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Foreword

In the spring of 1966 Professor Federico Zeri attributed a small panel in the University of Notre Dame Collection to Giorgio Vasari. This attribution was the starting point for Dean Porter, Curator of the Art Gallery at Notre Dame, to plan the present exhibition. The University Art Gallery of the State University of New York at Binghamton joined this project and we are all indebted to Mr. Porter for his initiative work and enthusiasm in this undertaking.

We express our sincere gratitude to His Excellency, Egidio Ortona, Italian Ambassador to the United States, for accepting the patronage of this exhibition.

To Miss Mary M. Davis and the Samuel H. Kress Foundation we are grateful for their unfailing support. Miss Davis was instrumental in assisting us with several important loans, and the catalogue could not have been possible without the generous financial support of the Kress Foundation.

Many individuals and institutions were involved in the process of assembling this exhibition and our gratitude is expressed to all of them on the following pages of this catalogue.

Finally, the generous support of our Administrations has enabled us to bring this undertaking to a successful end.

Rev. Anthony J. Lauck, Director
Art Gallery, University of Notre Dame

Michael Milkovich, Director
University Art Gallery
State University of New York at Binghamton
Introduction

Few of the “Old Masters” are better qualified to be the focal point of an exhibition in a university than is Giorgio Vasari. In an age when the university stresses the need for the liberal and the fine arts, history, theology and sociology, Vasari is the ideal individual. The versatility of Vasari has been criticized as well as applauded. As a painter, historians have sacrificed him to the lower ranks. As a draughtsman he has faired somewhat better but still is in the shadows of his Florentine contemporaries. However, as an art historian, few scholars working on the Quattrocento and the Cinquecento have been able to overlook Vasari’s *Le Vite de’Piu Eccellenti Pittori, Scultori e Architettori Italiani*. Scholarship demands primary source material: Vasari provides the art historian with contemporary information on the artists, their works and the dates of the execution of these pieces. His information is not only straightforward and factual, but also his anecdotes regarding the personality of an artist provide the reader with intimate details of the artist’s life, habits and peculiarities. In his *Vite* Vasari also introduces the reader to art historical theory with his notion of *progress*. Vasari’s knowledge and interest in classical antiquity is evident in his writings as well as his paintings and drawings. His theory of style, illuminated in Maurice Poirier’s discussion of *disegno* in this catalogue, has long been of a controversial nature to the aesthetician, and is one of the first, if not the first basis for conceptual art. Nor can we overlook Vasari the collector. His *Libro dei Disegni*, assembled to illustrate his *Vite*, is the first of the great collections. Vasari’s relationships to the political figures, the Medici’s, to literary personages such as Vincenzo Borghini, Pietro Aretino and Benedetto Varchi, as well as his affiliations with the Papacy, also provide us with a penetrating insight into sixteenth century Italy. All of his activities are well documented by his *Vite* as well as by the volumes of letters that are available for our perusal.

Vasari was a figure of great immediacy. His travels brought him into contact with virtually all of the noteworthy artists of this period. He apprenticed under Andrea del Sarto and Baccio Bandinelli, became a close friend of Michelangelo, was a companion of Francesco Salviati, and his travels brought him into contact with Romano and Titian.

He organized some of the most significant projects in the history of Florentine art. Few artists have attempted so much and met with as great success as Vasari. In 1536, given the task of preparing the decorations for the reception of Emperor Charles V in Florence, Vasari distributed the work to Giovanni Corsi, Luigi Guicciardini, Palla Ruccellai, Alessandro Corsini, and Niccolò Tribolo. While in Venice in 1542 he created the decorations for Pietro Aretino’s *La Talanta*. In 1562 Vasari was instrumental in the foundation of the Florentine Academy, the *Accademia del Disegno*. In 1564, Vasari, along with Agnolo Bronzino, Benvenuto Cellini, and Bartolommeo Ammannati, was charged by the *Accademia* to prepare the funeral ceremony for the first lieutenant and head of their *Accademia*, Michelangelo. Vasari in 1565, with Vincenzo Borghini, was placed in charge of the decoration of Florence for the marriage of Francesco de’Medici and Giovanna of Austria. While Vasari was performing these various artistic services, he was also involved with one of the most ambitious projects recorded in Florentine history: the decoration of the Palazzo Vecchio. From 1555 to 1572, Vasari was to remain the “master
supervisor” of this enormous project. Approximately thirty artists, if we include the Studioli di Francesco I, worked on the decoration of this grand structure. During the last three years of Vasari’s life, the artist was to work on the decoration of Brunelleschi’s cupola for Santa Maria del Fiori, the Dome of the Florence Cathedral.

Even if we are to question Vasari for his lack of ability as a painter, we must only do so in light of his other achievements. Few have accomplished as much... few have exerted as great an influence as Vasari. Artistically, he created a style that was followed by Giovanni Battista Naldini, Cristofano Gherardi, Jan van der Straeten (Stradano), Francesco Morandini, Prospero Fontana, Jacopo Zucchi, Marco da Faenza, and Carlo Portelli, to mention a few. This, however, is not Vasari’s most significant contribution; in fact history will overlook this role of Vasari more often than not. Art historians will, however, remember Vasari’s accounts of the Sack of Rome, they will reacquaint themselves through his writings with the acid personality of Baccio Bandinelli and the sickness of Jacopo Pontormo. They will recall the glory that was Italy... they will relive the tumultuous period of the Catholic Reformation... all of this through the eyes of Giorgio Vasari.

Michael Milkovich
Dean A. Porter
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Speculations Concerning Mannerism

The realistic High Renaissance style, as it was practiced by Raphael in the Vatican *stanze* early in the sixteenth century, creates an optical illusion of reality which is successful to the degree that it imitates visual experience and raises it to a higher level of significance. The relatively abstract style we call *Mannerism*, that was practiced throughout most of the sixteenth century, obeyed inner impulses, unique in some cases to particular artists, and was directed at a sophisticated audience that was ready to view it in its own terms. As this stylistic tendency fell from fashion's grace at the end of the sixteenth century, yielding its place to a new wave of realism and a new concept of artistic relevance, it was attacked by Giovanni Bellori, for example, for its abuse of artistic license, and for the next two hundred years and more the works created in accordance with its highly personal and esoteric aesthetic remained in relative obscurity. It is only during the past forty years really that the Mannerists have returned to respectability, and that art historians have been interested enough to search for positive values in their art. The reason may be that Mannerism is something of a bastard style, mingling figurative realities and abstractive principles to create a composite effect, which does not always produce successful offspring. Nevertheless, Mannerism is interesting both for its artistic creations and for what it reveals as an historical phenomenon. Its body of aesthetic principles shows little sense of organization and much vagueness, and therefore only indirectly explains what transpired in the act of creation; but this is to be expected of a movement in which intuition replaced rules, and accuracy of imitation is no longer the measure of success.

Vasari seems not to have understood the nature of the Mannerist's contribution to the greater historical movement launched in the early Renaissance, and he lacked the acumen and the critical vocabulary to define it as more than a search for the nebulous quality that he called "grace." Even early in the present century, Mannerism found no place in Heinrich Wolfflin's system, whereby he sought to link the Renaissance to the Baroque as part of a "natural" development cycle, since there is no way to consider it as a transitional phase between these two essentially realistic developments. But if we keep our historical perspective unclouded by *a priori* theories of progress and cycles, it becomes clear that the so-called Manneristic Style between circa 1520 and circa 1590 is an example of a recurrent tendency that surfaced twice before in the Italian Renaissance; once in the second half of the fourteenth, and once in the last quarter of the fifteenth century. In the earlier resurgence it came as a reaction against the realism of the Giottesque school continuing until it led to the style of the Papal Court at Avignon around 1400; and in the case of the later one, the stylizations of Polliuolo, Botticelli, and Verrocchio, from about 1475 on, are only separated from sixteenth century Mannerism by the relatively brief period that we know as the High Renaissance. Michelangelo, in fact, as a key figure in the creation of the Vatican style during the first decades of the sixteenth century, also can be seen as the most influential artist of Vasari's age, and as the most important pioneer in the creation of the Manneristic Style.

Mannerism, then, should be understood as a contrast to Realism, and, together with the latter, as one of the two major tendencies in conflict with one another throughout the Renaissance. Whereas realism seeks to *imitate* objective visual
experience, mannerism *editorializes*, subordinating objectivity to subjective interpretation. The realist is interested in creating a tangible, experimental sensation of depth, surface, and texture. To this end, he minimizes the edges of forms and exploits the effects of light and shadow in order to create sensations that suggest palpable objects separated by intervening spaces. The mannerist, in contrast, is more concerned with treating his forms as reliefs in relationship on a plane. He is likely to emphasize the contours of figures and objects in order to provide a compositional “machinery” to create sensations of interrelationship and movement; such sensations being expressed in terms of continuity of line, through contacts, contiguous, and closures. The realist seeks to heighten expressiveness through the acting *performances* of the figures in his compositions, accurately rendered in terms of physiognomic reaction and gesture. Because of his realistic sense of logic and actuality, the postures and gestures of his figures are governed by his knowledge of the normative structure of man, and expressed as angular arrangements and foreshortened projections that reflect the ineluctable characteristics of the underlying skeletal matrix. The mannerist, in answer to an inner necessity, which was supported by the current Neo-Platonic belief in cosmic unity, distorts physiognomy and gesture to meet compositional requirements that are germane to his art, even when they are not faithful to nature. In his works, the skeletal structure melts to conform to the linear flow of the relief on its plane, becoming malleable sometimes to the point of physical impossibility.

Michelangelo pointed the way in his early sculptured relief, the *Rape of Dejanira*, in which he fashioned a torrent of interwoven bodies into a spiraling garland around the central figure. He continually reinforced his contribution to the new style by creating figures, either painted or carved, that twisted in space, combining more than one side of the body in each axial view; so that each of the cardinal points would present the observer with a synthesis that summarized the dynamic interrelationship of the parts of the body. Later, Manneristic sculptors, like Giovanni da Bologna (fig. 1), were to sacrifice the elements of momentary synthesis to a unity of movement which suggests that the statues should be displayed on a turntable. Even in his late frescoes, the *Conversion of Saint Paul* (fig. 2), and the *Crucifixion of Saint Peter* (fig. 3) in the Cappella Paolina, which until quite recently were considered as evidence of his dotage, Michelangelo showed how figure compositions could be made to seem to swirl in spirals, or to suggest centrifugal and centripetal movements, as if they were subject to supernatural cosmic forces.

Allowing even for the powerful impetus given by Michelangelo, it is still surprising that an artistic development as successful as the High Renaissance was abandoned so quickly. The sudden change, beginning in Florence with Pontormo and Il Rosso, and even affecting Raphael, Giulio Romano, and their colleagues in Rome, before they had completed their Vatican projects, must mean that the stately harmonies of form, color, and space, exemplified by the *School of Athens* could no longer satisfy the artists’ criteria for a work of art. As monumental and impressive as it was, the achievements of the realistic approach suddenly seemed bland. The grandeur of its spatial illusionism contributed to the weakening of the impact of the human drama; and the human drama, choreographed in classic balance under the influence of geometric order, already seems to lack fire in comparison with the work of Michelangelo. Although Michelangelo’s influence was very important, we must look deeper to find the conceptual basis of Mannerism. Pontormo and Il Rosso began their innovations in Florence in his absence, tentatively and experimentally groping for their own solutions, and falling under
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his influence only later on. Perhaps the most significant clue is that they shared a common origin with Michelangelo, working in Florence, which was the home of the Platonic Academy founded by the Medici and developed by the most important Neo-Platonist of the fifteenth century, Marsilio Ficino, who indelibly stamped his mark on sixteenth century aesthetics.

Mannerism was an attempt to sever art from the surface realities of life and to pursue it, not to a logical, but rather to an intuitive conclusion. Although we are far from certain about the origin of the term, maniera, it seems to have had a positive sense before it acquired a derogatory association in Bellori's usage. There is a clue to its meaning in The Spiritual Espousals, a theological treatise by Jan van Ruysbroeck, the influential fourteenth century mystic. Ruysbroeck asserts that the experience of a “delectable unity with God is as it were a darkness and a lack of manner and an incomprehensibility.” He goes on to tell us that after such a mystic experience the recipient turns inward for essential rest, for none could endure a protracted revelation. During this period the intellect begins to examine and transform the overwhelming and inefiable experience, and in this process “recognition and comprehension consists in manner and measure.” Because man must communicate his experience both to himself and to others, he translates it into “many kinds of images and manners.” Manner, then, is the communicable form of the contemplative experience, and thus becomes a viable term for aesthetic theory.

Vasari can make little claim to being a philosopher, and thus for him maniera is a certain “grace exceeding measurement;” a nebulous stylistic quality which can be lost if the artist tries too hard to achieve it. In his usage the term seems to describe little more than an inherent personal sensitivity, which is manifest in style. But at its roots the concept that eluded Vasari belongs to the long lasting mystical tradition that links Ficino to Late Pagan and Early Christian philosophy. It relates to Plotinus' view that if the soul were made visible it would absorb the outward manifestation of the body within its aura. It is reminiscent of Augustine's concept of the cosmic “rhythm of relationships” of the “whole body inside and out,” which would reveal to the soul, if it could be discerned, “so ravishing a beauty that no visible shapeliness of form that delights the eye—the mere minister of our mind—could be compared with it.” This emphasis upon a form of experience unrelated to sensory data suggests a possibility for art that contrasts with the Renaissance’s Aristotelian materialism as much as the views of Marsilio Ficino contrast with those of his contemporary Leonardo da Vinci, who was already too committed to his own principles to adopt new ones. Whereas Leonardo tells us that we can represent even man’s soul “by the attitudes and movements of the limbs.” Ficino foreshadows the Neo-Platonic aesthetics of the sixteenth century by completely severing the spiritual from the physical world, pointing out the meaninglessness and relativity of proportion, composition, and surface embellishments. Giordano Bruno was to further elucidate these ideas towards the end of the sixteenth century, asserting in terms which anticipate twentieth century phenomenology, that we must throw off the “corruptible accidents, the dimensions, the signs and figures, from that which lies under these things,” if the intellect is to grasp the untrammeled essence of the things, themselves. Federigo Zuccaro belatedly published his Idea dei scultori, pittori e architetti in 1607, drawing this philosophical concept into the compass of aesthetics, particularly in his definition of disegno interno. By inward, or interior design, he means the concept which precedes the first sketch of a work of art. According to Zuccaro, “Design is neither matter nor body, nor the accident of any substance, but is the form, idea, rule,
and object of the intellect in which the things comprehended are expressed." He
tells us that "the goal of the external operation is a material thing, like the figure
drawn or painted, etc. . . . the goal of the internal operation is an immaterial
form representing the thing comprehended." With Zuccaro then, we arrive at the
artistic equivalent of the mystic's experience, described over two centuries earlier
by Ruysbroeck. Disegno interno is the process of translating the ineffable into the
communicable.

And the ineffable, in the philosophy of all mystics from the beginnings of time,
is the belief in the unity of all existence under Divine Power. The artist can com-
 municate this essential verity by creating interrelationships that overcome the bland
and misleading "facts" of sensory experience.

It may be that as you look at the works of art that reflect this philosophy you
will not experience the sense of exaltation that you are supposed to feel. Aesthetic
response can have something akin to mystic revelation; in the same way it requires
a certain kind of sensitivity and a degree of faith. The same requirements would be
necessary for the artists who seek to project such ideas. Not all of them, since most
artists are followers rather than pioneers, have the same ability to strike the key-
notes of a period; and an artistic movement as prolonged as this one was, is cer-
tain to suffer dilution. Nevertheless, if you are conscious of the difficulty of pro-
jecting a philosophy as intuitive and nebulous as Neo-Platonism, you will begin to
appreciate Vasari's age as a historic period in which the assertion of artistic indi-
viduality broke down the tyranny of a highly integrated conceptual system, and,
through this achievement, prepared the way for the new empiricism, and the
dynamic inventiveness, of Baroque art, in the same way that the science and phi-
losophy of the sixteenth century broke the spell of ancient and misleading authori-
ties and opened the way to the modern era.

Irving L. Zupnick
State University of New York
Binghamton, New York
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GIORGIO VASARI
Florentine Painting in Time of Giorgio Vasari

The history of Florentine painting in the age of Vasari belongs chronologically to Mannerism, a style which Dr. Zupnick in the previous article, has discussed carefully. The span of Vasari's activity embraced the first two generations of mannerists (from the 1540s to mid-1570s) a period which is all but a homogeneous one; it was the time in which many different elements indicated a certain revolt against the rationalism of the Renaissance.

The first generation of these artists was trained in the studios of the High Renaissance painters and the influences of Raphael, Andrea del Sarto, Correggio and the Venetians were evident in the first decades of the century; these trends can be seen in several works included in the present exhibition. In the more advanced stages there is a certain kind of perverse irrationality which became clear in the fundamental differences in the artist's concept: in the artificial landscape, the intensity of the motions and the distorted human figures.

_The Holy Family_ (no. P1) by an anonymous painter shows the effect of Andrea del Sarto's style and at the same time we notice the irrational use of colors which in the work of Beccafumi (nos. P2, P3) also are evident with the distorted forms of human figures. The outstanding work by Nosadella is a work worthy of his master, Pellegrino Tibaldi, and clearly indicates the new approach.

In Pontormo we have a fully developed mannerist, who brought to us the new elements with such fantasy and torment (nos. P5, P6). The artists represented in this exhibition to a greater or lesser degree project the general ideas of the period and form a unity to picture this restless artistic venture. Parmigianino (nos. P9, P10), Lello Orsi (no. P12), Francesco Salviati (no. P14), Santi di Tito (no. P16), Francesco Morandini (no. P11), Scipione Pulzone (no. P13), and the painter of Flemish origin, Stradanus (no. P15) present us with the peculiarities of Mannerism, which have been discussed in this catalogue on several occasions.

The major protagonist of this undertaking, Giorgio Vasari, in the exhibited works from his early _Annunciation_ (no. P17), _The Temptation of St. Jerome_ (no. P18), to the _St. Mary Magdalene_ (no. P19), _Holy Family_ (no. P20) and _Abraham and Melchizedek_ (no. P12) convincingly reflect the idea of his time, and his great achievements as an architect and bibliographer, deserves a period to be called the Age of Vasari.
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ANONYMOUS FLORENTINE
16th Century
P1. Holy Family
Oil on panel, 47 1/4 x 33 7/8 inches
Lent by H. Kleinberger & Co., Inc.
Provenance: Chalandon Family, Paris
Exhibitions: Bacchiacca and His Friends, Baltimore Museum of Art, 1916, No. 85, illustrated on page 56; *Problem Pictures: Paintings without Authors*, Vassar College Art Gallery, Poughkeepsie, 1965, No. 5; *Seven Centuries of Italian Art*, Rhode Island School of Design, 1967.
Several suggestions have been made for the author of this painting: Pier Francesco Foschi, Jacopo da Pontormo, but a firm attribution is still missing. The figure of St. Joseph reminds us of some compositions by Andrea del Sarto but the color and the treatment of drapery make this panel closer to Pontormo.

DOMENICO BECCAFUMI
(Siena ca. 1486-1551)
P2. The Baptism of Christ
P3. A Vision of St. Catherine of Siena
Oil on panel, both panels, 9 1/2 x 15 inches
Lent by the Philbrook Art Center
Samuel H. Kress Collection
Provenance: Manzi Collection, Siena; Samuel H. Kress Collection, 1939.
Probably part of a predella, these two panels are accepted as mature works by Beccafumi by G. Fiocco, R. Longhi, F.R.M. Perkins, W. Suida and A. Venturi. There is another painting of *The Baptism of Christ* in the Siena Pisanoteca (No. 344) containing the same elements but of a different, vertical, size, where the God the Father is emerging from the clouds. In *A Vision of St. Catherine of Siena*, the saint is offered two crowns: one of roses, the other of thorns; she chooses the thorned one believing that the suffering makes us like unto Him. The delicacy of the colors and the masterly brushwork date these panels to Beccafumi's mature period.

GIOVANNI FRANCESCO BEZZI
called NOSADELLA
(Born in Bologna, died 1571)
P4. The Holy Family with St. John
Oil on panel, 19 1/2 x 15 inches
Lent by The Art Association of Indianapolis, The Herron Museum
Provenance: Achillito Chieso, Milan; William Randolf Hearst
This panel was auctioned at the American Art Galleries, New York City on April 16, 1926.
Bezzi was a pupil of Pellegrino Tibaldi (1527-1595) but we know very little about his life. Bezzi probably worked with his teacher in Bologna and followed him to Milan. While Tibaldi's influence is evident, Bezzi succeeded in creating his own style.

