Originalveröffentlichung in: Schumacher, Andreas (Hrsg.): Florence and its painters. From Giotto to Leonardo da Vinci, Munich 2018, S. 85-95
Online-Veröffentlichung auf ART-Dok (2023), DOI: https://doi.org/10.11588/artdok.00008208

FLORENCE, 1485

STYLISTIC OPTIONS AND PERCEPTION CRITERIA IN THE SASSETTI CHAPEL

ULRICH PFISTERER

On Christmas Day 1485, another marvel was revealed to the city of Florence: the newly decorated chapel of the banker Francesco Sassetti. It is located in S. Trinità, the central parish and monastery church of the Vallombrosan Order, on the right at the end of the transept (fig. 1).[1] It includes two niches with tomb monuments in classical style for the donor and his wife, most probably after a design by Giuliano da Sangallo, and a fresco programme mainly featuring the life of Saint Francis, Sassetti's patron saint, by Domenico Ghirlandaio. The altar painting, also by Ghirlandaio, pictures the Christmas miracle, the newborn Christ Child with Mary, Joseph, the adoring Shepherds and the approaching train of the Three Kings in the background. On the back wall, on either side of the altar-piece, are life-size kneeling portraits of the chapel's patrons in fictional niches, beneath which an inscription proclaims the date of the work's consecration: A.D. M CCCCLXXX[V] / [XX]V DECEMBRIS. The pictorial ensemble of the Sassetti Chapel, comprising sculpture, frescoes and panel painting, was created in a very few years, and is unusual for having maintained its integrity to this day. It serves as a superb example with which it is possible to reconstruct the criteria followed by painters and sculptors in Florence in the 1480s and how the public viewed and judged their works.[2]

THE RESPLENDENCE OF MONEY

Over the course of his life, Francesco Sassetti (1421–1490) had not only managed to rise from a clerk of the Medici Bank to its director and partner, but also to invest his own capital with spectacular results. To be sure, precisely at the time Sassetti commissioned his new chapel, the Medici Bank found itself, not without his complicity, in an inexorable decline, for the substantial credits that branches in Lyons and especially Bruges had extended were no longer being repaid.[3] Against this background, the fact that Sassetti prominently appears next to Lorenzo de' Medici in one of the frescoes was doubtless seen to be little more than testimony to a (mutual) loyalty despite the crisis.[4]

Important as finances and numbers were in the life of the banker, unfortunately no sources relating to the cost of his chapel have survived. Five years later, however, on the unveiling of the next family chapel in Florence painted by Ghirlandaio, this one owned by

the (competing) Tornabuoni banking family and significantly larger, a chronicler noted that the frescoes alone had cost 1,000 florins.[5] In Rome, notoriously more expensive, Ghirlandaio had received 250 ducats in 1481 for his work in the Sistine Chapel, roughly corresponding to two compartments of the fresco in the Sassetti Chapel.[6] The main choir chapel in S. Trinità, painted by Alesso Baldovinetti, had been commissioned in 1471 for the fixed price of 200 florins, but the painter was ultimately compensated with 1,000 after his work was appraised in 1497.[7] Although these few examples naturally fail to provide a definite statistical basis, one has to consider whether high-quality fresco programmes did not become considerably more expensive over the course of the fifteenth century – and indeed, it was no longer the extent of the painted surface or number of figures that mattered, but increasingly the artistic quality.[8] Contemporary statements from Florence, Venice and Ferrara attest to this.[9] The practice of not agreeing to a fixed price from the start, but instead having a committee of experts appraise the finished work, may well have helped to influence the price increase.[10] Investment in 'value added' artistry, the conspicuous consumption of artistic achievement, was just as much a mark of distinction in a trading metropolis like Florence as it was at the courts of princes.[11] Altogether, the expended sums were also considered a direct expression of the donor's piety, an investment in his own salvation and that of his family members, and regarded as a benefaction to the Church and adornment to the city of Florence at large.[12] It was also possible to point to the ancient concept of magnificence – first observed again in the fourteenth century – which in the second half of the fifteenth century was again heatedly discussed and justified the display of splendour by individuals in the service of the common good.[13] That such donations in most cases involved distinctly personal interests – having to do with social pretensions, assurance of the posthumous fame of one's own person and dynasty, and possibly the solidification of one's political position as well – appears not to have been perceived as a contradiction. Using the example of chapel commissions in Florence since the fourteenth century, one can therefore readily observe the competition and alliances between old-money and nouveau-riche bourgeois families.[14]

