, et venghino in luce, et ricordatevi di amare come solete gli amici vostri, in fra i quali non mi reputo io però il minimo. State sano.

Similarly, Bartoli's reference to the tomb of Mario Nari as a recommendation for Bartolomeo Ammannati (COSIMO BARTOLI, *Ragionamenti accademici*, p. 19 b) is very out-of-date in the later 1560s. Bartoli's mention of Ammannati is devoid of literary intent, and it is transparently promotional.

⁴⁰ COSIMO BARTOLI, *Ragionamenti accademici*, p. 35 b-36 a:

[in margine: Ocghem musico. Donatello scultore. Iosquino Michelagnolo buonarroti.] L[orenzo Antinori]. Deh ditemi per vostra fede chi sono stati quegli, che voi havete conosciuti per tanto eccellenti quanto voi mi dite, et potete lasciar da parte quelli che sono stati avanti a tempi nostri, perche sarebbe un numero infinito, che io so bene che Ocghem fu quasi il primo che in questi tempi, ritrovasse la Muscia quasi che spenta del tutto: non altrimenti che Donatello ne suoi ritrovò la Scultura; et che Iosquino discepolo di Ocghem si puo dire che quello alla Musica fusse un monstro della natura, si come è stato nella Architettura Pittura et Scultura il nostro Michielagnolo Buonarroti; perche si come Iosquino non hà però ancora havuto alcuno che lo arrivi nelle composizioni, cosi Michelagnolo ancora infrattuti coloro che in queste sue arti si sono essercitati, è solo et senza compagno; Et l'uno et l'altro di loro ha aperti gli occhi a tutti coloro che di queste arti si dilettao, o si diletteranno per lo avvenire.

⁴¹ Josquin des Pres: *Encyclopedia of the Renaissance*, 6 vol., ed. Paul F. Grendler, New York: Scribner, 1999, *ad vocem*, 'Cosimo Bartoli', 'Josquin des Pres', 'Johannes Ockeghem'.

⁴² COSIMO BARTOLI, *Ragionamenti accademici*, pp. 35 b-36 a.

⁴³ COSIMO BARTOLI, *Ragionamenti accademici*, pp. 4 b, 5 a; cf. *infra*.

⁴⁴ MARGARET DALY DAVIS, *Archäologie der Antike 1500-1700 aus den Beständen der Herzog August Bibliothek*, exhibition catalogue (Herzog August Bibliothek, 16 July-2 October 1994), Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1994, pp. 65-66

(Wolfenbüttel, 1995); *The Illustrated Bartsch*, XXVII, formerly vol. 14, Part 2: *The Works of Marcantonio Raimondi and of his School*, ed. Konrad Oberhuber, New York: Arbis Books, 1978, pp. 199-216 (1528).

⁴⁵ C. ELAM, *Tuscan dispositions*, pp. 46-82: 46-47. The ideas in this article are foreshadowed in C. ELAM, *Michelangelo and the Clementine Architectural Style*, in: *The Pontificate of Clement VII: History, Politics, Culture*, ed. Kenneth Gouwens and Sheryl E. Reiss, Aldershot and Burlington: Ashgate, 2005, pp. 199-225: 222.

⁴⁶ GIUSEPPE RICHA sees the columns of the porta of Sant'Apollonia as Doric (*Notizie storiche delle chiese fiorentine divise ne' suoi quartieri*, 10 vol., Firenze: Viviani, 1754-1762, VIII, p. 312).

⁴⁷ PAOLO PORTOGHESI, *La Biblioteca Laurenziana e la critica michelangiotesca alla tradizione classica*, in: *Stil und Überlieferung in der Kunst des Abendlandes, Akten des 21. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte in Bonn 1964*, II (*Michelangelo*), Berlin: Verlag Gebr. Mann, 1967, pp. 3-11: 6-8. See also: PAOLO PORTOGHESI, *La Biblioteca Laurenziana*, in: *Michelangelo architetto*, ed. Paolo Portoghesi and Bruno Zevi, Torino: Einaudi, 1964, pp. 211-351. For further references, see C. DAVIS, *Bartoli and the Portal of Sant'Apollonia*, pp. 274-275.

⁴⁸ P. PORTOGHESI, *La Biblioteca Laurenziana e la critica michelangiotesca alla tradizione classica*, pp. 3-11: 6-8. Portoghesi's architectural reading of the architectural elements of the Laurenziana, with reference to the system of orders, remains by far the most knowledgeable and accurate one, grounded in a firm grasp of the classical orders.

⁴⁹ C. ELAM (*Tuscan dispositions*, 2005) identified the main order of the reading room of the Laurenziana as «a simple 'Tuscanising' Doric without a frieze». She identifies no single Tuscan element in the order, and the adjective 'Tuscanising' seems here merely a rhetorical reflection of her title in the service of advancing a mistaken thesis that attempts to link Michelangelo's architecture to a Tuscanising strain in Florentine culture, language, and literature. Although she is unable to identify any Tuscan elements in the order of the Laurenziana Ricetto (pp. 51-52), she writes of the Laurentian Library order as both 'Doric and Tuscan', and of «Michelangelo's Composed Tuscan Doric» (p. 81), although she comes close to recognizing that this is merely stretching a point. To see a Composite order as a sort of crypto-Tuscan order requires a considerable leap of the imagination. A Tuscan Doric would first of all contract the proportions of the Doric order as a defining trait of a variation in this sense; an example might be the ground level Doric order of Bartolomeo Ammannati's Palazzo Pitti cortile with its very simple Tuscan bases and capitals with high necking and triplicate annular rings on a very high rusticated order (base to order = 1: 9), combined with a highly contracted entablature (see FERDINANDO RUGGIERI, *Studio di architettura civile*, 3 vol., Firenze: Tartini & Franchi, 1722-1728 (5 vol., Firenze: Bouchard, 1755, vol. 2); MARIO BUCCI, *Palazzi di Firenze*, 4 vol., Firenze: Valecchi, 1971-1973). Michelangelo's 'variation' on the Doric is clearly in a Corinthian direction, as has been shown in earlier studies. Portoghesi does observe one possibly Tuscanising tendency: «Nel capitello della Laurenziana invece l'astinenza decorativa rievoca addirittura l'idea del Toscano: una volontà antinaturalistica, tutta tesa a realizzare una architettura e una bellezza ideali, porta il tema della scelta sincretica dei vari tipi di bellezza verso un atteggiamento di netta parzialità in cui la scarna semplicità degli ordini primitivi prevale sulla ricchezza degli altri mutuando da questi solo lo scorcio del fusto, d'altronde privo di scanalature» (p. 7). This obviously does not imply a programmatic evocation of 'toscanità'.