JACOPO CARRACCI, called IL PONTORMO
(Pontormo 1494-Florence 1557)
P5. Madonna and Child with Two Angels
Oil on panel, 40 1/4 x 31 inches
Lent by the M. H. De Young Memorial Museum
Samuel H. Kress Collection
Pontormo was a pupil of Andrea del Sarto and was influenced by Michelangelo and by Duerer, whose engravings were widely known in Italy at this time. He was one of the creators of the so-called *Primo Manierismo Fiorentino* whose impact on the entire development of Manerism could hardly be overestimated.
There are two similar versions of this composition: one in the Galleria Corsini, Florence and the other in the collection of Marchese Roberto Pucci, also in Florence. The Corsini picture does not have the child on the left side, while the Pucci panel, being of a lesser quality, has also three children. The Kress painting is dated by W. E. Suida and R. Longhi c. 1523, the time when Pontormo was working on the frescoes in the Cerasa di Val d'Enza (1522-25) and there is definitely a stylistic relationship between these two works.

JACOPO CARRACCI called IL PONTORMO
(Pontormo 1494-Florence 1557)
P6. Madonna and Child
Oil on panel, 49 1/2 x 40 1/2 inches
Lent by the Acquavella Galleries, Inc.
There are several known versions of this composition for which, perhaps, we find a reference in Giorgio Vasari's *Vite*, Vasari-Milanesi, 1881, VI, p. 280. This panel is considered by Prof. Roberto Longhi as an "original which does not leave any doubt as to the artist who executed it; it is certainly by Pontormo, and one of his most personal and fascinating creations." Professor Longhi dates this panel about 1520-25, but a date closer to 1530, seems to be more correct. For more details see: F. Goldschmidt, Pontormo, Rosso

AGNOLO BRONZINO, Circle of 16th Century

P7. Portrait of a Young Lady
Oil on panel, 27 1/2 x 21 3/8 inches
Inscribed and dated: C. A. C. M.D.LXV. (1565)
Lent by the Seattle Art Museum
Samuel H. Kress Collection
Exhibition: Bacichieca and His Friends, Baltimore Museum of Art, 1961, No. 48
Bibliography: Italian Art, Samuel H. Kress Collection, Seattle Art Museum, 1952, No. 18, illustrated;
This excellent portrait, painted with exceptional freedom, has been suggested by W. Suida, G. H. Smyth and M. Modestini as a work by Santi di Tito. The general character of the composition is that of Bronzino, but the pictorial treatment and the way in which Bronzino depicted his portraits are different.

GIROLAMO MACCHIETTI
(Florence c. 1533-1592)

P8. Holy Family
Oil on panel, 39 x 30 3/4 inches
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Robert L. Manning.
This panel was attributed to Federico Zeri to Macchietti, who began to paint in the studio of Michele di Ridolfo Ghirlandaio and collaborated later with Vasari on the project for the wedding of Francesco de’ Medici and Maria d’Austria in 1565. In the early 1570’s Macchietti was working in the Studiolo of Francesco I in the Palazzo Vecchio.

This composition of this interesting painting, particularly the figure of St. Joseph, is characteristic of the artists working around Giorgio Vasari. This specific painting is related to the Adoration of the Magi by Macchietti in the church of San Lorenzo in Florence.

Shown only in Binghamton.

Unpublished.

FRANCESCO MAZZOLA, called PARMIGIANINO
(Parma 1503- Casal Maggiore 1540)

P9. Lorenzo Cybo and His Page
Oil on canvas, 50 x 41 inches
Inscribed lower right: LAVENTIVS CYBO MAIC MASSAE ATQVE COMES FERENTILLI ANNO M.D. XXIII (1532)
Lent by the Columbia Museum of Art
Provenance: Contessa Prenanelli Cybo; Marchese Strozzi (son of Contessa Frenanelli Cybo), Florence; Wildenstein & Co., Inc., New York City


Parmigianino was one of the most influential Mannerist painters, whose complex restless diagonal patterns and the erotic character of his gracefully elongated figures, became the typical features of the style.

Lorenzo Cybo was Captain of the Papal Guard and this portrait was painted in Rome. There is another version of this canvas in the Royal Museum of Art, Copenhagen (no. 533), which Freedberg considers an authentic work by Parmigianino and the Columbia picture a copy of it; Berenson and Offner attribute this painting to Parmigianino. Vasari mentioned Captain Cybo as "a very handsome man, who heard the art of Francesco praised and had his portrait painted by him" (Vasari, Vite, V. p. 224).

FRANCESCO MAZZOLA, called PARMIGIANINO
(Parma 1503- Casal Maggiore 1540)

P10. Portrait of a Lady
Oil on canvas, 43 1/2 x 36 5/8 inches
Lent by Mr. Walter P. Chrysler, Jr.
Provenance: Ercole Coccapani, Modena; Private Collection, New York City; Newhouse Galleries, New York City.

Exhibitions: Italian Renaissance and Baroque Paintings from the Collection of Walter P. Chrysler, Jr., Norfolk Museum of Arts and Sciences, Norfolk, Virginia, 1968, no. 9, p. 13, illustrated.


According to Froelich-Bum this portrait must represent a great lady as it is proven by her elegant attire and her handdress and dates this magnificent portrait about 1535.

FRANCESCO MORANDINI, called IL POPPI
(Parma 1544-Florence 1597)

P11. The Deposition
Oil on panel, 47 7/8 x 34 1/2 inches
Lent by Mr. Edmund Pillsbury
Il Poppi was a friend of Giorgio Vasari with whom he worked in 1565 on the project for the wedding of Francesco de Medici and Giovanna of Austria. He also participated in the decoration of the Studiolo of Francesco I in the Palazzo Vecchio between 1570-73. In his early work II Poppi shows an influence of Parmigianino (particularly in the Studiolo decoration representing Alexander the Great
Giving Campaspe to Apelles) but later turned more toward the style of Pontormo and Vasari. Unpublished.

LELIO ORSI
(Reggio c. 1511-Novellara 1587)

P12. Noli Me Tangere
Oil on canvas, 36 x 29 1/2 inches
Lent by the Wadsworth Atheneum
Summer Fund, 1936
Provenance: Chiesa Collection, Milan, Italy; Ehrich Galleries, New York City; Durlacher Brothers, New York City
We know very little about the life and work of Orsi, and, as a matter of fact, there is not a painting recorded or signed by him. From the attributed works are evident his debts to Michelangelo, Correggio and Northern artists.
Noli Me Tangere is a typical painting by Orsi in which the exaggeration of the proportions, elongated figures and fantastic landscape, also characterize the Mannerist style. R. Longhi records a drawing for this painting in the Fourche Collection in the Orleans Museum (see above mentioned article by T. Kunze, p. 59).

SCIPIONE PULZONE, called IL GAETANO
Gaeta c. 1550-Rome 1598)

P.13 Portrait of a Lady
Oil on canvas, 18 3/4 x 14 1/2 inches
Lent by Mr. Victor D. Spark
Provenance: Mary E. Tiruby
Exhibitions: Pontormo to Greco, John Herron Art Museum, Indianapolis, 1954, No. 20, illustrated (as Alessandro Allori); The Joe and Emily Lowe Art Gallery, University of Miami, Coral Gables, 1956; Columbus Museum of Art, Columbus, 1956.
Bibliography: F. Zeri, Pittura e controriforma, Torino, 1957, reproduced on cover and illustrated No. 86.
Most of his mature period Pulzone spent in Rome but several visits to Florence made him aware of the happenings in this city. He was best known for his portraits but also executed some religious paintings in which he emphasized the Mannerist extravagance in color and design typical of the period.
Friedlaender attributed this painting to Allori and as such was exhibited in Indianapolis; the attribution to Pulzone by F. Zeri is correct and this painting has all the characteristics of the Pulzone fashionable portraits.
A very similar portrait of the same personality and evidently by the same hand was sold in London (Christie's, Fine Paintings by Old Masters, July 26, 1966, no. 92, illustrated), as Florentine, circa 1580 and the sitter was identified as "Anne of Austria," the daughter of Filip III of Spain.
Anne of Austria died in 1566, and therefore this could not be a portrait representing her. I am grateful to Robert L. Manning for bringing this information to my attention.

FRANCESCO DEI ROSSI, called FRANCESCO SALVIATI
(Florence 1510-Rome 1563)

P14. Portrait of a Gentleman
Oil on canvas, 48 1/2 x 36 3/4 inches
Lent by the Metropolitan Museum of Art
Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Nate B. Spengold, 1955
Salviati studied with Andrea del Sarto and during his activity in Florence became a close friend of Vasari, who in a detailed biographical note in his Vite describes the neurotic behaviour of Salviati.
Most of his mature activity Salviati divided between Florence and Rome and some shorter visits to Venice and France and he worked with a variety of media and subjects: oil, fresco, designer of tapestries, altarpieces and portraits. His adopted name he took from the Cardinal Salvati, who was one of his first patrons.
In this portrait Salvati, who with such brilliancy depicts an almost mirror-image of his sitter, shows his great ability as a portrait painter.

JAN VAN DER STRAET, called STRADANUS
(Bruges 1523-Florence 1605)

P15. The Charity of St. Nicholas
Oil on panel, 25 3/8 x 38 1/8 inches
Lent by the Columbia Museum of Art
Samuel H. Kress Collection
Provenance: Countess Reppi, Rome (?) ; Count Contini-Bonacossi, Rome; Samuel H. Kress Collection, 1930
Bibliography:

Provenance: Medici Collection, Florence; Riccardi Collection, Florence; Wengraf, Old Masters Gallery, London

Exhibitions:


Santi di Tito first studied with Sebastian da Montecarlo and also with Baccio Bandinelli and Angelo Bronzino. He was one of the important younger Mannerists, who in spite of the evident influence by Bronzino, succeeded in developing his own style. In 1556 Santi di Tito went to Rome and worked on several projects. In 1564 he returned to Florence and was commissioned to work on Michelangelo's funeral. His later style became more academic as compared with the rest of the artists working around Vasari.

Bertina Suida Manning correctly recognized an influence by Bronzino but suggested a strong individual approach to portrait: "more direct and with fewer psychological complications." Also this portrait has some resemblance with known portraits of Francesco de Medici, particularly with a portrait by Bronzino, which appeared on the New York market in 1957, in "the shape of the head, the line of the eyebrows, the nose, the mouth, even the ears."

GIORGIO VASARI
(Arezzo 1511-Florence 1574)

P17. Announcement

Oil on panel, 26 3/4 x 33 inches

Lent by the University of Notre Dame Art Gallery

Provenance: Collection of Charles A. Wightman


Since on many occasions in this catalogue reference will be made to the works and life of Giorgio Vasari, we will in this first entry record only the most essential information. Giorgio Vasari began his artistic career in the studio of Guglielmo di Pietro de Marchiatt, a glass and fresco painter in Arezzo. In 1524 Vasari left for Florence through the help of Cardinal Silvio Passerini and met Salvati Andrea del Santo and Baccio Bandinelli. In 1527 he returned to Arezzo after the expulsion of the Medicis from Florence, but in 1529 Vasari was again in Florence. Following an invitation by Cardinal Ippolito de' Medici in 1531, Vasari left for Rome where he studied extensively the works of Michelangelo, Raphael, and Peruzzi. In 1532 he returned to Florence working for Alessandro and Ottaviano Medici.
where he began his prolific career as a painter and architect.
After some works in Rome, near Bologna and Venice, Vasari began the decoration of his house in Arezzo, Casa Vasari, in 1542. Two years later Vasari finished the decoration of a sala in the Cancelleria in Rome with the scenes from the life of the Pope Paul III; in the same year he started to work on his "Vite." Vasari married Nicoletta Baccio in 1549 and finally moved with his family to Florence in 1554–55, where he was to work in the service of Cosimo I de' Medici on the Palazzo Vecchio. Until his death Vasari was directly or indirectly involved in all of the important decorative or building projects in Florence and Rome. A friend of Michelangelo and of the most illustrious Florentines, Vasari became a central artistic figure and a leading connoisseur of the arts, as evidenced in his "Vite," a monumental work on artists and arts from Gimabue to Titian.

The "Annunciation" panel entered the collection of the University of Notre Dame in 1924 as a gift of Charles A. Wrightman and was called "Florentine School." Prof. Zeri attributed the panel to Vasari and this attribution was also accepted by Edmund Pillsbury as an early work. Probably painted in the early 1540s, this painting could be compared with an engraving by Marco Dente da Ravenna (no. G2) traditionally attributed to a copy after a lost work by Raphael. Pillsbury also has rightly pointed to the precedents of this composition in the works of Saviti "Annunciation in the S. Francesco a Ripa, Rome" and Perino del Vaga ("Annunciation in the Pucci Chapel in S. Trinita dei Monti").

While in this early "Annunciation" Vasari puts the emphasis on the interior with all the accessories, rather than on the figures, a manner familiar in the Flemish paintings (see Stradanus, no. P15), in the Louvre "Annunciation" (no. 732) a later work, done for the high altar in the church of S. Maria Novella in Arezzo, the figures play a dominant role.

GIOVANNI BATTISTA VASARI
(Arezzo 1511-Florence 1574)

P.18. The Temptation of St. Jerome
Oil on panel, 65 3/8 x 47 1/2 inches
Lent by The Art Institute of Chicago Collection: Charles H. and Mary F. S. Worcester Vasari recorded in his "Vite" (ed. Milanesi, Vol. VII, p. 669) that he "did a Venus and a Leda for M. Ottaviano de' Medici from the cartoons of Michelangelo and a life-size St. Jerome in penitence, contemplating a crucifix and beating his breast, to drive away the lascivious thoughts that beset him in the wilderness, as he himself relates. To indicate this I did Venus fleeing with Cupid in her arms and leading Play, the quiver and arrows strewing the ground." Two other versions of this subject are known: one in the Pitti Palace and the other in the Leeds City Art Gallery in England. The Pitti and Leeds versions are very similar to each other, the Chicago version shows several deviations from the other two (see no. P18a) and this is perhaps the reason that the Chicago version was questioned in the past as an authentic Vasari. The smaller figures in the Chicago version and a more sketchy approach might be that Vasari changed the first idea and decided to introduce the figures on a more monumental scale and eliminate the elaborate landscape, replace the doves and add the Cupid in the upper right corner.

shown only in Notre Dame.

Unpublished

GIOVANNI BATTISTA VASARI
(Arezzo 1511-Florence 1574)

P.19. St. Mary Magdalen
Oil on panel, 34 3/8 x 25 5/8 inches

Dr. Suida dated this painting around 1560. The additions to all four sides of this painting have been removed and the "Holy Family" is reproduced here in its original size; the Brogi photograph No. 17642 clearly indicates the removed parts.

As in the "Holy Family" by an Anonymous painter (no. P1) in this painting we note the influence of Vasari's teacher, Andrea del Sarto, particularly reflected in the figure of St. Joseph.

shown only in Binghamton.

GIOVANNI BATTISTA VASARI
(Arezzo 1511-Florence 1574)

P.20. Holy Family
Oil on panel, 51 1/4 x 34 1/2 inches

The additions to all four sides of this painting have been removed and the "Holy Family" is reproduced here in its original size; the Brogi photograph No. 17642 clearly indicates the removed parts.

As in the "Holy Family" by an Anonymous painter (no. P1) in this painting we note the influence of Vasari's teacher, Andrea del Sarto, particularly reflected in the figure of St. Joseph.

shown only in Binghamton.

GIOVANNI BATTISTA VASARI
(Arezzo 1511-Florence 1574)

P.21. Abraham and Melchisedek
Oil on canvas, 23 5/8 x 17 1/8 inches

This painting is attributed to Vasari by Dr. Suida and Prof. Zeri and could be related in style and composition to the "Conversion of Saul" in the San Pietro in Montorio dated in the early 1550s.
P2. The Baptism of Christ

DOMENICO BECCAFUMI

P3. A Vision of St. Catherine of Siena

DOMENICO BECCAFUMI
P4. The Holy Family with St. John

GIOVANNI FRANCESCO BEZZI,
called NOSADELLA
P5. Madonna and Child with Two Angels

JACOPO CARRUCCI, called IL PONTORMO
P7. Portrait of a Young Lady

AGNOLO BRONZINO, Circle of
P9. Lorenzo Cybo and His Page

FRANCESCO MAZZOLA
called PARMIGIANINO
P11. *The Deposition*  

FRANCESCO MORANDINI  
called IL POPPI
PI2. *Noli Me Tangere*

LELIO ORSI
P14. Portrait of a Gentleman

FRANCESCO SALVIATI
P15. The Charity of Saint Nicholas

GIOVANNI STRADANUS
P15a. The Charity of Saint Nicholas
Courtesy of Mr. Kurt Meissner, Zurich

GIOVANNI STRADANUS

P15b. The Charity of Saint Nicholas
Engraving, 10 3/4 x 15 3/4 inches
Courtesy of the Samuel H. Kress Foundation

GIOVANNI STRADANUS
P16. Portrait of a Young Man

SANTI DI TITO
P18a. *The Temptation of St. Jerome*
Palazzo Pitti

GIORGIO VASARI
(photo Alinari)
P19. St. Mary Magdalen

GIORGIOVASARI
P21. Abraham and Melchizedek

GIORGIO VASARI
The Role of the Concept of Disegno in Mid-Sixteenth Century Florence

Of all the terms relevant to Italian mid-sixteenth century aesthetics, disegno is perhaps the most fundamental. In connection with this exhibition, it is fitting to consider its significance to Florentine artists and theorists of the period. Roughly, although inadequately, translatable as “design,” the word has acquired a complexity of meaning at least as challenging as that of its English counterpart. It is thus appropriate to begin this study with a discussion of the major connotations carried by the term in mid-sixteenth century Italy. These connotations have been touched upon by modern scholarship, but those most significant for the period—namely the association of disegno with composition, with proportion, and with beauty—have not so far received adequate attention. The present essay re-examines and reassesses this association.

The Meaning of Disegno

Throughout the Renaissance, the most elementary connotations of disegno and its verb disegnare concerned the activity of drawing, the skill in that activity, and the resultant product. A disegno, in this context, was simply “a drawing,” a representation made up of outlines and, where present, light and shade.

The situation was different when it came to apply the terms to painting. The tendency here was to view light and shade in intimate relationship with color, and to consider the disegno as residing solely in the outlines. We find this view already fully developed in the Quattrocento. When establishing the subdivisions of painting, Alberti for example, through the expression circumscriptione, strictly identified disegno with outlining: “circumscription is nothing but the disegnamento of the border . . . a good circumscription, that is, a good disegno . . . Having then finished circumscription, that is, the mode of disegnare . . .” [La circumscriptione è non altro che disegnamento del orlo . . . e uno buona circumscriptione, cioè uno buono disegnio . . . Finita adunque la circumscriptione, cioè il modo del disegnare . . .] Similarly, Piero della Francesca stated that “By disegno we mean the profiles and contours which are contained in the thing.” [Disegno intendiamo essere profili et contorni che nella cosa se contene].

Since the Albertian notion of disegno in relation to painting is of significance for an understanding of the concept of disegno in mid-sixteenth century, we shall investigate it more carefully. In so doing, we shall consider the outline with respect to two of its basic functions.

One of these functions is to set or establish a boundary to a form. Far from recommending a rigid, two-dimensional border, Alberti insisted that this boundary be smoothed out almost to extinction. For him, indeed, a good disegno meant first of all an outline which suggested continuity of the surface around the three-dimensional form represented: “Circumscription will describe the turning of the border in the painting . . . I thus say that this circumscription ought to be made up of lines most subtle, almost such as will tend to escape notice . . . Because circumscription is nothing but the disegnamento of the border, which, when done with
too apparent a line, will not indicate a margin of surface but a break, and I would wish that, in circumscribing, only the movement of the border be captured. In which thing, I affirm one ought to exercise a great deal. No composition and no reception of lights can be praised, where there not be a good circumscription added. And not seldom does one see a good circumscription, that is, a good disegno, by itself to be most pleasant.” [Sarà circumscriptione quella che descriva l’attorniare dell’orlo nella pittura. . . . Io così dico in questa circriscriptione molto doversi osservare ch’elle sia di linee sottilissime fatta, quasi tali che fuggano essere vedute. . . . Però che la cirriscriptione è non altro che disegnamento del orlo quale, ove sia fatto con linea troppo apparente, non dimostrerà ivi essere margine di superficie ma fessura et io desidererei nulla proseguirsi circonscrivendo che solo l’andare del orlo. In qual cosa così affermo debbano molto exercitarsi. Niuna compositione et niuno ricevere di lumi si può lodare ove non sia buona cirriscriptione aggiunta. Et non raro pur si vede solo una buona cirriscriptione, cioè uno buono disegnio, per se essere gratissimo].