The Sassetti Chapel has been considered a prime example of such a commission ever since Aby Warburg presented it in two famous essays in 1902 and 1907.[15] Since then, the history of its creation, its iconography, and ancient and modern 'models' for the works of Ghirlandaio and Sangallo, the many portraits of contemporaries in the frescoes, and the patron's interests with respect to his partners and competitors have been studied more precisely.[16] Warburg's actual theoretical interest, namely an explanation of 'the important features resisting organic stylistic developments' has received less attention. He noted that very different possible styles in the Florence of the time had been combined in the work, which struck him as an attempt at a 'reconciliation' between Florentine painting, antique sculpture, and painting from north of the Alps, with the aim of combining Christian faith with a classical philosophy of life.

Warburg ultimately failed to deal with his own question relating to 'a synopsis of attitude to life and art style', for he felt it could only be answered with a kind of psychologising overall explanation for the 'organic polarity in the capacity for broad vacillation on the part of the man of culture in the early Renaissance'. On the contrary, the English art historian Michael Baxandall – who happened to study in Munich exactly sixty years ago, in 1957/58[17] – has shown how from texts, from our knowledge of education and learning as well as from the demands of daily life in fifteenth-century Italy, we can reconstruct contemporary perception criteria (the so-called 'period eye').[18] Whereas Baxandall offers only more general considerations, I here investigate how visual expectations, judgement criteria and stylistic options came to produce a specific pictorial ensemble, how themes and forms of the Sassetti Chapel conspire to create a complex structure of meanings and relationships within the chapel itself, the church and the larger urban setting.

1 Sassetti Chapel, S. Trinità, Florence

IPSVM QVEM GENVIT ADORAVIT MARIA

Sassetti had purchased his new chapel over the course of the year 1479.[19] He had previously been in protracted negotiations with the Dominicans at S. Maria Novella, the home of the Sassetti family chapel until then. It is possible that the Dominican monks denied Sassetti's proposal because it would have presented the life of Saint Francis – the founder of a competing mendicant order – in the main choir of their church. Moving the family chapel to the Church of the Vallombrosians was a radical solution. The decision appears to have been made on relatively short notice, so there cannot have been a lengthy planning stage for the new setting in S. Trinità.[20] Preparatory work for the new chapel's decoration began in late January 1480. The project's logistics required that the tombs be installed before the fresco painting could begin. The painting was likely executed in the years 1484/85, for it was probably only in the spring of 1482 that Ghirlandaio returned to Florence from Rome, where he had worked in the Sistine Chapel, and he first had to fulfil a painting commission in the Palazzo Vecchio.[21] The inscription tells us that the chapel was finished on 25 December 1485, and regular services began to be held there on 1 January 1486.[22]

At the latest following the example of the swift painting of the Sistine Chapel in only a year in 1481/82, speed would become a key criterion in Italian art.[23] It could be seen as an expression of a patron's (financial) power and vigour if he caused works to be created overnight – from scratch, so to speak. At the same time, it was also reminiscent of the praise heaped on a succession of ancient painters for their rapid yet seemingly effortless approach.[24] In S. Trinità, Ghirlandaio's working tempo became especially obvious as compared with progress in the main choir chapel; his teacher, Alesso Baldovinetti, had been painting there since 1471. In his contract, Baldovinetti had promised to complete the project in five to seven years, but did not finish until early 1497.[25] For Ghirlandaio at least, swiftness of work became a term of praise that was emphasised in all subsequent contemporary sources. There is, for example, the blunt recommendation drawn up for the duke of Milan, who was looking for painters for the Certosa in Pavia: 'Domenico Ghirlandaio is a good panel painter and even better wall painter; his works make a good overall impression and he is a man who works swiftly, and can handle large projects. All the painters named [in addition to Ghirlandaio, they were Sandro Botticelli and Pietro Perugino] have [already] demonstrated their skill in the Chapel of Pope Sixtus […].'[26] By contrast, some of the greatest masters of the time around 1500 and afterwards, including Leonardo da Vinci and Michelangelo, used their dilatory habit, in disregard of all agreements, as a kind of licence indicative of their special position and genius.[27]