⁵⁰ On the otherwise Doric Porta Pia, Michelangelo uses simple single torus bases which may or may not be intended to be read as Tuscan.

⁵¹ For example, Michelangelo uses two *listelli* for the Doric of the so-called Cappella of SS. Cosmas and Damian (Castel Sant'Angelo, Rome); the pilasters of the *scalone* of the Palazzo dei Senatori are evidently Doric, too, because like Vignola, Michelangelo uses a single torus base plus *tondino* and the capitals comprise a *listello* and *gola* below the echinus; the drawing in Casa Buonarroti, 4 A verso, of a Doric entablature presents a *gola* and *listello* below the echinus. Conversely the bizarre capitals of the Doric Porta Pia employ only a *cavetto* below the echinuses.

⁵² The order of the similar columns of the door of Sant'Apollonia where the capitals include Corinthian abacuses and the bases are Attic; cf. note 46.

⁵³ The Pantheon derived bases of the upper floor of the cortile of the Palazzo Farnese, however, do not include the extra *listello* or *tondino* above the upper torus.

⁵⁴ Cf. the extensive discussion of the orders in the Cinquecento by Richard Schofield, in STEFANO DELLA TORRE and RICHARD SCHOFIELD, *Pellegrino Tibaldi architetto e il S. Fedele di Milano: Invenzione e costruzione di una chiesa esemplare*, Como: Nodo, 1994, pp. 58 ff. and pp. 69-92 («Il dibattito cinquecentesco sugli ordini toscano e dorico», pp. 69-78).

⁵⁵ P. PORTOGHESI, *La Biblioteca Laurenziana e la critica michelangiotesca alla tradizione classica*, p. 6.

⁵⁶ The proportions suggested here are approximate. They are based on the elevation drawings included in *Michelangelo architetto*, ed. Portoghesi and Zevi, pp. 288-314 (presumably prepared at the Istituto Universitario dell'Architettura di Venezia, 1960/1963).

⁵⁷ These remarks neglect other remarkable features of the main order of the vestibule: the doubling of the columns, their recession in the wall, and their visual support by mensoles, as a kind of floating '*colonna inginocchiata*' (see

infra, 'finestre inginocchiate'). The double columns supported by double mensoles are imitated by Ammannati in his alternative (to Vasari's) design for the Uffizi: BARTOLOMEO AMMANNATI, *La città: appunti per un trattato*, ed. Mazzino Fossi, Roma: Officina Edizioni, 1970, p. 349.

⁵⁸ A related study not taken account of in the discussions cited here is: HUBERTUS GÜNTER, *Michelangelo's Works in the Eye of his Contemporaries*, in: *The Beholder: The Experience of Art in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Thomas Frangenberg and Robert Williams, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006, pp. 53-85.

⁵⁹ Cf. C. DAVIS, *Bartoli and the Portal of Sant'Apollonia*, p. 274, note 44.

⁶⁰ DAVIS, *Bartoli and the Portal of Sant'Apollonia*, p. 275. My suggestion was taken up by Payne (ALINA A. PAYNE, *Architects and Academies: Architectural Theories of Imitatio and the Literary Debates on Language and Style*, in: *Architecture and Language*, ed. Georgia Clarke and Paul Crossley, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, pp. 118-137) and C. ELAM, *Tuscan dispositions*, cit.; cf. EUGENIO BATTISTI, *Il concetto d'imitazione nel Cinquecento italiano* (1956), reprinted in: EUGENIO BATTISTI, *Rinascimento e barocco*, Torino: Einaudi, 1960, pp. 175-215: 196-197. In a misled and, from the point of view of language, difficult to comprehend article, Payne attempts to argue that there was a close connection between Cinquecento Italian literary debates in the academies and the development of Italian architectural theory. This is very unlikely, and she is unable to demonstrate any real connections with architecture beyond very generic parallels in the form of issues but not in the content of questions discussed (cf. note 15). No such connections can be found in the verbose Bartoli, our «gentil'huomo accademico», who also, and in addition to being a literary *accademico*, was an architectural expert. Payne's study is long on opaque verbal assertion and short on concrete and convincing demonstration. Contrary to what this study assumes, linguistic symmetry does not necessarily imply a connection; it certainly does not demonstrate one. The attempt is made to posit an influence of the *questione della lingua* on what the author «would like to call the *questione dell'ornamento*», the status of which is doubtful, a controposition which creates a largely invented 'debate' which the author attempts to analyse, replete with fabricated catchphrases such as «*ut architectura lingua*» (p. 122, a fictitious coinage unknown even to Google). Although Payne offers a few obligatory references to the literature on the *questione della lingua* (in note 6), her reading about and knowledge of this matter appears slight. It remains undemonstrated that theory moved freely between the literary and artistic (i.e., architectural) domains. An anonymous tract in the Vatican Library (Vat. Lat. 6528), cited and discussed by Weinberg (1961: «possibly of around 1580»), but unmentioned by Payne, treats Ariosto and his violation of all of Aristotle's rules. Weinberg summarizes: «In the particular case of Ariosto, his proponents would say that by his genius he has fashioned a poem having all the attributes needed for the deducing of rules and for the establishing of models. They would compare him to Michelangelo, who, in the field of architecture, so wrought that he gained the admiration of later artists and gave to later theorists the basis of a new art [...]» (pp. 978-979; cf. p. 894). When Vincenzo Borghini writes to Vasari in Venice on the occasion of the latter's brief visit there in 1563, he relays his considerations to Cosimo Bartoli via Vasari concerning Castelvetro's «nuove composizioni sopra la lingua nostra». Borghini's discourse is at this point about «la lingua nostra» and there is no mixing of the rules of words and the rules of art (*Der literarische Nachlass Giorgio Vasaris*, I, pp. 756-758, 760, no. 411).

