



## UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

### The academization of art

*A practice approach to the early histories of the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca*

Jonker, M.J.

#### Publication date

2017

#### Document Version

Other version

#### License

Other

[Link to publication](#)

#### Citation for published version (APA):

Jonker, M. J. (2017). *The academization of art: A practice approach to the early histories of the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca*. [Thesis, fully internal, Universiteit van Amsterdam].

#### General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

#### Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

## Chapter Ten

### Art Academies in Patronage Practices

#### 10.1. Introduction

Between 1569 and 1575 the members of the Accademia del Disegno adorned their chapel in Santissima Annunziata in Florence with various paintings and statues. One of the sculptors participating in the decorative program was Zanobi Lastricati (d. 1590). His statue from 1570-1571 stands out from the others (fig. 58). On the one hand, it represents the prophet Joshua.<sup>1199</sup> As such it fits in nicely with the rest of the program, which consists of scenes and figures from the Old and the New Testament. On the other hand, however, it also bears the likeness of Cosimo I de' Medici. This means that this work of art confronted the academicians with their illustrious patron during burial ceremonies, religious feasts, and – until 1579 – also during official meetings.



**Figure 58.** Zanobi Lastricati (with Vincenzo Danti?), *Joshua / Cosimo I de' Medici*, 1570-71, (painted) clay, Cappella della Santissima Trinità, Santissima Annunziata, Florence (photo: author)

---

<sup>1199</sup> See Summers 1969, 82 for the identification of this statue as Joshua.

Lastricati's over-life-size portrait of Cosimo I in the Cappella della Santissima Trinità in Santissima Annunziata is the first and the most direct visual expression of the patron-client relationship between the grand duke and the Florentine art academy. Other manifestations of this relationship were the grand-ducal coat of arms, i.e. the famous Medici *palle*, painted by Jacopo da Empoli, placed above the academy's entrance in 1590;<sup>1200</sup> a posthumous portrait of Cosimo I painted by Cristofano Allori (1577-1621) in 1598;<sup>1201</sup> and the fresco of Bernardino Poccetti from 1610 in the vault of the loggia of the Ospedale degli Innocenti, the city's orphanage, which represents Duke Cosimo I conferring the first statutes of the Accademia del Disegno to his lieutenant Vincenzo Borghini (fig. 59).<sup>1202</sup>

---

<sup>1200</sup> ASF, AD 27, 9v-12v and ASF, AD 102, 91r-91v and 92v. See Also Barzman 2000, 72-3 and Pacini 2001, 25. Pacini, however, mistakenly writes that the grand-ducal coat of arms above the academy's entrance was painted by Bernardino Poccetti instead of by Jacopo da Empoli. Although archival documents show that the consuls of the academy, indeed, commissioned Poccetti to paint the coat of arms of the grand duke, they also clearly specify that this was meant to be a gift for their *luogotenente*, Giovan Battista Gianfigliuzzi, and thus not for the academy's entrance. And, indeed, in 1587 the Medici coat of arms was placed above the door of his residence. See ASF, AD, 27, 3r-3v, 4v and ASF, AD 102, 75v. Barzman correctly states that Poccetti's painting was intended for the *luogotenente*. However, she also holds that this was the first 'permanent public expression' of the connection between the academy and the state governed by the Medici. This is a problematic statement for two reasons. On the one hand, as mentioned, Lastricati's statue of Joshua as Cosimo I is a more suitable candidate for this qualification, although the accessibility of the academy's chapel in SS Annunziata to the public was probably limited to special occasions, such as Benvenuto Cellini's funeral in 1571. On the other hand and more importantly, it is not clear how the academy's gift of the Medici coat of arms to the lieutenant constitutes a 'permanent public expression' of the connection between the academy and the state. Rather, it seems to have been an expression of appreciation of the academy for the *luogotenente*, and it constituted a public connection of Gianfigliuzzi to the state.

<sup>1201</sup> ASF, AD 28, 6r-v, 31r. And see Barzman 2000, 76 and 304, n. 73, for a discussion and transcription.

<sup>1202</sup> Ważbiński 1978, 48-49 and Barzman 2000, 81-83. Barzman (2000, 71) also claims that the connection between the Accademia del Disegno and the Medici was expressed in the processions that the academy held on religious feast days, because the candles that were carried around were painted with the *palle*. See section 5.4. Poccetti's painting of the inaugural meeting, in which the duke confers the first statutes of the academy to Vincenzo Borghini, is not a representation of an actual event but should be understood in a symbolical way. For the Cosimo I was in Pisa on the day of this meeting, which was held on January 31, 1563 in the convent of Santa Maria degli Angeli. See the letters of Vasari (Frey 1923-1940, I, 712-714) and Borghini (ASF, AD 157, 3r) to the duke, from February 1, 1563, in which they inform him about the event.



Figure 59. Bernardino Poccetti, *Cosimo I de' Medici and the Inauguration of the Accademia del Disegno*, 1610, fresco, Vault of the loggia of the Ospedale degli Innocenti (photo: author)

In Rome, the popes engaged in a similar relationship of patronage with the Accademia di San Luca as the Medici grand dukes with the Florentine organization. The Roman academy also possessed artifacts that established a visual connection between the institution and its powerful patron. For example, in 1579-1580 the predecessor of the Accademia di San Luca, the guild-based lay confraternity of painters, had the coat of arms of Pope Gregory XIII made out of gold – or, more probably, gilded – and placed in its church.<sup>1203</sup> It is likely that the arms were brought out and exhibited in the church on the feast day of their patron saint, San Luca, because this also happened with the coat of arms of one of the Roman senators, which had been acquired by the organization in 1553,

<sup>1203</sup> AASL 41, 87r: 'E più per l'arme del papa fatta de oro per comisione del console e de tutti del'arte per lo bidello, scudi 2.' This entry is written by Adriano Rainaldi da Norsia (or Norcia), who was the institution's treasurer during Girolamo Muziano's consulate, which lasted from October 1579 until October 1580. Because Rainaldi did not include any dates in his entries, it is impossible to attach a precise date to the commission or execution of the papal coat of arms. However Salvagni (2012, 157, 286, and 337) states that they were placed in the church of San Luca – that is, the old church near Santa Maria Maggiore – just after Muziano's election as consul and on the occasion of the patron saint's feast day on October 18. Salvagni does not explicate how she arrives at this dating, but it probably has to do with her statement that the papal coat of arms replaced that of the senator, which were used for that feast. See following note.

when it was still under municipal jurisdiction.<sup>1204</sup> Gregory XIII's approval of the foundation of the art academy in his papal bull of 1577 is probably the reason for the academy's acquisition of his coat of arms in 1579-1580.

After the foundation of the academy, the production and display of the coats of arms of patrons of the institution continued. For example, for Candlemas of 1607 the academy had the coats of arms of the Pope Paul V and of Cardinals Del Monte and Pamphili painted on candles and donated them to these men.<sup>1205</sup> And in 1624, the academy commissioned the painter Pietro Contini for the coat of arms of Pope Urban VIII.<sup>1206</sup> However, the Roman institution never commissioned an explicit and permanent symbol of its connection to a powerful patron, such as Lastricati's statue of Joshua in the guise of Cosimo I. This is an indication of the different functions that the academies performed in patronage practices at the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries.

In the few instances when scholars embark upon a – usually very brief – comparison between the Roman and the Florentine art academies in their early years, the authors decry an important distinction in the institution's relationship with their patrons. The result of such reflections is that whereas the Accademia del Disegno was 'conceived or funded as an instrument of secular power' officially headed by the grand duke, the Accademia di San Luca was much more loosely connected to the papacy, on which it depended for official approval and legitimacy.<sup>1207</sup> Through a

---

<sup>1204</sup> AASL 41, 53r: 'Vengono pagati 15 baiocchi per l'arme del Senatore da usare nella festa di San Luca.'

<sup>1205</sup> AASL G1, 296: 'Io Pietro Roncanelli pitore fo fede come ms Agabito Visconti ^secondo retore^ fece le arme per la Candelaiia a la nostra congregazione per le candele, quale furno presentate a li nostri superiori cioè l'arme del papa, del cardinale Pamfilio, l'arme del cardinale Del Monte (...).'

<sup>1206</sup> AASL, 42, 43r: 'e più pagato a dì 11 detto [January 1624] al sig[nore] Pietro Contini per due mila bulletini da intimare le cong[regazio]ni et per fattura d'arme di papa Urbano si come appare per mandato, 1,60.' The treasurer at this time was the painter Antiveduto Grammatica (1571-1626), and the Pietro Contini mentioned in this record as the producer of the arms was a painter, whose first appearance in the academy dates to December 1593, when a notarial document names him as the appraiser of the institution (ASR, TNC, uff. 11, 1593, pt. III. Vol. 27, fol. 443r). In another document from 1596 Contini is also mentioned as appraiser of works of art in Cardinal Aldobrandini's villa in Frascati. See AASL G1, 29-30. In 1603-04 he was the academy's treasurer.

<sup>1207</sup> See Cohen 2009, 330-331; Rossi 1984, 386; Lukehart 2009a, 12 and 21, n. 50. Rossi, for example, argues that the greater autonomy enjoyed by the Accademia di San Luca in comparison to the Accademia del Disegno meant that the Roman institution had to exercise auto-censorship in order to stay in line with the desires of the papacy. The dependence of the Roman academy on the papacy, and the counter-reformatory church in general, is discussed only by Italian scholars – besides Rossi 1984, by Beltramme 1990,

more elaborate comparison of the functions of the art academies in patronage practices it is possible to adjust and deepen this superficial conclusion. This comparison is carried out by combining the practice approach with the central concepts from the literature on patronage studies.

### *10.2. Patrons, clients, and cultural brokers*

Patron-client relationships were widely dispersed in early modern societies.<sup>1208</sup> Generally stated, the patron offered protection and support to his client, and the client services and loyalty to his patron. This could take many forms, from basic means of subsistence such as money and the access to land for cultivation to political rights, jobs, recommendations, marriages, useful contacts, and commissions for cultural products on the part of the patron; and from labor service and specialized skills to information, advice, artifacts, and guarding a patron's reputation on the part of the client.<sup>1209</sup>

In political practices, patrons provided protection (e.g. from arbitrary laws or external dangers), security, and (material) support and favors to their clients, who, in return, offered services, products, and their loyalty. In religious practices, patronage was an integral part of the distribution of ecclesiastical offices, with the pope as highest patron and cardinals and other high church officials as semi-independent patrons.<sup>1210</sup> And producers of artistic, literary, and scientific artifacts and treatises dedicated their work to a potential patron, if an actual one had not already commissioned it.<sup>1211</sup> The dispersion of patron-client relationships entailed that patronage practices overlapped with many other social practices in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century societies in Italy.<sup>1212</sup>

---

and Salvagni 2008, 2009, and 2012. However, they do so in a general way or in terms of style, and not in connection to specific rules or activities in the academy.

<sup>1208</sup> According to Gellner (1977, 4) and Kettering (1986, 5), patronage was characteristic of incomplete centralized states, in which institutions often did not have the authority or power needed to function adequately. Although Kettering's remark is based on her research on France in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and Gellner's statement is part of his introduction to a volume of essays about patronage in contemporary Mediterranean societies, they also apply to Florence and Rome of around 1600. See, for a general discussion of patronage in early modern and modern states Lind 1996.

<sup>1209</sup> Scott 1977, 23-24; Kettering 1986, 3-4.

<sup>1210</sup> Lind 1996, 125-129.

<sup>1211</sup> See for an example from the context of the Florentine cultural field Mendelsohn 1982, 95, where the dedications of Varchi's *Due lezioni* are connected to Cosimo I, even though the duke was not the actual dedicatee of the book.

<sup>1212</sup> This means the patronage practices were more *dispersed* in early modern culture than other integrative practices such as artistic, literary, political, religious, and scientific

Patronage did not manifest itself in exactly the same way in the different social practices. For example, commissioning a poem or a painting was not the same as intervening in criminal trials to keep a client from being imprisoned or exiled.<sup>1213</sup> Whereas in English both activities are called ‘patronage’, the Italian language reserves the word *clientelismo* for the latter activity, as well as for the relationship between a political patron and a client in general, and it uses *mecenatismo* as artistic and cultural patronage for the former case, and as the patronage of the arts and sciences in general.<sup>1214</sup> This chapter focuses mainly on patronage as *mecenatismo* – although *clientelismo* does not disappear from the stage, since the same individuals *and* institutions often engaged in artistic *and* political patron-client relationships.<sup>1215</sup>

Notwithstanding the differences of patron-client relationships in various social practices, from the (vast) literature on this subject emerges the following definition to which most, if not all, authors would agree. The patron-client relationship is a long-term, personal, and obligatory allegiance between two partners, who possess an unequal amount of status, power, or resources and who bestow mutual but different benefits on each other.<sup>1216</sup> The following paragraphs explain the different terms of this definition.

---

practices. Dispersed is used here not in Schatzki’s sense of the term. The reason for this is that unlike Schatzki’s dispersed practices, the organization of early modern patronage practices was composed of a teleoaffective structure and rules in addition to practical understandings. In historical research patronage relations in political contexts have been studied first and most frequently. Whereas Kettering (1992, 839) argues that the reason for this is that ‘patronage ties are ... most visible and easily documented, and thus analyzed in a political context’, Gellner (1977, 5) suggests that politics is a sphere of life that is more ‘patronage-prone’ than others. Since the 1980s there has been growing attention for art and cultural patronage. See, for example, Kent/Simons/Eade 1987, Kempers 1992, Biagioli 1990 and 1993, Roeck 1999, Van Veen 2006, and Goudriaan 2015.

<sup>1213</sup> See Cavazzini 2008, 8-10, for various examples, in which patrons (mostly cardinals) used their influence to help painters in their dealings with justice in the early seventeenth century in Rome.

<sup>1214</sup> See Ianziti 1987, 299-301. See also Kettering 1992, 843.

<sup>1215</sup> The cases of Michelangelo Buonarroti the Younger (1568-1648) and Don Giovanni de’ Medici (1567-1621), discussed in Dooley 2006, Cole 2007, and Goudriaan 2015 are exemplary of this combination of artistic and political patronage.

<sup>1216</sup> See, for definitions and descriptions of the patron-client relationship, in which some or all of these characteristics are present Kettering 1986, 13; Kettering 1992, 856; Gellner 1977, 1; Scott 1977, 22; Weissman 1987, 25-26; Keblusek 2006, 10. Cfr. also Lemarchand and Legg’s (1972, 151-52) definition of political clientelism: ‘Political clientelism [...] may be viewed as a more or less personalised, affective and reciprocal relationship between actors, or sets of actors, commanding unequal resources and involving mutually beneficial transactions that have political ramifications beyond the immediate sphere of dyadic relationships.’