'TRUE' PAINTING

That Florentine masters were sought not only by the pope for the painting of the Sistine Chapel,

but also by the duke of Milan for the Certosa indicates how successfully Florence promoted itself as an art centre in the fifteenth century and deployed its painters, sculptors, architects and artisans, along with their works, as instruments of diplomacy. Texts that helped to spread the fame of its artists and supported them took on a whole new importance. Filippo Villani's history of the city (1381–97) and Domenico di Bandino's listing of its famous men (around 1400) already mention Cimabue and Giotto – Villani includes other outstanding Florentine painters.[28] Later writers continued this local patriotism with information about the best current native artists, Ghirlandaio repeatedly among them: examples are Alamanno Rinuccini (1473), Cristoforo Landino (1481), Ugolino da Verino (c.1484 and 1480–87) and Gianozzo Manetti (1480s/1490s).[29] By contrast, writers attached to courts – in Naples the humanist Bartolomeo Fazio (1456), in Urbino the painter Giovanni Santi (1492) – significantly extolled an 'international' spectrum of best artists, one that in addition to Florentines might include Gentile da Fabriano, Pisanello and Andrea Mantegna, working in northern Italy and Rome, as well as the Van Eycks and Rogier van der Weyden from the Netherlands.[30]

Such texts did not, of course, promote only Florence and its canon of local artists. For the first time since antiquity, they provided, again with a broader distribution, written criteria for the perception and judging of artworks. Indeed, in Florence too, there were widely different opinions about what good, 'true' painting ought to look like. Both 'what' pictures should illustrate and 'how' they were to do so were hotly debated – as were the questions of what ideal to aim for and where to draw the limits of artistic freedom. In 1477, for example, there were even voices complaining that the long pictorial tradition

2 Hugo van der Goes, *Portinari Altar*, 1473–77, Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence

of depicting the Star of Bethlehem and the Three Kings had no textual basis in the Bible, that 'lovers of truth' could not really tolerate and admire these painterly inventions, though they were normally acknowledged as such.[31] 'Truth' in formal design was also demanded. In the late 1470s, Giovanni Caroli, a monk from the Dominican Monastery of S. Maria Novella – the house that had refused Sassetti's proposed refurbishment of his family chapel – had complained that in the arts: 'nunc autem fucata omnia [est] ac ficta, et ad ostentationem magis quam ad veritatem artisque decentiam facta' ('today everything is superficial splendour and deception, and aims more for show than for truth and artistic propriety'). He particularly criticised the *trompe-l'oeil* effects of newfangled central perspective as distinguished from the previous painting of the Trecento: 'Periit quidem omnis illa priscorum simplicitas, illa virtus et probitas' ('Gone are that simplicity, that virtue, and honesty of the those of the past').[32] And Caroli was not alone in his criticism of the supposedly increasingly pointed artificiality: a short time later it was not only Savonarola in Florence who wished to see all 'vanities' – including pictures – publicly burned. The last quarter of the fifteenth century saw increasing numbers of pictures with gold grounds once again, deliberately reduced perspective effects and other 'archaised' design elements.[33]

Ghirlandaio appears to have chosen a middle course for his pictures with their 'impression of good taste': composition, perspective, personal description, scholarly quotes from antiquities, ornamental elements – all at the most up-to-date level and employed with virtuosity. Nevertheless, artistry never stands apart for its own sake; it always serves the assigned depiction. In that Ghirlandaio unmistakably referred to the most famous Saint Francis cycle in Florence, Giotto's frescoes in the Bardi Chapel at S. Croce, he obviously signalled not only his artistic pretension and Florentine tradition.[34] It is conceivable that he was also trying to combine demands like those of Caroli for the 'truth of art', as it was said to have existed in the Trecento, with recent advances in painting.