⁶¹ These words render the meaning more nearly than the more literal 'varied'.

⁶² GIOVANNI BATTISTA GELLI, *Venti vite d'artisti*, ed. Girolamo Mancini, Firenze: Cellini, 1896 (Nozze Imbrico-Mancini), p. 35 (example in Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florenz with *postille* by Cornelius Fabriczy; also in: GIOVANNI BATTISTA GELLI, *Vite d'artisti*, ed. Girolamo Mancini, in «*Archivio storico italiano*», V, XVII (1896), pp. 34-37 (also as an *estratto*: Firenze: Viusseux, 1896). Compare: GIORGIO VASARI, *Vite*, Firenze: Torrentino, 1550, fol. 974: «[...] che fu [Michelangelo] domandate da alcuni suoi amici: «Michele Agnolo, voi doverette molto variare la vostra lanterna da quella di Filippo Brunelleschi», et egli rispose loro «Egli si può ben variare, ma migliorare no». The version of Gelli conveys a more authentic impression.

⁶³ Cf. references in C. DAVIS, *Bartoli and the Portal of Sant'Apollonia*, p. 274, notes 43-44.

⁶⁴ CAMMY BROTHERS presents Bartoli's text as an elaborate defence of Michelangelo's use of the orders (*Michelangelo, Drawing, and the Invention of Architecture*, New Haven and London: Yale, 2008, p. 207; also p. 161, 231-232). Brothers misunderstands the chronological position of Bartoli's text and gives a somewhat unfocused summary and partial translation. In general, her book argues for a subordinate and peripheral role for the orders in Michelangelo's architectural thought and practice. On the orders of the vestibule and reading room, see p. 195 («All the cues typically used to identify the orders – the shape of the capital and base, the proportions of the width and height of the shaft – convey different and contradictory information»).

⁶⁵ LEON BATTISTA ALBERTI, *L'architettura di Leonbattista Alberti. Tradotta in lingua fiorentina da Cosimo Bartoli*, Firenze: Torrentino, 1550, p. 26 (Libro I, Cap. IX: De lo scompartimento, et onde sia nato il modo dello edificatore), in conclusion: «Percioche, o il repugnare alla consuetudine toglie il piu delle volte la gratia, o lo acconsentire arrega guadagno et fa bene: conciosia che gli altri approvatissimi Architettori, perche habbino con il fatto acconsentito, che, che questo sompartimento, o Dorico, o Ionico, o Corinthyo, o Toscano, sia piu di tutti gli altri commodissimo; non che quasi forzati da leggi doviai sforzarci (ammaestrati da loro) di mettere innanzi nuove cose trovate da noi, per vedere se gli si può acquistar' pari, o maggiori lodi di loro. Ma di queste cose a lor luoghi piu distintamente parleremo, quando noi andremo esaminando in che modo si debba collocare una Città, e le membra sue, et tutte quelle cose, che

sono ad usarci necessarie»; cf. p. 101). See J. BRYCE, *Cosimo Bartoli*, p. 271 note 41, for a related passage in Lenzoni's *Difesa della lingua fiorentina* (1556).

⁶⁶ *L'Architettura di Leonbatista Alberti tradotta in lingua fiorentina da Cosimo Bartoli, gentil'huomo et Accademico fiorentino. Con la aggiunta de' disegni*, Firenze: Torrentino, 1550, p. 213:

Tre adunque furono le maniere trovate de capitelli. [...] il Dorico dico lo Ionico et il Corinthio. Et che altra cagione credi tu che sia del ritrovarsi un' numero infinito di capitelli varii et che non si somigliano, se non che con grandissima cura, et diligentia sono stati fatti et trovati da coloro, che si sono ingegnati di ritrovare sempre cose nuove.

⁶⁷ COSIMO BARTOLI, *Ragionamenti accademici*, p. 2 b; the text as quoted has been modernised. The original reads:

Anzi mostrando la grandezza del bello ingegno suo, esaminate diligentemente le cose de gli Antichi, ingegnandosi non solamente di volergli immitare, cercò con la prontezza del suo divino ingegno di trovare un' nuovo ordine; & però con maiestà, con grandezza, con leggiadria, & con satisfattione universale, diede una conveniente, & bella proporzione alquanto piu lunga allo ordine Dorico, non men lodevole invenzione, che si fussi alcuna di quelle de gli Antichi, quando andarono investigando et variando l'una per l'altra.

⁶⁸ PELLEGRINO PELLEGRINI [Tibaldi], *L'Architettura*, ed. Giorgio Panizza and Adele Buratti Mazzotta, Milano: Edizioni il Polifilo, 1990, pp. 301-302 (1590 circa).