A second basic function of the outline is to compose a form. By this is meant that the outline, in going around the form on the two-dimensional surface, builds it up, as it were, and structures it. In so doing, the outline accomplishes several things: in the case of the human figure for instance, it articulates the limbs and establishes the posture of the figure; it also establishes its proportions.

In the eyes of Alberti and indeed of virtually all Renaissance theorists, the establishment of proportions was of central importance, for they considered harmony of proportions the chief component of artistic beauty. Let us simply note here that for Alberti this task, which in some respects constituted the core of the compositional function of the outline, did not strictly belong to circriscriptione or disegno. It pertained to a broader activity dealing with the composition of the painting as a whole, and which he had appropriately entitled composizione. Thus we read, under this heading: “First one ought to make sure that all the members agree well. They will agree when in size, function, kind, color and other similar things they correspond to a unified beauty.” [Convieni inprima dare opera che tutti i membri bene convengano. Converranno quando et di grandezza et d’offitio et di spetie et di colore et d’altrre simili cose corrisponderanno ad una bellezza].

The sixteenth century substantially modified the Albertian approach to painting. It recognized the compositional function of the outline, especially the establishment of proportions, as fully pertaining to disegno. When convenient, it also admitted under disegno the compositional aspects of light and shade, so that the total anatomical constitution of the human figure could be evaluated in terms of disegno. As a corollary to the first of these theoretical transformations, the concept of harmonious proportion, central to the notion of artistic beauty, found itself brought under the direct jurisdiction of disegno.

The first attempt to codify this Cinquecento view was made by the Venetian Paolo Pino in 1548 in his Dialogo di Pittura. Rejecting Alberti’s division, Pino substituted the henceforth standard one of disegno, invention (invenzione), and coloring (colorire). He then proceeded to subdivide disegno into judgment (giudizio), circumscription (circumscrizione), practice (pratica), and composition (composizione). Of composizione, and thus of disegno, he wrote: “In it are included all the others, that is, judgment, circumscription, and practice, since this correct composition consists in the complete forming of the surfaces, which are part of the members, and of the members as part of the body, and of the body, then, as whole-
ness of the work.” [In questa s’include tutte l’altra, cioè il giudizio, la circoscrizione e la pratica, imperò che questa retta composizione consiste nel formar integralmente le superfìzie, le quali sono parti de’ membri, et i membri come parte del corpo, il corpo, poi, come integrità dell’opera]. He then added, still referring to composizione and therefore to disegno: “It gives the right portion to the whole.” [Questa dà la giusta porzione al tutto]. Earlier in the Dialogo, Pino had identified “right portion” (giusta porzione) with harmonious proportion and had even given a set of measurements with which to achieve it.

Interestingly enough, a second attempt to penetrate into the more fundamental function of disegno was soon made by another Venetian, Ludovico Dolce. In his Dialogo della Pittura of 1557, Dolce, like Pino, subdivides painting into disegno, invention and coloring. More openly than his predecessor, Dolce discusses proportion under disegno, like him giving a set of measurements for the ideal human body. He eventually comes to the conclusion that “proportion, then, being the main foundation of disegno, he who will observe the former better will be, in the latter, a better master.” [essendo adunque il principale fondamento del disegno la proporzione, chi questa meglio osserverà fia in esso miglior maestro]. This was tantamount to asserting that a master in disegno was first and foremost a master of proportions.

Neither Pino’s reworking of Alberti’s division nor Dolce’s remarks were dictated by mere literary fantasy. The concepts of composition, proportion, and beauty lie indeed at the core of the broader notion of disegno in mid-sixteenth century. It is, for instance, essentially around these concepts that Vasari’s definition and discussion of disegno in the preface to the third part of the Lives revolve: “Disegno was the imitation of the most beautiful of nature in all the figures ...” [Il disegno fu lo imitare il piu bello della natura in tutte le figure ...]. As applied to the painter, the contemporary expression aver disegno (which meant to be skilled in disegno) would then refer to his talent primarily in the composition of the individual human figure (chiefly through the outline, to be sure). In reference to the finished painting, on the other hand, the expression would correspondingly allude to its compositional excellence (chiefly linear), especially as realized in the forms individually considered. Dolce certainly had this quality in mind when he equated disegno and beauty in the following way: “about whatever thing, wishing to signify that it is beautiful, one says that it has disegno.” [di qualunque cosa, volendo significar che ella sia bella, si dice lei aver disegno]. The textual identification of disegno with harmonious proportion eventually came with the Milanese theoretician G. P. Lomazzo, whose Idea del Tempio of 1590 stated that: “The foundation of the whole ... upon which every thing rests as on a base of the greatest firmness, and from which derives all the beauty, is that which the Greeks call Eurythmy and we name disegno.” [Il fondamento di tutto ... sopra il quale ogni cosa come sopra saldissima base si riposa, ed onde deriva tutta la bellezza, è quello che i Greci chiamano Euritmia e noi nominiamo disegno].

The viewing of the disegno of a painting in compositional terms had an important effect on the theoretical attitude towards the three-dimensional arts. It stimulated a new awareness of the linearity embodied in the media of sculpture and architecture, and chiefly through this awareness it allowed a free extension of the term disegno and of its more pregnant connotations to these media.

Disegno had indeed been occasionally used by Quattrocento writers in reference to three-dimensional forms, but rather timidly. As regards architecture, for instance,
disegno and disegnare had tended to refer exclusively to the preparatory drawing and to its layout in the drawing medium. Alberti had, however, described how one could look at a building as a three-dimensional construction of lines (or, one might say, as a three-dimensional linear construction) independently of the matter, and recognize the same construction in buildings identically structured. Writing in Latin, he had given this construction the name lineamentum, and this was plainly translated as disegno in the 1550 Italian edition: “Neither has the disegno in itself the disposition to follow matter, but it is such that we know that the same disegno is in an infinite number of buildings, if only we see in them a same form, that is, if only their parts, and the site, and their orders be in everything similar among themselves in lines and angles.” [Ne hà il disegno in se instinto di seguitare la Materia, ma è tale che noi conosciamo che il medesimo disegno è in infiniti edificii, pur' che noi vegghiamo in essi una medesima forma, cioè pur' che le parti loro, & il sito, & gli ordini di quelle siano in tutto simili infra loro di linee, & di angoli]23

If then the finished building could be seen as embodying a disegno, and now that disegno had decisively come to be viewed in compositional terms, the path was entirely open to a qualitative discussion of the building itself in terms of disegno. Thus we see Vasari remark about the leaning Tower of Pisa, no doubt referring, in the expression disegno, to its compositional qualities and specifically to its proportions: “it is praised, not because it has disegno or beautiful manner, but only because of its extravagance, not seeming to the viewer that it could in any way sustain itself.” [è lodato, non perché abbia in sè disegno o bella maniera, ma solamente per la sua stravaganza, non parendo a chi lo vede che egli possa in niena guisa sostenersi].24 In the same mode of interpretation, an architect could be rated in terms of disegno according to his greater or lesser sense of composition. Here again Vasari provides the example: “in our times certain plebeian architects, presumptuous and without disegno, have made almost carelessly, without observing decorum, art, or any order, all their things monstrous and worse than the German.” [hanno a' tempi nostri certi architetti plebei, proastiontosi e senza disegno, fatto quasi a caso, senza servar decoro, arte o ordine nessuno, tutte le cose loro mostruose e peggio che le tedesche].25

A related development can be observed as regards sculpture. We do come upon direct connections between disegno and sculptured forms, in Quattrocento literature, but they remain rare and generally restricted to relief depictions. A fully isolated sculptured form could, however, be viewed as made up of outlines in a way comparable to a painted one, According to Leonardo da Vinci, the painter’s and sculptor’s tasks were identical precisely in this outline aspect: “The sculptor seeks only the outlines that surround the carved matter, and the painter seeks the same outlines and aside from these he seeks light and shade, color, and foreshortening, in which things nature constantly helps the sculptor.” [Lo scultore solo ricerca i lineamenti, che circondano la materia scult, et il pittore ricerca li medesimi lineamenti et oltre a quelli ricerca ombra e lume, colore, e scorso, delle quali cose la natura n'aiuta di continuo lo scultore]26 The sixteenth century painter Bronzino similarly considered the art of sculpture as consisting solely in the handling of the outlines: “the art consists only in the lines that surround the body, which [lines] are on the surface” [solo è dell’arte le linee che circondano detto corpo, le quali sono in superficie].27 Within this conception, a sculptured form in the round could then be viewed as possessing or lacking disegno basically in the same way as a painted one. Thus Vasari could write about Michelangelo's Pietà in St. Peter's: “to which work let no sculptor, nor rare artist, ever think that he could add in disegno or in grace.” [alla quale opera non pensi mai scultore, nè artefice raro, potere aggiungere
di disegno nè di grazia]. Likewise, a sculptor could be legitimately discussed as possessing or lacking disegno without any necessary allusion to his talent as a draftsman, but with specific reference to his ability to properly compose the human figure (individually considered) in his own sphere. It is strictly in agreement with this interpretation that Francesco da Sangallo expressed the following: "any sculptor needs to have, not like the painter, excellent disegno, but more, if more be possible, with respect to the diversity of the statues which he makes; because, as I would say, in regards to the nude which the painter will make, the sculptor, wishing to make the same, is required to make many in a single one, with respect to the numerous views, since at every successive glance the round statue becomes another. Thus the painter with a unique view makes a unique figure, and the sculptor in a unique figure makes many with respect to the many views, as I said above. And returning, I say that it will be necessary for the sculptor to have more disegno."

The definitive inclusion of the compositional aspect of the outline under the aegis of disegno, and the full extension of this concept to the media of sculpture and architecture, contributed to the advent of an important notion: that of an art of disegno distinct from, although based upon, the one strictly associated with the drawing medium; a generic art form embracing all three arts of painting, sculpture, and architecture. The fundamental element involved in this arte del disegno is still—as in the case of drawing—line. But whereas in drawing we are dealing with lines traced with a drawing instrument, the lines involved in the new arte del disegno are those which we observe in the finished product, be the latter a painting, a sculpture, or a building. Arte del disegno, in its new sense, may therefore justifiably be called the art of "linear construction," or of "linear structure." Whoever practices the art of architecture, sculpture, or painting could thus be said to practice the art of "linear construction," irrespective of whether he uses preparatory drawings or not—simply because he is concerned with the creation, in whatever medium, of linear constructions (or linear structures). It is with this concept in mind, however confused, that the sculptor Vincenzo Danti could thus define arte del disegno: "I say that this art of disegno is the one which, as a genus, includes under itself the three most noble arts of architecture, sculpture, and painting of which each one, by itself, is like a species of it." [Questa arte, dico, del disegno è quella che, come genere, comprende sotto di sé le tre nobilissime arti architettura, scultura e pittura, delle quali ciascuna, per sé stessa, è come specie di quella].

There was room for confusion, especially because all three arts generally made use of drawing; and confusion did indeed generally prevail. The expression le arti del disegno (the arts of disegno), for instance, could mean either the arts that use the drawing medium or the arts concerned with the creation of linear constructions—or, most generally, an inextricable mixture of the two. Similarly, disegno as the foundation of painting, sculpture, and architecture could be interpreted as drawing or as linear structure, irrespective of the medium in which this linear structure is embodied. It is the latter sense that Francesco da Sangallo clearly alluded to when he wrote: "I say that it will be necessary for the sculptor to have more disegno; and
since the latter is the foundation of every art, not only of these, it follows that sculpture is more difficult in this respect" [dico che allo scultore gli sarebbe necessario avere più disegno, lo quale, per essere il fondamento d'ogni arte, non solo di queste, ne seguita che la scultura in questo è più difficile].

As a result of the transformations that we have been discussing, disegno provided a banner under which architects, sculptors, and painters could unite. This solidarity through disegno is expressed in the way all three came to be generically referred to as Artefici del Disegno32 (and later as Professori del Disegno), and in the way all came to be grouped cohesively in the Accademia del Disegno.33 This Academy, founded in Florence by Vasari in 1563, was the first association of its kind and the ancestor of all the later academies and schools of "design."

It remains true that drawing was the instrument common to all these artists and that the teachings of the Academy seem to have been intended to center on the discipline of drawing (therefore partly justifying the term). But the new connotations acquired by disegno—whereby in painting, sculpturing, or in devising a work of architecture one was creating a linear construction (or a linear structure) in which, specifically in its proportions, resided the core of potential beauty—undoubtedly played an important role in bringing about a disegno coalition on such a scale. A significant clue to this is given in the Code of Rules of the Accademia, where the organization is referred to as the Accademia dell'Arte del Disegno and where, in the opening article, l'arte del disegno is unambiguously referred to in generic terms and not as the art of drawing: "Having, the year 1239 (sic), considered the masters, who were then the heads of the art of disegno, that its birth and first restoration was due, in architecture, to M. Arnolfo di Lapo, excellent architect, in the building of S.Maria del Fiore, and to M. Giotto di Bondone da Vespignano, who was then the guiding light in drawing (disegno), painting, and mosaic, and to M. Andrea di Nino Pisano, most excellent master of sculpture and bronze casting; and as heads of these most noble arts. . . . " [Havendo l'anno 1239 considerato i maestri, i quali furono allhora capi dell'arte del disegno, che la sua nascita et prima rinovazione fu nell'Architettura per M.o Arnolfo di Lapo architettetto ecc. te nella fabbrica di Santa Maria del Fiore, e per M.o Giotto di Bondone da Vespignano, allhora prima luce del disegno, della pittura et del mosaico, et per M.o Andrea di Nino Pisano nella scultura e nel getto del bronzo m.o ecc.mo; e come capi di queste nobilissime arti, . . .].

The New Status of Drawings

Throughout the Trecento and the early part of the Quattrocento, most of the preparatory drawing activity in the creation of a painting took place on its support.35 Indeed, the number of preliminary drawings on paper was certainly limited, a fact that partially explains the scarcity of such extant drawings. This scarcity may be accounted for by yet another factor: the contemporary lack of interest in the preparatory stages of a painting. Drawing tended to be considered totally subservient to the finished product. As a rule, preparatory studies on paper were not found more worthy of independent preservation than the studies that remained buried beneath the paint. Although some were retained in the workshop for future reference or for the purpose of study, most would have been discarded in the belief that their value had ceased with the completion of the painting.
The introduction of the cartoon, in mid-Quattrocento, altered this situation by establishing drawing on paper as the natural medium for the preparation especially of the fresco. At first limited to single figures, the cartoon came to be a full-size preparatory model of the whole. This meant that the entire composition would be worked out in detail on paper, until the artist was satisfied that the only element missing was color. In larger undertakings the artist might involve himself only up through this stage, and leave the transfer of the cartoon to the wall and the execution in paint to assistants.\(^{36}\)

This new procedure was of great significance. Perhaps most important of all, it stimulated a reconsideration of the role of drawing in the creation of a painting. If, until then, drawing had been regarded as little more than a link between the artistic conception and the finished product, it now came to be looked on as possessing a significance of its own, and as constituting a point of arrival in its own right. At first restricted to the cartoon, this notion was eventually extended to any creative drawing. In the second edition of his Lives, Vasari coined a definition expressive of the new attitude. He applied to the medium of drawing a notion first formulated by the ancient Greeks: that the work of art materializes a form pre-existing in the mind of the artist.\(^{37}\) Drawing, he implied, is the stage at which this materialization takes place, and a drawing is nothing less than a visible expression of the concept formed in the mind: “One may conclude that this drawing is nothing but a visible expression and declaration of the concept which one has in the mind” [. . . , si può concludere che esso disegno altro non sia che una apparenne espressione e dichiarazione del concetto che si ha nell’animo. . . . ]\(^{38}\)

The reconsideration of drawing was given a further impetus by a particular development in the technique of drawing on paper. Until the later Quattrocento, as Gombrich pointed out, “it remains remarkable how rare even small pentimenti are in drawings. As a rule, if one of these artists did have doubts about which pattern to adopt for a composition, he preferred to begin afresh, to draw two or more alternatives side by side.”\(^{39}\)

It was given to Leonardo da Vinci to liberate drawing from such inhibitions. The method Leonardo devised consists in first laying down the components of a composition without insisting on their definition: “Sketch subject pictures quickly and do not give the limbs too much finish; [only] indicate their position.”\(^{40}\) The draftsman was then to adjust and correct the forms again and again with pentimenti until the desired outline was finally chosen. This was truly a new exploitation of the drawing medium, whereby the working creativity of the mind was registered more spontaneously.

Leonardo was well aware of the revolutionary character of his method and he justified it by comparing it with the poet’s working method: “Now have you never thought about how poets compose their verse? They do not trouble to trace beautiful letters nor do they mind crossing out several lines so as to make them better.”\(^{41}\) Expressed at a time when painting was struggling for recognition among the liberal arts, such remarks must have encouraged recognition of the potential connections between artistic creativity and the drawing medium.\(^{42}\) Along with the new method itself, they would also have easily stimulated in the contemporaries a new curiosity about drawings.

Chiefly as a result of these developments, drawings in the sixteenth century acquired a new status: their association with creativity and with artistic genius became openly recognized and they enjoyed a new level of appreciation. The drawings of
the greater artists became particularly sought after, Pietro Aretino's request to Michelangelo is an illuminating testimony to the value that could be attached to them: "But why, my Lord, do you not reward this great devotion of mine—I who bow to your celestial qualities—with a relic of these sheets that are less precious to you? Certainly I would appreciate two traces of charcoal on a sheet more than so many goblets and chains which this and that prince ever offers me." [Ma perché, o Signore, non remunerei voi la cotanta divozione di me, che inchino le celesti qualità di voi, con una reliquia di quelle carte, che vi son meno care? Certo che apprezzeresti due segni di carbone in un foglio più, che quante coppe e catene mi presentò mai questo principe, e quello].

Drawings, indeed, came to be valued not only aesthetically, but for what they might disclose about the artistic personality of the artist. More specifically, they would be scrutinized for aspects which the finished works might not reveal, and in this the drawing decisively took on the value of complement to the finished work. In some cases an artist's drawings could even be judged of more aesthetic merit than his paintings, as in the case of Vasari's estimate of Giulio Romano: "One could affirm that Giulio always expressed his concepts better in drawings than in the execution or in paintings, for in the former one can see more vivacity, vigour and feeling." [si può affermare che Giulio esprimesse sempre meglio i suoi concetti nei disegni che nell'operare o nelle pitture, vendendosi in quelli più vivacità, fiera ed affetto].

A logical consequence of the new interest in drawings was that they came to be collected on a systematic basis, in a spirit that has continued to the present day. If until then they had been preserved mostly as study material or as objects of curiosity, they now began to be gathered for historical purposes, and the ground was laid for a wholly self-sufficient field of connoisseurship and aesthetic satisfaction. Giorgio Vasari was the first collector of drawings in the modern sense. His Libro de' Disegni, meant as a graphic illustration to his Lives, was the first compilation of drawings that aimed at the new ideal. Included in it were specimens by artists ranging from Cimabue to his own contemporaries. This exhibition presents two drawings that were originally part of Vasari's collection (cat. nos. D5, D25). It is further testimony of the new status drawings had achieved that Vasari framed the great majority in his Libro with highly decorative, individually conceived borders.

**The Practical Importance of Drawing**

Drawing, in sixteenth century Florence, played a major role in nearly all the visual arts. It was the most common means of giving birth to a project and of developing it, often as far as its final configuration. The convenience of its handling had also established it as the most natural visual means of communication between the patron and the artist, especially when distance separated them. For these reasons alone, draftsmanship was a primary requirement for any serious aspiring artist.

The Quattrocento had already acknowledged the importance of the discipline of drawing, especially for the painter, the sculptor, and the architect. Ghiberti, for instance, had declared it the most determining condition of excellence for both the painter and the sculptor: "the more accomplished he will be [in drawing], the more perfect will be the sculptor, and likewise the painter" [quanto sarà piu perito nel disegno], tanto sarà perfettissimo lo scultore e così il pittore]. Filarete had similarly
recognized it as a necessity for the architect: “he needs to know the art of drawing” [bisogna che sappia l’arte del disegno].