A similar synthesis is exhibited by the altarpiece *Adoration of the Christ Child*. In its painterly execution and its cost, it is the most important picture in the chapel, yet for all its visual abundance has a remarkably clear overall design and message.[35] This is evident if one compares it with other variations on the theme: the *Adoration of the Magi* by Gentile da Fabriano, with its flaunting of gold and ornament (1423; Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence), albeit produced a half-century previously, but right next door in S. Trinità's Cappella degli Strozzi; Leonardo's unfinished *Adoration of the Magi* (1481/82; Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence) with its tour-de-force of emotions, architectural perspectives and horses; Botticelli's painting on the same subject for Guasparre di Zanobi del Lama (*c.*1475; cat. no. 52), in which what appear to be most important are portraits of contemporaries; the painstakingly detailed landscapes and precisely observed objects by Alesso Baldovinetti (1460; SS. Annunziata, Chiostro dei Voti, Florence) and Fra Diamante (1465/70; Musée du Louvre, Paris); or the deliberate use of a gold ground by the former Ghirlandaio collaborator Bastiano Mainardi (end of the fifteenth century [?], Musei Vaticani, Pinacoteca, Vatican City).[36]

For Ghirlandaio, however, the most important precedent was a triptych by Hugo van der Goes installed a short time before, in May 1483, in Florence's S. Egidio: an *Adoration of the Shepherds* commissioned by the Portinari banking family, employed by the Medici in Bruges (fig. 2).[37] With his reference to that work, he alluded to both the association and the competition between the Sassetti and the Portinari – but not only that. Ghirlandaio was interested above all in the group of adoring shepherds on the right, the way they were rendered so simply and naturally. These two features of Netherlandish painting, its 'truth' in imitation of nature – precisely observed faces, light effects and differing material surfaces – and its expression of deep veneration, were especially admired in fifteenth-century Italy.[38] Ghirlandaio clearly did not simply copy elements from Hugo van der Goes's paint-

3 Giuliano da Sangallo (design), *Tomb of Francesco Sassetti*, 1480–83/84, S.Trinità, Sassetti Chapel, Florence

ing but corrected their perspective, for example, and fully integrated them into his picture concept and painting style. Here, too, a striving for 'true painting' using the most up-to-date achievements in the art becomes visible.

From today's point of view, the works of a Botticelli and Leonardo can seem more innovative than those of Ghirlandaio. And a few contemporary sources already appear to have actually preferred Botticelli over him. Still, Ghirlandaio's artistic strategy of combining the newest achievements with traditional elements was not unlike that of Perugino, according to the sources the most famous painter in Italy along with Mantegna.[39] When reconstructing contemporary reception, it is important not to project our knowledge of later developments and forward-looking elements back onto the, in many respects, open situation of the public of a specific moment – for example the year 1485 – and to consider these more important than supposedly conservative or, from our present perspective, 'inartistic' criteria or historically less successful creative approaches.[40]

THE LESSONS OF ANTIQUITY

Much as we now treasure the Sassetti Chapel for its paintings, to the public of the 1480s the two spectacularly innovative tombs were no less admired, and the original partial gilding of their inscriptions, architectural elements and reliefs further underscored their

importance (fig. 3). Unlike the frescoes, however, their visual message was intended to be read up close, for the chapel was then closed off from the transept by a high marble balustrade.[41] It is as yet uncertain who created them. The design of the two monuments at least was likely produced by Giuliano da Sangallo; there are close similarities to his studies of antiquities and his other sculptural works.[42] The logistics of the works in the chapel would suggest that they were created in the period between 1480 and 1483/84.