⁶⁹ Patronal styles may well have existed, although this has not been conclusively demonstrated, but, in the case of an artist of Michelangelo's strong will and temperament, it is difficult to believe that his imagination was much shaped by someone who, in his view, was there only to pay the bills. A belief in Clement VII's impact on Michelangelo's architectural imagination is largely wishful thinking. Michelangelo's response, in 1551, to criticisms of and questions about his designs posed by the future pope Marcello Cervini (Marcellus II, 9 April 1555-1 May 1555) and the deputati of the fabbrica of St. Peter's is, in this regard, eloquent:

Io non sono, né manco voglio essere obbligato a dirlo, né alla signoria vostra né a nessuno, quel che io debbo o voglio fare; l'ufizio vostro è di far venire danari et avere loro cura da i ladri, et a' disegni della fabbrica ne avete a lasciare il carico a me (VASARI, *Vite*, 1568: G. II, 757).

Even a more docile artist, Giorgio Vasari, often had a jaundiced view of patrons (some indications are found in LUCIANO BERTI, *Lo Studiolo nella carriera 'cortigiana' del Vasari*, in: *Il Vasari storiografo e artista, Atti del Congresso internazionale, Congresso internazionale nel IV centenario della morte*, Firenze, 2-8 settembre 1974, Firenze: Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento, 1976, pp. 249-257, but many more testimonies are found in Vasari's *Vite* and letters). The idea of a patronal style owes much to a somewhat naive belief in patrons and collectors, common in Anglo-American art history, which sometimes seems to miss a clear understanding of the subject matter and the ends of the history of art and which has thus produced endless studies in praise of patrons and collectors, in part to satisfy the vanity of collectors and in part to support the claims of the art market.

⁷⁰ COSIMO BARTOLI, *Ragionamenti accademici*, pp. 4 a-5 b.

⁷¹ The word, 'cincischando' is the gerund of the verb, 'cincischiare'; here: dividing or breaking up in an irregular way, with too many fine divisions. It is parallel to the phrase, 'cincischando le parole', often used by literary intellectuals of the day. This may indicate a transportation of verbal patterns from the literary to the architecture sphere, but not a determinative influence of the former on the latter.

⁷² GIORGIO VASARI, *Le Vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori*, ed. Milanese, VIII, p. 40 (Sala di Saturno).

APPENDIX I

THE *FINESTRE INGINOCCHIATE* IN 'IL MARTELLO, OVER RAGIONAMENTO PRIMO'

The topic of the Florentine *finestra inginocchiata* is treated in the following studies: LEONARDO GINORI LISCI, *I palazzi di Firenze nella storia e nell'arte*, Firenze: Giunti & Barbèra, 1972, I, pp. 60-64 *et passim*; *Variorum architectorum delineationes portarum et fenestrarum, quae in urbe Florentiae repriuntur*, ed. Luigi Zangheri, in: *Il disegno interrotto: Trattati medicei d'architettura*, 2 vol., ed. Franco Borsi *et al.*, Firenze: Gonnelli, 1980 (in the same volume, see the similar treatise by Giorgio Vasari il Giovane); AMEDEO BELLUZZI, *Il tema delle finestre inginocchiate nell'architettura di Bartolomeo Ammannati*, in: *Arti a confronto: Studi in onore di Anna Maria Matteucci*, ed. Deanna Lenzi, Bologna: Editrice Compositori, 2004, pp. 137-144 (including further literature); MICHAEL HIRST, *Two Notes on Michelangelo in Florence: The Façade of San Lorenzo and the 'kneeling' windows of Palazzo Medici*, in: «*Apollo*», CLIX (February 2004), no. 504, pp. 39-43 (with a new, later dating of the *inginocchiate* of Palazzo Medici); HOWARD BURNS, *Michelangelo e il disegno di architettura*, in: *Michelangelo e il disegno di architettura*, Venezia: Marsilio, 2006, pp. 23-29; 178-181. See further: VITALE ZANCHETTIN, *A new Drawing and a new Date for Michelangelo's 'finestre inginocchiate' at the Palazzo Medici, Florence*, in: «*Burlington Magazine*», CLIII, 2011, pp. 156-162. The attribution to Michelangelo (BURNS) of the windows of the former Palazzo of Baccio Valori (pp. 27-29) appears to be without any foundation beyond a patronal connection, which, methodologically speaking, is only a pointer and does not constitute a basis for attribution. Burns proposed this attribution at the 1980 Medici Congress in: Florence, *Firenze e la Toscana dei Medici nell'Europa del Cinquecento* (Summer 1980), in the context of a paper concerning the Cinquecento Florentine vogue for *finestre inginocchiate* particularly connected with members of the ducal court (Bryce, *Cosimo Bartol*, p. 270), but the paper remained unpublished. The ex-Valori *inginocchiate* are not dated at all securely; they are unremarkable in quality and characteristics, and they belong to a widespread serial manifestation in Florentine palace architecture. In 2006 Italian newspapers contained a large number of reports about this important discovery.

The origin of the terminus '*inginocchiate*' is not clear. See SALVATORE BATTAGLIA, *Grande Dizionario della Lingua Italiano*, Torino: UTET, 1972, VII, pp. 1039-1040 ('*Inginocchiare*', '*Inginocchiata*', '*Inginocchiato*', '*Inginocchiatoio*'; the ecclesiastic act of *genuflessione* and the related church furniture, similar in form, seems relevant). Leonardo uses '*inginocchiato*' for '*poggiato su mensole*'. Vasari mentions two *finestre inginocchiate* by Giuliano di Baccio d'Agnolo Baglioni (1491-1555), and others at the Florentine palaces of Sforza Almeni and Giovanni Conti. Bartoli's uses of these terms are early examples. For the earlier literature on the Palazzo Medici *inginocchiate*, see: GIORGIO VASARI, *Le vite di Michelangelo nelle redazioni del 1550 e del 1568*, III, pp. 751-752, V, p. 238. The windows have undergone a rather unfortunate restoration in fairly recent years, with the partial substitution of stone components.