The mid-sixteenth century Florentine attitude towards the medium was basically a continuation and a deepening of these ideas. In the section which he added at the beginning of Della Pittura in the second edition of his Lives, Vasari attempted to codify the prevailing current notion by demonstrating that disegno, understood as the discipline of drawing, was truly the key to success in all three arts,

Vasari began by pointing out that the hand must be trained so as to materialize, in drawing, the concepts already existing in the artist’s mind: “But be as it may, this disegno needs, when it extracts from the judgment the invention of a certain thing, that the hand, through many years of study and practice, be swift and apt to draw and correctly express whatever nature has created, with pen, stylus, charcoal, pencil or other thing; because, when the intellect correctly sends out refined concepts, these hands that have practiced drawing for many years make known the perfection and excellence of the arts together with the knowledge of the artist.” [Ma sia come si voglia, questo disegno ha bisogno, quando cava l’invenzione d’una qualche cosa dal giudizio, che la mano sia, mediante lo studio ed esercizio di molti anni, spedita ed atta a disegnare ed esprimere bene qualunque cosa ha la natura creata, con penna, con stile, con carbone, con matita o con altra cosa: perché, quando l’intelletto manda fuori i concetti purgati e con giudizio, fanno quelle mani che hanno molti anni esercito il disegno, conoscere la perfezione ed eccellenza dell’arti, ed il saper dell’arteefice insieme]. But Vasari was also acquainted with sculptors who were not too proficient in drawing, primarily through lack of practice, and yet who could work in sculpture rather well. He therefore added—somewhat to the detriment of the theory he was interested in building up—that a sculptor can give excellent embodiment to his artistic concepts without recourse to drawing: “And since some sculptors at times do not have much practice in lines and contours, consequently they cannot draw on paper; these, in exchange, with beautiful proportion and measure, making, with earth or wax, men, animals and other things in relief, do the same as does the one who draws on paper or other flat surfaces perfectly.” [E perché alcuni scultori talvolta non hanno molto pratica nelle linee e ne’dintorni, onde non possono disegnare in carta: egli, in quel cambio, con bella proporzione e misura facendo con terra o cera uomini, animali ed altre cose di rilievo, fanno il medesimo che fa colui, il quale perfettamente disegna in carta o in su altri piani].

After enumerating the different types of drawing, Vasari then proceeded to describe the value that drawing could be to each one of the three arts. The aspect he focused on, and through which he correlated all three, was, understandably, the outline. For architecture this was easily established “because its disegni are composed only of lines; which so far as the architect is concerned are nothing but the beginning and end of his art, since the rest, with the aid of wooden models taken from the said lines, is nothing but the work of carvers and bricklayers” [perciocché i disegni di quella non son composti se non di linee: il che non è altro, quanto all’architetto, che il principio e la fine di quell’ arte, perché il restante, mediante i modelli di legname tratti dalle dette linee, non è altro che opera de scarpellini e muratori]. Sculpture was then treated: “in sculpture the drawing of all the contours is of use, because the sculptor uses it in going around from view to view, . . .” [nella scultura serve il disegno di tutti i contorni, perchè a veduta per veduta se ne serve lo scultore, . . .].

Painting was likewise treated, with the outlines as the focal point: “In painting, the line-drawings are useful in many ways, but particularly to outline every figure, . . .”
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[Nella pittura servono i lineamenti in più modi, ma particolarmente a d'intornare ogni figura,...]. Then came the conclusive statement: "Hence it follows that whoever understands and manages these lines correctly will be, with the aid of practice and judgment, most excellent in each one of these arts." [E di qui nasce, che chiunque intende e maneggia bene queste linee, sarà in ciascuna di queste arti, mediante la pratica ed il giudizio, eccellentissimo]. Thus had disegno, understood as the discipline of drawing, been established as the key to success in all three arts.

It is especially for the painter that drawing was most relevant, and Vasari came back to this idea repeatedly. Perhaps his most determined justification can be seen in his life of Titian. Expanding on what he had written on the subject at the beginning of Della Pittura, Vasari specified drawing as a necessity for the clarification of the invenzioni, since the mind cannot imagine them perfectly but needs their externalizing: "for him who wants to dispose his compositions and establish his inventions well, it is necessary that he should first lay them out on paper in different fashions, in order to see how the whole works out together. For the reason that the "idea" cannot see nor imagine the inventions perfectly within herself, if she does not reveal and show her concept to the eyes of the body so that the latter may help her to form a good judgment" [è necessario a chi vuol bene disporre i componimenti ed accomodare l'invenzioni, che'fa bisogno prima in più modi differenti porle in carta, per vedere come il tutto torna insieme. Concosciachè l'idea non può vedere nè immaginare perfettamente in se stessa l'invenzioni, se non apre e non mostra il suo concetto agli occhi corporali che l'aiutino a farne buon giudizio]. The practice of drawing is also judged to fill the mind with beautiful artistic concepts: "Drawing on paper will fill the mind with beautiful concepts" [disegnando in carta, si viene a empiere la mente di bei concetti]. Drawing will also enable the artist to learn how to depict the objects of nature without needing them in front of him: "Drawing on paper... one learns to depict all the things in nature from memory, without needing to have them constantly before one's eyes" [disegnando in carta... s'impara a fare una mente tutte le cose della natura, senza avere a tenerle sempre dinanzi]. Vasari also held drawing to be invaluable for developing facility, ease, and judgment: "when one has formed one's hand by drawing on paper, one comes little by little to execute one's works in drawing and painting with greater ease; and so by practicing the art, one makes one's manner and judgment perfect, doing away with the labour and effort with which are executed the paintings" [quando altri ha fatto la mano disegnando in carta, si vien poi di mano in mano con più agevolezza a mettere in opera disegnando e dipingendo: e così facendo pratica nell'arte, si fa la maniera ed il giudizio perfetto, levando via quella fatica e stento con che si conducono le pitture]. Vasari likewise considered drawing essential to acquire command over the human figure: "one needs to give a great deal of study to the nudes, if one wishes to understand them well; which does not happen, nor is it possible, without laying them out on paper." [bisogna fare grande studio sopra gli immudi a volergli intender bene; il che non vien fatto, nè si può, senza mettere in carta]. It is, finally, in the repeated drawing of selected antique or modern works that the artist will learn how to endow natural forms with a degree of perfection not usually found in nature: "He who has not drawn much, nor studied selected antique or modern things, cannot work well from memory by himself; nor can he improve the things that are depicted from life by giving them that grace and perfection which art gives beyond the order of nature, since the latter ordinarily does some parts that are not beautiful" [chi non ha disegnato assai, e studiato cose scelte antiche o moderne, non può fare bene di pratica da sé né aiutare le cose che si ritranno dal vivo, dando loro quella grazia e perfezione che dà l'arte fuori dell'ordine della natura, la quale fa ordinariamente alcune parti che non son belle].
Such an all-out attempt to justify drawing arose out of Vasari's disapproval of Giorgione for having initiated the method of developing a painting with the brush directly on canvas, without the required drawing stages. The typical Florentine method in Vasari's day had, on the contrary, remained essentially the same as that popularized in Rome and Florence during Raphael's lifetime: from its first intimation in the artist's mind, the concept would be evolved graphically on paper until its full clarification (to the exclusion of color) in the cartoon.

The first stage of this method "consisted of schizzi, or rough compositional sketches. Vasari described them as follows: "One makes them to find the manner of the attitudes, and the first composition of the work; they are made in the form of a blotch, and laid out by us only as a rough draft of the whole." [si fanno per trovar il modo delle attitudini, ed il primo componimento dell'opera; e sono fatti in forma di una macchia, ed accennati solamente da noi in una sola bozza del tutto]. A satisfactory composition of the whole having been arrived at (e.g. cat. no. D43), the artist would proceed to the second stage—although, needless to say, at all times was he liable to make drastic revisions. Here he might study specific aspects, such as the fall of light, or the grouping of a certain number of figures (e.g. cat. no. D21). He would also make individual studies of poses that gave him difficulty (e.g. cat. nos. D2 and D41). He might even wish to draw the whole figure composition in the nude so as to realize the anatomies with greater clarity (cat. no. D1). Unlike the practice in Raphael's time, when the artist would normally work assiduously from the model, the mid-century artist would, ideally, work from his own knowledge; but he might draw from life if (in Vasari's own words) he did not feel secure enough.

The third stage began with the layout of the whole in as finished a form as desired. This drawing would then be squared (see, for instance cat. nos. D48 and D40) and its content would be transferred to the cartoon, at the dimensions of the painting-to-be. Then, applying the cartoon to the surface to be painted, the artist would go over the outlines with an iron stylus so as to imprint them. This accomplished, the cartoon would be set up next to the area to be painted, and the artist would proceed to paint, closely following the distribution of light and shade embodied in the cartoon. As mentioned earlier, in larger undertakings the master might entrust the transfer of the cartoon and the execution in paint to assistants. In this case he would dictate the coloring and merely exercise supervision. The decoration of the Palazzo Vecchio by Vasari witnessed this procedure.

As should be expected, it is essentially around drawing that the education of the Florentine painter revolved, and copying was the first requirement. Among the antique works which he would have drawn were statues and architectural ornaments, but especially reliefs on both sarcophagi and arches. Chief among the modern works which he was expected to copy were those of Michelangelo, including his cartoon for the Battle of Cascina. The present exhibition includes a copy by Rosso Fiorentino (cat. no. D8) of Michelangelo's Apollo in the Bargello (Florence). Another important cartoon for copying, of which this exhibition offers a version (by Vasari himself; cat. no. D31), was the one for the Martyrdom of the Ten Thousand by Perino del Vaga. Vasari gives us an interesting glimpse into the role of drawing in the formation of the painter when telling about his trip to Rome with Francesco Salviati. They set out to draw all the significant works available, and to facilitate this coverage they divided them between themselves; their evenings were partly spent making sketches of each other's copies.
We saw earlier that possession of disegno, for the painter, referred primarily to his command over the composition of the individual human figure. It is first and foremost as the gradual perfection of this command that Vasari saw the history of painting to his own day. He indeed conceived of disegno thus understood as an ability which, having all but died out at the fall of the Roman Empire, was fully revived by Giotto and brought to perfection in the works of Michelangelo.

When Vasari’s conception of the history of painting appeared in the first edition of his Lives (in 1550), the achievements of Michelangelo in the composition of the human figure had already affected the course of Florentine painting radically. They had first of all contributed to establishing the human figure, especially the nude figure, as the central subject of painting. And this is indeed of itself an important characteristic of mid-sixteenth century Florentine painting. Secondly, they had contributed to establishing the composition of the figure as the major challenge and the foremost preoccupation of the painter. The more varied and complicated the poses, the more the artist would reveal his command of the human figure, and therefore the more he could claim the praise of his fellow citizens. In this challenge and in this preoccupation resides perhaps the single most comprehensive explanation of the contorted poses, the crowding of bodies, and the seemingly irrelevant display of muscular figures in the painting of the period. The three major contemporary examples from which the painter derived these interests were all Michelangelo’s works: the cartoon for the Battle of Cascina, the Sistine Ceiling, and the Last Judgment.

If we now turn to the repercussions that disegno (with more inclusive connotations) had on the Florentine attitude towards color, we find that in Vasari, for instance, there was, theoretically at least, no lack of interest in it. Color was recognized as the area where painting proved itself decisively superior to sculpture in its ability to materialize the transient phenomena of nature, the textural quality of human flesh ... etc. Vasari had, in fact, the highest respect for the coloring of artists like Correggio and Titian, and he admitted that the complete perfection of painting involved the perfection of both disegno and colorire. But he also recognized that such a perfection was very rarely attainable: “This art is so difficult and has so many main branches, that very often an artist is not able to practice them all to perfection. For there have been many who have drawn divinely, but have shown some imperfection in coloring; others have been marvelous in coloring, but have not drawn half as well.” [E quest’arte tanto difficile ed ha tanti capi, che uno artefice bene spesso non li può tutti fare perfettamente; perchè molti sono che hanno disegnato divinamente, e nel colorire hanno avuto qualche imperfezione; altri hanno colorito maravigliosamente, e non hanno disegnato alla metà]. And he added that these difficulties were partly due to training, which might lead one painter to specialize from youth in disegno and another to concentrate on color: “All this arises from judgment and from the practice which is taken in youth: for one it will be in disegno, and for another it will be in color.” [Questo nascie tutto dal giudizio e da una pratica che si piglia da giovane, chi nel disegno e chi sopra i colori].

Since the education of the Florentine artist centered on disegno, it was to be expected that his handling of color should not as a rule reach that perfection which Vasari had in mind. The very method of preparing and evolving a painting, and
the belief that it was in qualities of draftsmanship that the core of artistic excellence lay, also predisposed him to a lesser interest in color. And this predisposition partly explains the relatively dry coloring of the painting of the period. On the other hand, an artist of exceptional stature like Salviati could occasionally rise to levels of coloring decidedly superior. The rich, vibrating chiaroscuro of his frescoes in the Oratorio of San Giovanni Decollato in Rome demonstrates this very clearly. But the more normal Florentine color quality of the period should not be seen exclusively in negative terms: the linear content of Florentine painting was positively motivated as well, and moreover we shall now see how both linearity and color were really complementary to one another.

The essentially linear treatment of form had been common to pre-High Renaissance painting as a whole, and it is a commonplace to say that Leonardo brought about a revolution in this domain with his sfumato. His motivations had been, among others, partly naturalistic (integration of the forms in air and atmosphere) and partly logical (line does not exist in nature and therefore ought to have no place in a painting). This is the attitude which was adopted by artists like Raphael, Fra Bartolommeo, and Correggio. In the Doni Holy Family, on the other hand, Michelangelo had resisted Leonardo's innovation and proclaimed the integrity of the outline and the purity of the silhouette.

This linear mode of circumscription found popularity among mid-sixteenth-century Florentine painters under the stimulus of a variety of interests. One of the most important of these was the interest in the qualities of antique relief sculpture, and in relief (rilievo) in general. It remains true that Leonardo had been no less concerned with rilievo, but he had sought to accommodate it mainly to his naturalistic ambitions. In so doing, however, he had caused the painted form to weaken or to lose in strength of pure sculptural presence. It is such a presence that Michelangelo had attempted to recapture in the Doni Holy Family, and with which the mid-century artists, following Michelangelo, continued to be preoccupied.

Interest in the technical mastery of the human figure (or in disegno thus understood) was equally a major factor in dictating the mid-century attitude towards the outline. For if the ability to compose the human figure (or, one might say, to draw the human figure) constitutes the single most important ambition of the painter, it follows that he ought to avoid anything that would tend to veil or obscure not only this ability, but the structural and plastic values of the figure. Anything, on the other hand, that would bring out this ability and project these values in a more arresting and compelling manner should be exploited. The graphic treatment of form as we find it in the painting of that period does precisely that. The values just mentioned are, in fact, partly dependent on it for their very level of quality. The blurring of the outlines was thus as inimical to Florentine aesthetic ideals as it was to the artist's display of his own command over the human figure. That the latter was of the highest importance is brought home in frequent references. Vasari, for instance, advocated the practice of drawing so that the artist would not be forced "to conceal beneath the loveliness of colors the painful [result] of not knowing how to draw." [avere a nascere sotto la vaghezza de' colori lo stento del non sapere disegnare].

A similar discussion applies to color. In a mid-sixteenth century Florentine painting, color was assigned a very definite role: that of contributing to the formal clarification and articulation of the forms, and to the assertion and projection of their structural and plastic values. But in so doing it was made to take a secondary position and to relinquish the richness which one admires in a Venetian painting.
Deep shadows, particularly, were to be avoided. Just as the contours were forced to stiffen in order to project the structural and plastic values of the figures more eloquently, likewise color was compelled to adopt a more frozen mien in order to render this projection more assertive. Both were really meant to work hand in hand. The most distinguished representative of this sculptural mode of vision operating in Florence was Bronzino. Unusually gifted in color, Bronzino usually succeeded in preserving a purity of atmosphere totally devoid of the dryness one generally finds in his Florentine contemporaries.
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Notes

1. This essay has been written in the context of a larger study (which will be submitted as a doctoral dissertation) dealing with the concept of disegno during the Renaissance and afterwards. I wish to acknowledge my deep indebtedness to Professor Craig Hugh Smyth for his guidance and encouragement. I also wish to express my gratitude to the Samuel H. Kress Foundation for a grant which has made possible the continuation of this research.

2. See the entry for instance in the Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca (various editions).

3. Among the more important works incorporating discussions on the concept of disegno for the period under consideration, the following may be cited: K. Birch-Hirschfeld, Die Lehre von der Materie im Cinquecento (Rome, 1912); E. Panofsky, Idea, first publ. 1924, trans. by J. Peake (Columbia, S.C., 1968); L. Grassi, Storia del Disegno (Rome, 1947); idem, Il Disegno Italiano dal Trecento al Seicento (Rome, 1956); and J. Rouchette, La Renaissance que nous a légué Vasari (Paris, 1959). The references in this essay will be kept at a minimum.


5. Ibid., p. 82. Alberti, p. 87.

6. Ibid., p. 87.


8. Alberti, op. cit., p. 82.

9. One of the conveniences of this characterization was that it could apply to an architectural construction as well as to a human body. Significantly, Alberti's most ambitious definitions of beauty are found in his architectural treatise, De Re Aedificatoria. For example, in Book IX: "Thus we may say that beauty is a certain agreement and harmony of parts within that to which they belong, with regard to a definite number, proportionality and order, such as concinnity (i.e., the absolute and primary law of nature) demands." (Translation taken from Panofsky, op. cit., p. 54). On this subject see especially Panofsky, idem, pp. 47f.


12. Ibid., p. 114.

13. Ibid., p. 114.

14. Ibid., p. 104. Elsewhere in the text, Pino had defined beauty mainly in terms of proportion: "altro non è bellezza, in ciascuna specie creata, ch'una commensurazione e corrispondenza de' membri prodotti dalla natura senza alcuno impedimento de mali accidenti." (p. 98).


16. Earlier Dolce had connected proportion and beauty in an uncompromising fashion: "Non procedendo la bellezza da altro, che da una convenevole proporzione che comunque ha il corpo umano, e particolarmente tra se ogni membro, et il contrario derivando da disproporzione" (ibid., p. 155).

17. Ibid., p. 176.

18. G. Vasari, Vite, ed. G. Milanesi (Florence, 1878-1881)—henceforth, in this essay, referred to as Vasari-Milanesi—IV, p. 8. It is true that Vasari, immediately after, discusses beauty of composition in the human figure under maniera. But the latter is not the specific constructive process that materializes this beauty of composition. Maniera controls what one could call the general style of the artistic creation (and by the same token of the work of art). Under its dependency fall qualities of color and invenzione as well as of disegno. This is made clear when Vasari says that until the third age maniera was still lacking in the following: "la copia de' belli abiti, la varietà di tante bizzarrie, la vaghezza de' colori, la universita ne' casamenti, e la lontananza e varietà ne' paesi" (IV, p. 9). Throughout the Lives, indeed, disegno irrevocably emerges as the most immediate and comprehensive regisseur of compositional qualities in the human figure (to the exclusion of color). On maniera, see G. H. Smyth, Manerism and Maniera (New York, 1962).

19. So far, our discussion of disegno has been focused on the composition of the single figure. The term could also be used to refer to the linear layout of the painting as a whole. Dolce, for instance, began by defining disegno as "la forma con che egli fa [invenzione] rappresenta" (op. cit., p. 164). But this application of disegno remained secondary at the time, even for Dolce, and it would be inappropriate to carry it along in our discussion. It is interesting to note that F. Baldinucci, a century later, defined the expression aevum disegno in terms of both aspects: "Aver disegno, termine de Pottori, e vale sapere ordinatamente disporre la [invenzione], dopo aver bene e aggiustamente delineata e contornata ogni figura, o altra cosa che si voglia rappresentare" (Vocabolario Toscano dell' Arte del Disegno, Florence, 1681, voce).