The qualifications ‘long-term’ and ‘personal’ distinguishes the patron-client relationship from economic transactions on the market and from bonds that are formalized through legal contracts.<sup>1217</sup> The relationship often began with the patron’s acceptance of a gift from an aspiring client without immediately reciprocating it.<sup>1218</sup> In this way the patron was indebted to the gift-giver and had an obligation to return the gift at a later moment, after which the client would be indebted to the patron. In an unpublished treatise on the Roman court (‘Discorso sopra la corte di Roma’) the humanist and philosopher Giovanni Ciampoli (1589-1643) phrased this principle eloquently when he wrote ‘Blessed is he who through giving can accelerate his fortune.’<sup>1219</sup>

An example from the realm of art can be found in Raffaello Borghini’s *Il Riposo* (1584). Borghini, who was not related to the academy’s first *luogotenente* Vincenzo Borghini, recounts how the sculptor Valerio Cioli (1529-1599) was called to Florence by Cosimo I, after having made a small marble statue of Venus for the duke in 1561:

(...) during that time he was called to Florence by Grand Duke Cosimo, to whom he had donated a not very large marble Venus and for which he received from the liberality of that lord hundred *scudi* as compensation. And so he came to serve him (...).<sup>1220</sup>

Borghini not only states that Cioli was rewarded with 100 *scudi* but also that this gift was the beginning of their patron-client relationship. Together with his father Simone, Valerio Cioli served the grand duke

---

<sup>1217</sup> See, for these distinctions, Paine 1971, 9; Gellner 1977, 3; Weissman 1987, 25-26. Cavazzini (2008, 119-121) has argued that in seventeenth-century Rome the same persons could be patron on one occasion and client on another. According to Cavazzini, this even held for Cardinal Del Monte, the protector of the Accademia di San Luca. In Florence the artists who were on the grand-ducal payroll, including several members of the art academy, were engaged in a patron-client relationship, even though in some instances the bond was formalized with a contract. See Fumagalli 2014.

<sup>1218</sup> Cole 2007, 740-741; Kettering 1992, 845. In his theoretical essay in a volume on patronage and brokerage in the East Arctic, Paine (1971, 14), by contrast, suggests that the aspiring patron usually has the initiative.

<sup>1219</sup> Guglielminetti/Masero 1978, 232: ‘Beato chi col donare può accelerare la sua fortuna!’ Cf. Bredekamp 2001, 1569-157 and Biagioli 1993, who both use this phrase to interpret the donations Galileo made to the Medici family in order to acquire a position at the Florentine court. Ciampoli was a supporter of Galileo.

<sup>1220</sup> Borghini 1584/1807, IV, 175-176: ‘(...) nel qual tempo [1561] venne a Firenze chiamato dal Gran Duca Cosimo, a cui aveva donato a Roma una Venere di marmo non molto grande e ricevutone dalla liberalità di quel Signore scudi cento in guiderdone. E così si mise a servirlo, riducendoli a buon termine tutte le sue anticaglie.’

from 1563 onwards by restoring antiquities and making sculptures for gardens.<sup>1221</sup>

The obligatory nature of the patron-client relationship was usually concealed, as both parties emphasized that their gifts were freely given and completely disinterested.<sup>1222</sup> This concealment is, generally, achieved through the lapse of time, because this is what makes it possible to conceive of a counter-gift as an act of generosity, rather than as a calculated move and an investment for the future.<sup>1223</sup> The inequality of the partners is connected to this point.<sup>1224</sup> The disparity in status, wealth, or power between patron and client also meant that the benefits and gifts that they exchanged were of a different kind and had a different monetary value. The patron had to offer something that was proportionate to his

---

<sup>1221</sup> In 1563 the names of Simone and Valerio Cioli occur for the first time on the grand ducal payroll, both receiving a salary of about 7 *scudi* a month. See Fumagalli 2014, 107, with references to the payrolls in the ASF. From 1574 onwards Valerio received 15 *scudi* per month. According to Fumagalli, this must have been when his father died and he carried out all the work.

<sup>1222</sup> Kettering 1992, 844.

<sup>1223</sup> Bourdieu 1977, 28 and 1979, 171-178. The importance of time and timing in gift-giving, and in social practices in general, is emphasized by Bourdieu (1979, 4-6 and 1990, 98-111). According to him, taking account of time when analyzing practices is necessary to ward off the reductionist interpretations that are based on objective and mechanical models. Instead of seeing gift-giving as a necessary, logical, or rational cycle of reciprocity, in which the actors' moves are predetermined, the attention for time, i.e. the interval between gift and counter-gift, reintroduces the uncertainty that characterizes the actual practices and the actors' point of view into the analysis. For this reason Bourdieu holds that the analysis of time should be an integral part of the analysis of practice. Furthermore, according to him, the concealment of the functions of the exchanges of gifts, ceremonies, and visits is as important as these functions themselves, insofar as it aids the continuation established relations. It can be said, more generally, that the fundamental and functional ambiguity of social actions and social transactions are important features in Bourdieu's work.

<sup>1224</sup> The concealment of the obligatory nature of the patron-client relationship makes it difficult for modern scholars to determine to what extent it was purely materialistic, pragmatic and self-interested, and to what extent the bond included genuine feelings of affection between the partners. It is not unlikely that often the actors involved did not make sharp distinctions themselves. Although this is what differentiates the patron-client relation from a friendship, the lines were often blurry. Furthermore, it has been noted that the modern concept of friendship is not applicable to early modern cultures and that the nature of the bond was subject to change. The difficulty of distinguishing between patron-client relations and friendships has to do with the fact that patrons and clients generally called each other 'friend' in order to emphasize their trust and loyalty towards each other and to conceal the obligatory nature of their bond. See Kettering 1986, 14-15 and 1992, 844, and 849-860. See, for an example of how a friendship changed to a patron-client relationship the case of Maffeo Barberini (later Pope Urban VIII) and Michelangelo Buonarroti the Younger, described by Cole 2007, esp. 738, 763-766. See, for the difficulty of applying the modern notion of friendship to early modern culture, Lind 1996, 123. And see Goudriaan 2015, 238-240, for a discussion of all three points.

own status.<sup>1225</sup> For example, the painter Guido Reni (1575-1642) typically refused to name a price for works done for the wealthiest and most powerful patrons, but rather give them as a gift. According to his biographer Carlo Cesare Malvasia (1616-1693), in this way Reni received a considerable higher reward for his paintings than was the custom, and also more than he would have asked himself.<sup>1226</sup> Many artists of the early modern period employed the same strategy or 'Preispolitik'.<sup>1227</sup>

The asymmetry in social status and power between a patron and client is exemplified by the way in which the Accademia del Disegno came into possession of its first headquarters. This was Brunelleschi's famous *Tempio di Pippo Spano*. As discussed in Chapter Four, the chapel belonged to Bernardo Scolari, and had been in his family's possession since the early fifteenth century. In the 1480s the chapel had served as the seat of the university. However, it had remained unfinished due to insufficient funds. In July 1562 Cosimo I made arrangements with the monks of the convent that the academicians were allowed to use the chapel and an adjacent room, and to finish the chapel as it was started. After Cosimo I's intervention Scolari conceded his chapel freely to the academy.<sup>1228</sup> This is an example of how Cosimo I as patron of Scolari called in a favor for another client, the academy. The unfinished state of the chapel and the lack of funds to complete it probably made it easier for Cosimo I to convince Scolari to donate it to the new institution, but even without this circumstance it would have been difficult for Scolari to refuse such a request from the duke. And by complying to Cosimo I's wish, he increased the likelihood of advancing his own interests with the duke's help.

Another important figure in early modern patronage practices was the *broker*, a middleman or mediator between client and patron.<sup>1229</sup> A broker was someone who arranged an exchange of resources between parties who were separated by physical, social, or political distances.<sup>1230</sup> However, a broker was more than just a go-between. He did not only

---

<sup>1225</sup> Cole 2007, 741. Goudriaan 2015, 250.

<sup>1226</sup> Malvasia 1980, 115.

<sup>1227</sup> For example, in his autobiography the sculptor and goldsmith Benvenuto Cellini (1500-1571) recounts the story of how he receives a lot more money for his work than his master Lucagnolo by not naming a price, and initially even by offering it as a gift to Porzia Chigi. Cellini 1910, §§ 19-21. Reni and Cellini are but two of many examples of artists operating in this way.

<sup>1228</sup> Van Veen 2006, 174; Barzman 2000, 47-51.

<sup>1229</sup> Cole 2007, 749.

<sup>1230</sup> Kettering 1986, 4. See also Keblusek 2006, 10. Keblusek's article is the introductory essay of a volume, in which scholars of different academic disciplines (history, art history, history of medicine, book history, and social and economic history) attempt to 'profile' the early modern agent. The term 'agent' is used here as synonym for 'broker'.

bring two parties together, but also influenced or manipulated the transaction by adding emphasis or drawing on his own resources, which usually consisted of the people he knew, i.e. his social capital.<sup>1231</sup>

In recent studies the notion of *cultural broker* has been fruitfully developed to describe those individuals who mediate between patrons and producers of cultural objects, such as works of art but also literary treatises, and scientific knowledge.<sup>1232</sup> In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the function of cultural broker was mainly carried out in Rome by men descending from the lower nobility and in Florence by members of patrician families. These cultural brokers mediated between the artists and the higher nobility and cardinals. They were experts in talking about the visual and literary arts; and they also advised the higher nobility about their art collections.<sup>1233</sup> Literary and cultural academies, such as those discussed in Chapter Seven, can be seen as the training ground (or *palestra*) for such cultural brokers, as a well as meetings places.<sup>1234</sup> Examples are the Accademia Fiorentina in Florence and the Accademia degli Umoristi in Rome. In these academies, cultural brokers acquired the practical understandings necessary for participating in contemporary patronage practices.

A relevant example in the context of this study can be derived from the brokerage activities of don Giovanni de' Medici (1567-1621), the natural son of Cosimo I and a member of the Accademia del Disegno since 1583. Between 1601-1604 don Giovanni participated as soldier on the side of the Spanish in the siege of Ostend in 1601-1604, which was part of the Eighty Years' War (1568-1648) and the Anglo-Spanish War (1585-1604). Giovanni had friends and clients on the battlefield write him letters about the fights. He used these letters, together with his own observations in the field, as source for the regular reports of the

---

<sup>1231</sup> Paine 1971, 19-21; Kettering 1986, 4, 42, and 55-56; Goudriaan 2015, 241-242. Whereas in Kettering's book the brokers are regional notables, i.e. members of the lower nobility in French provinces such as Provence and Languedoc, Goudriaan's examples are drawn from the Florentine patrician families.

<sup>1232</sup> Cole 2007; Dell'Antonio 2011; Goudriaan 2015. The concept of *cultural broker* originated in anthropological studies in the middle of the twentieth century. See, for example, Wolf 1956, Geertz 1960, and Paine 1971. I thank Maaïke Derksen for pointing this out to me and for these references. And see also her forthcoming dissertation at the Radboud University Nijmegen on cultural brokers in during the Dutch colonization of South New Guinea. However, there is an important difference between the use of the term 'cultural broker' in these anthropological studies and in the abovementioned (art) historical publications. In the former case the broker is someone who stands between two cultures (e.g. the Dutch and New Guinean, Mexican and Spanish, or peasant and metropolitan culture on Java), i.e. he is a cross-cultural mediator, whereas in the latter case he brings together producers and consumers of cultural goods.

<sup>1233</sup> Dell'Antonio (2011) uses the term *virtuosi of taste* in this context.

<sup>1234</sup> See for het term *palestra* Procaccioli 2016.

proceedings of the war, which his half-brother Grand Duke Ferdinando I had requested. The grand duke was interested in these reports from his half-brother because the outcome of the war would influence his position and strategy in diplomatic relations with other European countries, and because the other ‘news-bulletins’ that reached Florence were notoriously unreliable. In addition to this information brokerage, in the same period Giovanni also functioned as a cultural broker. He commissioned battle scenes from a (unnamed) Flemish painter on behalf of the grand duke, and he procured black marble from Dinant for the construction of the Cappella dei Principi in San Lorenzo, for which he himself composed the design.<sup>1235</sup>

This shows that a (*cultural*) *broker* was not only a middle-man between patron and client but that he himself could also assume the roles of patron and client in larger networks of patronage relations.<sup>1236</sup> Thereby, the concept of *broker* allows for a more precise interpretation of the diversity and fluidity of social relations that characterize early modern culture than the terms ‘patron’ and ‘client’ alone. This makes the concept highly suitable for its implementation into a practice approach.

In patronage studies, the notions of (*cultural*) *broker*, *patron*, and *client* have been used exclusively to describe the behavior of individual persons.<sup>1237</sup> This chapter aims to show that these notions can also be fruitfully applied to institutions in the early modern period, namely to the Florentine and Roman art academies. In the following sections these

---

<sup>1235</sup> Dooley 2006. Don Giovanni was elected academician at the age of sixteen on April 17, 1583. ASF, AD 26, 32v: ‘si vinse de nostri achademici il signor Giovanni de Medici figliolo del gran duca cosimo, e si degnio di ciedere d’essere achademicho con ogni umanità.’ On the celebration of Candlemas he carried a candle of two *libre*, which was the same weight as that of the *luogotenente* of the academy. ASF, AD 26, 46v. Barzman 2000, 65. On January 18, 1584 he urged Cristofano di Papi (Cristofano dell’Altissimo) to continue his function as *provveditore* of the academy after the latter had stated that he wanted to resign because of his old age. Cristofano indeed continues his function, stating that Giovanni could command him as he wishes and that he is Giovanni’s servant. ASF, AD 26, 41r. Barzman 2000, 66. In November 1585 Giovanni intervened on behalf of the academy in a conflict about the boundaries of its headquarters in Cestello with the monks of the convent. ASF, AD 26, 45v. In archival documents from 1594 and 1596 Don Giovanni is named ‘patron’ and ‘protector’ of the academy. ASF, AD 27, 112r and ASF, AD 28, 51v. See, for a discussion, Barzman 2000, 75-76.

<sup>1236</sup> Kettering 1986, 4. Although Goudriaan also emphasizes the flexibility of brokers in patronage networks, she does make some general distinctions between patrons and brokers. For instance, she (2015, 244) argues that brokers usually had larger networks than patrons, but that they could not directly control their resources as patrons could (e.g. jobs).