To properly appreciate these monuments, one has to recall an unspoken code in fifteenth-century Florence: it was forbidden to erect a wall tomb with a recumbent figure for oneself even if one could afford it.[43] Such tombs were reserved for ecclesiastical and political dignitaries, and generally commissioned either by the Church or the commune. With their two arcosolium tombs, the Sassetti followed the tradition of such wealthy Florentine patricians as the Strozzi, whose chapel in S. Trinità from the 1420s was right next to it.[44] The innovations in the Sassetti tombs must therefore have seemed all the more sensational. For the two sarcophagi were neither reworked antique pieces nor carved in the then familiar Renaissance forms; they were tours de force, both technically and stylistically – elegantly curved sarcophagi with bucrania in classical style, each with a *tabula ansata*, all newly created out of black monoliths (*pietra di paragone*) and brought to a high polish. The inscription in Roman capitals on each of the lids, larger and more legible than the names of the deceased on the tablets below, identifies the chapel as the last resting place for the Sassetti family, and may justify the move of the family burial place from S. Maria Novella: 'GEN[TI or: IO] SAXET[AE or: ORUM] / FR[ANCISCUS] T[HOMAE] F[ILIUS]' – 'Francesco, Son of Thomas, Erected [or Dedicated This] to the Sassetti Family [or Genius].'[45]

The tondi and square panels in the framing of Francesco's wall niche depict the family coat of arms and warriors and centaurs with slings (the family device is a stone, Italian: *sasso*); the sea centaurs and Nereids framing the niche of his wife, Nera Corsi, are to be read as allusions to her first name. Personal symbols and depictions with centaurs in general were highly fashionable in the 1480s.[46] Adorning each of the relief bands beneath the sarcophagi is a tondo with a portrait bust of the deceased. In Francesco's case, the tondo is additionally flanked by two figural friezes. The front frieze especially, the one visitors entering the chapel see first, is remarkable (fig. 4): it was long ago recognised that the central scene quotes an ancient Meleager sarcophagus in Rome that was famous at the

4 Giuliano da Sangallo (design), *Tomb of Francesco Sassetti* (detail: right-hand relief), 1480–83/84, S. Trinità, Sassetti Chapel, Florence

time.[47] Just before this, it had served as the model for a relief which was probably made for the tomb of Giovanna Tornabuoni, who died in childbirth in 1477; that tomb was the work of a sculptor from the circle around Andrea del Verrocchio (fig. 5).[48] The relief, which presumably pictures Giovanna's death, is the earliest known example of such a deathbed scene from the fifteenth century. The unusual monument of the competing family in the Roman church S. Maria sopra Minerva would in any case have been known in Florence as well. Whether as a deliberate response to that work or not, Sassetti's relief presents, by contrast, how one narrates 'correctly' in the antique style. Here, no attempt was made to bring the classical scene into the present with contemporary clothing, as on the Giovanna relief. Nor is the scene supplemented (as in Rome) by an additional episode that has no classical precedent. Instead, Sassetti's relief tells a story in three steps that include still other classical models.

It begins on the left with a group of three figures, where a man and woman join hands, and with a quotation from a Roman tomb relief known since the third quarter of the fifteenth century as *Fidei Simulacrum*.[49] The earliest response to that piece can be seen on a medal from 1478.[50] It is obvious that in this case too, Roman antiquities of current

5 Circle of Andrea del Verrocchio, *Death of Giovanna Tornabuoni in Childbed* (?), relief from her demolished tomb in S. Maria sopra Minerva, Rome (?), *c.*1480, Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence

interest were being copied for Sassetti. In addition, the medal inscription suggests that an interpretation of the three as expressions of the virtues honour, love and truth was already widely known at that point. Then follows the scene adapting Meleager, into which several Sassetti coats of arms were incorporated. One is tempted to associate it with the death of the donor's nineteen-year-old son, Teodoro Sassetti, in late 1478 or early 1479. It should be noted – for it is just as important – that here, a composed example of male mourning in the form of the man holding a book on the left is contrasted with extreme forms of female lament. In the closing third scene to the right, an elderly man with a book and two putti is being led out of the relief narrative. A nude young man to his left draws back from what he is seeing. Of the three scenes, each of which shows a man wearing a toga, twice with a beard, once without, the central scene at most may allude to an event in Sassetti's life. Taken together, they are meant to illustrate in general terms the proper way of dealing with death, as extolled in contemporary poems of lament based on classical models. They attempt to translate the structure of such texts into pictorial topoi: praise of the deceased (here, the reference to honour, love and truth as exemplary) is followed by mourning as performed by men and women, then consolation, and an admonition to meet death free of fear (the older man strides calmly out of the picture field, while the nude young man shrinks back in terror).[51] The message was thus twofold: celebration of the deceased and an incentive to the living to pattern themselves after his example.[52]