22. It is worth noting that the fifteenth century Filarete occasionally referred to the architectural model as a disegno rilevato or a disegno di legname (A. Filarete, Trattato di Architettura, ed. as Filarete's Treatise on Architecture by J. Spencer (New Haven, 1965), II, folio 8r).
significance of this use of disegno cannot be discussed here.
25. Ibid., I, p. 136.
30. V. Danti, Il primo libro del trattato delle perfette proporzioni (Florence, 1587) in Barocchi, op. cit., I, p. 236.
31. Sangallo, op. cit., p. 73.
32. E.g. in Vasari-Milanesi, I, p. 9.
33. On this Accademia, see N. Pevsner, Academies of Art, Past and Present (Cambridge, 1940), pp. 42ff.
34. As quoted by Pevsner, op. cit., p. 296.
36. This came to be a practice especially of Raphael and his circle.
37. On this notion in Antiquity, see Panofsky, op. cit., pp. 27ff.
38. Vasari-Milanesi, I, p 168. Vasari’s definition, expressed in 1568, also reflects the contemporary interest in clarifying the process of conception of the work of art. Already in 1549, in a book entitled Disegno (publ. in Venice), A. Doni had stated that “il disegno non e altro che speculazione divina che produce un’arte eccellentissima, talmente che tu non puoi operare cosa nessuna nella scultura, e nella pittura senza la guida di questa speculazione e disegno” (p. 7v). This subject, which is more suitably handled in the context of late sixteenth century theory, cannot be gone into here.
40. Quoted by Gombrich, op. cit., p. 60, from Leonardo’s Treatise on Painting.
41. Ibid., p. 59.
42. This was originally suggested to me by a passage in Prof. Smyth’s book, op. cit., p. 77, note 168.
44. Vasari-Milanesi, V, p. 528.
47. Filarete, op. cit., II, folio 113r.
49. Ibid., p. 169.
50. Ibid., p. 170.
51. Ibid., p. 170.
52. Ibid., p. 170.
53. Ibid., p. 170.
54. It is interesting to note that even within the Florentine ambiente, there were views at odds with this notion. Cellini, for instance, insisted that sculpture was the key to success in both painting and architecture (let alone in its own field): “La scultura e madre di tutte l’arte dove si interviene disegno, e quello che cara valente scultore e di buona maniera, gli sara facilissimo l’esser buon prospettivo e architetto e maggior pittor, che quegli che non posseggono la scultura” (Letter to Varchi in Barocchi, op. cit., I, p. 81).
56. Ibid., p. 427.
57. Ibid., p. 427.
58. Ibid., p. 427.
59. Ibid., p. 427.
60. Ibid., p. 447. Vasari and his contemporaries considered it the task of the painter to improve upon the forms of nature. This problem is beyond the scope of the present study.
62. A discussion of this method is provided in C. de Tolnay, History and Technique of Old Master Drawings (New York, 1943), pp. 19ff.
64. Ibid., p. 174. This practice was intimately connected with the belief that the artist’s task was to improve upon the forms of nature.
65. On the importance of antique relics, see especially Smyth, op. cit., passim.
67. See especially his letter to Varchi, in Barocchi, op. cit., I, p. 61.
68. Vasari-Milanesi, IV, p. 113. Pino had recognized that a perfect painter would combine Michelangelo’s disegno with the coloring of Titian (op. cit., p. 127).
69. Ibid., p. 113.
70. The superiority of Salvati in the handling of color was recognized by Vasari, ibid., VII, p. 41.
71. On this subject, see Smyth, op. cit., passim.
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Drawings
NICCOLO DELL' ABBATE  
(Modena 1512-Fontainebleau 1571)  

D1. Allegory of Peace  
Black chalk heightened with white on grey paper; 9 3/4 x 5 1/2 inches  
Lent by a Private Collector, New York  

Dated in the 1540's, this drawing is characteristic of Niccolo's style before he went to Fontainebleau in 1552. Like Vasari and Bedoli, Niccolo was deeply influenced by Parmigianino. Demonstrating much of the same delicacy and sensitivity of a Parmigianino drawing, Niccolo depicts a triumphant Peace standing on the arms of war. Her right arm is raised holding a laurel branch and her head is crowned with laurel leaves. Her robust but graceful form is betrayed by thin, clinging, diaphanous draperies. With a delicacy and refinement, Niccolo applied white highlights to the black drawing.  
The drawing is similar to Parmigianino's "Virgins" in the Church of the Steccata, Parma, (produced in S. Freedberg, Parmigianino, His Works in Painting, Cambridge, 1950, ill. 87) as well as a figure in the Virgilia of the Albertina's drawing Coriolanus Receiving His Wife and His Mother in the Volcanic Camp (Inv. 14396, reproduced in O. Benesch, Meisterzeichnungen der Albertina, 1964, pl. 34). It may have been a study for the decoration of a processional ceremony or for one of Niccolo's frescoes in Modena or Bologna.  

ALESSANDRO ALLORI  
(Florence 1535-Florence 1607)  

D2. Study of Seated Male Figure  
(study for the Pearl Divers, Studiolo of Francesco I, Palazzo Vecchio, Florence), ca. 1570-1572  
Black crayon on cream paper; 10 3/4 x 7 1/2 inches  
Lent by the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts Collection, on permanent deposit at the Philadelphia Museum of Art  
Provenance: Richard Cosway (Lugt 628); Barry Delany (Lugt 350)  
Inscriptions: Inscribed in old hand in sepia, verso: "... [A. A. (?)] Bronzini";  
Watermark: IHS suspended from cross on trefoil.  
Formerly attributed to Agnolo Bronzino, the drawing is a study by Bronzino's pupil, Alessandro Allori for the Pearl Divers (no. D2a) in the 'Studiolo' of Francesco I, Palazzo Vecchio, Flor- ence. The drawing is for a figure in the upper right of the composition. The figure is one of the two inactive but interested spectators who are watching the mass of diving, climbing, and swimming pearl divers.  
The drawing was probably one of the several studies for the painting. The Florentine artist often created a rapid sketch (the schizzo) of the entire composition and later developed individual elements such as the study exhibited here. Later the cartoon of the entire surface was constructed from these individual elements.  

Even though Allori followed closely in the footsteps of Bronzino many of the figures in the Pearl Divers are derived from Michelangelo types. The figure climbing onto the rocks to the left of the two spectators is clearly inspired by Michelangelo's Battle of Cascina (probably from other copies of Michelangelo's influential cartoon).  

BARTOLOMMEO AMMANNATI  
(Settignano 1511-Florence 1592)  

D3. River God (recto); Sketches for the Finishing of the Vestibule of the Laurentian Library, Florence (verso)  
Red chalk and brown ink; 9 5/8 x 7 1/4 inches  
Lent by Mr. Harry G. Sperling  
Provenance: Giuseppe Vallardi, Milan (Lugt 1223)  

Bartolomeo Ammannati was one of the principal Florentine sculptors of Vasari's era. Ammannati worked with Vasari on several occasions, beginning as early as the mid 1530's. Vasari records in Bartolomeo Genga's "Life," that the younger Genga made the friendship of Vasari, and Ammannati, and learned much from the sculptor Ammannati (Lives, III, p. 266).  
Ammannati's greatest achievement was the "Nep- tune Fountain" that stood in front of the Palazzo Vecchio. Finished in 1571 with the aid of the Flemish sculptor, Giovanni da Bologna, the drawing, here exhibited, was thought to be a study for one of the figures on this Fountain (Ludwig Goldscheider in a letter to Harry Sperling). Goldscheider later found that the drawing corresponded more closely to two small bronzes by Ammannati in the Bargello, Florence (reproduced in A. E. Popp, Die Medici Kappelle Michelangelos, 1922, pls. 78 and 80). There are several possible sources of inspiration for this drawing. Mr. Sperling has brought to my attention a 'river god' in the first floor stucco ceiling design of the Palazzo Firenze, Rome, which corresponds in detail to this drawing. Ammannati could have made this preparatory drawing while in Rome and before going to Florence. We should, also, not overlook Michelangelo's terra cotta 'river gods' for the Medici Chapel. They were to have an influence on the Florentines and it is very likely that Ammannati was not the exception. Nor can we overlook the 'river god' in Marcantonio Raimondi's engraving.
after Raphael's drawing of The Judgment of Paris. Ammannati's drawing is very close to the Raimondi 'river god.' The basic difference, is that the Ammannati 'river god' is in reverse. The image of the 'river god' was to be the most popular motif in 16th century Florentine art. The 'river god' is readily recognizable in a great number of contexts.

This drawing is a fine illustration of Vasari's statement that some sculptors, though not good draughtsmen, were good sculptors. Like many of the drawings of Baccio Bandinelli, Ammannati's drawing does not demonstrate the same delicacy and sensitivity that characterizes the drawings of the Florentine painter. The harsh cross-hatches and the heavy, bold line often distinguish the Florentine sculptor from the Florentine painter.

DOMENICO BECCAFUMI
(Siena ca. 1486-1551)

D. A Study for a Part of the Mosaic Frieze of the Siena Cathedral Pavement, 1544

Pen and bistre wash; 8 x 11 5/8 inches
Lent by the Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, Meta and Paul J. Sachs Bequest
Provenance: Giuseppe Vallardi (Lugt 1223); Blaisot (Lugt 263); Langton Douglas to Paul J. Sachs

Although there have been opinions stating that this drawing is after the mosaic frieze of the Siena Cathedral Pavement, the drawing is generally accepted as a study for this project that Beccafumi worked on in 1544. There is a decisiveness and sureness of line that is not typical of an artist who is considered to have been more of a colorist than as a painter and draughtsman. His drawings for frescoes were generally more painterly, often done in tempera and emulsion. This drawing, however, was to be employed as a guide for a mosaicist rather than a painter...a discipline that required a more linear approach.

The Mosaic Frieze is not mentioned by Vasari, but Beccafumi's activities at the Siena Cathedral are. Although Beccafumi spent most of his life in and around Siena, he, as a youth (ca. 1510-12 and 1519) did go to Rome where he studied the works of Michelangelo, Raphael, and the antique statues and sarcophagi. This trip was to have a pronounced influence on Beccafumi's works. The drawing is similar in many respects to Michelangelo's paintings as well as the sarcophagi. The tensions created by the muscular, foreshortened figures, struggling in a shallow space, are evident in both the works of Michelangelo and this drawing by Beccafumi. "While their action is spirited, it is also a little frantic and suggests their inner, spiritual tensions..." (Parks, Pontormo to Greco, no. 7).

DOMENICO BECCAFUMI
(Siena ca. 1486-1551)

D.5. The Descent from the Cross

Pen, brown ink wash and wash over black chalk; 14 1/2 x 7 1/8 inches
Lent by the Achenbach Foundation for Graphic Arts, California Palace of the Legion of Honor, Provenance: Giorgio Vasari; Pierre Crozat; Gabriel Huquier, Paris; purchased 1932 with funds of the Senator James D. Phelan Bequest from O'Hara, Livermore and Arthur Baken, San Francisco.

This handsome drawing plays several roles in this exhibition. On the lower right corner the inscription, "D. Builfumi mitarino cauato Del libro di Vasari," identifies this sheet as once belonging in Vasari's celebrated collection. (See A. Wyatt, "Le Libro de Disegni del Vasari," Gazette des Beaux-Arts, 1859, IV, 350). Vasari's impressive collection of drawings, assembled to supplement pictorially his Le Vite de Piu Eccellenti Pittori Scultori, e Architettori, was bound in five volumes, and had examples representing artists from the Trecento to the third quarter of the sixteenth century. Unfortunately, this drawing no longer retains the decorative border (mount) that distinguished many of the drawings from Vasari's collection (for example see drawing by Federico Zuccaro, no. D25 in this exhibition).

No surviving painting has been connected with this drawing. Reflecting the influence of Raphael and particularly that of Michelangelo, Beccafumi's exploration of tonal values through the use of
ink washes and black chalk is the most notable quality of the drawing. Figures severely elongated create a composition of verticality, an economy of line, supplemented by broad areas of liberally applied wash creating figures of structure. Perhaps the most dramatic element in the drawing is the untreated white surface that gleams against the gradations of grey and black, producing a kind of luminous unreality. The work is energetic, and the style is characteristic of Beccafumi’s later works. It also presents the viewer with a startling contrast to the Study for the Mosaic Pavement of Siena Cathedral, no. D4 in the exhibition.

GIROLAMO MAZZOLA BEDOLI
(Parma 1500/5-1569)

D6. Lucretia
Watercolor heightened with gouache; 11 3/4 x 8 3/8 inches
Lent by Mr. & Mrs. Jacob M. Kaplan
Provenance: Nourri (sale, Paris 1785); Marquis C. de Valori (1820-1883), (Lugt 2500); Eugene Rodrigues, (Lugt 897); Henri Delacroix, collection mark in lr; Jacques Seligman, New York, 1966.

This drawing was first brought to the attention of Mr. A. E. Popham, after the scholar had published his catalogue raisonne on Bedoli’s drawings (Popham, “The Drawings of Girolamo Bedoli,” Master Drawings, II, No. 3, 1964, pp. 243-267, pls. 1-17). In a letter to Mrs. Kaplan, Popham attributed the drawing to Parmigianino’s controversial cousin Bedoli, suggesting that the drawing may have been inspired by Parmigianino. The drawing is unquestionably after Parmigianino. An engraving of Lucretia (Bartholomew, XV, 17) by Enea Vico bears the inscription: “E.V./Franch. Par. Inv.”, is very close to the Bedoli drawing (the engraving is reproduced in S. Freedberg, Parmigianino, His Works in Painting, Cambridge, 1950, p. 238 and ill. 119). The engraving is also similar to a double sided drawing Studies for a Lucretia in the Budapest Museum (reproduced in Freedberg, ibid., illus. 118 a & b). As the Bedoli drawing differs in some respects with both the Vico engraving and the Parmigianino drawing, it is difficult to conclude the exact source of Bedoli’s composition. Vico’s engraving is the most likely to be an accurate account of Parmigianino’s painting, and Bedoli, though indebted to his cousin for many of his forms and style, may have wished to retain some degree of individuality. This would account for the differences in the directions in which Lucretia looks (in the engraving she looks toward the upper left and in the drawing to the upper right), as well as the change from a landscape seen through a window in the engraving to a paneled wall in the drawing. In this drawing and the Vico engraving we may have a record of what Vasari calls Parmigianino’s last and one of his best works (Lives, III, p. 12).

Stylistically, the drawing relates more closely to Bedoli’s Eve in an Oval (Louvre, no. 6503), a drawing that Popham dates ca. 1538-1540 (op. cit., pl. 4b, cat. no. 18). Parmigianino’s death in 1540 is further evidence of the value of the engraving and the drawing as a record.

BENVENUTO CELLINI
(Florence 1500-1571)

D7. Standing Nude Male Figure with a Club
Pen and brown ink, brown wash; 16 1/8 x 7 3/4 inches
Lent by Mr. Ian Woodner
Provenance: John Barnard (Lugt 1419); Sir Thomas Lawrence (Lugt 2445).

Inscriptions: In pen and brown ink at lower right corner: alla porta di fontana/Bellio, di bronzio p piu di due volte il viso . . . ferano due variali (at the portal of Fontainbleau, in bronze, twice life-size—there were two versions).


Bibliography: Jacob Bean and Felice Stampfle, Drawings from New York Collections—1—The Italian Renaissance, Greenwich, New York Graphic Society, 1965, no. 82, repr.

Stampfle and Bean consider this drawing to date from Cellini’s period in Fontainebleau, and corresponding to Cellini’s description of the sculptured portal for the Chateau de Fontainebleau. “Instead of columns . . . I fashioned two satyrs, one upon each side. The first of these was in somewhat more than half-relief, lifting one hand to support the cornice and holding a thick club in the other; his face was fiery and menacing, instilling fear into the beholders . . . Though I call them satyrs, they showed nothing of the satyr except little horns and a goatish head; all the rest of the form was human.” (Bean and Stampfle, no. 104 and Autobiography, tr. J. A. Symonds, New York, p. 272)

Unfortunately the portal was never completed. Only the bronze lunette with the nymph of Fontainebleau, in the Louvre, is known. Stampfle and Bean relate this drawing to a black chalk study of Juno, also in the Louvre (op. cit., no. 104).

ROSSO FIORENTINO
(Florence 1495-Fontainebleau 1540)

D8. Standing Youth
Red chalk on white paper; 7 9/16 x 3 3/8 inches
Lent by Mr. Janos Scholz

Giovanni Battista di Jacopo, called “Il Rosso,” probably received his early training from Andrea del Sarto, Fra Bartolomeo, and the graphics of Albrecht Durer. Like so many of the Florentines, he could not escape the influence of Michelangelo. The Sistine Ceiling, the cartoon for the Battle of Cascina and Michelangelo’s sculpture made a lasting impression on Rosso. This study, attributed to Rosso, is after Michelangelo’s David (ca. 1530, Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence). Employing red chalk, Rosso found in Michelangelo’s sculptures, the turning, dynamic forms that were to characterize his panels. Rosso often placed individual forms in narrow and shallow spacial niches. The drawing compares to the numerous allegorical drawings that he had engraved by Gian Giacomo Caraglio.

PROSPERO FONTANA
(Bologna 1512-1597)

D9. Study for a Ceiling Decoration
Pen and wash over red and black chalk; 14 3/8 x 9 5/16 inches
Lent by the Art Institute of Chicago, the Leonora Hall Gurley Memorial Collection
Inscriptions: upper left corner, Fontana Prospero
Provenance: J. J. Lindeman (Lugt 1479A)
Exhibitions: Art Institute of Chicago, 1922
In 1922 Ulrich Middeldorf attributed this drawing to Fontana, calling it a study for a ceiling by Prospero in the Palazzo Parilla in Bologna.

More recently, Philip Pouncey, John Shearman and Edmund Pillsbury have suggested that the study is by Vasari. It is thought to be an early study for the Sala of Clement VII in the Palazzo Vecchio. In support of this position, Dr. Wiener has pointed out that the device, called Cander Illaesus, above the picture of the bearded old man (botten, center) was that of Pope Clement VII (Tervaint, “Symbols dans l’Art,” Suseil, 1958, p. 358)

PROSPERO FONTANA
(Bologna 1512-1597)

D10. Thesis Ordering from Vulcan the Armour of Achilles
Pen and bistre, bistre wash on blue paper; 9 5/16 x 5 5/8 inches
Lent by Mr. Janos Scholz

This drawing, traditionally attributed to Prospero Fontana, depicts Thetis, mother of Achilles, before Vulcan, the god of fire in the act of forging and smelting. Apparently she is ordering armour for Achilles to enable her son to shed the elements of mortality that he had inherited from his father. However, we should also note the several urns and vases that surround Vulcan. As part of her program to make Achilles immortal, Thetis anointed her son with ambrosia during the day and held him in the fire in the evening.

Fontana was influenced by Parmigianino, Michelangelo, the followers of Raphael, and Vasari. The figure of Thetis also indicates the influence of Perino del Vaga if compared with Perino’s drawing of the Guerriero (Louvre, no. 624) and no. D24 in this exhibition. Fontana had worked with Perino in Genoa and certainly knew the older master’s works. Nor should we underestimate the influence of Vasari. This drawing was influenced by Vasari’s mature style of the 1560’s, as can be seen in the fluidity of the lines.

GIOVANNI BATTISTA NALDINI
(Florence 1537-Florence 1591)

D11. Study for the Virgin, St. Agnes, St. Helena, and Other Saints, ca. 1571-1576
Pen, brown ink and brown wash on paper prepared with red wash, perhaps faded; 7 1/2 x 7 1/8 inches
Lent by Mr. Edmund Pillsbury
Provenance: Padre Resta (inscribed in pen and brown ink at the lower center, m 157, and annotated on the mount with Resta’s original attribution to Cesare Nebbia); H. S. Olivier (Lugt 1373); sold at Christie’s, 27 June 1967 (lot 175) to Pillsbury.


Originally attributed to Cesare Nebbia, this wash drawing is a study for a modello. “The Ascension above the Virgin, St. Agnes, St. Helena, and Other Saints” now located in the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford. The altar-piece for which the drawing and modello were executed, is now lost, apparently destroyed in a fire in S. Maria del Carmine in 1771 (Peter Cannon Brooks, “Three Notes on Maso da San Friano,” Burlington Magazine, April 1965, pp. 192-197). The altar-piece was originally scheduled to be painted by Maso da San Friano (see Brooks, ill. 32) and Naldini’s modello corresponds in some detail to Maso’s preparatory study (Uffizi, 602s). However, Maso died in 1571 and between this time and the death of Elena Ottonelli in 1576 (donor for the altar-piece), the commission was transferred to Naldini.

Although Naldini retains the relative position of several of the figures from Maso’s drawing, he introduces several variations which reflect his indebtedness to Vasari. Most noteworthy is his treatment of the Virgin. It is very similar in attitude to Vasari’s “Allegory of the Immaculate Conception for Santi Apostoli” (see Barocchi,
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GIOVANNI BATTISTA NALDINI
(Florence, 1537-1590)

D12. Project for a Ceiling. (Study for the Ora-
tory of Antonio Giacomini, Sala Grande,
Palazzo Vecchio, Florence), ca. 1563-1566

Pen and brush, brown ink on white paper;
3 7/8 x 8 5/8 inches

Lent by Mr. Janos Scholz

Inscriptions: “sogliano” II, of central sheet

Exhibitions: Mills College Art Gallery, Oakland, Calif., Drawings from Tuscany and Umbria, 1350-
1700, 1961; Department of Art History Gallery, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Italian Draw-
ings, 1964, No. 39, ill. 19 (as Giorgio Vasari).