<sup>1237</sup> Barzman (1989a, 460) states that although the Medici implemented a new form of patronage with the foundation of the Accademia del Disegno, that the recipients of that patronage, i.e. the artists in the six major workshops in Florence, remained the same. She does not clarify of what this new form of patronage consisted in her opinion.

notions are applied to the functions of the art academies in early modern patronage practices.

If the previous discussion about the literature on patronage studies is reformulated in Schatzki's terminology, the following aspects of the organization of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century patronage practices can be identified. Regarding the teleoaffective structure, one of the main goals of patronage practices was the cultivation and maintenance of networks, consisting of individuals of various social standings – but, as will become clear, also of institutions – for the sake of exchanging favors when necessary (teleology). The production of cultural artifacts, such as artworks, was also part of the teleoaffective structure of patronage practices – albeit not as ultimate goal – in the sense that, as gifts, these products were used to establish and maintain patron-client relations. In addition, as to the affectivity of Schatzki's *teleoaffective* structures in early modern patronage practices, an important way of maintaining relationships in a network was the demonstration of affection for one another, whether this was genuine or feigned (or both).<sup>1238</sup>

Many of the rules that linked the actions in patronage practices concern the exchange of gifts between members of a patron-broker-client network. In the first place, participants were obliged to return a gift or favor if they wanted to remain participants of this practice. However, the obligatory nature of the counter-gift was to be concealed or denied. One important way of doing this was to let enough time pass, so that the counter-gift could be perceived as a spontaneous act of generosity. However, one had to avoid waiting too long, otherwise the initial gift could be perceived as unanswered. Finally, the favor or gift should be appropriate to the (expected and desired) counter-gift or –favor *and* to one's own status, as is shown by the example of Reni's 'Preispolitik'.

One of the practical understandings (skills) that the participants of patronage practices had to possess was the use of a cultivated and formal language in speech and in writing when dealing with potential patrons, clients, and brokers. Another important skill, related to the rules of gift exchange, was timing, that is, knowing when to act and to react. Furthermore, sophisticated social skills and the ability to talk about a wide variety of subjects were important assets for the participants in these

---

<sup>1238</sup> Goudriaan (2015, 248-251) shows that in the circles of the Florentine patricians in the seventeenth century this was also done by sending letters to patrons, clients, and brokers on different occasions: new year, Christmas, marriages, promotions, deaths of relatives. It should be noted that the affectivity of the teleoaffective structure of the social practices in Schatzki's sense is more general than demonstrating affection for one another and that it can consist of a variety of emotions and moods that are required and/or acceptable. However, in the case of early modern patronage practices, demonstrating affection is the dominating form of affectivity.

practices. And finally, the ability to produce highly specialized artifacts, which could be exchanged with other practitioners, was a relevant skill in this practice.

### 10.3. *The art academies in patronage practices*

The Accademia di San Luca and the Accademia del Disegno had three types of functions in patronage practices in the second half of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth century. In the first place, and most obviously, they functioned as a client in relation to a powerful patron, i.e. the Medici grand dukes in Florence, and the popes in Rome. In both cities a mediator stood between the academy and its patron. In Florence this was the *luogotenente* ('lieutenant'), literally the 'placeholder' of the duke, who was formally the head of the academy. In Rome this was a *cardinale protettore* (cardinal protector), who was not a member of the academy.<sup>1239</sup> As discussed, the fact that the academies possessed different types of artifacts that referred to these patrons shows the different nature of the relationships: they had an impersonal and abstract connection to the Medici and the popes, which is revealed by the presence of their coats of arms in the institutions; an personal and direct relation with the *luogotenenti* and the cardinal protectors, which is expressed by the presence of their portraits.<sup>1240</sup>

Moreover, the titles *luogotenente* and *cardinale protettore* suggest that these functions in the patron-client relationship were somewhat different. Whereas the former implies a greater proximity to the patron (grand duke) than to the client (Florentine academy), the latter highlights its function as protector of the client (Roman academy). However, the distinction is one of emphasis only, and should not be overestimated.<sup>1241</sup> The *luogotenenti* and the *cardinali protettori*

---

<sup>1239</sup> See, for a brief history of the figure of the cardinal protector, Witte 2008, 157-162.

<sup>1240</sup> See section 4.4.

<sup>1241</sup> In the past, especially in the tradition of cultural-politics interpretation of the Accademia del Disegno, the role of the *luogotenente* as agent of the duke is overestimated. Barzman (2000, 23, 28, and 34-35), for example, argues that the Accademia del Disegno was from the beginning conceived as an instrument of the court. It was used in the centralization and reformation of the state, and it promoted the formation of a 'national', i.e. Florentine and Tuscan, cultural identity under authority of the duke. See also Kemp 1974, 237, and Van Veen 2006, 160-184. Van Veen's account is more comprehensive because he discusses the religious, linguistic, and artistic aspects of Cosimo I's patronage as part of the same cultural-political strategy. His account is also more nuanced because he decries a development in the strategies of Cosimo I. Van Veen characterizes this development as one from the cultivation of an image of absolute ruler in the early period of his reign, when his position was still weak, to an image of first among equals or confraternity elder after his victory over Siena in 1559, when his absolutist rule

performed functions of control for the grand duke and pope *and* of advocacy and protection for the academies. This means that the *luogotenente* and the *cardinale protettore* functioned as *cultural brokers*.<sup>1242</sup>

Secondly, the academies functioned as *cultural brokers* themselves insofar they mediated between artist-clients and amateur-patrons. In order to qualify as brokers the academies had to carry out the functions of individual brokers that have been discussed in the previous section. To reiterate, the cultural broker had to be more than a ‘mediator’ or ‘go-between’, helping to overcome social boundaries between patron and client. This could be achieved by adding value to, or otherwise manipulating gifts, by giving advice in matter of art and culture, or by employing artists and exchanging gifts themselves. In doing so a cultural broker could also help to produce cultural innovations and to solve conflicts.

The third and final function performed by the art academies in this period was that of patron. For instance, the Accademia del Disegno acted as patron when it commissioned from its members paintings and statues for the Cappella della Santissima Trinità in Santissima Annunziata and from young aspiring members artworks for the celebrations of the feasts of San Luca and the Santissima Trinità. This aspect of the academies, which was more important in Florence than in Rome, has been discussed in relation to the academies’ religious and educational practices.

---

over Tuscany was virtually uncontested. In this context Van Veen also discusses the foundation of the Accademia del Disegno, which, in line with Cosimo’s ideology, was presented to the public as a continuation and conservation of the great Florentine artistic tradition. According to Van Veen, this is shown both by the fact that in 1563 the duke nominated a *luogotenente* as head of the academy in his place, which meant that he was officially the head of, and thus personally participated in, the institution. Also Kempers (1992, 275, 284) sees the victory over Siena as turning point in Cosimo I’s patronage of the arts. Like Van Veen, Kempers emphasizes that the duke respected republican institutions and policies and that he was far from an absolute ruler, although he did become a symbol of the state. In other publications this development in Cosimo I’s cultural political strategy is not taken into account. For example, in her article on the court artists in Medici Florence from 1540 until 1670 Elena Fumagalli (2014, 123) states that Cosimo I’s attitude towards artists and artisans was one of ‘easy familiarity’ throughout his reign, and cites as evidence Anton Francesco Doni’s observation that ‘Tribolo, Pontorno, Bronzino, Bandinelli, and Cellini achieved excellence thanks to the “nobility of the ruler [Cosimo], who treats them as sons.”’ Cited from Anton Francesco Doni (1552-1553), *I marmi*, Venice: Marcolini, III, 26.

<sup>1242</sup> It should be noted that, contrary to the way in which the concept of cultural broker is predominantly used in the literature, namely as an informal or *ad hoc* intermediary between two parties, the *luogotenente* and the *cardinale protettore* had official and institutionalized functions.

### 10.3.1. Florence: the academy as client

The dominant function of the Accademia del Disegno in patronage practices was that of client, at least until the second half of the seventeenth century. Duke Cosimo I and his successors were the patrons. The incorporating statutes clarify the nature of this relationship at the time of the foundation of the academy. Here, Cosimo is named the ‘benign lord and father of the men of design’ (*benigno signore et padre degli uomini del disegno*).<sup>1243</sup> Giorgio Vasari, who had a hand in drafting these statutes, is even more explicit in a letter to Michelangelo.<sup>1244</sup> The letter is dated March 17, 1563, six weeks after the foundation of the art academy. Vasari writes that the duke had shown himself

Not as lord, but protector and father of all of us, helping them who cannot succeed without the help of others. (...) And this lord has deemed himself worthy to lower himself in order to aggrandize these arts, letting himself be called “prince, father and first academician, and universal protector of these arts”.<sup>1245</sup>

---

<sup>1243</sup> BNCF, Cod. Magliabecchiano II.I. 399, capitolo I (np). In the first section of the statutes the duke is also described as ‘father, head, guide, and corrector’ in the renovation of the arts (*Padre, Capo, e Guida et Correttore*). No less than seventeen of the forty-seven incorporating statutes refer to the duke. For example, the second and third statutes begin by stating that ‘the Duke wants that ...’ (‘Vuole S[ua] E[ccellenza] I[llustrissima]...’). According to Barzman (2000, 34) (who, in parenthesis, counts only fifteen references), this shows that ‘the institution ... was closely associated with Cosimo’s will and authority, if not with his person.’ The thirty remaining statutes make no mention of the Duke. They either refer to an unnamed group, probably the drafting committee, as in ‘They want that...’ (‘Volsono che’), or they are written in an impersonal and imperative form, as in ‘they have to meet ...’ (‘Debbesi ragunare’). Generally, it can be said that the statutes, in which the duke is mentioned, deal with the governance and organization of the academy, whereas the statutes in which he is not mentioned concern the religious and educational activities.

<sup>1244</sup> In his *Life of Montorsoli* Vasari lists the names of the men who were responsible for drafting the first statutes of the academy. He writes that the statutes ‘furono fatti dagl’uomini a ciò deputati et eletti da tutto il corpo per riformatori, fra’ Giovann’Agnolo, Francesco da San Gallo, Agnolo Bronzino, Giorgio Vasari, Michele di Ridolfo e Pierfrancesco di Iacopo di Sandro, coll’intervento del detto luogotenente [Vincenzo Borghini] e confermazione di Sua Eccellenza.’ According to Ważbiński (1987, II, 423), Vasari delivered the final draft personally to the duke in Pisa in the beginning of January 1563. And on January 8/9 Cosimo also discussed the statutes with Borghini, before they were approved on January 12. Ważbiński refers to Frey 1923-1940, I, 702-705.

<sup>1245</sup> Frey 1923-1940, I, 736-737 quoted in Van Veen 2006, 233, n. 101: ‘non come Signore, ma Protettore et Padre di tutti noi, aiutando colori che non si possono sollevar senza l’aiuto d’altri. (...) E s’è degniato questo Signore di abassar sé per ingrandir queste arti, facendosi chiamare Principe, Padre et Signore et Primo Accademico et Protettore Universale di questi arti.’ According to Fumagalli (2014, 123), Cosimo I’s ‘easy familiarity’ with the artists in his service is expressed by the numerous letters he exchanged with them. It is also confirmed by Anton Francesco Doni (1513-1574), who in

The most obvious benefits that the institution received from this patronage relationship with Cosimo I were the approval of the academy's statutes in 1563 and that of the formation of the guild in 1571. With these decrees Cosimo I recognized the organization as the official corporation and school of the arts in Florence, and lent prestige, authority and (relative) autonomy to its members. The benefit of the patron-client relationship for the Medici grand dukes consisted of the prestige that the academy would lend to their reign. Italy, and especially Florence, knew a tradition of employing the arts as instruments of cultural distinction and the representation and legitimation of power, to make up for their limited military force in comparison with France, Spain, and the Holy Roman Empire.<sup>1246</sup> Italian works of art and the artists who made them were highly valued and sought-after in other European courts. This prestige reflected on the cities, in which the artists were born and worked, and on the rulers they served. A well-organized academy of art with the best of the Florentine artists equally bestowed prestige on its protector and patron.<sup>1247</sup>

One example of the prestige bestowed on the academy and Cosimo I was the request in 1567 of the King of Spain to assess the designs for the royal palace, El Escorial. A copy of the questions about the style and construction of the palace as well as the responses of the academicians can be found in the academy's archive.<sup>1248</sup> This request not only confirmed the status of the art academy outside of the city, but also reflected on Duke Cosimo I, since it recognized his artists and institution

---

his *I marmi* (Venice: Marcolini, 1552-1553, III, 26) wrote that the duke treated the artists Tribolo, Pontormo, Bronzino, Bandinelli, and Cellini as sons. According to Fumagalli, Cosimo I's 'fatherly' attitude towards the artists was different from that of his two sons and successors, Francesco I (1541-1587) and Ferdinando I (1549-1609). Whereas the former participated in the activities of the artists and craftsmen, the latter remained at a greater distance than both his father and brother.

<sup>1246</sup> Kempers 1992; Cropper 2000; Jonker 2010. Cropper (2000, 11-12) argues that for the same reason diplomacy – and diplomacy through art – was also more important in Italy than in other regions. See Cools/Keblusek/Noldus 2006 and Broekman/Helmens 2007 for studies on diplomacy through art in other European countries.

<sup>1247</sup> From this perspective the foundation of the art academy was completely in sync with the narrative of Giorgio Vasari's *Lives* of the artists, according to which the arts had not only been reborn and steadily grown in Florence, but also reached their apex there due to Cosimo I's patronage. Van Veen, 2006, 172 and Ważbiński 1987, I, 386. Van Veen (2006, 175-176) emphasizes that Cosimo I's strategy was purposively indirect. The city of Florence should be the main recipient of artistic praise, and the Medici family and he himself secondarily.

<sup>1248</sup> ASF, AD 157, 12r-14v.

as the ultimate judge in matters of art, and thus higher than the artists of the Spanish court.<sup>1249</sup>

A more specific reason why Cosimo I was immediately interested in supporting the academy, was that he could employ the academicians to create his own image and that of his state, that is, he could use them for propagandist purposes.<sup>1250</sup> The grand dukes could use an academy of loyal artists to carry out their program of cultural politics, in which the Medici rule over Florence was legitimated. For example, on the occasion of the wedding of prince Francesco I de' Medici with Joanna of Austria of the Habsburg family in 1565 many of the artists of the academy were asked to create (ephemeral) works of art, which were placed in the city during the festivities.<sup>1251</sup> Vincenzo Borghini invented the iconographic program. Among other things, the program expressed the importance of the political allegiance between the Medici and the Habsburg family.<sup>1252</sup> This was done through the creation of two triumphal arches dedicated to the Medici and Habsburg families, respectively. There also was a representation of the Accademia del Disegno as one of the six glories of Tuscany.<sup>1253</sup>

Notwithstanding the grand-ducal interest in and support of the academy, Cosimo I and his successors only very rarely provided financial support for the institution's activities. The only two occasions on which the duke contributes funds for the academy's activities were for the obsequies of Michelangelo in 1564 in the church of San Lorenzo and for the renovation of the new headquarters in Cestello in 1567.<sup>1254</sup> It has been

<sup>1249</sup> Furthermore, in 1566 six Venetian artists requested to become members of the Accademia del Disegno. This was another sign of recognition of the Florentine institution, although it did not reflect as directly on the duke.