Attempts to assign the '*techniche*' and other introductory material in Vasari's *Vite* to Bartoli are far from certain and most probably completely mistaken. No serious and systematic philological demonstration of this position has been offered (cf. THOMAS FRANGENBERG, *Bartoli, Giambullari and the Prefaces to Vasari's Lives (1550)*, in: «*Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*», LXV (2002), pp. 244-258 and various reviews, studies, and talks by Charles Hope). The following text is relevant to this question. It also amply illustrates Bartoli's approach to architectural analysis.

RAGIONAMENTI ACCADEMICI DI COSIMO BARTOLI,
GENTIL'UOMO & ACCADEMICO FIORENTINO.

IL MARTELLO, OVERO RAGIONAMENTO PRIMO.

M. ANGELO DA LA STUFA, M. COSIMO BARTOLI, ET M. VINCENZIO MARTELLI.

M. A. = Messer Angelo Da la Stufa [*Della Stufa*]

M. C. = Messer Cosimo Bartoli

M. V. = Messer Vincenzio Martelli

[4a]

[...]

M. A.: Queste cose ci mostrerete voi poi in su il luogo, seguitate hora di dirci la facciata.

M. C.: Io son contento, et andavo ordinando questo progresso, per potervela meglio dimostrare con parole. In quella per dir brevemente havevano ad essere oltre alla porta principale, dieci finestre inginocchiate, & due altre porte piccole, per l'una delle quali si entrava nel salotto che io vi ho detto, & per la altra nella Chiesa di S. Dionigi, la quale sapete che è quivi presso, verso il Munistero di S. Luca.

[...]

M. A.: Havevi voi scompartite queste finestre talmente che elle osservassino alcuno ordine in fra di loro?

M. C.: Ben sapete, percioche di verso il Salotto ne venivano due in su le logge; & due poi nel Salotto, che mettevano in mezzo la porta di esso Salotto, & una finalmente nella camera, & di queste ce ne erano tre che havevano i loro riscontri parte di porte et parte di finestre tal che lo occhio forava insino nel Giardino [...]

[4b]

[...]

M. A.: Si ma tante finestre inginocchiate sono di una grande spesa.

M. C.: Egli è vero; ma io rispiarmavo l'altre spese di detta facciata con il non andare come intenderete molto alto, il che nelle muraglie importa assai: & di poi non era possibile dare bellezza, & allegrezza alle stanze, come desiderava Monsignore, senza dette inginocchiate.

M. A.: Deh per vostra fede diteci come voi le disegnaste grandi o ricche di concii.

M. C.: Questa è cosa lunga, & massimo se voi volessi sapere le misure o le proporzioni, delle quali io non so come io me ne ricordasse, che è pure assa[i] tempo che il le disegnai, & non ne hò memoria così fresca.

M. V.: Deh M. Cosimo per amor mio & di M. Agnolo esercitate un poco quella virtù della anima che voi altri Accademici chiamate la reminiscenza.

M. C.: Eccoci in su le burle, come se voi ancora non fussi Accademici.

M. A.: Si ma io sono stato; come sapete, un tempo in Francia, & M. Vincenzio in Spagna, & in Salerno, l'uno et l'altro di noi occupato nelle azzioni della vita attiva, et non in quelle della contemplativa, si come fate ogni giorno voi altri, che ritrovate alle dispute & alli esercizi Accademici, della qual cosa siate certo grandemente lodati: Ma lasciamo per hora da parte questi ragionamenti, & torniamo a quello delle inginocchiate, perche in vero io sono uno di queglii che se io ne havesse a far fare, non so come mi trovasse Architetto che mi contentasse, & voi M. Vincenzio che ne dite?

M. V.: Le piu belle certo che io vegga in Firenze mi paiono quelle che fece fare il Buonarroto alla casa de Medici, non vi pare cosi M. Cosimo?

M.C.: Veramente si.

M. A.: Questo è vero ma ogniuno non hà una facciata come quella de Medici, da potervele accomodare talmente che elle paiono come gemme legate in oro si come fece di quelle Michelagnolo.

M. V.: Questo non si puo negare, ma considerate come sta pensoso & cheto M. Cosimo?

M. C.: A dirvi il vero io andava riducendomi alla memoria quelle misure, per vedere se egli era possibile di contentarvi, ma certo io non credo che ci sia ordine, pure io vedrò se io mi potrò ricordare di una parte, & voi vi contenterete di quelle che mi sovverranno, & delle altre mi perdonerete, & accio che meglio voi le possiate comprendere avvertite di grazia. Questi ingegneri anchor che io credo che voi lo sappiate, dividono il braccio in soldi & danari, & lo chiamano lira, percioche ei lo scompartiscono appunto in venti soldi.

M. A.: Et che

[5a]:

è poi per questo?

M. C.: Scompartiscono con queste misure ogni minimo membro delle cose che e' disegnano.

M. A.: voi ancora facesti in questo dello Architetto?

M. C.: Orsu Messer Agnolo, io lo harei fatto ancora per voi che mi siete uno de cari amici che io habbia, bastivi che quello che io feci, lo feci per uno che io riputava per amico; à quali voi sapete che non si può ne debbe mancare, ne crediate che io lo facesse per alcuno altro conto o rispetto.

M. A.: questo sò io certo, ma voleva un poco di burla de casi vostri, però perdonatemi, & di grazia diteci queste vostre finestre come havevano ad essere fatte?