Bibliography: Neumeyer-Scholz, Drawings from Tuscany and Umbria 1350-1700 Oakland, 1961;
Jack Wasserman, Italian Drawings, Milwaukee, 1964, No. 39, ill. 19; Gunther Thiem, “Neuent-
deckte Zeichnungen Vasaris und Naldinis fur die Sala Grande des Palazzo Vecchio in Florenz,”
Zeitschrift fur Kunstgeschichte, 1968, pages 143-
150, fig. 1.

This drawing was attributed to Giorgio Vasari
until 1969 when Gunther Thiem reattributed it
to Battista Naldini, one of Vasari’s principle as-
sistants at the Palazzo Vecchio. As the sheet com-
pares favorably to other drawings by Vasari for
the ceiling of the Sala Grande, the present at-
tribution is open to discussion.

In his monumental essays, Thiem reconstructs
the second plan of the ceiling of the Sala Grande.
The plan, outlining the themes of the thirty-nine
panels composing the ceiling is in the Uffizi (no.
7979A) and reproduced in Thiem, “Vasari’s
Entwurfe fur die Gemalde in der Sala Grande
des Palazzo Vecchio zu Florenz,” Zeitschrift fur
Kunstgeschichte, 1960, II, fig. 1). Thiem states
that these drawings correspond to panels 24, 27
and 30 (numbers 1 through 39 were assigned to
the panels). “It contains the sketched suggestions
for panels 24 (Piano di Val di Casini), 27

(Princijpio della Guerra di Pisa et consiglio di
Cittadini a farla which is also known as Arringa
di Antonio Giacomini on the basis of Rigaioni-
menti), and 30 (Livorno Mare) (translated from
Thiem, “Neuentdeckte Zeichnungen Vasaris und
Naldinis fur die Sala Grande des Palazzo Vecchio
in Florenz,” Zeitschrift fur Kunstgeschichte, 1968,
p. 145). These three sketches, joined with the two
sheets attached from the Fogg Art Museum
(no. D42), play a major role in Thiem’s recon-
struction.

LELIO ORSI
(Reggio 1511-Novellara 1587)

D13. Study for the ‘Walk to Emmaus,’ London
National Gallery

Crayon, heightened with white on brown paper;
13.5/8 x 10 1/8 inches

Lent by the Wadsworth Atheneum. The Ella
Galloway Sumner and Mary Catlin Sumner Collec-
Provenance: Purchased from Duracher Bros.,
London, England, in 1897

Exhibitions: Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford,
Conn., Life of Christ, 1948, no. 158; Detroit
Institute of Arts, Sixty Drawings from the Wad-
sworth Atheneum, Hartford, 1948; Wadsworth
Atheneum, In Retrospect—Twenty-One Years of
Museum Collecting, 1949, no. 50; The John
Herron Museum of Art, Indianapolis, Ind.,
Pontormo a Greco—The Age of Mannerism,
1954, no. 31, repr.; The School of Fine Arts, The
University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn., The
Figure in Mannerist and Baroque Drawings, 1967.
Bibliography: Florence Kossof, “Lelio Orsi and
the Walk to Emmaus,” Master Drawings, 1966,
IV, no. 4, pp. 415-418, plate 30.

Florence Kossof cites four drawings (Louvre, Inv.
No. 6686; Collection of Mr. Charles M. Muskav-
itch, Sacramento, California; Geneo, Palazzo
Rosso, Inv. No. 572 and Wadsworth Atheneum)
that are in some way connected with Orsi’s panel,
The Walk to Emmaus, in the London National
Gallery (no. D13a). She convincingly demonstrates
the Wadsworth Atheneum drawing to be a copy
after the panel, yet by the hand of Orsi. (Kossof,
“Lelio Orsi and the Walk to Emmaus,” Master

The four drawings present a unique group as they
represent three practices common in the sixteenth
century. The Louvre version is the preliminary
study for the panel, whereas both the Wadsworth
Atheneum and Muskavitch drawings are copies
after the panel. The Wadsworth Atheneum draw-
ing was the first of the two copies as it is less
mechanical in execution. Orsi probably had other
requests for the subject that led him to make
these copies. The fourth drawing, representing an-
other practice, is a poor copy, by a student rather
than Orsi.

This is not the only instance where Orsi made
copies after his own compositions. The Princeton
Art Museum, the Chatsworth Collection and the
Galeria Estense, Modena, all possess drawings
titled “Project for a Decoration of a Facade” that
are similar and by Orsi.

LELIO ORSI
(Reggio 1511-Novellara 1587)
D14. Design for a Facade Decoration
Pen and brown ink; 8 5/16 x 11 1/16 inches (two
sheets joined horizontally at the center).
Lent by Mr. Janos Scholz.
Inscriptions: signed, inscribed in pen and brown
ink at lower left margin lolio.
Provenance: H. Beckmann (Lugt S. 2756a)
Exhibitions: Hamburg, Scholz Exhibition, 1963,
n. 103, plate 21; the Metropolitan Museum of
Art, New York, Drawings from New York Collec-
tions—I—The Italian Renaissance, Nov. 8, 1965-
Jan 9, 1966, n. 106, repr.
Bibliography: Jacob Bean and Felice Stampfle,
Drawings from New York Collections—I—The
Italian Renaissance, Greenwich, New York

Lelio Orsi was essentially a provincial artist who
came under the influence of Michelangelo
(through a trip to Rome), and Correggio and
Parmigianino (probably because of the proximity
of Novellara with Parma). The influence of the
later artist is perhaps most noticeable in this draw-
ing—particularly when looking at the female
figures in this composition.

Orsi’s drawings far outnumber his paintings. This
is largely due to his practice of making several
drawings of the same subject (see discussion of
no. D17). Orsi also painted several exterior
frescoes that no longer survive. Bean and
Stampfle suggest that this drawing may have been
for a palace facade that has since been destroyed
(Bean, Stampfle, Drawings from New York Collec-

It is difficult to determine the iconography of this
drawing. On the upper tier, to the right, a danc-
ing female is enclosed by an arcade, Caryatids,
and putti. To the left of her is a rocky land-
scape sheltering an embracing couple whose activi-
ties have attracted three wind gods. The bottom
tier depicts a second female framed by an arcade
and surrounded by Caryatids and putti.

Florence Kosoff calls our attention to a similar
scheme of Caryatids in the fragments of interior
frescoes removed from the Casino di Sopra in
Novellara (Kosoff, Mostra di Lelio Orsi, Reggio
Emilia, 1950, nos. 18-35) and Stampfle and Bean
point out a pen study for similar Caryatids in the
Seattle Art Museum (op. cit., no. 106).

FRANCESCO MAZZOLA, called
PARMIGIANINO
(Parma 1503-Casal Maggiore 1540)
D15. Three Studies of Putti and of a Seated Boy
(recto); Studies in Red Chalk of a

Woman’s Head of a Putto, and of a Fence
(verso)
Red chalk; 7 3/16 x 5 13/16 inches (red chalk on
white paper)
Lent by Mr. Janos Scholz.
Exhibitions: Indiana University, Bloomington,
Ind., Drawings of the Italian Renaissance from
the Scholz Collection, 1958, No. 35, repr.; Ham-
burg, Scholz Exhibition, 1963, No. 108, pl. 22;
Yale University, New Haven, Conn., Italian
Drawings from the Collection of Janos Scholz,
1964, No. 43, repr. No. 10; The Metropolitan
Museum of Art, New York, Drawings from New
York Collection—I—The Italian Renaissance,
Nov. 8, 1965-Jan. 9, 1966, No. 89, repr.
Bibliography: Jacob Bean and Felice Stampfle,
Drawings from New York Collections—I—The
Italian Renaissance, Greenwich, New York
Graphic Society 1965, no. 89, repr.

Although this handsome sheet has not been re-
lated to any painting, it is an unusually fine study,
characteristic of Parmigianino’s hand. A. E. Pop-
ham dates the drawing early in the artist’s career,
probably in the early 1520’s before Parmigianino
went to Rome (Bean-Sampfle, Drawings from
New York Collections, 1965, no. 89).

Vasari’s introductory remarks about Parmigianino
epitomize the qualities found in this drawing. The
sensibility and grace are common qualities in
Parmigianino’s chalk drawings. Vasari credits
Parmigianino for his “vivacity of invention” (Lives,
III, p. 6). The manner in which he treats
the youthful figures, boldly foreshortened, with
a resolute strength and yet with a softness, is unlike
Parmigianino’s contemporaries. Structure of form
is created through the treatment of surface rather
than through inner structural elements. The result
of Parmigianino’s approach to the human figure is
an elegance and refinement admired and praised by
Vasari.

FRANCESCO MAZZOLA, called
PARMIGIANINO
(Parma 1503-Casal Maggiore 1540)
D16. Study for Lucretia, ca. 1524-1527
Red chalk heightened with white; 7 5/16 x 5 1/8
inches
Lent by Mr. Janos Scholz.
Exhibitions: Crozat; Banks; Triqueti; Goldstein
Exhibitions: Pontormo to Greco—The Age of
Mannerism, John Herron Museum of Art, Indian-
apolis, 1954, No. 22, repr.
Bibliography: Robert O. Parks, Pontormo to
Greco—The Age of Mannerism, 1954, No. 22,
repr.

According to Sydney Freedberg, this study was
made during Parmigianino’s trip to Rome in
1524-1527. (Parks, Pontormo to Greco, no. 22).
Parmigianino was to treat the subject on several
occasions. This drawing was perhaps one of the
earliest and most unconventional. Vasari records
in the “Life” of Parmigianino a much later paint-
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ing of Lucretia but eliminates any possible connection with this drawing when he states that it was Parmigianino's last painting before his death ("Lives," II, p. 12).

This drawing is symptomatic of the anti-classical style that Friedlaender described (Mannerism and Anti-Mannerism in Italian Painting). By comparison to the other Parmigianino drawing in this exhibition (no. D15), the artist demonstrates an increasing interest in surface movements, gestures, rhythms, etc. The stress is placed on the massive heavy limbs of Lucretia as she shifts her weight, impaling herself on the sword. Parmigianino creates a tension that we are compelled to share with Lucretia.

JACOPO DA GARRUCCI, called PONTORMO
(Pontormo 1494-Florence 1557)

D17. Bust of a Nude Youth (Study for the Virgin, Deposition, Altar-piece, S. Felicita) ca. 1526-1527.

Red chalk; 6 3/16 x 5 inches
Lent by Mr. Janos Scholz
Provenance: Piancastelli, Brandegee.


This study for Pontormo's altarpiece of the Deposition in S. Felicita, was considered a 16th century copy after a drawing in the Uffizi (no. 666F) by Janet Cox Rearick (The Drawings of Pontormo, 1964, p. 399, no. A234). Miss Rearick discredits the Scholz study on the grounds that there is no other example in Pontormo's work of this kind of repetition.

The drawing, however, has been accepted as Pontormo by A. E. Popham, Philip Pouncey, Charles de Tolnay, Agnes Mongan, J. Byam Shaw, John Gere and Lugt. Dr. Ivan Fenyo has expressed orally that the drawing is not by the hand of a copyist. He feels that it pre-dates the drawing in the Uffizi. The Scholz drawing is less elaborate that the Uffizi study, while the modeling of the torso, the neck and the attachment of the head are more convincingly rendered in the drawing exhibited.

The Florentine draughtsman often made several studies for paintings. This may be the instance where Pontormo decided to work out, in greater detail, a second study for the S. Felicita Deposition.

FRANCESCO MORANDINI, called IL POPPI
(Poppi, Casentino 1544-Florence 1597)

D18. Manna in the Wilderness
Red and black chalk on white paper; 10 1/16 x 7 1/8 inches
Lent by Mr. Janos Scholz
Provenance: Cav. Giovanni Piancastelli, Rome; Mrs. Edward D. Brandegee, Boston

Exhibitions: The John Herron Museum of Art, Indianapolis, Ind., Pontormo to Greco—The Age of Mannerism, 1954, No. 14, repr. (as Rosso Fiorentino); Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., Drawings of the Italian Renaissance from the Scholz Collection, 1958; Mills College Art Gallery, Oakland, Calif., Drawings from Tuscany and Umbria, 1961; Department of Art History Gallery, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Italian Drawings, 1964, No. 33, ill. 15 (as Rosso Fiorentino).


Formerly attributed to Rosso Fiorentino, this drawing is now assigned to Poppi. Although it has not been possible to discover the purpose of the drawing, the style is characteristically that of Poppi. The figures are constructed with undulating short, crisp strokes of chalk, and strengthened by parallel lines of chalk. Poppi considers form first in terms of the outline and then analyzes it in terms of geometric units. He plays with space, thrusting limbs toward the viewer from the shallow space that encloses the figures. Movements are strengthened by darker lines, faces are reduced to basic areas seen as shadows. This drawing can be compared to Uffizi no. 471 F, "Ulysses and the Wings" (reproduced in Barocchi, Mostra di Disegni dei Vasari e della Sua Cerchia, pl. 56) as well as the Falling of the Manna in the Boscoreale, Santa Croce (reproduced in Barocchi, Vasari Pittore, pl. V).

FRANCESCO DEI ROSSI, called FRANCESCO SALVIATI
(Florence 1510-Rome 1563)

D19. Design for a Fantastic Emblem
Pen and brown ink, brown wash; 7 1/2 x 7 3/8 inches
Lent by Mr. Janos Scholz
Provenance: Richard Cosway (Lugt 628)
Inscriptions: In pen and ink at the lr. "Julio Romano"


Fantastic animals of such invention were common creations by the sixteenth century Roman and Florentine artists. Animal grotesqueries appeared often from the hands of Giulio Romano, Perino del Vaga, and Francesco Salviati. The designs often served as preliminary sketches for the decoration of door knobs, lamps, candlesticks, vases, ceilings, etc. Giulio Romano is perhaps best known for this kind of invention, which is probably the reason for the inscription that the drawing bears.

However, the style is not that of Giulio Romano, rather it is that of Vasari's close friend Francesco Salviati. In this drawing, Salviati has created a horse with two heads, perched on a small base. One of the horse's heads strains upward, breathing fire, and attracting a huge moth or butterfly. The Louvre owns another drawing (Inv. 12,085) which is a variant on this design and is listed as Anonymous Italian. In the Louvre drawing the horse is replaced by an elephant with a human head (Bean, Stampfle, Drawings from New York Collections, no. 103). Pouncey has also called our attention to a similar drawing in the British Museum as well as a pen version of the same animal in the collection of Mr. Hans Schaeffer, New York, which is attributed to Perino del Vaga.

The inscription on the banderole is illegible and does not assist us with determining the purpose of the drawing.

FRANCESCO DEI ROSSI, called FRANCESCO SALVIATI
(Florence 1510-Rome 1563)

D20. Warrior Kneeling before an Enthroned Pope (Study for the Walls of the Salotto in the Palazzo Farnese in Rome)

Pen and brown ink, brown wash, heightened with white, over traces of black chalk, horizontal pen-line at center; several layers of pentimenti pasted on the foreground; 8 1/4 x 10 7/16 inches


In 1961 Richard Wunder suggested that this drawing was a study for the fresco in the Palazzo Farnese, Rome, depicting Pope Eugenius commissioning Rannuccio Farnese as the military defender of the Papal States (no. D20a). Both the drawing and the fresco show Pope Eugenius IV giving the baton of papal command to Farnese.

Even though there have been substantial changes made from the drawing to the fresco, it is safe to conclude that this drawing does represent the very early stages of Salviati's plans for the fresco. The most significant part of the composition has remained relatively unaltered from the drawing to the fresco, while the crowd that witnesses the scene is noticeably altered. These changes are perhaps due to two factors. The first being Salviati's own indecision which is clearly evident in the changes that are already made on the initial drawing. The pentimenti added in the foreground indicates that Salviati was already deviating from his original design. The river god image added in the right foreground was clearly inspired by the river god in Marcantonio Raimondi's engraving after Raphael's drawing of The Judgment of Paris. The second reason for change could be due to the fact that Taddeo Zuccaro completed the fresco in 1555, after Salviati's designs.

This drawing relates to another group of drawings by Salviati at Windsor, also representing the history of the papacy (Popham, Wilde, Italian Drawings at Windsor, nos. 888-890).

The Florentine artist often deviated from his initial design. This drawing is a very quick, almost hasty sketch. The figures are suggested with an economy of line and wash. Salviati appears more concerned with the over-all design rather than with individual elements.

JAN VAN DER STRAET, called STRADANUS
(Bruges 1523-Florence 1605)

D21. Nobilitas

Pen and brush, brown ink over black crayon on white paper: 4 1/4 x 5 13/16 inches

Lent by Mr. Janos Scholz Provenance: Piancastelli; Branddegge; R. Wien Bibliography: Michel N. Benisovich; "The Drawings of Stradanus (Jan van der Straet) in the Cooper-Union for the Arts of Decoration, New York," The Art Bulletin, pp. 249-254.
D22. The Annunciation
Pen and brush, brown ink, blue wash on white paper; 4 3/16 x 2 7/8 inches
Lent by Mr. Janos Scholz.
Provenance: Piancastelli; Brandegee.

D23. Christ Washing the Feet of His Disciples
Pen and brush, brown ink and red watercolor over black crayon on white paper; 5 3/16 x 4 1/16 inches
Provenance: Piancastelli; Brandegee.
Lent by Mr. Janos Scholz.
These drawings, formerly in the collection of Mr. Giovanni Piancastelli, Director of the Borgese Gallery, are but three of the over three hundred drawings by Jan van der Straetzen in New York collections (The Cooper Union Museum for the Arts of Decoration, New York, has 312 in its collection).
The Flemish born Stradanus was one of the principle assistants to Vasari at the Palazzo Vecchio. These sketches were probably done after the biographer's death in 1574. They still, however, retain the style developed by Vasari and his circle.
The initial drawing was outlined in crayon and traced and elaborated with ink and wash. The tracing was done in a cursive script by a pen which tears and burns the paper. (Bensovich, The Drawings . . ., p. 250).
They cannot be considered finished drawings since they were intended to be further elaborated and turned over to engravers in Munich or Antwerp. Bensovich has reproduced examples where the drawings were engraved, (The Drawings . . ., illa, 2a and 2b-f).
It is difficult to date these drawings with accuracy. Bensovich suggests that they could have been done as early as 1575 but also raises the possibility that they could have been lying dormant in his portfolios. (Ibid., p. 250).
The drawings from the Scholz collection are of interest to us for a variety of reasons: The Annunciation because of its relationship to Vasari's early works, notably the Notre Dame panel (no. P17) and the Pierpont Morgan Library modello (no. D48); Christ Washing the Feet of His Disciples because of its spatial arrangement and Nobilibas because of its allegorical content.
Stradanus' sketchbook offered a wide variety of subject matter, from hunting scenes (a series was engraved by J. Collaert and dedicated to Cosimo de' Medici), allegorical and Biblical themes, industrial and professional scenes, to those decorative in nature. The complete group offers a penetrating insight of Western Europe in the second half of the 16th century.

PERINO DEL VAGA
(Florence 1501-Rome 1547)
D24. Scene From the History of Alexander the Great
Pen, brown ink and grey wash, 12 3/8 x 8 1/4 inches
Lent by Mr. Ian Woodner
Inscription: In old hand, lower left Perino del Vaga
Bibliography: Jacob Bean (review of National Gallery of Scotland; Catalogue of Italian Drawings) Master Drawings, vol. 71 No. 1, p. 57, pl. 38.
Perino del Vaga is considered one of the most important Florentines who paved the way for the "second generation Manerists." In 1513 he worked with Giulio Romano in the atelier of Raphael. Perino soon became Raphael's most gifted pupil for fresco decoration. In 1523 he fled from Rome to Florence where his impression on the youthful Florentines, Vasari, Salviati, etc. was to be established with the exposure of his cartoon for the Campagnia dei Martire of The Martyrdom of the Ten Thousand under King Sapor in Persia (see D24a).
In 1528 Perino worked for the Doria family in Genoa and in 1534 and 1536 he worked in the Cathedral of Pisa. In 1539, Perino returned to Rome where he undertook the decoration of Castel Sant'Angelo.
Perino's influence on Vasari is readily apparent in No. D31. Perino's style is characterized by an assimilation of Raphael's classicism with Michelangelo's formalism. Perino's contact with Rosso Fiorentino and Parmigianino in Rome contributed to the development of Perino's elegant and decorative style.
The drawing exhibited here is a study for the fresco in the Sala Paolina in the Castel Sant'Angelo. The vibrant drawing, dramatically lit from the upper left, depicts a group of figures surrounding two sarcophagi. To the left in profile, is the figure of Alexander the Great. In the background, the mass of figures are tightly compacted into a shallow space. The decorative elements of the sarcophagi reflect Romanos' influence on Perino del Vaga's Scene From the History of Alexander the Great. According to Mr. Ian Woodner, Philip Pouncey has confirmed that the drawing is a study by Perino for one of the five colossal monochrome frescoes of the story of Alexander in the Sala Paolino. The only other study known for this project is in the collection of Mr. and Mrs. John Gere. Both drawings show some variation from the frescoes.
Perino was working on this project at his death in 1547.