<sup>1250</sup> See, for example, Fumagalli 2014, 111. Giving new initiatives more prestige through the reference to glorious Florentine traditions was common procedure in that period, and especially in Medici circles. And for this purpose invented traditions could be as useful as real ones. Rossi 1980, 167. Moreover, according to Van Veen (2006, 176), Cosimo frequently referred to his ancestors, and especially Lorenzo il Magnifico, for legitimation of his rule.

<sup>1251</sup> Ważbiński 1987, I, 383-393.

<sup>1252</sup> See Ważbiński 1987, I, 383-384.

<sup>1253</sup> Ważbiński 1978, 48. The other glories were literature, industry, agriculture, poetry, and military virtue. Borghini explains his invention to Duke Cosimo I in a letter from April 5, 1565, quoted in Ważbiński 1987, I, 119.

<sup>1254</sup> However, the money for the funeral, 100 *scudi*, was not sent as promised and Borghini had to repeatedly ask the duke for it. It was finally paid on July 1, 1564. See ASF 24, 101, 7v, Lorenzoni 1912, 8-9 and Wittkower/Wittkower 1964, 23. According to Wittkower and Wittkower, the elaborate funeral celebrations with works of art of twenty-five artists, prominently the young members of the academy, meant to honor the new institution as much as Michelangelo's life and work. Ruffini (2011, 23) goes even further and argues that Borghini and Vasari wanted the academy to have a depersonalized identity, for which the participation of young artists was much better suited than

argued that in the case of Cosimo I, the reason for his reluctance to provide financial aid was that he wanted to avoid being seen as absolute ruler, who stood above the academy and provided all the necessary funds. Instead, as the official head of the academy he participated in its activities, albeit through the *luogotenenti*. Additional evidence for this interpretation can be found in the duke's exhortations to the academicians to make the necessary contributions themselves, whereby he underlined the collective nature of the institution.<sup>1255</sup> The passage in Vasari's letter to Michelangelo, quoted above, also supports this interpretation. Vasari writes that Cosimo I's relation to the academy is not that of 'lord, but protector and father' (*non come Signore, ma come Protettore e Padre*). However, as discussed, in the incorporating statutes the Duke had been described as 'benign Lord and father of the men of design' (*benigno signore et padre degli uomini del disegno*), which thus ignores Vasari's distinction and undermines this interpretation as it places Cosimo I as an absolute ruler above the artists.<sup>1256</sup>

---

established masters with developed personal styles. Van Veen (2015, 20-23), however, convincingly criticizes this hypothesis by reference to Vasari's writings of that period. Van Veen shows that Vasari not only continued to see Michelangelo as the prime example for young art students, but also that he held the workshop tradition, in which personal styles were handed down through master-pupil lineages, to be of relevance in the new institution.

<sup>1255</sup> See Barzman 2000, 46-57. Jack (1976, 10) also claims that Cosimo was not generous in his financial support of the academy. As mentioned Borghini had to write repeatedly for contributions for the obsequies for Michelangelo in 1564, and the 100 *scudi* finally advanced were insufficient. The fact that individual academicians did receive monthly wages from the duke might suggest that Cosimo I was more interested in the support of certain individual artists than in the sponsorship of the new artistic institution. Jack refers here to ASF, Miscellanea Mediceo, 264, insert 20, iv, 2r-2v, 7r. According to Van Veen (2006, 176), Cosimo's reluctance to provide the requisite funds was not an expression of a lack of interest for the activities of the academy but had to do with the fact that he wanted to avoid being seen as an absolute ruler, who displayed his princely *liberalitas* by offering all the necessary funds. Therefore, Van Veen argues, the duke only contributed modest funds and urged 'the other' academicians to do the same. In this way he underscored the collective and corporate spirit of the institution.

<sup>1256</sup> This terminological ambivalence poses problems for Van Veen's interpretation of Cosimo I's political strategy as avoiding to be seen as absolute ruler and emphasizing his role as protector and father. As evidence for his argument Van Veen refers to the incorporating statutes of the academy, which describe the duke as 'benigno padre degl'uomini di disegno' and the 'padre, capo, e guida et correttore.' However, Van Veen has used Barzman's (2000, 222-223) transcriptions of the statutes. Unlike Ważbiński's transcriptions, Barzman's do not include Borghini's marginal notes. This is relevant for Van Veen's argument because Borghini inserted the words 'Signore et' in the first of the quoted phrases. With Borghini's insertion this phrase reads 'benigno ^Signore et^ padre degli'uomini di disegno', 'benign Lord and father of the men of design.' Borghini thus added precisely that qualification for the duke, which Vasari explicitly denied in his letter to Michelangelo and which Van Veen argues that Cosimo I tried to avoid. Another passage that problematizes Van Veen's argument is found in Vasari's 'Life of

### 10.3.2. Brokerage of the *luogotenenti*

In the early period of the Accademia del Disegno, all members of the institution were professional artists. No other amateurs were allowed to become member of the academy although their admittance into the institution was considered shortly after its foundation. This is shown by a draft of the addenda to the first statutes, dating from July 1563, which stated that amateurs and noblemen could become members if they were learned in the sciences pertaining to architecture or to the art of *disegno*.<sup>1257</sup> The passage was, however, crossed out and did not make it into the final version of the addenda.<sup>1258</sup> This means that Duke Cosimo I monopolized the patronage of the academy and, at least formally, left very little room for other potential patrons to engage with or participate in the academy.<sup>1259</sup>

Although Duke Cosimo I was officially the head of the academy, from the start he had a *luogotenente*, or lieutenant, take his place during the academic meetings. The second paragraph of the incorporating statutes states that the *luogotenente* should not be a professional artist but

---

Montorsoli', where the duke is named a 'true magnanimous prince' in relation to the academy. Vasari 1966-1987, V, 508: 'Disse oltre ciò il detto signor Duca, come principe veramente magnanimo che è, non solo voler favorire sempre la detta Accademia, ma egli stesso esser capo, guida e protettore, e che perciò creerebbe, anno per anno, un luogotenente che in sua vece intervenisse a tutte le tornate.' Moreover, as Van Veen himself acknowledges, Cosimo I was portrayed as a prince with a scepter by Lastricati in the Cappella della Santissima Trinità. Another argument of Van Veen is more convincing. He explicitly disagrees here with Barzman's interpretation of the word 'father' as linked to God the Father, which would make an absolute, and even omnipotent, ruler of the duke. Van Veen argues that *Padre* should by read here rather as *maggiore* or confraternity elder. This is more in line with the art institution's function as religious lay sodality.

<sup>1257</sup> Capitolo VI of the Addenda, quoted in Barzman 2000, 236: '(...) che nella Compagnia ed Accademia nostra non si debbano ricevere et accettare se non quelli, che sono Scultori o Pittori, e *coloro anchora i quali, sendo gentilhuomini e persone nobili, sono dotati delle scienze appartenenti all'architettura et arte del Disegno o al'una di queste.*' The emphasized words are canceled with a line.

<sup>1258</sup> See BNCF, Cod. Magliabecchiano II.I. 399 capitolo VI (np); and see Barzman 2000, 35 for a discussion and 236 for a transcription of this draft. The addenda are also transcribed in Waźbiński 1987, II, 442 and Adorno/Zangheri 1998, 23. However, only Barzman includes the crossed out phrase about the amateurs and gentlemen in one of the three drafts.

<sup>1259</sup> However, shortly after Ferdinando I assumed the grand-ducal throne in 1588 members from prominent Florentine families began to join the academy as amateurs. According to Barzman (2000, 71-73), this coincided with their transformation from patricians to courtiers and bureaucrats. A mastery of the basics of Disegno became an important skill for the participants of court practices. See Goudriaan 2015 for the activities of the patricians at the Medici court in the seventeenth century.

a lover (*amatore*) of the arts and he could hold office for one or two years, as it pleased the duke.<sup>1260</sup> For many years the lieutenants, all scions of Florentine patrician families, belonged to the grand ducal court and held other important positions in the administration.

In the early period of the academy's existence, there were two exceptions to the rule that no amateurs could join the academy in the early period, or so it seems. These are Tommaso del Nero (d. 1572) and don Giovanni de' Medici. Del Nero was elected as academician on December 12, 1571 and don Giovanni on April 17, 1583. However, Del Nero, who had been one of the interlocutors in Alessandro Allori's treatise on *disegno*, immediately took on the function of vice-lieutenant, which justified his admission into the institution, even though he was an amateur. When don Giovanni de' Medici was elected, he was only sixteen years old. His admission to the Accademia del Disegno at such a young age had probably more to do with the fact that he was the son of Cosimo I, than with his artistic abilities. However, he had considerable artistic talent and he later became an accomplished artist in his own right. Moreover, as member of the ducal family, his membership was no exception to the rule that patrician-amateurs were not allowed to join. He is occasionally referred to a patron in the archival documents of the academy.<sup>1261</sup> In 1591, Giovanni became consul of the Accademia di San Luca.

The patronage practices in the institution can be reconstructed from an episode that took place immediately after the academy's foundation. One day after the first official meeting of the academy, on February 1, 1563 Borghini sent three lists with names of candidate academicians to Duke Cosimo I. The lists itself have not survived but the accompanying letter in which Borghini explains the procedure of the creation of the lists is preserved in the archive of the academy.<sup>1262</sup> Fifteen officers of the institution and twelve members of the company – who were drawn by lot – composed two lists through a secret vote. The first contained the names of 22 artists working in Florence; and the second list had 15 names of artists residing elsewhere at that time. These 37 artists had received the most votes from the committee. However, in his letter Borghini wrote that he also included a third list, which contained the names of all the candidate academicians and the corresponding votes. His reason for adding the third list was that in this way the duke could elect

---

<sup>1260</sup> BNCF, Cod. Magliabecchiano II.I. 399 capitolo II (np).

<sup>1261</sup> Towards the end of the sixteenth century non-artists also started to join the academy. For example, in 1595 the physician Giulio di Girolamo became a member. ASF, AD 27, 83r.

<sup>1262</sup> ASF, AD 157, 3r.

the first academicians freely and add and subtract from the other lists as he pleased.<sup>1263</sup>

The response at the bottom of Borghini's letter states that the duke agreed with the outcome of the vote and that he did not know of other candidates.<sup>1264</sup> The fact that Cosimo I could freely choose the first academicians and that Borghini facilitated this process and mediated between the duke and the committee who did the voting confirms that their respective relationship to the academy was that of patron and broker. In the archival documents there is no mention of any grand-ducal involvement in the election of new academicians after this date. Instead, this task was carried out by the members of the academy, who had to be at least sixteen in number and who had to approve of the candidate with at least two-thirds of the votes.<sup>1265</sup>

The final list with the names of the first academicians was made public on March 14, 1563. Shortly thereafter, six artists wrote a letter to Duke Cosimo I, preserved in the academy's archive, in which they voiced their objections against the list. The six artists were the sculptors Andrea Calamech (1524-1589), Raffaello Peri, and Batista di Benedetto Fiammeri (1530-1606) and the painters Federigo (Friedrich) Sustris (ca. 1540-1599), Francesco del Bastiere, and Giovanni Fedini. Their critique was twofold. On the one hand, they argued that the statutes were not observed because the list contained names of artists who they claimed were not old enough to become academician. The example they give is that of Jacopo di Piero del Zucca (1541-1590). And on the other hand, they argued that many others had been unjustly omitted. They give fourteen examples including the sculptor Valerio Cioli, who, as discussed above, had been placed on the ducal payroll after giving Cosimo I a small marble Venus.<sup>1266</sup>

The letter was forwarded to Vincenzo Borghini on March 23 by the duke's secretary, Lelio Torelli (1498-1576), who had also been responsible for drafting the final version of the incorporating statutes. Torelli wrote a short note at the bottom of the letter: 'To the venerable Prior of the Innocenti, who knows of this affair; if you cannot resolve it,

---

<sup>1263</sup> ASF, AD 157, 3r: '...che Ella si contenti di fare questa prima eletione liberamente, con aggiungere o levare come parrà al suo sapientissimo giudicio....'

<sup>1264</sup> *Ibidem*: 'Pare a Sua Eccellenza che i voti habbino dato nel buono, però non saprebbe alterarli.'

<sup>1265</sup> See Capitolo 12 of the Addenda to the statutes (Waźbiński 1987, II, 444; Barzman 2000, 238; Adorno/Zangheri 1998, 25).

<sup>1266</sup> ASF, AD 157, 4r-v. See Barzman 2000, 240-241 and Cavallucci 1873, 45-46, for transcriptions.

inform the duke about it'.<sup>1267</sup> Borghini chose the second option and addressed the matter in a letter to the duke from March 28. The *luogotenente* starts by excusing himself, for notwithstanding his promise to the duke that everything would go peacefully (*che le cose passerebbono con tutta pace*), there had arisen a little bit of disturbance (*un pochetto di perturbatione*) in the 'Compagnia del Disegno'. Furthermore he writes that he hesitated to bother the duke with this matter, which he characterized as 'foolishness of children' (*baie da fanciulli*) and 'madness' (*pazzia*), but that in the end he decided to inform him because he considered it good that Cosimo I also knew of the small things.

Concerning the arguments of the complainants, Borghini stated that there was no rule in the statutes about the minimum age of the academicians, although the point had been discussed by the drafting committee (*i riformatori*). Furthermore, the *luogotenente* wrote that he had established that the fourteen artists, who were supposedly unjustly omitted from the list, were not involved in the complaint. Borghini talked with each of them and they all said that they wanted to be accepted into the academy through the way described in the statutes, namely through working virtuously with their hands, instead of with words (*lasciando le parole, et operando virtuosamente con le mani*).