On the whole, then, the relief, conceived for close-up viewing by the mourning family and a select public, not only conveys a challenging humanistic notion of virtue in combination with a highly up-to-date antiquarian understanding of classical art appropriate to Sassetti, a lifelong lover of art and antiquities. It also emphatically suggests that the style and imagery of such a classicising relief must be different from those of the narrative frescoes on the chapel walls. With their multiple references to Sassetti's world and social network, their painterly mastery and evident demonstration of advances in art since Giotto, these paintings also convey, in obedience to the demand for 'true (Christian) painting,' a clearly understandable message of salvation and faith in resurrection. In a sense, the central altarpiece then ties the two concepts together. In other works Sassetti appears to have undertaken a similar differentiation. For his portrait bust by Andrea del Verrocchio (1464, Florence, Museo Nazionale del Bargello), he chose a design *all'antica*, while his panel portrait by Ghirlandaio, which shows him with his small son Teodoro (*c.*1485/88; The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York), is in a contemporary style. Here, sculpture as a whole is presented as a distinguished ancient medium, painting as a modern one – a classification found in contemporary sources since Petrarch.[53]

The Sassetti Chapel reveals to this day how consciously stylistic options and perception criteria were followed in Renaissance Florence. Decisions were by no means only about the individual style of a Ghirlandaio or Giuliano da Sangallo, as opposed to other available artists from Florence, elsewhere in Italy or the Netherlands, or about what was financially feasible. Florence's traditions and self-image, the patron's social position, the site, the relationship to viewers, the themes and materials, references within the chapel, the church, the city and beyond, and finally the continually changing flanking texts and discussions about art – all these required and made possible quite specific representational options, and opened up new and individually adapted modes of perception. To say nothing of the ephemeral elements, the liturgical vessels, the vestments, the flickering candlelight during celebrations in the chapel. It is important to fully understand the deliberately selected artistic options before one can, with Warburg, truly inquire after 'a synopsis of attitude to life and art style'.

In museum presentations, such contexts, visual references and differentiations are largely lost. Instead, museum presentations impose their own criteria in many respects:

ideal viewing conditions, selections (if possible) of autograph works by the most important masters, arrangments according to schools and lines of historical development (which in the analysis sketched here play a subordinate role at most). It is the paradoxical challenge of any reconstruction of how works were viewed in the past that it always has to both begin with the present-day viewing experience and proceed in opposition to it.

