

The Business of Sculpture in Venice 1525–1625

Volume I: Text



**Emma Jane Jones
Department of History of Art
Pembroke College**

**This dissertation is submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
University of Cambridge
September 2016**

CONTENTS

VOLUME 1:

	page
Acknowledgements	i-ii
List of Abbreviations	iii-iv
Introduction	1-17
I. Patrons: Sculptural Genres, Motivations, Locations	18-51
II. Sculptors: Contracts, Fees, Quality	52-84
III. Materials: Sourcing, Supply, Significance	85-127
IV. Workshops, Authorship, Networks, Problem-solving	128-160
Conclusion	161-163
Bibliography	164-209

VOLUME 2:

Illustrations	
Introduction	1-23
Chapter I	24-130
Chapter II	131-179
Chapter III	180-223
Chapter IV	224-269

VOLUME 3:

Appendix

I. Notes on Documentary Transcriptions; Currency and Units of Weight and Measurement	1-2
II. Catalogue of Select Commissions	3-217
III. Tables:	
1: Contract drawings and models	218-223
2: Sculptors' fees	224-233
3: Copper prices	234-235
4: Tin prices	236
5: Bronze prices	237-238
IV. List of Illustrations and Photo Credits	239-260

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research has been made possible thanks to the generous doctoral scholarship provided by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) of Great Britain. My most sincere thanks go to the Faculty of Architecture and History of Art for putting me forward for this scholarship and to the University of Cambridge for endorsing it. Research undertaken in Venice for this thesis was made possible through the generous and much-appreciated financial support of the AHRC Travel Fund, the Gladys Krieble Delmas Foundation, and the Kettle's Yard Art History Travel Fund, University of Cambridge.

In Venice, the staff of the following institutions have been marvellous facilitators and advisers, and incredibly generous and kind with their time: the Archivio di Stato di Venezia (especially Dott.ssa Alessandra Schiavon and Dott.ssa Claudia Salmini); the Archivio Storico del Patriarcato di Venezia (especially Dott.ssa Manuela Barausse and Dott. Davide Trivellato); the Biblioteca del Museo Correr; the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana; the Archivio parrocchiale di Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari (Renata Marzi). For access to wonderful photographs, I offer my heart-felt thanks to Francesco Turio Böhm (Osvaldo Böhm archive); Dennis Cecchin (Archivio fotografico, Museo Correr); Leslie Contarini (Save Venice, Inc.); Matteo De Fina; and Ilaria Turetta (Fototeca, Fondazione Giorgio Cini). For access to works of sculpture not usually easily accessible, I am indebted to Leslie Contarini (Save Venice, Inc.); Irene Galifi (Curia Patriarcale); and Ettore Vio (*Proto emerito*, Basilica di San Marco). Finally, I am most grateful to Lady Frances Clarke (President of Venice in Peril), who has been a wonderful source of enthusiasm and encouragement throughout.

I am sincerely grateful to the following scholars, conservators, and practitioners for their encouragement, advice and helpful discussions during the course of my research: Denise Allen, Frances Andrews, Nebahat Avcioglu, Alexandra Bamji, Peter Bell, Francesca Bewer, Sarah Blake McHam, Amy Bloch, Patricia Fortini Brown, Marietta Cambareri, Donal Cooper, Tracy Cooper, Blake De Maria, Marcella De Paoli, C.D. Dickerson III, James Draper, Iain Fenlon, Maria Fusaro, Anna Gannon, Julian Gardner, Maartje van Gelder, Beth Glixon, Jonathan Glixon, James Grubb, Michael Hatt, Kelley Helmstutler Di Dio, Andrew Hopkins, Peter Humfrey, Paul Joannides, Donald Johnston, Volker Krahn, Claudia Kryza-Gersch, Andrew Lacey, Mary Laven, Manfred Leithe-Jasper, Siân Lewis, Alison Luchs, Richard Mackenney, Vittorio Mandelli, Jean Michel Massing, Daniel Maze, Marco Morin, Rebecca Norris, David Oldfield, Benjamin Paul, Debra Pincus, Gary Radke, Gianni Ridella, Roberto Santamaria, David Scrase, Allison Sherman, Dylan Smith, Paul Smith, Susan Steer, Richard Stone, Shelley Sturman, Giorgio Tagliaferro, Dora Thornton, William Wallace, Jeremy Warren, Paul Williamson, Thomas Worthen, and Dimitrios Zikos.

Special thanks go to Professor Louise Bourdua (History of Art, University of Warwick) for her interest in my research, as well as her support and encouragement, which began

when she was my MA supervisor during the Warwick History of Art Venice MA in 2008–09, and which has been so much appreciated.

I am most grateful to the History of Art Department, University of Cambridge, and especially Francé Davies and Nichola Tooke for their wonderful administrative, practical, and pastoral support over the course of my doctoral research.

I would also like to thank the Master, Fellows, and staff of Pembroke College for their support, especially Dr Polly Blakesley (also my PhD Advisor), Professor Loraine Gelsthorpe (my College Tutor) and Frances Kentish (Graduate Secretary) for their much-appreciated support and kindness, especially during the period of my parents' illnesses and deaths.

I have a number of academic role models to whom I am hugely indebted for their inspirational scholarship, stimulating discussions, advice, and unerring friendship: Victoria Avery, Charles Avery, Susan Connell, Deborah Howard, and Peta Motture.