The duke's response, written again by Torelli at the bottom of the letter of the protestors, underwrites Borghini's point of view. Dated March 30, it states that 'His Excellency says that it is necessary to produce works, not words, and not attend to this chatter and foolishness, because this is not the way to work, but to produce scandals'.<sup>1268</sup> Several scholars of the Accademia del Disegno have interpreted this episode as evidence of how the academicians' desire for social elevation through the development of art theory was pushed back by the political rulers. However, since *parole* refers here to organizational and administrative disagreements and not to theoretical disputes, this interpretation is unwarranted.<sup>1269</sup>

---

<sup>1267</sup> ASF, AD 157, 4r: 'Al Venerabile Priore delli Innocenti, che ne sa la cosa, se non potrà accomodarle, n'informi Sua Eccellenza.'

<sup>1268</sup> ASF, AD, 157, 4r-v: 'Sua Eccellenza dice che bisogna far con l'opere, non con le parole, senza attendere a tante cicalerie et baie, perchè questo modo non è d'operar, ma di seminar scandali.'

<sup>1269</sup> Kemp (1974, 236) holds that Cosimo I's admonition, quoted in the text, is a sign of the duke's prohibition of discussions about art theory in the academy, which was desired by the artists. Kemp writes that 'Den Titel Akademie und die damit verbundene Anhebung des Socialstatus wird man als hohle Formel werten, wenn man sieht, auf welche Weise hier das Bedürfnis nach theoretischer Auseinandersetzung, da in allen Körperschaften dieser Art sich regt, zurückgedrängt wurde. Schon wenige Wochen nach der Gründung, im März 1563, als Cosimo Berichte über Dispute und Streitigkeiten der

Rather, the episode is insightful because it brings to light the brokerage function that Borghini fulfilled between the duke and the academy. After having received the letter of the six protestors, the duke's secretary forwarded it to the *luogotenente*. Borghini, in turn, forwarded the letter together with his own advice and opinions to the duke, to which the latter sent a short reply, again via his secretary. It seems that this resolved the matter because at the bottom of Borghini's letter was written, in a different hand, that nothing more occurred (*non occorr'altro*); moreover, the issue is never mentioned again in the archival documents.<sup>1270</sup> Finally, as has been pointed out in the past, two of the complainants, Federigo Sustris and Batista di Benedetto Fiammeri, were elected as academicians on July 16, 1564, after their successful participation in the obsequies for Michelangelo.<sup>1271</sup>

---

Akademiker zu Gehör kamen, legte er ein für allemal fest: "S. Ecc. dice che bisogna far con l'opere, non con le parole..." However, this interpretation is unfounded as the remark is made the context of incipient mutiny and not in that of the theorization of art. Kemp also connects this episode to Borghini's remark in his speech on the day of the feast of Saint Luke (October 18) 1564. This remark, already discussed in section 9.2, was that the academy was one of doing (*fare*) and not of reasoning (*ragionare*). Kemp's interpretation that the political powers suppressed theoretical discussions in the academy is more justified in this instance, because Borghini's admonition is made in the context of the theoretical dispute about the *paragone*. However, it could be argued that also in this case the lieutenant's main goal was to avoid disturbance in the institution and not to forbid the artists to discuss theoretical matters in general.

<sup>1270</sup> ASF, AD 24, 9r. According to Barzman (2000, 35-39), with his reprimand Cosimo I found a solution to a situation that was potentially undermining the stability of the new institute. She sees this as an example of how in complex relations of power the artists were disciplined (in a Foucauldian sense) and submitted to the will of centralized authority.

<sup>1271</sup> Batista di Benedetto Fiammeri, a sculptor from the workshop of Bartolomeo Ammannati, was already elected as one of the three consuls of the academy on October 18, 1563. He was the consul that was drawn from the body of the company. The other two consuls were the academicians Giovanni Stradanus (Jan van der Straet) (1523-1605) and Alessandro Allori (1535-1607). Fiammeri's consulate was, however, short-lived. He was removed from office in December of the same year because he had unlawfully removed the statue he had made for the feast of San Luca. It had been decided that the works of art that had been created for this feast by the *festaioli*, would remain in the possession of the institution. See ASF, AD 24, 2v-4r. Apparently, neither his complaint about the list of the first academicians nor his violation of the rules influenced his election as academicians in 1564. Fiammeri's presence in the academy is recorded until 1577 (ASF, AD 123, 53v-54r), which is the last year he paid his taxes. It is possible that this is the same Fiammeri as the painter and Jesuit priest Giovanni Battista Fiammeri, of whom Giovanni Baglione included a short biography in his *Vite* from 1642. Baglione writes that before turning to the art of painting and entering the Jesuit Order in Rome, Fiammeri had been a good sculptor. Moreover, the biographer states that Fiammeri died an old man in Rome at the beginning of the papacy of Paul V (1605-1621), which is compatible with his activity as a young artist in the Accademia del Disegno in the 1560s and 1570s. Baglione 1642/1995, 98. In February 1571, the *provveditore* recorded that 'Giovanbatista di Benedetto

As first lieutenant, Borghini was directly appointed by Cosimo I, which underlines their patron-client relationship more than the former's function as cultural broker of the academy.<sup>1272</sup> Borghini's successor, Agnolo Guicciardini (1525-1581), seems to have been nominated either by the artists or by Borghini, or by both, before he was approved by the duke. In any case, he was appointed in February 1565, after Borghini had asked to be replaced due to his many occupations.<sup>1273</sup> Cosimo I was notified of the change of the academy's lieutenants by his secretary Bartolomeo Concini. The secretary wrote that it had been a good and elaborate election process (*molto ben' examinata*), in which the qualities of many candidates had been considered. In response to Concini's notice the duke replied that he approved of the change and that he deemed Guicciardini a suitable choice as lieutenant, because 'being young and reasonable, he will have to regulate with his brain the strange caprices of the artists'.<sup>1274</sup> It is telling that the duke saw it as one of Guicciardini's most important tasks to deal with the whims of the artists in the academy. This was, no doubt, still a result of the strife that had broken out among the painters and sculptors over the relative prominence of the statues of painting and sculpture on the catafalque of Michelangelo the year before. The letters written by the ducal administration to Guicciardini during his tenure emphasized the promotion of unity within the academy.<sup>1275</sup>

---

schultore alias dell' Ammannato' had paid his taxes for the academy. ASF, AD 24, 93r. In April 1573, the sculptor Giovanbatista di Benedetto is screened for the function of *camarlingo*. ASF, AD 25, 25v. In August 1574 A Giovanni Batista Fiammeri is recorded as a painter in a lawsuit against Pierlorenzo Vigiemini. ASF, AD 7, 8v-11r and see section 6.4. Andrea Calamech, who also participated in the decorations for Michelangelo's funeral, was not chosen as academician. The sources do not disclose a reason for this. Two months earlier, on May 9, 1564, he became one of the three advisors (*consiglieri*) of the institution.

<sup>1272</sup> See Borghini's letter of thanks from February 3, 1563 to the Duke (ASF, Cart. Med. Un. filza 497, 974 transcribed in Frey 1923-1940, I, 716) and Vasari's letter to Cosimo I of February 1, 1563 (Frey 1923-1940, I, 712-714) and the latter's remarks about the first meeting of the academy in his *Life of Montorsoli*.

<sup>1273</sup> In a letter to Vasari of May 22, 1563 Borghini already stated that he intended to fulfill the office of lieutenant only for one year. See Frey 1923-1940, 757.

<sup>1274</sup> ASF, MP 1687, 70v: 'si certo perché sendo giovane sensato arà bisogno con il suo cervello a regular li strani caprici di simil artefici.' The notice is not dated. However, it is written on the same sheet as three other memo's that all date from February 1565. Therefore, Concini's notice about the election of Guicciardini as *luogotenente* must have been composed just after it took place.

<sup>1275</sup> See for example the ducal reply, written by Tommaso de' Medici, to a letter from Guicciardini of the second half of 1567, in which the latter had asked Cosimo I for more money on behalf of the academy for the completion of their headquarters in Cestello. Whereas the duke in this short reply begs the question about the additional funds, he stresses twice that the academicians have to stand united. AG, Legazione XII, 19. See Appendix 2.

At the moment of Agnolo Guicciardini's appointment as *luogotenente*, he was forty years old. Born to an aristocratic family, in his youth Guicciardini was educated by the famous humanist Piero Vettori (1499-1585), who later praised his pupil's proficiency in Greek and Latin. In 1541, at the age of sixteen, Guicciardini became a member of the Accademia Fiorentina, which is further evidence of his interest in humanist and literary undertakings. However, most important in this respect was his edition of the first sixteen books of his uncle Francesco's famous *Storia d'Italia* in 1561. From 1559 onwards he carried out various diplomatic missions to France, Rome, and Venice. And in July 1565, just after his appointment as lieutenant of the academy, he was elected as a member of the Florentine Senate or the Forty-Eight (*Quarantotto*).<sup>1276</sup>

There is nothing known of any interest on Guicciardini's part in the visual arts before his appointment as *luogotenente* in February 1565. It is not unlikely that Vincenzo Borghini had something to do with his election, as they were friends and Guicciardini regularly visited Borghini's summer villa near Castello di Poppiano.<sup>1277</sup> Moreover, he also attended the first meeting of the academy, in which Guicciardini's presence was recorded. This was the gathering of June 25, 1565, in which the contract between the academicians and friars of Santissima Annunziata about the use of the chapel was signed.<sup>1278</sup>

As lieutenant of the Accademia del Disegno, Agnolo Guicciardini helped the academy find a permanent headquarters in 1567. As discussed in Chapter Four, until then the academy had met in various buildings.<sup>1279</sup> However, before long the academy abandoned these sites for different reasons. On December 31, 1566, Guicciardini wrote a letter to the duke in which he explained the situation and petitioned for a new and more permanent meeting place for the artists, one in which they could all come together and teach the young students of the arts. The lieutenant stated that he and the artists had found three suitable locations as headquarters for the academy: some of the rooms of the garden behind

---

<sup>1276</sup> [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/agnolo-guicciardini\\_\(Dizionario\\_Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/agnolo-guicciardini_(Dizionario_Biografico)/), with further references, retrieved on September 13, 2015.

<sup>1277</sup> Zangheri 2015, 121 and verbal communication in September 2015 with Sanne Roefs, who has completed a master thesis about the patronage of the Guicciardini family from 1530-1670 at the University of Groningen.

<sup>1278</sup> ASF, AD 24, 13r.

<sup>1279</sup> Van Veen 2006, 174-175. And see Barzman 2000, 46-56, Ważbiński 1987, I, 79-80 (not 65 as it is referred to by Van Veen 2006, 232, n. 97.), and section 4.2.1.

San Marco, the chapel or *Tempietto* ('little temple') of Giulio Scala in the convent of Cestello, and a place to be built behind the New Sacristy.<sup>1280</sup>

On the bottom of Guicciardini's letter there is the ducal reply, written by Tommaso de' Medici on February 7, 1567. It simply states that 200 scudi will be donated for the work on the place of the Scala, implying that Cosimo had chosen the chapel in Cestello as the academy's headquarters. A month later, in March 1567, Guicciardini informed the academy that 'His Excellency had given, donated and conceded Giulio Scala's temple [i.e. chapel] in Cestello to the academy.' In addition, the duke provided 200 *scudi* for the chapel's completion.<sup>1281</sup>

Three things are noteworthy in this episode. First, the lieutenant had a hand in the donation of the temple to the academy. In Guicciardini's letter quoted above he also states that he talked to Giuliano Scala and that the latter would gladly and freely give it to the academy.<sup>1282</sup> Second, in the *libro del provveditore* of the academy it is stated that it was Cosimo I who gave Giulio Scala's chapel to the academy. Apparently, as Bernardo Scolari previously had done with his

---

<sup>1280</sup> AG, Legazione XII, 18r: 'Una parte delle stanze del Giardino rincontro a San Marco. Il Tempietto di Giulio Scala in via Laura a conto al Mon[asterio] di Cestello (...). Saria ci da fabricare un luogo dietro alla sagrestia nuova di San Lorenzo, che risponde nell'horto del Priore (...).'

<sup>1281</sup> See the entry of the *provveditore*, Roberto Lippi (ASF, AD 24, 17v): 'Il signor luogotenente meser Angolo Guicciardini ... disse in presenza di consoli e altri come sua eccelle[n]tia aveva dato e donato e consenato alla academia il tempio di Giulio Scali che è i[n] Cestello con scudi 200 che li academici li finisino [sic] secondo che è principiato.' See, for discussions, Barzman 2000, 46-57 and Pacini 2001, 9. That the 200 *scudi* were indeed provided becomes clear from letter in the Guicciardini Archive, written by Agnolo Guicciardini. In it Guicciardini asks the duke on behalf of the academy 600 *scudi* in addition to the 200 that had been donated in the past months. Guicciardini also asks the duke to make a choice among the many designs that the academicians made for the completion of the temple of Giulio Scala. In the book of the *provveditore* (ASF, AD 24, 18v) it is written that the *luogotenente* ordered a group of artists to meet in Bronzino's house on July 17, 1567, in order to come up with and decide on designs of the temple in Cestello (see below). The duke's reply to Guicciardini's letter, written by Tommaso de' Medici, is signed November 17, 1567. Consequently, Guicciardini's letter must have been written between July 17 and November 17, 1567, and the 200 *scudi* were donated before that time. It seems that additional funds were indeed provided the following year, since there is a letter in the Archivio di Stato di Firenze (ASF, MP 225, 138), dated April 3, 1568, in which Cosimo I orders Isidoro di Lorenzo da Montauto to pay Guicciardini 200 *scudi* for expenses made on behalf of the art academy: 'Re[verend]o don Isidoro da Montauto pedalingo di Santa Maria Nuova, pagate in virtù di questo mandato à Agnolo di Girolamo Guicciardini scudi dugento di moneta per tanti pagati à l'Accadademia de Pittori et scultori per donatio che habbiamo loro fatto per le spese di detta accademia, et pone teli à conto nostro che veli faremo buoni ne vostri conti data in Fiorenza el di 3 d'Aprile 1568.'

<sup>1282</sup> See AG, Legazione XII, 18r. See Appendix 2: '...et Giulio mi ha detto lo darà volentieri libero, et in dono...'

chapel in the convent of Santa Maria degli Angeli, Giulio Scala conceded the unfinished chapel that had belonged to his family as a favor to his patron.<sup>1283</sup> Like Scolari's gift to the academy, this was another example of the asymmetry in status and power between patron (Cosimo I) and client (Scala). Third, it is emphasized that it is a gift – *dato e donato e conse[g]nato* – a term that was often used to conceal the obligatory nature of the patron-client relationship.