TADDEO ZUCCARO
(Sant'Angelo in Vado 1529-Rome 1566)
D25. The Sermon of St. John the Baptist (verso)
 Kneeling Man (recto)
Pen and brush, brown ink, heightened with white on blue paper (verso); black and white chalk on blue paper; (the border is in pen and brush, golden-brown ink); 16 9/16 x 11 1/16 inches
Provenance: Giorgio Vasari; Bendor; Walspole.
Lent by Mr. Janos Scholz
Inscriptions: On mount by Vasari; "TADDEO ZVCHERO/DA S. AGNOLO/PITTORE" (verso) "TADDEO ZVCHERO DA S. AGNOLO PIT." (recto).
This double-sided drawing was once in Vasari's celebrated collection. Unfortunately, the Vasari mount has been trimmed. The subject of each side of the drawing is open to question. Robert Parks listed the subject of the recto, "Kneeling Man," as possibly being a study for a "Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane." (Pontormo to Greco, 1954, no. 42). Both the titles, "Christ in Limbo" and "The Sermon of St. John the Baptist" have been suggested for the verso. The latter seems more probable, despite the lack of certain iconographic requirements, i.e. no evidence of the "Ecce Agnus Dei" on the banner.
The drawing is a fine example of the exciting effects Taddeo produced in his chalk and pen drawings. One can sense the absolute ease and freedom of Taddeo's stroke.

JACOPO ZUCCHI (attributed to)
(Florence 1541-1589/1590)

D26. Design for a Catafalque of Cosimo the Great, 1574
Pen and brown ink with brown wash over black chalk; 15 1/16 x 10 3/8 inches
Lent by The Pierpont Morgan Library
Provenance: P. & D. Colnaghi and Co., Ltd.
Inscriptions: Upper center, Insom Zucchi; in cartouche, MAG COSMUS / ETRURIE
Plan I inscribed: Pisa/carara/florenza/siena
Plan II inscribed: cavaliere (or cavalieri) / creazione/trionfo/coronazione
Plan III inscribed: liberaita/carita/fortitudinei / justizia

D27. Drawing of a Catafalque, 1574
Pen and brown ink, and brown wash, over a preliminary drawing in black chalk, with the aid of a straightedge; 15 3/4 x 10 3/4 inches
Lent by Mr. Edmund Pillsbury
Provenance: From an album of Tuscan and Perugian drawings put together by an Italian collector at the end of the 19th century; P. & D. Colnaghi and Co., Ltd. (sold 1965); Herbert Bier, London (sold 1967).

On April 21st, 1574, Grand Duke Cosimo the Great died. In honor of his death, catafalques were erected throughout Italy. The two drawings exhibited here from the collections of Mr. Edmund Pillsbury and The Pierpont Morgan Library are studies for one of those catafalques. The drawings were initially listed as "school of Vasari" and later attributed to Francesco Morandini (called Poppi) by Bossock. Philip Pouncey is responsible for the attribution of the Pillsbury drawing to Zucchi. The Morgan Library drawing, by the same hand, should also bear the same attribution.
At the time of Cosimo's death, Zucchi was in Rome. Pillsbury, on the basis of documents, has verbally suggested that the drawings may have been for the catafalque built in S. Giovanni del Fiorentini or some other church in Rome. The drawings were probably used for the presentation of Zucchi's ideas. The projects may or may not have been executed according to these designs. Of the two, the Morgan Library drawing is far more complete. Zucchi has included on this sheet a complicated decorative scheme. Three cross-section drawings (right side of the drawing) indicate the sculpted virtues to be included and a sketch on the upper right corner shows the back side of the catafalque.
The Pillsbury drawing is less complex, but shares numerous similarities with the Morgan sheet. The virtues are again shown (the figure of Justice on the left being most noteworthy in light of Cosimo's deeds), as well as a portrait bust of Cosimo in a niche in the upper story. Each drawing has an equal number of stories with one story open for a painting of Cosimo. The river gods found in the Morgan Library drawing are replaced by cherubs in the Pillsbury study. Both drawings have four cherubs bearing torches and two cherubs supporting a medallion.
A comparison of Vasari's drawing for the Borgo Ognissanti (no. D46) with these designs, reflects the continued influence Vasari had on his followers. A survey of all three drawings also emphasizes the influence of Cosimo on the arts and the tribute paid to him and the Medici family in the sixteenth century.

JACOPO ZUCCHI
(Florence 1541-1589/90)

D28. Study for an Allegorical Figure (Perhaps the Genius of Architecture)
Pen and brown ink, and brown wash, over a preliminary drawing in black chalk; 7 3/4 x 6 13/16 inches

Lent by Mr. Edmund Pillsbury
Inscription: Annotated in pen and brown ink in an old hand at ll. A. Carats
Provenance: Sir Joshua Reynolds (Lugt 2364); P. Huart (?)(Lugt 2084); P. & D. Colnaghi Co., Ltd. (sold 1967)
Exhibitions: Colnaghi, Old Master Drawings, June 1967.

This drawing was first attributed to Zucchi by Mr. Philip Pouncey. Zucchi, a member of Vasari's circle, has demonstrated in this drawing, the influential role that the antique and Michelangelo played in the sixteenth century. The Laocoon group, rediscovered in 1506, had an immediate influence on the Florentines and Romans. The three figures in this composition were inspired by this sculptural group, while the bottom half of the central figure comes from Michelangelo's Jonah on the Sistine ceiling.

The drawing also exhibits some of the playful qualities of the Vasari-inspired pen stroke, as well as the growing interest in the 'worm's-eye' view. Evidence of Luca Cambiaso's influence is also suspected by the abstraction of forms into geometric shapes.

Mr. Edmund Pillsbury feels that the drawing was done at the time of the Ruspoli Gallery in ca. 1585.

JACOPO ZUCCHI
(Florence 1541-1589/90)

D29. The Martyrdom of St. Apollonia
Pen and ink, brown wash, and white highlights, over black chalk; 9 15/16 x 5 1/16 inches (Circular top)
Lent by Dr. Julius S. Held
Inscriptions: on reverse in pencil, T. Zuccaro
Bibliography: Drawings, The Held Collection, University Art Gallery, State University of New York at Binghamton, 1970, no. 141, illustrated. Attributed to Zucchi by Edmund Pillsbury, this drawing is a modello for an unknown altarpiece.

GIORGIO VASARI
(Arezzo 1511-Florence 1574)

D30. Deposition (Study for the altarpiece for S. Domenico in Arezzo) c. 1536
Pen and wash drawings; 12 7/8 x 8 3/16 inches
Lent by the Wadsworth Atheneum
Inscriptions: History unknown. However, in J. I. Byam Shaw's hand in pencil on the back of the mount is Rosso Fiorentino—ep. Volterra Altarpiece, A10841. Also, on the back of the drawing, written in two places, in what appears to be a modern hand is, Salsiatii.


This is one of the earliest known Vasari drawings. The sheet is a study for the Deposition, an altarpiece commissioned by the Compagnia del Corpo di Cristo d'Arezzo in 1536 (Frey I, 77, 79, 80 and Le Ricordanze di Giorgio Vasari, pp. 23/24, No. 13).

From this drawing much is learned about the early Vasari. By his own admission, Vasari was a very eclectic artist. He spent countless hours copying and recording the achievements of the antique, the works of the Quattrocento and the works of his contemporaries. We shouldn't be surprised to find that the influence of Rosso Fiorentino and Baccio Bandinelli are evident in this drawing as well as in the altarpiece. Bernice Davidson in her discussion of the two works, calls our attention to the elements that Vasari borrowed from Rosso. The most noteworthy influence is the similarity between Vasari's figure of Christ and the figure of Christ from Rosso's Volterra Deposition and Borgo San Sepolcro Pietà. Vasari's kneeling Magdalene is based on a female saint in the right side of Rosso's Citta di Castello in Majesty. (B. Davidson, "Vasari's Deposition in Arezzo," The Art Bulletin, Sept. 1954, XXXVI, p. 230).
It is difficult to discern whether Rosso or Vasari's teacher, Baccio Bandinelli, had a more important influence on Vasari's pen stroke as well as his thin, elongated figures. The system of bold cross-hatching is more characteristic of Bandinelli's drawings, as are the classically structured figures. The facial types of those figures in the lower left may also be a direct influence of Bandinelli.

The Deposition was to become one of the preferred motifs in sixteenth century Roman and Florentine painting. The subject was treated by Michelangelo (ca. 1540-1542, plaster cast from lost wax relief; Florence Casa Buonarroti), Daniele da Volterra (1541, Rome, Trinità dei Monti), and Francesco Salvati (c. 1547, Florence Museo di S. Croce).

Including the Rosso and Vasari Depositions, all were to share certain stylistic similarities. Each of the artists was interested in the psychological tensions created by the interplay of figures within a shallow space, and around and through the ladders and the cross. Gestures and emotions are abundant as the figures enact the tragedy of the moment.

GIOVAN PAVASI (after PERINO DEL VAGA)
(Arezzo 1511-Florence 1574)

D31. Death of the Martyrs
Pen and bistre heightened with white on brown paper; 14 5/8 x 13 5/8 inches
Lent by the Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, Bequest of Charles A. Loeser
Provenance: Charles A. Loeser

In the 1520's Perino del Vaga excited the Florentines with his drawing for the Church of the Camaldoli. Vasari writes: "Artists and connoisseurs declared they had never seen a more beautiful cartoon, except that designed by Michelangelo for the hall of the council in Florence" (Lives, Vol. III, p. 128). Until 1960, the Fogg Art Museum sheet was thought to be the modello

for the cartoon that Vasari acclaimed. However, Bernice Davidson, in a letter to Agnes Mongan, first questioned the attribution of the drawing to Perino (a suspicion that was supported by Konrad Oberhubner of the Albertina in Vienna in a letter to the former Fogg Art Museum Director, John Coolidge). The original, by Perino, is in the Albertina (no. D31a), while other copies exist in the Louvre (no. 618) and in Chantilly (F.R. 90). The present attribution to Vasari was suggested by Davidson and later supported by Philip Pouncey and Walter Vitzthum. An examination of the two drawings reveals a greater fluidity in the Albertina version. Vasari's copy becomes mechanical; shadows that are subtly treated by Perino become more defined by Vasari, and the copy loses much of the freshness and vitality that excited the Florentines.

In light of Vasari's comments, as well as his youthful practice of copying all that surrounded him, Vasari certainly would not have left this drawing untouched or unrecorded by his own hand if the opportunity had availed itself.

The subject of the drawing is the massacre of the 10,000 martyrs by King Sapor in Persia. The king on the far left, condemns the prisoners to the cross. Some of the semi-clothed prisoners kneel before the king and his staff, straining to free themselves from their bonds. Their fate is seen in the groups of prisoners already condemned and either being led to their execution or meeting death on the crosses.

Like Michelangelo's cartoon, The Battle of Cascina, Perino's drawing displays a wide range of forms, costumes, armour, gestures, etc. The material objects, as well as the physical and psychological, made Perino's cartoon an excellent source for the youthful Florentines, Francesco Salvati and Vasari.

GIOVAN PAVASI (Arezzo 1511-Florence 1574)

D32-D33. Project for A Ceiling
Pen and brush, brown ink on white paper; 3 7/8 x 8 5/8 inches
Lent by Mr. Janos Scholz
Provenance: Moscardo, Verona
Inscriptions: No. D32, inscriptions on rectangular openings; capricornus/urgo/aries; inscription below figures: FLORA/CRESER No. D33, inscriptions on rectangular openings: pisces/libral concer; inscriptions below figures: B CCV' (Bacchus)/VETRYN

D34-D35-D36-D37. Four Planets
Pen and brown ink (Luna: 3 1/2 x 2 7/16 inches; Sol: 3 5/8 x 2 3/8 inches; Mercury: 3 7/16 x 2 7/16 inches; Chronos: 3 7/16 x 2 3/4 inches)
Lent by Mr. Janos Scholz
Provenance: Moscardo, Verona
Inscription: Each of the figures in the four draw-
ings are identified: D34 AQUA? MERCURIUS D35 AERIS D36 LVNA D37 SOL

Bibliography: Walter Vitzthum, Master Drawings, IV, no. i, p. 64, repr. These are two of the seven Vasari drawings acquired by Janos Scholz from the Moscardo Collection in Verona. (Four of the remaining five are also in the exhibition, entitled the Four Planets, nos. D34, D35, D36, and D37.) Stylistically they are similar to a sheet in the Uffizi (no. 1618 E, no. D34a), and are probably studies for the same project. Barocchi compares the allegories in the Uffizi drawing to the Neapolitan allegories of Monteoliveto. She dates the Uffizi drawing after Vasari's stay in Venice of 1541-1542, suggesting that the Uffizi study may have been a Neapolitan commission, corresponding to an entry in the Ricordanze of April 14, 1545. "I remember how on April 14, 1545, Don Pietro Tolledo, Vecre of Naples, asked me to do for him by the order of Ottaviano de' Medici, who was with the illustrious Duke Cosimo, his son-in-law, who came from Florence, a loggia of worked plaster with figures, ornaments, grotesques, foliage, and colored full of stories worked out in fresco, for the price that it would cost to put the work up, and for the trouble that this would cost to put the work up, and for the trouble that this would cause us, to go from Naples ten miles to Pozzuolo by the sea, we decided that Don Pietro should give us rooms, beds and provisions for the time it would take." (translation from F. Barocchi, Mostra di Disegni del Vasari e della Sua Cerchia, 1964, p. 19).

Whether or not the Uffizi drawing was executed for this decoration is questionable. We can be certain, however, that all six of Scholz sheets are either for the same project or one of a very similar nature and of the same period. The figures between the arches, as well as the calligraphy in the Uffizi drawing and the two Scholz drawings are similar. The Four Planets, Mercurius, Aeris, Luna, and Sol, were probably intended to occupy a space comparable to the squares between the large squares in the Uffizi drawing.

GIORGIOVASARI
(Arezzo 1511-Florence 1574)

D38. St. Paul Preaching
Pen, brown ink, and brown wash, over black chalk; 12 5/8 x 9 3/8 inches
Lent by The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund, 1963
Provenance: Professor J. Issacs, London (sale, Sotheby's, London, March 12, 1963, No. 103: "Giora Vasari, Scene from Roman History") Inscriptions: In pen and brown ink, bottom recto, DEBEDIT SE CORAM REGE PRESIDE ROM June 3, 1550 Vasari was commissioned to decorate the Capella del Monte, San Pietro in Montorio, Rome. (Ricordanze, p. 66, C, 19 v. 76). Several of the drawings relating to the vault decoration have been connected with this project (Louvre nos. 2151, 2152 and Uffizi no. 639F; see Barocchi, Vasari Pittore, Ills. 40-42). All of the paintings center around the life of St. Paul, Louvre 2151 representing St. Paul Preaching at Athens, St. Paul Exulting to the Skins and St. Paul Conducting before the Pro Council. Louvre 2152 too is simply a further study for St. Paul Preaching at Athens. To this group of drawings should be added the Metropolitan sheet. The Metropolitan drawing relates very closely to the Louvre drawing (no. 2152). St. Paul in both drawings assumes a similar attitude, the only differences being the position of the Saint's left arm and the positioning of his feet. The Metropolitan sheet is particularly noteworthy for its freshness of concept. The artist is able to instill in his muscular figures an elegance with delicate lines and select areas of ink washes. Vasari's indebtedness to Simone Mosca, a sculptor and architect, who was scheduled to work on the tomb for Cardinal del Monte in San Pietro is evident in the corinthian capitals on the columns flanking the scene.

GIORGIOVASARI
(Arezzo 1511-Florence 1574)

D39. Ceiling Design for the Sala di Lorenzo il Magnifico, (Il Quartiere di Leone X, Palazzo Vecchio, Florence) ca. 1556-62
Pen and brown ink, brown wash, over faint traces of black chalk: the center panel squared in black chalk; 15 1/2 x 14 1/4 inches
Lent by The Pierpont Morgan Library Provenance: E. Guntrip, Book and Printseller of Tonbridge, Kent; Mr. George H. Fitch, New York City
Inscriptions: By Vasari, below the central panel: PRESENTE DEL SOLDANO E DALTRI PRINCIPI, the Coats of Arms, the blank portrait medallions reading from the top clock-wise: (1) JULIANUS MED DUX NEMORS (2) PETRUS MEDICIS (3) IOANNES CARDINALIS DE MEDICIS (4) JULIANUS MED PETRI; the paired virtues reading from the top clock-wise: (1) AUDACIA and BUONCONVENTO (2) BUON GIUDITIO and CLEBRE (3) FIETTA and PEDE (4) FAMIA and VIRTU. The inscription Geo. Vasari below the right of the central panel is by a latter hand. Bibliography: Felice Stampfle, "A Ceiling Design by Vasari, "Master Drawings, 1968, VI, No. 3, pp. 266-271, pls. 32, 33; Karl Frey, Der literarische Nachlass Giorgio Vasaris, Munich, 1, 1923, pp. 437-438.
In 1965, Felice Stampfle discovered and identified this drawing. One of the finest Vasari drawings in this country and Europe, the sheet is a preparatory sketch, squared for transfer, for the Sala di Lorenzo il Magnifico (II Quartiere di Leone X, Palazzo Vecchio, no. D39a).
In keeping with the attitude of the decorations of the other rooms of the Palazzo Vecchio, the drawing is the result of a collaborative effort of the artist, Vasari, the humanist, Cosimo Bartoli, and the ancestor, Cosimo. It recalls the deeds of the great 15th century Florentine Lorenzo il Magnifico. In the central square Lorenzo receives offerings from ambassadors representing the King of Naples, the Duke of Milan, the Sultan, the papacy, etc. In the semi-circles surrounding this panel, Lorenzo is depicted seated amongst Florentine scholars and men of letters (left semi-circle), In the top semi-circle we see Lorenzo presiding at the Congress of Cremona; in the right semi-circle he continues the siege of Sarzana and, on the bottom semi-circular opening, we find Lorenzo before the king of Naples, petitioning for peace. Lorenzo is depicted as a humanist, as a scholar, and as a diplomat. Lorenzo’s character is further reinforced by the pairs of virtues that are found in the triangular spaces adjacent to the semi-circles. Portrait medallions, supported by pairs of putti, are also located on the four sides of the drawing.

Stampfle discusses the numerous changes that take place between this drawing and the ceiling. This appears to have been one of the first, if not the first, plan conceived by Bartoli and Vasari. A drawing in the Uffizi (1185 E, no. D39a) is closer in detail to the panel than the Morgan drawing. Stampfle suggests that some of the changes may have been made by Vasari’s assistants working from the master design. Vasari’s staff, on occasion, deviated from the master’s design. However, since the Uffizi drawing is unquestionably by the hand of Vasari it is unlikely that Vasari’s students made the changes. The changes were probably made by Vasari following the suggestions of Cosimo I and Bartoli. A second drawing in the Chatsworth, Devonshire Collection, (Stampfle fig. 4) again falls in line between the Morgan drawing and the panel. The drawing for Lorenzo before the king of Naples has been drastically altered. Full-length figures are replaced by shoulder-head figures; the balustrade is replaced with a balcony; the result is a simplified drawing. Drawings for other rooms of Il Quattroiere di Leone X are located in the Cabinet des Dessins at the Louvre, the Gabinetto Di segni e Stampe of the Uffizi, as well as Budapest, Stockholm, and Chatsworth and Ottawa (no. D40).

GIORGIO VASARI
(Arezzo 1511-Florence 1574)

D40. A Young Soldier in Roman Costume Receiving Tribute from an Old Man Kneeling Before Him (Study for the Ceiling of the “Sala Cosimo I Granduca” in the Quattroiere di Leone X, Palazzo Vecchio, Florence) 1559.

Pen and light brown wash on blue paper heightened with white, squared in black chalk; 6 3/8 x 7 3/16 inches.