M. C.: io mi comincerò da basso.

M. A.: come vi piace.

M. C.: Io mi rilevava di su il piano del muricciuolo con un Regolone alto soldi tre & danari quattro della nostra lira, ò vogliamo dire braccio, sopra del quale da amendue le bande rizzava duoi Mensoloni alti due braccia, & grossi soldi sei; & lasciava infra Mensola & mensola, un vano di un soldo & sei, & havevano di aggetto fuori del muro nel dacapo soldi tredici, et danari otto; & da piedi soldi sei & danari dieci, & sopra queste mensole posava il lastrone, ilquale haveva ad essere il davanzale della finestra grosso sei soldi; & fuori del diritto del muro haveva à sportare con il suo aggetto soldi diciotto; & infra questo lastrone, & le mensole & il regolone da basso, veniva ricignendo atorno atorno uno altro regolone di soldi sei; & un soldo & sei danari di pianuzzo faceva dipoi divisione infra questo ultimo regolone, & una pietra riquadrata che riempieva quel resto del vano.

M. V.: Sta bene, ma quanto venivano discosto l'una dall'altra questa copia delle vostre mensole?

M. C.: Due bracia & sei soldi, che tanto ancora veniva ad essere la larghezza del vano o vogliamo dir del lume, della finestra sopra il lastrone; sopra del quale lastrone si rizzavano in alto quattro pilastri che a due à due, venivano a punto a posare in su i diritti, & sodi delle mensole; percioche ei non erano piu larghi che si fussino esse Mensole, ma erano ben lunghi tre bracia, & dodici soldi, servando sempre infra di loro, & da capo & da piede i medesimi intervalli che le mensole sotto al lastrone; ma delle tre braccia & dodici soldi della altezza io haveva fatto a ciascun pilastro una mensola della medesima larghezza, ma havevano soldi quattordici di lunghezza, & da capo di aggetto soldi sei, & da piede soldi quattro, & nello strozzato della mensola soldi uno & danari otto. & queste medesime aggiugnevano appunto con la sommita loro allo Architrave, il quale serrava il lume.

M. A.: che sorte di Architrave vi facevi voi per vostra fede?

M. C.: ei non mi piacque mai lo andare (per dir cosi) cincischiando le membra, anzi il vederle quasi che di un pezzo, & sode, pur che elle sieno ben lavorate,

[5b]

& ben pulite, mi piacque sempre grandemente; il che io vegho che fece ancora il nostro Michelagnolo a quelle del palazzo de Medici; & però a questo Architrave feci da capo un pianuzo di un soldo, & il resto che vi rimase che era cinque soldi movendomi a guisa di guscio tirai di poi diritto infino alla fine; & il fregio che io vi messi di poi sopra, non mi parve di farlo piano, ma bistondo; come voi sapete che in Roma se ne veggono ancora molti, usati da gli Antichi, & massimo nelle opere Ioniche; & sopra le Mensole feci risaltare in fuori l'uno & l'altro per quattro soldi, & otto danari; & di sopra messi poi il suo Cornicione alto soldi sette, della piu alta parte del quale ne presi due soldi, & ne feci un regoletto, & una cimolina, overo goletta, & tutto il resto tirai a piano insino alla sua fine a guisa di Gocciolatoio; & per aggetto fuori del diritto del muro gli detti soldi diciotto come haveva ancora il davanzale da basso, & lo feci pure risaltare sopra dette mensole, non altrimenti che faceva lo architrave & il fregio.

M. A.: Perche faceste voi quel poco di intervallo fra Mensola & mensola?

M. C.: perche io volli che in quello entrassino dentro i ferri della ferriata.

M. A.: Et haveste a sprezzare da capo lo architrave, il fregio & la cornice?

M. C.: io non gli chiamo sprezzati Messer Agnolo, ma volli bene che & lo Architrave, & il fregio così come risaltavano fuori sopra delle Mensole, ritornassero ancora medesimamente in dentro, sopra quel poco di intervallo che era infra Mensola & mensola: Percioche in questo modo, non offendendo ne la parte che restava dentro a i ferri, ne quella che rimaneva di fuori, quel poco di intervallo prestava di se commodità, & luogo alla Ferriata molto opportuno; & la Cornice non feci io già dipoi ritornare indentro sopra detto intervallo, ma la lasciai correre a diritto, perche i ferri non havevano a passarvi sopra, ma si bene a terminare nel Cielo di essa.

M. A.: non mi dispiace questo disegno, non so già come si piaccia a Messer Vincenzio: che lo veggo star cheto.

M. V.: à me certo pare assai ragionevole proporzione.

M. A.: sì, ma ei mi pare che M. Cosimo habbia lasciato una delle belle parti che si faccino alle finestre di questa sorte.

M. C.: Et che cosa?

M. A.: Il frontispizio, del quale non havete detto cosa alcuna.

M. C.: ò Messer Agnolo voi sapete che M. Vincenzio fece il patto che noi camminassimo ad agio, così vo dire a voi, lasciatemi finire di dire a bell'agio, et vedrete che io non lo harò poi lasciato indietro.

M. A.: ah ah ah io ne era più che certo, ma volevo un poco la burla de casi vostri.

M. C.: delle nostre, che ve ne par M. Vincenzio.

M. V.: eh io non so però se io me gli credo così ogni cosa, che egli non rideva già quando ei cominciò a dirvelo, ma perdonategliene per questa volta, & sia come si voglia.

[6a]

M. C.: io son contento & accioche voi veggiate che io dica da vero, M. Agnolo io haveva fatto che il medesimo cornicione salisse a fare Frontispizio, havendovi posto sopra il suo Grondatoio, overo gola, grosso cinque soldi, & lo haveva alzato tanto dal piano del Cornicione corrente, che con la sua più alta punta, era discosto da quello un braccio, & tre soldi, il che a gli occhi miei parava assai conveniente proporzione, ma molto meglio la giudicherete voi in su il luogo; perche di così fatte finestre ve ne è già una in opera alla Camera lungo la spalliera delli Aranci, che risponde in su il Giardino; ma è ben vero che questa non hà le Mensole da basso tanto lunghe quanto io voleva che fussino quelle delle finestre da via.