The most obvious instance of Cosimo I's control over the academy through the *luogotenente* in the archival sources also pertains to the 'temple' in Cestello. On July 13, 1567, the academy met in the chapterhouse of Santissima Annunziata to discuss the designs and plans for the completion of the temple. The designs, which had been made by Alessandro Allori, led to great disputes (*grandissime dispute*). At a certain point the *luogotenente* ended the arguments and ordered a group of ten artists to meet in Agnolo Bronzino's house four days later to finalize a design that could be shown to the duke and to the public.<sup>1284</sup> Guicciardini added that if they failed, 'he would use his authority, given by the duke, to take away the stipends of the artists on the duke's payroll.'<sup>1285</sup> The ten men of the designing committee were Domenico Poggini, Giambologna, Giorgio Vasari, Agnolo Bronzino, Zanobi Lastricati, Batista Lorenzi, Alessandro Allori, Giovanni Stradano, Vincenzo Danti, and Francesco Cammilliani. The first four of these were

---

<sup>1283</sup> This is made explicit on the following page of the *Libro del provveditore*, in which the chapel is mentioned as a gift from Cosimo I, ASF, AD 24, 18r. The entry concerns a report of a visit in May 1567 when officials of the academy went to see the new location for the first time.

<sup>1284</sup> ASF, AD 24, 18v: '... il signor luogotenente (...) di sua mano scris[s]e che gli infrascritti accademici doves[s]ino e[s]sere insieme per tucto [il] dì 17 del presente in casa [di] messer Bronz[in]o a ore 20 e ultimas[s]ino e disegnassino e faces[s]ino uno disegno che lui lo potes[s]i mostrare a Sua Eccellentia. E che la domenica seguente lo recassino nel capitolo de Servi a mostrarlo in publico.'

<sup>1285</sup> *Ibidem*: 'E dis[s]e con sua bocha che per l'a[u]torità che lui ave da Sua E[ccellentia] d'es[s]er luogotenente, a tucti quelli che erano istipendiati da Sua Ec[c]ellentia che fare tor la provisione se non o[s]servavamo al suo volere.' Barzman (2000, 55 and 294, n 135), has a slightly different reading of the final part of the sentence. She transcribes it as '...se non, o serva vano al suo volere,' which she translates as 'otherwise, [the provisions they received] did not serve the Duke's interests.' Although this does not alter the meaning of the phrase in a profound way, it is problematical for several reasons. In the first place, there is a bar on top of the 'o' of 'oservavamo', which indicates that the word is abbreviated. Second, there is no full stop (nor even a comma) between 'se non' and 'oservavamo.' Third, the final part of word seems to read 'vamo' rather than 'vano.' Fourth, the phrase 'se non os[s]ervavamo al suo volere' ('if we do not observe his wishes') is more straightforward than 'o serva vano al suo volere' ('otherwise it serves vainly to he wishes'). Moreover, and most importantly, this entry in the book of the *provveditore* (ASF, AD 24, 19r) ends with the artists promising to observe ('promesano o[s]jervar') what the duke has written.

indeed on the duke's payroll at that time.<sup>1286</sup> By threatening to terminate their individual patron-client relationships with the duke, Guicciardini demonstrated Cosimo I's interest in the ordered completion of the academy's headquarters.

Guicciardini's activities in relation to the chapel in Cestello – finding it as one of the three suitable candidates for the academy's headquarters and admonishing the artists to come up with a design for its completion – exemplify the two functions he performed as cultural broker of the institution: assistant in its protection and controller of its internal functioning.

It is not clear how the two lieutenants after Guicciardini, Jacopo Pitti (1519-1589, lieutenant 1570-1573) and Lorenzo Ridolfi (1503-1576, lieutenant 1573-1574), were elected, but since they were Guicciardini's brother-in-law and father-in-law respectively, it seems obvious that he had something to do with it.<sup>1287</sup> After Ridolfi, the *luogotenenti* were elected in a different procedure. First, the academicians preselected four candidate-*luogotenenti* from the Senate (or the Forty Eight).<sup>1288</sup> Next, the grand duke chose one of these candidates.<sup>1289</sup> For example, in August 1574 the grand duke chose Simone Corsi out of four candidates, who had been preselected by the academy.<sup>1290</sup> And in 1579 the academicians preselected Agnolo Guicciardini – who already had been *luogotenente* from 1565 until 1570 – Vincenzo Alamanni, and Niccolò Gaddi. The latter was chosen by the grand duke.<sup>1291</sup> The fact that the academicians also had an important role in the procedure, is another indication that the

---

<sup>1286</sup> See Fumagalli 2014. Allori would make the list of the *salariati* in 1583. ASF, M 321, 230 and see Fumagalli 2014, 116. According to Ważbiński (1987, I, 201), Bronzino was taken off the list of *stipendiati* in 1564. He refers in this context to a letter by Bronzino to the duke of April 15, 1564 (transcribed in Gaye 1840, 134-135), in which the painter states that he will serve the duke, although he has learnt from Cavaliere Tommaso de' Medici that he will no longer receive a fixed salary. However, in the book of the *stipendiati* (ASF, M 321) Bronzino's name turns up on the ducal roll of 1566 (79), and of the rolls of Prince Francesco of 1568 (179), 1568 (183), and 1571 (187).

<sup>1287</sup> Zangheri 2015, 1.

<sup>1288</sup> The senators were appointed for life by the duke and they approved laws, assigned jobs, and nominated magistrates. Goudriaan 2015, 27.

<sup>1289</sup> Barzman (2000, 34-35) only mentions the role of the grand duke in this process.

<sup>1290</sup> ASF, AD 25, 37v. The three other candidates were Captain Francesco de' Medici, Bartolomeo Panciatichi, and Matteo Strozzi. Corsi was installed on October 18 (feast of St Luke) of that year. See also ASF, AD 25, 27r about the preselection of four candidate lieutenants on July 12, 1573. The names are not written here, but on the following page it becomes clear that the grand duke elected Lorenzo Ridolfi.

<sup>1291</sup> ASF, AD 26, 13r-v (January 1579). See also ASF, AD 26, 22v: preselection of four candidate lieutenants, who remain unnamed except the one who was chosen by the grand duke, Cosimo de' Pazzi; ASF, AD 26, 23r: preselection of Baccio Valori, Vincenzo Alamanni, Giovanbatista Tati, and Luigi Altoviti on October 18, 1581. Alamanni was elected (see ASF, AD 26, 24v).

*luogotenenti* functioned as *cultural brokers* between academy and grand duke.

A final example of someone who acted as a broker on behalf of Accademia del Disegno was the already mentioned Don Giovanni de' Medici, the natural son of Cosimo I. The records of the academy show that on November 4, 1585 Giovanni promised to help the institution to solve a conflict with the monks of the convent of Cestello about the use of the oratory. The monks had appropriated a part of the academy's oratory in March of that same year and did not want to give it back, not even after they were confronted with a written decree from the grand duke in which they were ordered to do so.<sup>1292</sup> The document states that the monks would not listen to reason, that Giovanni would make them do so either through love or through force, and that this encouraged the artists.<sup>1293</sup> It seems that Giovanni kept his word, because the matter is not mentioned again in the sources.<sup>1294</sup> Although an academician himself – since 1583 at the age of 16 – Giovanni acted here as broker, by temporally taking over the function of patron of the academy, in protecting its interests against the monks.<sup>1295</sup>

---

<sup>1292</sup> See for a copy of a letter of complaint about the monks to the grand duke of March 8 with the decree below, 1585, ASF, AD 25, 71r. And on April 1 the academy sent a citation to the monks, in which they were ordered to go to the bishop to see the grand ducal decree. ASF, AD 26, 43r. See also ASF, AD 101, 147v.

<sup>1293</sup> ASF, AD 26, 45v: 'Ricordo questo di 4 novembre [1585] come il Cavaliere Mr Ridolfo Sirigatti et Ser Persio nostro Cancelliere con Cristofano proveditore parlorno all' Ill.mo Giovanni, figliolo del Granduca Cosimo sopra i casi dell'achademia et particolarmente sopra i metere i confini cho frati di cestelli, i quali non vogliono ascoltare ragione nessuna, anzi tramano e caciono via, però il detto Signore promette farli venire alle cose ragionevoli o per amore o per forza, e ci messe animo che noi non saremo fatti fare / et altri bonissime parole, e speriamo migliori fatti per esso Signore buono e virtuoso.'

<sup>1294</sup> This is also Pacini's (2001, 13-14) conclusion.

<sup>1295</sup> In contrast to what Barzman (2000, 65) states, there is no evidence that Don Giovanni here 'intervened in the administrative affairs of the academy, apparently acting in an *ex officio* capacity in the Grand Duke's interests.' Rather, the document suggests that he acted primarily in the interests of the academy – which, as explained, *indirectly* were the interests of the grand duke – and it, no doubt, helped that he was a member of the ruling family. It is nine years later, in 1594, that Giovanni is referred to for the first time as 'patron' and 'protector' of the academy. This is in the context of the academy's decision to celebrate the Oration of the 40 Hours on Saint Luke's Day to pray for victory in the battle against the Turks, in which Giovanni participated. See ASF, AD 27, 112r (record from October 9, 1594). And see Barzman 2000, 75-76. Previous to this date, Don Giovanni is referred to as our academician (*nostro academico*).

### 10.3.3. *The Accademia del Disegno as broker: membership and presence of amateurs*

There is almost no record of amateurs, other than the *luogotenenti*, visiting the Accademia del Disegno in the early period. As mentioned, according to the statutes, only practicing artists could become members, but this would not have banned *amatori* from the institution entirely. In his *Lettera ai principi* from 1605 Federico Zuccari gives examples of amateurs who visited the Accademia del Disegno in its early years. The *Lettera ai principi* is a plea to Italian princes and noblemen to found public academies in their cities. In the first place he names Duke Cosimo I as one of them. However, there is no archival record in which a visit of Cosimo I to the academy is mentioned. And it is almost inconceivable that it would not have been noted by one of the *provveditori* if it had occurred.

The other two examples that Zuccari gives of *amatori* visiting the academy date from the end of the 1570s – when he was completing Vasari’s frescoes in the dome of the Cathedral. These examples are Bernardo Vecchiotti (1514-1590) and Niccolò Gaddi (1537-1591). Zuccari writes that they occasionally visited the Florentine academy in order to encourage the students and measure their worth. They are characterized *luogotenenti* and *amatori singolari* (‘rare amateurs’) of the arts, who also have in their houses the most beautiful studies. Zuccari does not present these men as grand-ducal agents or brokers, but as autonomous lovers and patrons of the arts.<sup>1296</sup> Although Zuccari was wrong to state that Gaddi and Vecchiotti were both *luogotenenti* of the academy – in fact only Gaddi briefly held this position in 1579 – it is possible that amateurs, other than the lieutenants, on occasion participated in the academy’s activities.

One of the first patrician-members of the academy, who was not a *luogotenente* – or vice-lieutenant such as Tommaso del Nero – is Jacopo Giraldi (d. 1630). His presence in the academy can be retraced to 1596, and in 1610 and 1620 he was elected as consul of the academy. There exists a drawing from Baccio del Bianco (1604-1657), which represents Giraldi on horseback and in a rich nobleman’s costume. The colors of the costume are described in the drawing. Del Bianco became a member of the academy himself in 1626 and his drawing must also date from the late 1620s, as Giraldi died in 1630. More patricians and

---

<sup>1296</sup> Zuccari 1605, 115-116. Zuccari was familiar with the situation in Florence from two sojourns. In the 1560s he worked alongside Vasari in the ducal palace (Palazzo Vecchio) and from 1575-1578 he took Vasari’s place, after the latter’s death in 1574, as painter of the dome of the cathedral. He is recorded as member of the Accademia del Disegno in 1565. See ASF, AD 24, 13v for the admission of Zuccari to the academy on October 14, 1565, together with seven other of Vasari’s assistants.

noblemen joined the academy in the seventeenth century, such as various members of the Dell'Antella family.<sup>1297</sup> In the course of the Medici principate, the honorific title of 'academician' came to function as a stand-in for traditional signs of nobility.<sup>1298</sup>

#### 10.3.4. Rome: the academy as client

In Rome the art academy also fulfilled the function of client in relation to the political rulers, i.e. the subsequent popes. However, the head of the academy was not an amateur as the *luogotenente* in Florence, but a professional artist. This means that the president, or *principe*, as he was called in Rome, stood closer to the other academicians than to the pope. The broker-function between academy and pope was, however, fulfilled by cardinal protectors (*cardinali protettori*). The cardinal protector was a common phenomenon at the end of the sixteenth century in Rome. The function was originally instituted for religious orders around 1200, but at the end of the sixteenth century also lay-sodalities and charitable organizations were assigned cardinal protectors. The reason for this was that a cardinal could exercise control over such institutions, thereby bringing them in line with the centralized Post-Tridentine views on the Catholic faith and avoiding heresy. They controlled and patronized religious orders and lay organizations on behalf of the papacy and they pleaded for these organizations with the pope. For a cardinal a protectorate was a prestigious office, which could further his career.<sup>1299</sup>

The first cardinal protectors of the Accademia di San Luca were Alfonso Gesualdo (1540-1603), Federico Borromeo (1593-1595), Gabriele Paleotti (1595-1597), and Francesco Maria del Monte (1595-1627).<sup>1300</sup> The academicians demonstrated their loyalty by handing out

---

<sup>1297</sup> Francesco and Cosimo dell'Antella became members in the 1610s, whereas their brother Niccolò was – the longest sitting – *luogotenente* from 1609-1630. See Accademia delle Arti del Disegno 2000. And see Goudriaan 2015, 133-135, for Niccolò dell'Antella's patronage of artists for the decoration of the façade of his palace in Florence in 1619-1620.

<sup>1298</sup> Barzman 1989a, 461. Barzman, however (at least in this article), seems to locate this development already during Cosimo I's reign. See, for an overview of the implications for the Florentine patricians of the establishment of the Medici principate in 1530 Goudriaan 2015, 25-52.

<sup>1299</sup> The first time the title and function of cardinal protector was assigned was by Saint Francis to Cardinal Ugolino for the Franciscan Order. See Witte 2008, 157-162.