---

1 Borsook/Offerhaus 1981; Cassarino 1996; Roettgen 1996–97, vol. 2, 1997, pp. 136–63; Cadogan 2000, pp. 230–36, 253–55; Kecks 2000, pp. 245–75.
2 For other examples, see Rubin 2008; Müller 2009; for the earlier 15th century, Pfisterer 2002.
3 Edler de Roover 1943; Roover 1963, esp. pp. 361–64.
4 Rohlmann 2004a.
5 Landucci-Herzfeld 1912–13, vol. 1, 1912, p. 90; the surviving contract shows that 1,000 florins were paid to Ghirlandaio; for the chapel, see Simons 1987; Roettgen 1996–97, vol. 2, 1997, pp. 164–201; Schmid 2002; for the family's entire art patronage, see DePrano 2018.
6 The evaluation report with information on payment is reprinted in Pfisterer 2014, p. 128.
7 Horne 1903, pp. 167–71, 173–74; Kennedy 1938, pp. 167–81, 246–47.
8 For pricing developments, see Wackernagel 1938, pp. 346–53.
9 Gilbert 1959; for the precedence of *ingenium* and *ars* over material, Bernardo Giustiniani in Venice 1441; see Monfasani 1984, p. 154. In 1470, Francesco del Cossa points to the 'fame of his name' when requesting higher payment from Borso d'Este for the frescoes in the Palazzo del Schifanoia; see O'Malley 2013, p. 97.
10 Committees of experts were apparently especially common for sculptures in the first half of the 15th century; see Glasser 1977, pp. 41–46; O'Malley 2013; for the first half of the century, Jacobsen 2001.
11 Goldthwaite 1993; Welch 2005.
12 Müller 1999; Schmid 2002; Rubin 2007, esp. pp. 120–33.
13 For this, only Kent 2004; Howard 2012.
14 Nelson/Zeckhauser 2008.
15 *The Art of Portraiture and the Florentine Bourgeoisie* (1902); *Francesco Sassetti's last Injunctions to His Sons* (1907); both quoted from Warburg (1932) 1998, vol. 1, pp. 89–126 and 127–58.
16 Porçal 1984; Gombrich 1997; Seidel 1997; Reddaway 2014.
17 Baxandall 2010, pp. 99–110.
18 Baxandall 1971; Baxandall 1972; also Hills 2013.
19 On this, two documents in Padoa Rizzo 1987, p. 150.
20 Chronological problems, preliminary drawings with iconography significantly different from the final execution, and a few portraits later added to the frescoes cannot be discussed here; on the findings, see Welliver 1969; Rosenauer 1972.
21 For Ghirlandaio's collaboration in the Sistine Chapel, see Pfisterer 2014, pp. 31–34. The sibyls of the ceiling with their inscriptions can probably be related to Philippus de Barberii's *Discordantiae sanctorum doctorum Hieronymi et Augustini; Sybillarum et prophetarum de Christo vaticinia* [n.p., n.d.], a text first published in Rome in 1481; see Porçal 1984, pp. 29–30; Augustyn 2018, vol. 1.
22 Borsook/Offerhaus 1981, p. 61, doc. 11; Padoa Rizzo 1987, pp. 150 and 353 n.7 (document from 15 January 1486).
23 See Pfisterer 2014, pp. 41–46; in general, see O'Malley 2013.
24 Plinius, *Naturalis historia*, Book XXXV, 109; Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 12, 10, 6; Alberti-Bätschmann/Schäublin 2000, pp. 304–05 (*De pictura* III, § 59); see the north-alpine reception in Boesten-Stengel 1990 and Wegmann 2008.
25 See note 7.
26 'Domenico de Grilandaio [sic!] bono maestro in tavola et piu in muro: le cose sue hano bona aria, et e homo expeditivo, et che conduce assai lavoro: Tutti questi predicti maestri hano facto prova di loro ne la capella di papa syxto […].' (translated by Russell Stockman). For this document, see Baxandall 1987, pp. 36–39; O'Malley 2013, pp. 13–19.
27 Burke 2011.
28 Villani-Tanturli 1997, pp. 152–55, 411–13; Domenico di Bandino's *Fons mirabilium universi* quoted from Tanturli 1976, p. 278; see also Schürer 2017, pp. 197–207.
29 For Rinuccini, see Gombrich 1985–88, vol. 1, 1985, pp. 12–13; for Landino, Baxandall 1987, pp. 141–84; for Verino, Verino-Bausi 1998, pp. 324–28 (Liber III, poem no. 23), here also reference to the passage in Verino's *De illustratione urbis Florentiae libri tres*, Liber II, verses 443–486; for Manetti, see Murray 1957.
30 For Fazio's text, see Baxandall 1971, pp. 99–111, 163–68; for Santi Santi-Michelini Tocci 1985, vol. 2, pp. 668–77 (Liber XXII, Chap. xci, verses 364–379); see Romano 1987. One might also refer to Siena, which obviously pursued quite deliberately a negative stance or a stylistic alternative to Florentine innovations; see Christiansen 1988; see also Kawsky 1995, and the essay by Scott Nethersole in this volume.