M. V.: perche?

M. C.: perche io voleva che dal piano di casa alle finestre da via si avesse a salire almanco con tre scaglioni, & alle finestre dello orto voleva che si andasse a piano.

M. V.: & perche questo?

M. C.: perche io non voleva che chiunque passasse per la strada, fusse cosi al primo sempre con gli occhi padrone di tutte le stanze, di dentro, se le finestre si fussino posate troppo basse; dove del Giardino non mi dava cosi noia.

M. V.: Consideratamente certo, ma come vi piacque di far lavorare queste pietre? che havessino del buono.

M. C.: quella parte di fuori dove altri non si haveva ad appoggiare, facevo lavorar di quella sorte lavoro che gli scarpellini chiamano picchiato, & la parte dei fianchi de gli stipiti, & il piano del Davanzale facevo arrenare & pulire come le altre pietre.

M. A.: & piglia pulimento?

M. C.: piglialo benissimo, ma eccoci gia presso al giardino.

M. V.: Si & non habbiamo finita questa facciata?

M. C.: poco ce ne resta hora mai, perche la porta che andava nel Salotto haveva ad esser simile ad una di quelle finestre levatone pero le mensole da basso, la onde gli stipiti venivano insin giu al pian del muricciulo.

M. A.: & quella parte della facciata che oltre a Balaustri veniva di quà & di là della casa, sopra il Salotto, la chiesa, & le camere, come haveva da essere?

M. C.: Dirovvelo il medesimo Davanzale che correva sopra i balaustri, correva ad un medesimo piano, ancora per tutto sotto le finestre del piano di sopra, lequali corrispondevano appunto, sopra i diritti delle inginocchiate, da basso.

M. A.: Si ma come havevano ad essere queste finestre?

M. C.: non erano di molta spesa, & di esse ne vedrete parecchi che già sono in opera sopra la loggia che risponde nel Giardino, pero entriamo dentro.

M. V.: voi mi diceste pure che vi era paruto di lasciare luogo per arme o per imprese, ma non mi havete detto dove.

M. C.: io haveva disegnato che hevendo Monsignore ricevuti tanti beneficii dal Duca & dala Duchessa, ch'egli facesse su alto al pari delle finestre di sopra nelle cantonate di quà & di là che metevano

[6b]

in mezzo il terrazzo scoperto de balaustri, due Armone della medesima pietra bigia una del Duca & l'altra della Duchessa.

M. A.: & le cantonate di qua & di là di questa facciata come finivano.

M. C.: facevale' di bozzi della medesima pietra, ma bassi con un' dito solamente di rilievo come lo arco della Porta principale.

M. A.: Et di verso .S. Luca venivano tante stanze quante di verso Chiarito?

M. C.: venivanvene appunto quante quelle, salvo però che dove diverso chiarito veniva il Salotto, diverso .S. Luca veniva la Chiesa di S. Dionigio, che si disfaceva la vecchia & si rifaceva alquanto piu abasso.

M. V.: ancora ci resta che dire.

M. C.: che cosa?

M. V.: non diceste voi che havevi piu lungezza di verso .S. Luca che diverso Chiarito?

M. C.: dissilo.

M. V.: Hor bene veniva adunq; dal mezo della Porta principale piu, lunga la facciata verso questa parte che verso quella altra?

M. C.: Messerno. Perche tanta casa faceva io di sotto quanta disopra.

M. V.: che si faceva adunque di quel resto?

M. C.: lasciavovi il muro ordinario senza ornamento alcuno, solo con una porta Nana & larga per la quale bisognando volevo che potessino entrare i Cocchi & le Carra cariche; Perche tutto quello spazio che da cotesta parte mi auanzava, lo distribuiva in una Stalla, & in un Pollaio, & in uno edificio che con secchie simile a quello di M. Ottaviano de Medici, o degli Innocenti attignesse la acqua per le fontane, & per il resto delle necessità del Giardino, & della casa; et sopra vi faceva stanze per strami, per il Giardiniere, & per altri bisogni simili.

M. V.: certamente che questo era un disegno non superbo, ma non anco povero, & conveniente in vero ad un Prelato, & per quanto io posso giudicare, molto commodo; ma di grazia entriamo dentro, che io non posso quasi stare piu in piede [...].

APPENDIX II

COSIMO BARTOLI ON MICHELANGELO'S «NUOVO ORDINE»

«Although Bartoli's dialogue on Michelangelo's architecture constitutes one of a quite small number of contemporary critical documents concerning his architecture, it has not been noted in the literature on Michelangelo. The related texts have been most recently considered by DAVID SUMMERS (*Michelangelo on Architecture*, in: «*Art Bulletin*», LIV, 1972, pp. 146-157), who argues that Michelangelo affirms «the essential autonomy of both architect and architecture from the bonds of nature and the classical orders». Summers's exposition may also be consulted as a bibliographical guide to these texts and their discussion. In as much as the reading of any one of the early texts is somewhat dependent upon all the rest, the addition of another text suggests that the interpretation of this body of criticism be re-examined. In addition to the literature mentioned by Summers and the authors he cites, note should be taken of ALESSANDRO PARRONCHI, *Michelangelo e Vitruvio. Nel 1520 sei giovani fiorentini studiosi e artisti iniziano col Buonarroti un commento del classico trattato di architettura*, in: «*La Nazione*», Florence, 14 April 1973, p. 12; JOHN SUMMERSON, *The Classical Language of Architecture*, London: BBC, 1963, pp. 11-12; JOHN SUMMERSON, *Inigo Jones*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1966, p. 43; and ERIK FORSSMAN, *Dorico, ionico, corinzio nell'architettura del Rinascimento*, Roma-Bari: Laterza, 1973, pp. 8-9 *et passim*. Bartoli's hopeful, liberal approach to the rules of art clearly should not be confused with a genuine anti-classicism. It is noteworthy that Bartoli was found in the modernist camp in the two sixteenth-century literary debates concerning Dante and the Italian language, which foreshadowed the somewhat later quarrel of the ancients and the moderns, the family feud of classicism which lasted well into the next century and beyond (Bernard Weinberg, *A History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance*, 2 vol., Chicago University Press, 1961). Many of the same issues come to the fore in Bartoli's remarks on Michelangelo's architectural invention, the text of which follows (*Ragionamenti accademici*, pp. 1 b - 2 b). The original punctuation has been retained and only indicated abbreviations have been resolved.»
[quoted from: DAVIS, 1975, pp. 275-276]