<sup>1300</sup> It is not clear how these first cardinal protectors were elected. But it is conceivable this happened in a similar way as the election of the fifth cardinal protector Francesco Barberini (1597-1679). Barberini was asked by the officers of the academy to take up the function after Del Monte's death in 1627. The cardinal accepted after consulting with his

candles to the cardinal protectors for the important religious celebrations, especially the feast day of Saint Luke on October 18.<sup>1301</sup>

The patron-client relationship had various benefits for the academy in its early years. In the first place, Pope Gregory XIII's papal brief of 1577 is already mentioned in the introduction to this chapter. In 1588, Pope Sixtus V reiterated Gregory XIII's approval of the foundation of the academy in a papal bull. The bull mentions that the church of Santa Martina was freely and spontaneously given by the parish priest and rector of the church, Michele Timotei (d. 1619/20).<sup>1302</sup> However, it is clear that the pope had a hand in this 'spontaneous' act of generosity, if only because he had the old church of the painter's guild demolished for his ambitious campaign of urban renewal.<sup>1303</sup> The parallels with Scolari's and Scala's donations of the chapels to the Accademia del Disegno are obvious. Timotei most likely conceded the church to the Accademia di San Luca because this was the pope's wish.

---

uncle, Pope Urban VIII. See ASR, TNC, uff. 15, 1627, pt. II, vol. 112, fols. 323r–v. Alberti mentions that it was the Borromeo who commissioned him to take notes about the progress of the Academy. Alberti also mentions Borromeo's taste and great pleasure in the Accademia di San Luca, which he protected benignly. After his departure for Milan, his tasks were taken over by Cardinals Gabriele Paleotti and Francesco Maria del Monte (Alberti 1604/1961, np). Cardinal Borromeo was already connected to the predecessor of the in 1593 erected art academy, the Compagnia di San Luca. His name occurs in a record in the account book of this guild-based confraternity, which can be dated to August 1589. See AASL 41, 97r: 'e piu a lo manatario per la dunanza giuli cinque che ce venne il cardinal borromeo' [cf. AASL 69, 300: 'e piu per la dunanza che ce venne il cardinal giulii cinque allo mandatario']. The confraternity also was protected by a cardinal. In the same account book (AASL 41, 83v) a payment from December 1576-January 1577 is recorded for a porter who brought a canvas to the house of Ottaviano Mascarino for painting on it the coat of arms of an unnamed protector ('baiocchi tre per portar la tela ingesata a casa di meser otaviano mascarini in borgo per far l'arma grande del nostro protettore'). A year later Cardinal Granvella is mentioned in the Libro Mastro (AASL 41, 85r). On October 18, 1578 – the day of the feast of Saint Luke – a porter was paid (20 baiocchi) for bringing things from and returning things to the cardinal's house. 'e piu il fachino che porto e riporto le robe da casa del Cardinal granvella.'

<sup>1301</sup> See AASL 42, 95v, for the production of the *impresa* of San Luca and of the coats of arms of the protectors in 1597. See AASL 42, 107r and G1, 198 for candles bought for the cardinal protectors, the judges and procurator on January 2, 1604. See AASL G1, 190, for wax bought for Cardinals Borghese and Del Monte on May 31, 1605, and for the judges on February 2, 1605. See AASL G1, 296 for candles for Cardinals Pamfilio and Del Monte on July 7, 1607; for the arms of Pope Urban, on 11-1-1624 (42, 43r); candle for the cardinal protector in 1590/1591 (no precise dates), candle for cardinal Mondovi (Vincenzo Laureo), candle for Pope Gregory XIV (elected on December 5, 1590) (41, 97r).

<sup>1302</sup> Missirini 1823, 24. On January 29th, 1589, a consensus is reached between Timotei and the confraternity of Saint Luke about the consignment of the church of Santa Martina to the latter. See ASR, TNC, uff. 11, 1589, pt. I, vol.12, fols. 241r–v.

<sup>1303</sup> See, for Sixtus V's campaign of urban renewal, Salvagni 2009.

Sixtus V's bull also specifies that all the assets, goods, and revenues of the church and its annexed properties, i.e. gardens and buildings, were assigned to the painters and sculptors. Other benefits of the papal patronage for the academy were the plenary indulgences granted by Pope Clement VIII in 1592 to those who visited the academy's church during the feasts of the Assumption and of Saint Luke, and the approval by the cardinal vicar of the imposition of the tax of 2% on appraisals in Rome. Both decrees meant additional revenues for the academy. In the second case, the decree also entailed that the appraisers were to be appointed by the Accademia di San Luca.<sup>1304</sup>

The academy's monopoly in carrying out appraisals in Rome meant that at the end of the sixteenth century the Church deemed the academicians the only legitimate judges of art. Although the academy's predecessor, the guild and confraternity of Saint Luke, had also laid claim to this title, it had never been officially implemented.<sup>1305</sup> The decree from 1595 about the appraisals also meant that academicians more frequently than before would visit the palaces and villas (*ville* or *vigne*) of Roman nobles and prelates outside of the city. For example, in the beginning of the seventeenth century academic artists such as Fabio Donadei, Cherubino Alberti, Jacopo Gallo, and Marcantonio Boscho appraised works of art by other artists in the villas of Cardinals Aldobrandini, Cesi, and Cesario.<sup>1306</sup>

---

<sup>1304</sup> For example, on October 20, 1624, the following artists were elected as appraiser: Tomasso Salina, Bartholomeo Balducci, Stefano Maderna, Cristofaro Coscietti, Bartholomeo Lavarozza, Paolo Venetiano, Silvio Capiro, and Crispino Tomassino. ASR, TNC, uff. 15, 1624, pt. IV, vol. 102, 198r.

<sup>1305</sup> Moreover, around the turn of the century it was not an obvious position for the academy either. This becomes clear from Giulio Mancini's *Considerazioni sulla pittura* (*Considerations on Painting*), written between 1617-1621 and published in the twentieth century. Mancini was a medical doctor who would later become the personal physician of Urban VIII, and he also corresponded with several artists, both members and non-members of the Accademia di San Luca. According to him, it was the amateur and not the painter, who was better qualified to judge art. Mancini gave two reasons why painters could not be excellent judges of their art. Painters always remain at the surface of the natural or artificial things they imitate and they never understand their internal truth. For this reason painters lack prudence, which is necessary for making judgments. Moreover, Mancini holds that, when painting, they do not correct their fantasy with their intellect. Therefore, they have not acquired the habit of knowledge and intelligence, which are necessary for judging. Mancini 1956-1967, 8-9. Most of the artist-authors of the treatises discussed in the previous chapter would strongly disagree with this view.

<sup>1306</sup> See Dell'Antonio 2011, 41 for the function of art in the villas or *vigne* of the Roman elite. Between 1602-1603 Cavalier d'Arpino decorated the vaults of the villa Aldobrandini in Frascati. See Draghi/Masini 1980, 8. In the account book of the academy the following entries concern the appraisals in the villas: I. AASL 42, 18v: 'adi 22 di marzo 1604. E adi deto riceuto da meser Fabio donadei scudi 4 di moneta li quali a dati a bon conto dela stima deli lavori ch lui a fati a la vila di frascati del cardinal aldobrandini';

The benefit for the papacy of this patron-client relation was control over the visual arts. The arts had come to play a crucial role in the strategies of the counter-reformatory church. In Chapter Five, two episodes of papal control in the academy in the early period of the institution have been discussed. In 1563, shortly before the conclusion of the Council of Trent, the Church admonished the members of the predecessor of the Accademia di San Luca, the company, to only paint honest things, otherwise their works would be destroyed and they themselves punished.<sup>1307</sup> A similar episode of Church interference dates from the early years of the academy. It was the lecture delivered by the Jesuit priest about decorum during the presidency of Durante Alberti.<sup>1308</sup>

Besides these two episodes, more than thirty years apart, there is little evidence that the Church attempted to directly influence the production of artistic images through the academy. Although the cardinal protectors of the Accademia di San Luca were supposed to control and oversee the institution, they do not seem to have been very much involved in the early years of its existence.<sup>1309</sup> The only record of the presence of a cardinal protector during a meeting is that of Cardinal

---

II. AASL 42, 19v: ‘adì 30 magio 1604. E adì deto recevuto da meser Joachomo Gallo pitore scudi 1 di moneta quali a dato per una stima fata da meser Cerubino Alberi a la vigne del cardinale cesis’; III. AASL 42, 22r: ‘a dì 24 di settembre 1604, e a dì detto receuto da meser Fabio donadei schudi due di moneta le quali a dati a bon conto dela stima fata a suo favore a la vila di frascati per il cardinale aldobrandini.’ (See, for this appraisal, also AASL G1, 130: ‘Anibal Coradino per la stima illustrissimo Cardinale de Cesi scudi ...[sic]’); IV. AASL 42, 25v: ‘a dì 6 di ottobre 1604. E adì detto riceuto da meser fabio donadei schudi due di moneta li quali me a dati a bon conto dela stima già fata a suo favore a la vila di belvedere a frascari per il cardinale aldobrandini.’; V. AASL 42, 30r: ‘a dì 8 di novembre 1605. A dì detto o receuto da meser pietro contini scudi dieci e baiochi ottanta per diverse stime cioè schudi uno e baiochi ottanta della stima dela galer[i]a per la parte sua fatta stimata da meser marcantonio boscho; e scudi 2-20 per una stima di 5 arme nele volte delle stanze de aldobrandino stimato da signore giovan batista rici; e scudi 4 per la stima del catafalco del cardinal d’austria stimato dal sudetto e dal signore girolamo mazei; e scudi doi e baiochi 80 per il chochio del Cardinal S Cesario stimata da meser girolamo de botti che intutto sono 10.80.’

<sup>1307</sup> See for this meeting, which took place on May 1, 1563 in the convent of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, ASR, CNC, 38, 1562-1564, D. Jo. Bapt.ta de Amadeis, 308v-309r: ‘Item il p.to Domenico console ha admonito tutti li sopradetti presentsi da parte del s.r vic.o et mons.or cesarini che quelli che depingono le imagine del S.re et della Madonna et de altri s.ti et s.te le habino a dipingere honeste altremente le si butteranno et guasteranno et loro serrano gastigati et che ognun se guardi della mala ventura.’

<sup>1308</sup> See section 5.6.

<sup>1309</sup> On 20 April, 1609 the academy received 25 *scudi* for the release of a prisoner, the half of which was paid by the man himself and the other half by the cardinal. AASL 42, 39v: ‘scudi 25 riveuto dal prigionie a[v]uto per la festa di santo luca per lemosina e pagate la meta del pezo del [?] cardinale e mandato’.

Federico Borromeo in August 1589.<sup>1310</sup> It is only at the end of the second decade of the seventeenth century that Cardinal Francesco Maria del Monte becomes more involved in the academy.<sup>1311</sup>

### 10.3.5. *'Signori, e gentiluomini amatori': the Accademia di San Luca as broker*

Unlike the Florentine grand dukes, the popes did not come from the same family. This means that there was less continuity of policy. It also entails that the popes could not monopolize the patronage of the city's art academy to the same extent as the Medici family could with the Accademia del Disegno. Another consequence is that the bond between the papacy and academy was weaker than that between the Accademia del Disegno and subsequent grand dukes in Florence.<sup>1312</sup> This weaker bond between the academy as client, the popes as patrons, and cardinal protectors as brokers left room for the Accademia di San Luca to assume another function in patronage practices, namely that of *cultural broker*. As cultural broker, the Accademia di San Luca was a mediator between practicing artists and potential patrons, insofar as it constituted a site where these groups from different social backgrounds could meet and exchange ideas. This function was at least as important in patronage practices – if not more so – as that of client.

Archival records and published sources show that from the start academicians welcomed amateurs in their meetings, because they were potential patrons. For example, on August 11, 1601 Giovanbattista Crescenzi (1577-1635) and Massimiliano Caffarelli were present at the academy. Caffarelli was a knight of the Order of Saints Maurice and Lazarus and a relative of the later Cardinal-Nephew Scipione

---

<sup>1310</sup> AASL 41, 97r: 'e piu a lo manatario per la dunanza giuli cinque che ce venne il cardinal borromeo' (cf. AASL 69, 300: 'e piu per la dunanza che ce venne il cardinale giulii cinque allo mandatario'). This meeting took place before the 'official' foundation of the academy, but after the papal approval and the concession of the church.

<sup>1311</sup> For example, on October 19, 1624 Cardinal Del Monte sent a letter to the academy, in which he ordered on the pope's authority ('per l'autorità datali à bocca dalla Santità di nostro Signore Papa Urbano Ottavo') a meeting for the following day. During the meeting the officials of the academy were to be elected. ASR, TNC, uff. 15, 1624, pt. IV, vol. 102, 186r. And indeed on the next day a meeting was held in the academy's church, in which the officers, including the teachers of the studio (*rettori dello studio*) for the following Sundays, were elected. And as representative of Del Monte a certain Andrea is present at the meeting (*Signor Andrea del Signor Cardinale del Monte*). ASR, TNC, uff. 15, 1624, pt. IV, vol. 102, 184r-185v, 198r-v, 233r-v, 246r.

<sup>1312</sup> Spear 2010, 34.

Borghese.<sup>1313</sup> Crescenzi was a painter and architect from a noble Roman family; his brother and his son would become cardinals.<sup>1314</sup> Both men donated small sums to the Accademia di San Luca for work on the entrance of the academy's church near the Forum Romanum. These donations are known because the names of the givers occur on a list of contributors in the archive of the art academy.<sup>1315</sup> This list contains nineteen names of men who are almost all referred to as 'sig[nore]'. Crescenzi and Caffarelli are the only ones who are referred to as 'Ill[ustrissi]mo sig[nore]'. This is an indication of their higher social standing. A couple of months later Caffarelli made another donation for the work on the church and Crescenzi turns up again in an archival document from 1611, in which he is recorded as an appraiser for the academy.<sup>1316</sup>

Archival documents reveal that in the 1620s other men from noble families were also present at academy meetings. For instance, the name of Cassiano dal Pozzo (1588-1657) turns up in the records in a meeting in 1627, in which the candidates for the presidency were

---

<sup>1313</sup> Scipione Borghese's last name was actually Caffarelli, but after his uncle from his mother's side, Camillo Borghese, was elected as Pope Paul V, he exchanged it for his mother's last name. See for the Caffarelli family <http://www.vergaracaffarelli.it/styled-2/files/-genealogia-della-famiglia-caffarelli-secoli-xiv-xviii-.pdf> visited on 4-3-2015. This page includes scans with the family tree derived from Adinolfi 1865, 164.

<sup>1314</sup> Giovanbattista Crescenzi's brother Pier Paolo (1572-1645) and son Alessandro (1607-1688) would become cardinals in 1611 and 1675 respectively. Massimiliano and Giovanbattista seem to have been related through marriage, since Massimiliano's second wife was named Laura Crescenzi, daughter of Ottavio. See reference in previous note. Until now it has been impossible to determine the exact nature of the relation.