31 Thus the humanist Marzio da Narni, writing in northern Italy and suspected of heresy; see Marzio-Frezza 1948, p. 96; for 'unnecessary' inventions by painters, see also the *Summa* of the Florentine archbishop Antonino; also Gilbert 1959.
32 Camporeale 1981, pp. 218, 220–21, 255 (translated by Russell Stockman); see Camporeale 1990. One might compare this with the virtually contemporary unlimited praise of the perspective in Matteo Colacio's *Laus perspectivae cori in Aede Sancti Antonii* from 1475, referring to the (lost) inlays of the choir stools in the Santo in Padua, published in Savettieri 1998.
33 Filippini 1992a; Assonitis 2003.
34 Rohlmann 2004a; Rubin 2007, pp. 120–29.
35 Three years later, in 1488, Ghirlandaio would receive 115 florins for his *Adoration of the Magi* for the Ospedale degli Innocenti in Florence; see Baxandall 1987, pp. 15–16; for its iconography, see Porçal 1984; for the success and reception of the altarpiece, see Pons 1996a.
36 For the panel attributed to Mainardi, but also to Ghirlandaio himself, in the Pinacoteca Vaticana and its pendant, a *Resurrection* in the Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen, see exh. cat. Florence 1992b, p. 195, no. 7.5 (Lisa Venturini).
37 Nuttall 2004, pp. 148–53.
38 Ibid., pp. 31–40.
39 O'Malley 2013, 22–23, 42–47.
40 See Sohm 2001; Pfisterer 2002, pp. 22–110; Hoppe 2008; Keizer 2015; Campbell 2017.
41 Removed in 1743; see Vasaturo 1987, p. 21.
42 The problems were summarised most recently in Parmiggiani 2017, esp. pp. 200–01.
43 Butterfield 1994. One of the two exceptions of privately financed tombs with recumbent figures is the monument of the government official and legal scholar Giuliano Davanzati (*c.*1445), likewise in S. Trinità; for the changes following the Pazzi Conspiracy in 1478, see Strocchia 1992, pp. 188–217.
44 Jones 1984; Gregory 1987; Strehlke 2008.
45 The divergent suggested deciphering in Borsook/Offerhaus 1981, p. 21, and Kecks 2000, p. 250, ignores, in my opinion, the message of the identical lid inscriptions on the two sarcophagi, in which Francesco Sassetti places himself in the service of his family and only in the second line names himself in smaller letters. They are to be seen not only with the two other sarcophagus inscriptions, in which Sassetti identifies himself as patron, but also with the inscription in the marble tondo on the floor, which seals the access to the crypt that Sassetti envisioned as a burial place for his descendants: 'FRANCISCVS SAXETTVS POSTERIS SVIS POSVIT'.
46 Strocchia 1992, pp. 192–93. For criticism of the fashion for personal symbols already around 1480, see the documents in Pfisterer 2008, pp. 226–27. For the interest in centaurs, see a letter from 1476 to Ludovico Gonzaga (Brown/Lorenzoni 1973, pp. 158–59). For Florence, ancient models and the artistic responses to them, see, for example, Schweikart 1986, p. 101 and figs. 120, 121.
47 Schottmüller 1902; see also Catoni 2012.
48 The source of the tomb relief cannot be traced with certainty; see Butterfield 1997, pp. 237–39; Covi 2005, pp. 144–49.
49 RDK 8, Cols. 831–876 (Karl-August Wirth); Horster 1975 (on similar groupings on the sarcophagi of married couples); Borsook/Offerhaus 1981, pp. 25–26.
50 Pfisterer 2008, p. 410, no. A23.
51 Hardison 1962, p. 117; for the classical models, especially Statius, see Esteve-Forriol 1962, who in addition to the central triad of *laudatio*, *lamentatio* and *consolatio* distinguishes an introduction and the *descriptio* of illness and death; see McManamon 1989; McClure 1991, esp. pp. 160–61. The pose of the man drawing back is reminiscent of the bronze statuettes of the 'gnudi della paura'; see most recently exh. cat. Bergamo 2017, pp. 160–61, no. 10 (Paola Frau).
52 McManamon 1989, pp. 32–33.
53 For the bust, see Butterfield 1997, pp. 16, 203, no. 3; Covi 2005, p. 260 (not by Verrocchio); for Ghirlandaio's panel, see Cadogan 2000, pp. 278–79, no. 47; Kecks 2000, p. 409 (not by Ghirlandaio); for the choice between *all'antica* and modern in earlier portrait busts, see Marek 1993; for the art literature, see Pfisterer 2002, pp. 80–81, 88–89.