RAGIONAMENTI ACCADEMICI, pp. 1 b - 2 b:

Messer Agnolo della Stufa: Ditemi un poco, io so che voi doveste nel disegnare questa facciata osservare qualche ordine o Dorico, o Ionico, o Corintio, di qual di questi in vero vi serviste voi ?

Messer Cosimo Bartoli: Del Dorico Messer Agnolo, piu che di alcuno altro; ma non pero lo vollì osservare appunto come gli Antichi.

M. A.: Perche?

M. C.: Dirovvi, gli antichi come voi sapete si servivano di questo ordine nel fare quelle sorti di muraglie, che ei volevano, che fussino sode gagliarde, et stabilissime, et per dire brevemente, che servissino quasi che per basa de gli altri ordini Ionici, Corinthij, o Compositi, che vi havessino ad andare sopra, quando volevano che le muraglie loro havessino piu d'un'ordine l'uno sopra l'altro. Ma io in questo luogo, havendo Monsignor di Cortona [*Giovanbattista Ricasoli*], desiderio che la casa di questo giardino si habitasse per stanze principali a terreno, non volendo di sopra altre stanze che a tetto, mi deliberai di fare la muraglia quanto piu svelta et quanto piu rilevata io poteva.

M. A.: Adunque vi potevi voi servire dello ordine Corintio che è piu svelto che il Dorico?

M. C.: Potevo certo, ma due cagione mi feciono risolvere al Dorico.

M. A.: Et quali?

M. C.: L'una il volere haver rispetto alia borsa del Cortona che non era molto gagliarda; et l'altra fu che io ho havuto sempre in venerazione le cose di Michelagnolo Buonarroti.

Messer Vincenzo Martelli: Voi havete ragione a questo, ma dove havete voi veduto che Michelagnolo si sia servito dell'ordine Dorico, et non l'abbia osservato come gl'Antichi?

M. C.: Nello Spogliatoio della libreria, che comincio Papa Clemente VII in S. Lorenzo, et che hoggi per ordine della Eccellenza del Duca Cosimo si va finendo, si servi Michelagnolo nel far le Colonne, della Maniera Dorica; ma non osservo già le misure degli Antichi.

M. V.: Enne egli per questo biasimato o lodato?

M. C.: Secondo da chi, voi sapete che nature di huomini sono hoggi a Firenze, quanto al gusto della Architettura. Io per uno lo lodo grandemente, perche se egli ha variato dagli Antichi, egli ha tenuta una proporzione nelle cose sue, che è molto grata a chi la riguarda, et diletta molto chi accortamente la considera.

M. V.: Ei non si puo negare, ma questo variare è molto difficile.

M. C.: Voi dite il vero, ma quando nelle cose della Architettura si varia in maniera, che egli si satisfaccia alla maggior parte degli huomini, o a quegli che hanno miglior iudizio degli altri, questa certamente è cosa molto lodabile; Et io sono uno di quegli, ancor che io mi intenda poco di queste cose, che giudico che chi sa far questo, si come ha fatto il nostro Michelagnolo, non sia punto inferiore a gli Antichi, pure io me ne rimetto al iudizio vostro et di Messer Agnolo.

M. A.: Veramente del Buonarroto non si puo dire tanto bene che sia bastante, per lodarlo quanto sono i meriti suoi, perche se bene egli vario in quelle colonne come fece ancora in quelle che sono alla porta del Monasterio di S. Appollonia, egli non pose pero un Capitello dove ordinariamente ha da stare la basa, ne messe al Capitello una maschera coprendoli quasi che il mostaccio con una mensola; ne ingrossando o stravolgendo sconciamente le Membra fece apparire come Monstri*, quelle belle proporzioni che gli antichi usarono nelle cose loro; che ancora per tutta Italia si veggono in infiniti luoghi molto celebrate; ne ando dietro quasi che al peggio delle cose, talche è paresse che egli in questa nostra età nella quale gli huomini sono tanto iudiziosi et accorti, che non sono forse da manco che gli Antichi, volesse parere

senza iudizio, o accorgimento, in rinnovare quella manieraccia vecchia Todesca, che da un Cinquecento anni adietro, confusa senza ordine o regola alcuna che buona fusse, era quasi che usata per tutto; Anzi mostrando la grandezza del bello ingegno suo, esaminate diligentemente le cose degli Antichi, ingegnandosi non solamente di volergli immitare, cercò con la prontezza del suo divino ingegno di trovare un' nuovo ordine; et pero con maiestà, con grandezza, con leggiadria, et con satisfattione universale, diede una conveniente, et bella proporzione alquanto piu lunga allo ordine Dorico, non men lodevole invenzione, che si fusse alcuna di quelle de gli Antichi, quando andarono investigando et variando l'una per l'altra.

M. C.: Così la giudico ancor'io, et per questa cagione mi piacque, et nella porta et nelle colonne che sono poi dentro in quella parte che è fatta della casa, di seguitare questa invenzione di Michelagnelo.

*See HORACE, *Ars Poetica*, lines 1-14 and throughout; FRANCISCO DE HOLLANDA, *Dialoghi*.