<sup>1315</sup> AASL G1, 120. Crescenzi and Caffarelli contributed 140 and 60 baiocchi respectively.

<sup>1316</sup> Caffarelli's second donation was on January 8, 1602 and it consisted of 35 *baiocchi*. The money was spent on building the brickwork for the church's entrance: 'lista de li dinari che io Gio Paulo Picciolli spendo per fare il mattonato nel intrare in chiesa di santo Luca a dì 18 agosto 1601'. See AASL G1, 120. See for the meeting of September 25, 1611, in which Crescenzi is nominated as the official appraiser for the Accademia di San Luca, ASR, TNC, uff. 15, 1611, pt. III, vol. 52, fols. 210v: 'Io'i Bap'tae Crescentio ad hoc ut dignaretur curare quod in aextimationibus, et arbitriis per eum dandis super operibus Picturae, et sculpturae solvant etc. scuta duo pro quolibet centenariorum Ecclesiae Sancti Lucae predictae.' Gage (2009, 282, n. 78) has drawn attention to the fact that other members of the Crescenzi family were involved in the academy in the 1620s. On June 29, 1626 an academic meeting was held in Giovanbattista's brother Giacomo Crescenzi's palace (ASR, TNC, uff. 15, 1626, pt. II, vol. 108, fols. 896r-v). Francesco Crescenzi was present at two meetings (October 24, 1624 and September 21, 1625) and Giulio Cesare at one meeting (August 12, 1629). See ASR, TNC, uff. 15, 1625, pt. II, vol. 105, fols. 441r - v, 442r - v, 447r; ASR, TNC, uff. 15, 1624, pt. IV, vol. 102, fols. 231r - v, 232r - v, 247r - v, 248r; and ASR, TNC, uff. 15, 1629, pt. III, vol. 121, fol. 319r.

proposed. And on September 21, 1625 four noblemen were elected as heads of the feast of San Luca of that year.<sup>1317</sup>

The main source for the interpretation of the Accademia di San Luca as *cultural broker*, however, is Romano Alberti's descriptions of the meetings in the first years of the academy's existence.<sup>1318</sup> In Alberti's account of the first years of the Accademia di San Luca non-professional artists play an important role. He calls them alternatively 'gentlemen' (*gentilhuomini*), 'men of letters' (*letterati*), and 'art lovers' (*amatori*), or a combination thereof as in *gentilhuomini amatori*. It seems that he uses these terms interchangeably and that he conceives them as belonging to a single group and at the very end of his descriptions of the academic meetings he provides a list of these *signori, e gentilhuomini amatori*. The names on the list are Asdrubale Mattei, Baldo Catanio, Giovan Antonio Fineo, sir Magagnioti, Giulio Baldini (or Bardini), Simonate Anastagi, Camillo Ducci, Arigo Falconio, Ottavio de Richi, 'and others' (*et altri*).<sup>1319</sup>

Anastagi and Mattei were known patrons of the arts. Anastagi was a Perugian humanist and collector, who patronized the painter Federico Barocci and the sculptor and academician Flaminio Vacca. Vacca dedicated his treatise about the ancient remains in Rome to Anastagi.<sup>1320</sup> Asdrubale Mattei was the brother of Cardinal Gerolamo and of Ciriaco, who was a famous art collector. Fineo and Ducci were present at an academic meeting that was held on October 31, 1593. Ducci was part of Cardinal Giulio Santori's household and a member of the Compagnia di San Giuseppe di Terrasanta, the religious confraternity for artists founded in the 1540s. He also was a friend of the painter and academician Cavalier d'Arpino. Catani was a poet and an amateur sculptor, who published a treatise about the funeral oration for Pope Sixtus V (1591). The artists Cavalier d'Arpino and Francesco Villamena – of which the former (and possibly also the latter) was a member of the Accademia di San Luca – contributed to the production of the prints for

---

<sup>1317</sup> See ASR, TNC, uff. 15, 1627, pt. IV, vol. 114, fols. 257r–v, 272r and ASR, TNC, uff. 15, 1624, pt. IV, vol. 102, fols. 231r–v, 232r–v, 247r–v, 248r. These men were Count Francesco Crescenzi, Marcello Sacchetti, Gio. Batista Muti and Lord Marino. See ASR, TNC, uff. 15, 1625, pt. II, vol. 105, fols. 441r–v, 442r–v, 447r.

<sup>1318</sup> The role of these amateurs in the early years of the Accademia di San Luca is not discussed extensively in the literature. The only exception is Gage 2009. The interpretation that is offered in this paragraph deepens Gage's insights by describing the interaction between the artists and the amateurs in terms of social practices; it also presents some new arguments on the basis of a different reading of Alberti.

<sup>1319</sup> The discussion of these figures in the following paragraph derives from Gage 2009, 248, 259, and 262 and from Waźbiński 1992, 321–322.

<sup>1320</sup> Vacca 1594/1704.

this publication.<sup>1321</sup> Falconio would become a member of the literary Accademia degli Umoristi (founded in or shortly after 1600), as well as Il Cavalier d'Arpino and Orazio Borgianni.<sup>1322</sup> Of Ottavio de Richi and Giulio Baldini (or Bardini) nothing is known.

From Alberti's narrative it becomes clear that in the first year of its existence the Accademia di San Luca functioned as a meeting place for these *letterati* and artists, and that the institution organized activities that were interesting for both groups. These activities pertained to the theoretical and practical aspects of art education, and especially that of *disegno*. The academy can be understood as a cultural broker in the sense discussed above because, in these pedagogical sessions, it was more than a go-between; it also changed the relations between practicing artists and potential buyers by integrating visual-art and literary practices.

The Accademia di San Luca not only encouraged the artists to acquire the practical understandings of the *letterati* through its lecture program, but it also aimed to teach *letterati* the skills of artists. In the first place, it has been argued that the Accademia di San Luca may have provided the amateurs with a basic training in *disegno* and mathematics.<sup>1323</sup> In Alberti's account of the first year of the academy's activities, there is some indirect evidence that the amateurs also participated in practical training, although it should be noted that his descriptions thereof are very brief. For example, after having successfully urged Zuccari to make his definitions of *disegno*, painting, sculpture, and architecture more succinct, the poet Catani expresses his thanks to the *principe* for the opportunity given to *all* to partake in the useful discourses and honorable exercises (*utili discorsi, e honorati essercitij*). It is probable that *essercitij* here refers to practical training.<sup>1324</sup>

---

<sup>1321</sup> Villamena is recorded only once as being present at a meeting of the institution, namely on October 31, 1593, two weeks before the academic meetings under Zuccari's presidency started. ASR, TNC, uff. 11, 1593, pt. III, vol. 27. 27, fols. 168r-v, 169r-v.

<sup>1322</sup> Gage (2009, 248) mistakenly writes, following Maylender, that the Accademia degli Umoristi was founded at the time of Pope Gregory XIII (1572-1585). Therefore, her argument that Falconio was already familiar with academic conventions of lecturing through his experience in the Umoristi is incorrect. Rather, the opposite is more probable: Falconio's academic experiences were shaped through his participation in the Accademia di San Luca, as were those of others, such as Il Cavalier d'Arpino and Borgianni. See Ważbiński 1992, 335 and Gabrieli 1935, 174 for the dating of the foundation of the Accademia degli Umoristi in the beginning of the seventeenth century.

<sup>1323</sup> Gage 2009, 273. Gage (ibidem, 255) bases this conclusion on on contemporary theoretical treatises about art, and especially on Giulio Mancini's *Considerazioni sulla pittura* because, according to her, direct evidence is the participation of amateurs is lacking. However, Alberti's narrative provides some indirect evidence. See below.

<sup>1324</sup> In the Vocabolario della Crusca 'esercizio' is said to be derived from the Latin 'exercitatione', which can be translated as 'exercise, training, practice, or discipline.'

Furthermore, Alberti writes that Catani spoke on behalf of all the *letterati*, which suggests that they also participated in the exercises.<sup>1325</sup>

As discussed in Chapter Eight, during one of the meetings in which the *impresa* for the academy was debated, Zuccari proposed to do an anatomy. Alberti writes that this idea was liked by *all* and that during fifteen days, *all* drew the various stages of the dissection of the corpse that the president carried out.<sup>1326</sup> Although the *letterati* are not explicitly mentioned in this context, they were probably present at this meeting because they participated in the discussions about the *impresa*. Therefore, Alberti's use of the word 'all' (*tutti*) must have included them as well.

By integrating artistic and literary practices, the Accademia di San Luca constituted a site for artists and potential patrons to meet each other. This means that the academy functioned as a cultural broker in the sense discussed above. Not only was it a go-between, but it also influenced and manipulated the outcome of the meetings through its educational program. As discussed in Chapter Eight, archival sources show that in the 1620s noblemen participated in the practical instruction of young artists. For instance, Count Francesco Crescenzi and papal treasurer Marcello Sacchetti were paired with Andrea Sacchi and Pietro da Cortona, respectively, to organize the drawing classes during one month.<sup>1327</sup> It has been suggested that the partnership between Sacchetti and Cortona in the academy's studio was probably the beginning of their long patronage relationship.<sup>1328</sup>

Recent studies suggest that in the beginning of the seventeenth century this broker function was performed by men, who mediated between the artists and the higher nobility and cardinals. Often descending from the lower nobility, these *cultural brokers* (or *professional tastemakers*) were experts in conversing about the visual and literary arts; and they also advised the higher nobility about their art collections.<sup>1329</sup> Discourses about the arts were developed in literary academies such as the Accademia degli Umoristi, which was founded in or shortly after 1600.

By making discourse about the visual arts a central element of its curriculum, the Accademia di San Luca stood at the basis of the formation of these *cultural brokers*. Examples of such men in the academic context are Giulio Mancini and Cassiano dal Pozzo. In his *Considerazioni sulla pittura* from 1617-1621, Mancini took the

---

<sup>1325</sup> Alberti 1604/1961, 46.

<sup>1326</sup> Alberti 1604/1961, 28.

<sup>1327</sup> See section 8.5, ASR, TNC, uff. 15, 1624, pt. 4, vol. 102, fols. 232r-v, and Roccasecca 2009, 141.

<sup>1328</sup> Roccasecca 2009, 141.

<sup>1329</sup> Dell'Antonio (2011) uses the term *virtuosi of taste* in this context.

perspective of the art collectors and gave them advise on what to look for in paintings and how to build an art collection. Dal Pozzo was an art patron and collector himself, but also a cultural broker between artists and Cardinal-Nephew Francesco Barberini, who became cardinal protector of the Accademia di San Luca in 1627. The Accademia di San Luca can be seen as the predecessor of these brokers. And they may even have been trained in the Roman art academy, although the lack of relevant sources makes this difficult to prove.

#### 10.4. Conclusion

The analysis in this chapter overlaps with the interpretations in the cultural-politics tradition in the historiography of the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca, insofar as it discusses the incentives of the Medici grand dukes and popes for supporting these institutions in their cities. The practice approach that is taken here differs from the cultural-politics tradition, because it does not focus mainly on the interests of the political rulers, but it also interprets the functions of the academies and the lieutenants and cardinal protectors in (more) detail.<sup>1330</sup> This has been done with the help of concepts from the literature on patronage in the early modern period: patrons, brokers, clients, *and* their relationships. These concepts, and especially that of the *cultural broker*, have made it possible to pay more attention to the fluidity of the patron-client relationship and of the various functions of the art academies in it. The application of the theoretical vocabulary from the patronage literature to the art academies opens a new path for patronage studies. The argument in this chapter has shown that the notions of *patron*, *client*, and *broker* can be fruitfully applied not only to individuals, but also to institutions.

It has become clear that the Florentine and Roman art academies performed similar functions in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century patronage practices, but that they differed as to their dominant function. The academies pursued the goals of contemporary patronage practices by cultivating and maintaining patronage relations with people from different social standings; they obeyed the rules of patronage practices by exchanging gifts and favors with the people in their network; and they

---

<sup>1330</sup> In contrast to the interpretations in the cultural-politics tradition, the meaning of the academies is not reduced to their functions in patronage practices. These functions are but one aspect of their meaning and identity in their early years, in addition to their functions in religious, artistic and knowledge practices, discussed in the other chapters.

## CONCLUSION

appointed *cancellieri* or procurators with specialized language skills (practical understandings) for communicating with their patrons.<sup>1331</sup>

The main function of the Accademia del Disegno in contemporary patronage practices was that of client of the Medici grand dukes. This relationship was mutually beneficial, as is shown, for instance, by the request from the Spanish court to the academy in 1567 to judge the designs for the Escorial. Moreover, the request was not only a confirmation of the prestige that the academy and, thereby, Cosimo I had already achieved abroad, but it also augmented their fame. The *luogotenenti* served as (cultural) brokers in this patron-client relationship. Guicciardini's activities concerning the academy's chapel in Cestello, for instance, show that he assisted the duke in the institution's protection (procuring the building for the academicians) but also in its control (coercing the academicians to peacefully and swiftly complete the construction and decoration).

The Accademia del Disegno itself did not function as a cultural broker in the beginning. There is very little evidence that amateurs other than the *luogotenenti* visited, let alone participated in, the Florentine academy in the first twenty-five years of its existence. The Florentine academy took on the role of cultural broker only towards the end of the sixteenth century, that is, around the same time that the Roman institution was founded. The broker function of the Florentine academy seems to have become more important in the course of the seventeenth century, as more amateurs were admitted, and especially towards the end of that century when the relationship of the academy with the Medici family weakened.<sup>1332</sup> This means that during the first decades of the existence of the Accademia del Disegno, the integration of literary and artistic practices took place elsewhere, either in other formal academies such as the Accademia Fiorentina, or in private 'academies', such as those of Buontalenti and Gregorio Pagani.<sup>1333</sup>

In contrast to the Accademia del Disegno, the Accademia di San Luca had two dominant functions in contemporary patronage practices from the start. Like the Florentine academy, it functioned as a client in relation to the political ruler, in this case the pope. In addition, it functioned as a cultural broker, mediating between practicing artists and potential patrons. Examples of this latter function are the coupling of artists and aristocrats as teachers in the 1620s and the participation of *letterati* and amateurs in the discussions during Zuccari's presidency. The institution functioned as a cultural broker in these lectures and debates

---

<sup>1331</sup> See Chapter Six.

<sup>1332</sup> See Barzman 2000 for the history of the academy at towards the end of the Medici rule of Florence.

<sup>1333</sup> On Pagani's 'academy' see Balducci 1681-1728, IV, 201-202.

because it was more than a mediator; it also changed the relations between practicing artists and potential buyers by integrating visual-art and literary practices.