Lent by The National Gallery of Canada


Eight paintings decorate the angles of the ceiling of the “Sala di Cosimo I” in the Quattroiere di Leone X of the Palazzo Vecchio, Florence. This is a finished drawing, squared for transfer for one of the panels. A design for the entire ceiling exists in the Louvre (no. 2174).

Each of the eight paintings in the angles of the ceiling represent towns paying homage to Duke Cosimo I. According to Popham and Fenwick, the section on the Louvre drawing corresponding to this study is inscribed with the word Borgo. This presumably would refer to the town of Borgo San Sepolco (European Drawings in the Collection of the National Gallery of Canada, 1965, p. 18).

The purpose of the drawing was first identified by Dr. Gunther Thiern. The portion of the ceiling corresponding to this drawing is reproduced in Alfredo Lensi, Palazzo Vecchio, Milan, 1929, p. 192.

GIORGIO VASARI
(Arezzo 1511-Florence 1574)

D41. Seated Man (Study for the Arringa di Antonio Giacomini, Sala Grande, Palazzo Vecchio, Florence) ca. 1563-1566

Black chalk; 11 3/8 x 7 15/16 inches

Lent by the Pierpont Morgan Library
Provenance: Sir Thomas Lawrence; W. Y. Ottley; Golnaghi, London.

Exhibitions: Exhibition 1965, No. 6


This is one of several sketches for the Arringa di Antonio Giacomini (no. D12a) in the Sala Grande of the Palazzo Vecchio. It is a study, by Vasari, for the Patriarzir, in the left-central foreground, listening with his fellow Florentines to Giacomini’s oration, encouraging them to go to war against Pisa.

The drawing joins a rather problematic group of four studies related to the panel. It is the only one that is without question, by the impresario, Giorgio Vasari. It relates closely to Vasari’s black chalk studies of this period, particularly to a drawing of Elias in the British Museum (reproduced in Barocchi Vasari Pittore, no. 86). Other drawings from this group, and not by Vasari, are in the Fondazione Horne of Florence and in the
J. B. Speed Art Museum in Louisville (reproduced in Thiem, "Neuentdeckte . . ." figs. 2 and 5). The third is the drawing from the Scholz Collection (no. D12) which Thiem attributes to Battista Naldini.

It is not surprising to find several artists working on a single panel in the Palazzo Vecchio. It has been demonstrated by Barocchi in her studies, that the decoration of the Sala Grande and the other rooms and halls of the Palazzo Vecchio was accomplished through the efforts of Vasari and his assistants. Vasari was the organizer and, as a consequence, retained control over the project. However, he also permitted certain freedoms to his assistants and it is not surprising to see the hands of Naldini, Cristofano Gherardi, Marco da Faenza, Giovanni Stradanus, Jacopo Zucchi, etc. appearing in the decorations.

GIORGIO VASARI
(Arezzo 1511-Florence 1574)

D42. Design for a Series of Six Frescoes (Sala Grande, Palazzo Vecchio, Florence) ca. 1563-1566

Pen and bistre wash; 8 5/8 x 8 1/2 inches (two sheets attached)

Lent by the Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, Bequest of Charles A. Loeser

Provenience: Charles A. Loeser

Inscriptions: Right sheet, top rectangle: Papa Alessandro IV da linsegna presa di Cacina la sacramuccia di Monastero/ middle rectangle: Edificazione di Firenze/ Consiglio della guerra con la deliberazione/ Deliberazione, vigilanza, patienza fortezza prudenza/ bottom rectangle: Carlo IV da privilegi/La presa di vico pisano/ La presa di Casoli

Left sheet, top rectangle: PP Leone X da privilegi/La presa de brigantini/ Middle rectangle: Restaurazione o amplificazione di Firenze/ Rotta de viniatini in essentino al b battione/ Bottom rectangle: Carlo V (crossed out)/Batteria del soccorsi fr . . . Bonbagianni


In 1566, Giorgio Vasari, with the aid of assistants and advisors, completed the ceiling for the Sala Grande in the Palazzo Vecchio. When the job was completed, thirty-nine panels set in three rows comprised this complete iconographic program. Our complete understanding and appreciation of this staggering achievement is partially realized through the study of these drawings. In 1960, Gunther Thiem reviewed some of the preparations and agonies involved with this project. He published several drawings that lead to an understanding of the project and the most vital sheets were these from the Fogg Art Museum (Thiem, "Vasari's Entwuerfe . . ." pp. 97-135). The drawings are suggestions for six scenes from the history of Florence. Thiem indicates that the six studies belong to the second ceiling plan which is in the Uffizi (no. 7979A) and states that the sheets must be detached and laid end to end (the top of each sheet must meet). The result is an ordering of the drawings as presented to Cosimo I by Vasari.

The scheme, as dictated by the Fogg sheets, was apparently criticized by Cosimo and never reached the final stages. Captions on two of the six drawings are already crossed out on the Fogg Sheet Carlo V (bottom left) and Carlo 4 da privilegi. The themes of the top two drawings were also dropped in favor of other themes. The middle right sheet, Edificazione di Firenze, was changed but carried over and the middle left study, Restaurazione e Amplificazione di Fiorenza, was not carried through (ibid., p. 104). These changes were apparently not uncommon to Vasari. Changes were often dictated by Vasari's patron, Cosimo, as well as Cosimo's historical advisor, Don Vincenzo Borghini. Vasari also found his ideas altered on other projects. This may explain studies that are not connected with any project and can only be connected stylistically with other studies.

Other drawings belonging to the second plan are found in the Uffizi (nos. 1490 ORN; 9625; 9615; reproduced in Thiem, figs. 2, 3, 4, 5). Stylistically the sheets are closely related.

GIORGIO VASARI
(Arezzo 1511-Florence 1574)

D43. Allegory of the Two Parts of Florence (Study for the Ceiling of the Sala Grande, Palazzo Vecchio, Florence) ca. 1563-1566

Pen and brown ink; 8 1/2 x 10 1/4 inches

Lent by the Art Institute of Chicago, The Leonora Hall Guiry Memorial Collection

Provenience: Dr. William Ogle

Two large tondos terminate the central longitudinal axis of the ceiling of the Sala Grande in the Palazzo Vecchio. This drawing is probably the schizzo for one or both of these tondos.

Each of the tondos depicts two districts of Florence and are called Quartieri di Santo Spirito e Santo Croce (no. D43a) and Quartieri di Santa Maria Novella e San Giovanni. In both panels the dominant figures are the two shield bearers (the Caborianis), three cherubs and the lion of the city on the bottom level, the eight cherubs waving banners and seated on a semi-circular concave balcony in the middle level, and the flower strew-
ing figure of Florence (Firenze) hovering in the top level.
A comparison of the drawing and the tondo reveals the numerous changes made from the earlier idea as represented in the schizzo. There are a greater number of figures and the attitudes of the figures are different. However, the arrangement of figures in space has not changed. The relationship of figures to architecture produces the same horror of vacui as in the tondos.
Günther Thiem reproduces another drawing from the Ashmolean Museum (Vasari Entwürfe . . . . “fig. 20) which is a more finished study than the Chicago study. Yet even this drawing exhibits major differences and incompleteness when compared to the tondos.

Copy after GIORGIO VASARI

D44. *Cosimo I with His Artists*, (Sala di Cosimo I de Medici, Il Quartiere di Leone X, Palazzo Vecchio, Florence) ca. 1556-62

Pen, brown ink, and wash, heightened with white traces of pink on greenish paper; diameter: 9 1/4 inches

Lent by The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund, 1958


This was thought to be a study for the central panel of the Sala di Cosimo I in the Palazzo Vecchio (no. D44a), depicting Cosimo surrounded by his artists. However, Jacob Bean feels that the drawing is an old copy, perhaps after a drawing in the collection of the Castello Sforzesco in Milan. Because of the ruined condition of the Castello Sforzesco drawing, it is impossible to determine whether it is the original or a second old copy after the original design by Vasari.

This drawing, as a copy, is of interest to us because it reveals the changes made from the study to the finished panel. The most notable alteration is in the attitude of Cosimo. In the drawing there is a more distinct relationship between the patron and his artists. Cosimo appears to be talking to the kneeling figure on his left, who has been identified as Niccolo Tribolo. In the painted version he points to Tribolo who now holds a model and stares out of the picture away from all of his artists.

Vasari also reduced the number of artists surrounding Cosimo from twelve in the drawing to ten in the panel. In 1883 E. Plon identified the artists in the finished painting: clockwise from the bottom left foreground; San Marino, Bartolommeo Ammannati, Tasso, Vasari, Baccio Bandinelli, unidentified, Francesco di San Jacopo, Benvenuto Cellini, Tribolo, and Nanni Unglierio. (E. Plon, *Benvenuto Cellini*, Paris, 1883). Gertrude Rosenthal has suggested that the unidentified artist be Bacchiacea (Rosenthal, *Bacchiacea and His Friends*, 1961, no. 79).

GIORGIO VASARI
(Arezzo 1511-Florence 1574)

D45. *Sacrifice to Jupiter* (?)

Pen, sepia ink and wash on faded white paper; 11 1/3 x 7 7/16 inches.

Lent by the Wadsworth Athenæum

Inscriptions: Giorgio Vasari signed ll. in later hand

Provenance: (Markings on frame of mount: Collector’s stamp ll. of Count Moriz von Fries (1777-1826); 163 in ll. corner of mat in ink; Lught No. 2903; 335, white label with black numbers in lower left of mat: cf. drawing of eagles in the Albertina Inv. No. 61 on reverse of Savonarola portrait. One eagle in a similar position.


Based on a drawing in the Uffizi (no. D45a), Marco da Faenza, one of Vasari’s assistants at the Palazzo Vecchio, is traditionally credited with the invention of this sacrificial scene to Jupiter. However, the discovery of the Wadsworth Athenæum drawing demonstrates that it was the master who first created the image. The Faenza drawing, a copy of the Athenæum sheet, has little of the life exhibited in the Wadsworth Athenæum study. It is calculated and belabored and the freedom of Vasari’s lines are drawn by Marco with a deliberation and precision that marks the Uffizi drawing as a copy.

The subject of Jupiter is one of the most significant in Roman mythology. Since Jupiter was god of weather, altars were erected on those sites struck by lightning. In this drawing, Vasari has depicted the sacrifice of the lamb to Jupiter. The eagle may be a representation of Jupiter.

GIORGIO VASARI
(Arezzo 1511-Florence 1574)

D46. *Project for an Arch at the Entrance to the Borgo Ognissanti*, Florence, 1565

Pen and brown ink, and brown wash, over a preliminary drawing in black chalk, on a laid paper with a watermark similar to Briquet nos. 1083-4; 16 1/4 x 10 3/4 inches

Lent by Mr. Milton Heald

Provenance: Sold at Sotheby’s, March 25, 1965, lot 61, (as Jacopo Zucchi)

Bibliography: Edmund Balfour, “Drawings by Vasari and Vincenzo Borghini for the ‘Apparato’
Inscriptions: Recto: upper left ENTRATA DI BORG OGNI SANTI N II. (N II is crossed out); inscription on middle right questo e, il disegno del entrata di Borg ogni San/disscrirto al quad(er) no. 15-16 Verso: below cross-section diagram of the arch questa e la pianta del arco che e dala banda di A di questo/ medesimo foglio di no 3 disegnato per lentrata di Borg ogni San.
In 1565 Vasari and Vincenzo Borghini were charged to complete the decorations for the wedding of Francesco de' Medici and Giovanna of Austria. Edmund Pillsbury has demonstrated that this drawing was a study for part of the decorations ("Drawings by Vasari and Vincenzo Borghini for the 'Apparato' in Florence in 1565," Master Drawings Vol. V, no. 3, 1967, p. 281-283).
On April 5, 1565, Borghini wrote to Cosimo I in Pisa, sending him nineteen drawings by Vasari and two drawings by himself for the decorations. One sheet described by Borghini in this group of drawings was the Heibald study: "I studied the drawings of Borgo Ognissanti, in which, as far as I'm concerned, I would not put the arch, but I would put, in any case, a beautiful and magnificent base, on which I would place a statue of a woman at least 7-8 arms length in height. And these two statues would make a way for passage, leaving enough space, for the passing of a crown, about one and a half to two lengths in diameter, between raised arms, as you can see in the design. Other than the arch, I should not change the concept nor the set-up; however, one must be careful not to complicate the design too much since other things must follow." [Num. II. Sequita l'entrata di Borgo Ognissanti, dove, in quanto a me, non vorrei arco, ma disegnerrei in sur orgni canto una bella e magnifica base, sopra la quale vorrei una statua di donna il meno di 7 o 8 braccia, e queste due statue si facessero tanto innanzi nella via, che, lasciando lo spazio comodo per il passo, potessero con un braccio in alto aggiungere a tenere l'une dall' un canto, e l'altra dall' altro una corona, che arrebbe di diametro delle braccia uno e mezzo in due, come nel disegno si vede; e quando pur anche si giudicasse che l'arco vi stesse bene, se ne manda il disegno, e non variera l'invenzione, ne il concetto; ma bisogna anche aver l'occhio di non multiplicare troppo, dico così, avendo rispetto a quel che seguirà] (ibid., p. 281, note 2, translated).
Even though Borghini liked the drawing, a different scheme was employed. Arches for such ceremonies were customarily made of wood, painted to imitate marble, and mounted with terra cotta sculptures. The part of the arch shown on this sheet indicates that some surfaces would be decorated with paintings, perhaps scenes in grisaille. At least two statues, probably representing Tuscany and Austria, would also be included as an integral part of this complex.
The arch, as initially conceived by Vasari, was to have been a splendid setting for this marriage ceremony. Cosimo's sponsorship was to have been evident by the 'imprese' of Cosimo (the turtle with a sail on the base of the arch). But like so many projects of Vasari's during this period, the artist was to alter his plans to conform to the will of others. The final decorations followed Borghini's suggestions.

GIORGIO VASARI
(Arezzo 1511-Florence 1574)
D47. The Risen Christ, Adored by Saints and Angels, 1568
Pen and bistre, bistre wash, heightened with white, brown tinted paper; 16 9/16 x 10 1/2 inches
Lent by Mr. Norbert L. H. Roessler
Provenance: Moscardo; Calcellarii; House of Savoia-Aosta; Janos Scholz
Exhibitions: The John Herron Museum of Art, Indianapolis, Ind., Pontormo to Greco—The Age of Mannerism, 1954, No. 60 (as Benedetto Caliari).
Formerly attributed to Benedetto Caliari, this drawing is one of two studies for the Resurrection in Santa Maria Novella, Florence (no. D47a). The altarpiece was painted in 1568 for The First Grand Duke's physician, Andrea Pasqualli. The panel was also dedicated to Duke Cosimo. Vasari records: "I remember that at the end of December I put up Andrea Pasqualli's panel in Santa Maria Novella, which was 7 arm lengths high, and 4 arm lengths wide; with the resurrection of Christ and four Saints. It cost 200 scudi, but I didn't get more than 150 from him" (translated from the Ricordanze, pp. 98/99).
In the drawing we are able to examine Vasari's approach to the painted surface as he works out in detail, lighting, modeling, etc. He employs a painterly approach in the use of wash and highlighting.
The drawing and panel were probably inspired by Agnolo Bronzino's Resurrection (no. D46b) painted in 1552 and in S. S. Annunziata, Florence. The position of Christ and the figures at the tomb and Vasari's own admission, suggest that Vasari was conscious of Bronzino's panel while working on the Santa Maria Novella altarpiece. In 1584, R. Borghini states his puzzlement over the unusual iconography of the altarpiece. The presence of the Apostles at the scene of The Resurrection is contrary to the Holy Scripture. Borghini was bothered because many ignorant
people would see the panel. He also criticized the expression of Christ as well as the positions of SS. Damian and Andrew (Barocchi, Vasari Pittore, no. 94, pp. 143-144, quotes from Borghini, Il Riposo, Firenze, 1584, I, p. 106). A second drawing related to the altarpiece, attributed to Battista Naldini, is in the Musee Wicar Lille (for reproduction, see Barocchi, Vasari Pittore, plate 94).

GIORGIO VASARI
(Arezzo 1511-Florence 1574)

D48. The Annunciation, ca. 1571
Pen and brown ink, brown wash, squared in black chalk; Diameter 5 1/4 inches
Lent by The Pierpont Morgan Library
Provenance: Charles Fairfax Murray; purchased by J. Pierpont Morgan in London, 1910
Although this modello has been squared for transfer, scholars have been unable to identify it with any painted composition. Stampfle and Bean correctly dismiss the Annunciation in the Louvre as a possibility. It is also clear that the drawing has little to do with the Notre Dame Annunciation (no. P17) even though there are elements that are similar in both. The Notre Dame panel dates nearly twenty years earlier than the drawing and was based on an engraving after a lost drawing by Raphael rendered by Marco da Ravenna (no. G2).
Pillsbury has suggested orally that this drawing may be the cartoon for a lost ‘tondo’ in the Capella di S. Michele in the Torre Pio in the Vatican which dates in 1571 and is described in Taja’s Description of the Vatican . . . ,” and in the “Ricordanze” (1929, p. 109).
Evident in Vasari’s latter oeuvre is an earlier concept of beauty . . . the beauty or sublime found in earlier Leonardsque drawings and those of Botticelli. This aesthetic which Vasari developed throughout his career, either consciously or unconsciously, is particularly evident in the face of the Virgin. Vasari attains a grace, an elevation of gestures, emotions, etc. in his figures that he worked for in his earlier works and attained shortly before his death. However, wherever Vasari dealt with architectural elements such as the prie-dieu, he returned to familiar decorative schemes.

GIORGIO VASARI
(Arezzo 1511-Florence 1574)

D49-D50. Pair of Allegorical Designs
Pen and black ink, gray and yellow wash; diameter 3 11/16 inches
Lent by The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund
Vasari’s rapid schizzi are found in great numbers, and it is likely that many of them remain only as a record of the artist’s ideas, never being realized in painted form. These drawings may have been used to complete the iconographic program of a ceiling or a wall. The very nature of the drawings, quick and spontaneous in execution, preclude the possibility that they were finished drawings for a painted surface. There is no doubt that the drawings belong together. They are two pendants that seemingly depict positive and negative situations. Allegorical design no. D49 pictures a seated, winged female, who holds the head of a seated youth. Overhead three angels (cherubs) are seen flying above the two seated figures. Each of them holds a clay tablet and is showing it to the female who looks up. She appears to be curing the young man with assistance from the flying figures. This leads one to believe that this may be a Biblical scene rather than an allegorical scene. The second design (no. D50) shows a seated figure who seems to be casting a spell over an urn. From a mouth on the urn, water is shown flowing. A dog either sleeping or dead is depicted at the base of the urn. Below the dog, a salamander is shown. Above the kneeling figure a crowd of demonic figures, perhaps devils, in a furious state of mind, fly away from the scene.
Vasari often employed such elements. One is not always certain of the reason for their inclusion and must conclude that they were purely decorative elements and perhaps without any meaning.
D1. Allegory of Peace

NICCOLO DELL 'ABBATE
D2. Study of Seated Male Figure

ALESSANDRO ALLORI

ALESSANDRO ALLORI
D3. River God

BARTOLOMMEO AMMANNATI
Domenico Beccafumi

D4. A Study for a Part of the Mosaic Frieze of the Siena Cathedral Pavement
D5. The Descent from the Cross

DOMENICO BECCAFUMI
D6. Lucretia

GIROLAMO MAZZOLA BEDOLI
D7. Standing Nude Male Figure with a Club

BENVENUTO CELLINI
D8. *Standing Youth*  
ROSSO FIORENTINO
D9. Study for a Ceiling Decoration

PROSPERO FONTANA
D10. Thetis Ordering from Vulcan the Armour of Achilles
D11. Study for the Virgin, St. Agnes, St. Helena, and Other Saints, ca. 1571-1576

GIOVANNI BATTISTA NALDINI

GIOVANNI BATTISTA NALDINI

D12a. *Sala dei Cinquecento*
Palazzo Vecchio, Florence

GIORGIO VASARI
(Photograph Alinari)
D13. Study for the Walk to Emmaus

LELIO ORSI
D13a. *Walk to Emmaus, London National Gallery*
D14. Design for a Facade Decoration

LELIO ORSI
D15. *Three Studies of Putti and of a Seated Boy*

FRANCESCO MAZZOLA
called PARMIGIANINO
D16. Study for Lucretia

FRANCESCO MAZZOLA
called PARMIGIANINO
D17. Bust of a Nude Youth

JACOPO CARUCCI
called IL PONTORMO
D18. *Manna in the Wilderness*  
FRANCESCO MORANDINI called IL POPPI
D19. Design for a Fantastic Emblem

FRANCESCO SALVIATI