For their love, support and solidarity, I offer my family and friends my most heart-felt and sincere thanks: Jean Chester; Sean, Lexi and Martha Morris; Barbara, Philip, Amelie and Brooke Wilson; Steve and Maggie Beresford; Yvonne and Mike Harris; Charles and Mary Avery; Susanna Avery-Quash, James Carleton-Paget, William and Joseph Quash, and Hope Carleton-Paget; Charlotte, Pierre and Dylan Pillet-Avery; and Lily; Lucilla Burn, Timothy and Clare Chambers, Anna Lloyd-Griffiths, Alistair McFarlane, Helen Ritchie, Henrietta Ryan, Jo Story, Helen Strudwick, Clare, Dave and James Terry. In Venice: Frances Clarke, Chiara Farnea Croff, Geraldine Ludbrooke, Alba Scapin, and Micky White. Spiritual support has been given most generously by Father Howard Levett (formerly Chaplain of St George's Anglican Church, Venice); and the wonderful Bishops and Chapter of Ely Cathedral: Bishop Stephen Conway, Bishop David Thomson, The Very Reverend Mark Bonney, Canon Dr Jim Garrard, Canon Dr Alan Hargrave (now retired) and Canon Dr Vicky Johnson (plus Percy the dog!).

Professor Deborah Howard has been the most wonderful supervisor and her sage advice, illuminating discussions, patience, kindness, friendship, and the example of her exemplary scholarship mean the world to me. Thank you so much for always believing in me.

This thesis is dedicated to my beloved parents Noreen Morris (1950–2014) and Richard Morris (1945–2013), with love and gratitude, whom I wish were here to see this thesis completed; and most of all to my darling wife, soul-mate, best friend and pilgrim partner, Vicky Avery, for her infinite love and kindness, and for her boundless enthusiasm, encouragement, and unfailing good humour. I would be lost without you.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Institutions:

AdA	Archivio dell'arca del Santo, Padua
APF	Archivio parrocchiale di Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, Venice
APS	Archivio parrocchiale di San Silvestro, Venice
ASF	Archivio di Stato di Firenze
ASP	Archivio di Stato di Padova
ASPV	Archivio Storico del Patriarcato di Venezia
ASV	Archivio di Stato di Venezia
BMCV	Biblioteca del Museo Correr, Venice
BMV	Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Venice
IRE	Istituzioni di Ricovero e di Educazione, Venice

Archival *fondi*:

Cod.Cic.	BMCV, Codice Cicogna
Demanio	ASV, Direzione Dipartimentale del Demanio e Diritti uniti
Grimani-Barbarigo	ASV, Archivio privato Grimani e Barbarigo
GV	ASV, Giustizia Vecchia
NA	ASV, Notarile-Atti
NT	ASV, Notarile-Testamenti
PSM	ASV, Procuratoria di San Marco
Rosario	ASV, Scuola di Santa Maria del Rosario
SGM	ASV, San Giorgio Maggiore
San Salvador	ASV, San Salvador
San Zaccaria	ASV, San Zaccaria
Tiepolo 'Libro dei conti'	ASV, Archivio Tiepolo, Consegna II, b. 108 (no. 236), 'Conto de fabriche per San Felise della casa de statio e quella del Querini e della Capella à Santa Tonino'
Tiepolo 'Spese'	ASV, Archivio Tiepolo, Consegna II, b. 133 (no. 262), fasc. 'Spese fatte per la fabrica della Cappella di San Sabba nella chiesa di Sant'Antonin'

Dictionaries

DBI	<i>Dizionario biografico degli Italiani</i> (accessed via http://www.treccani.it/biografie/)
Grove	Grove Art Online, ed. Alodie Larson (Oxford: Oxford University Press) (accessed via subscription at http://www.oxfordartonline.com)

Other:

b.	<i>busta</i>
doc./docs	document/documents
fasc.	<i>fascicolo</i>
fl.	flourished
fol./fols	folio/folios
n.p.	not paginated
proc.	<i>processo</i>
r.	reigned
reg.	<i>registro</i>

INTRODUCTION

Desiring that this church be adorned as much as possible in honour of the Lord God, we have conceded, and do concede to the said Goldsmiths and Jewellers the freedom and authority to make their altar [...]

Doge Marino Grimani, 9 April 1601¹

With the above concession, issued in spring 1601, Doge Grimani granted the Guild of Goldsmiths and Jewellers, one of Venice's most prominent trade guilds, the right to construct an altar in the ducal church of San Giacomo di Rialto, one of Venice's most prestigious and ancient churches that had just been completely rebuilt.² The Goldsmiths' altar, erected over the following six years, was designed by architect Vincenzo Scamozzi (1548–1616) and adorned with bronzes by sculptor Girolamo Campagna (1549–1621), then at the pinnacle of their respective careers (fig.0.1). The over life-size *St Anthony Abbot*, the Goldsmiths' patron saint, is given pride of place. In abbot's attire, holding a crozier and with a ball of fire (another attribute) at his feet, he is shown being crowned with a mitre by two angels (fig.0.2). The ensemble is surmounted by three further angels (an infant flanked by two adult companions) and two bronze urns. On its completion, the altar must have made a striking impression on the viewer entering the small dark church.

The commission's extensive documentary evidence is a rare survival and includes the guild's detailed account-book of incoming and outgoing funds (fig.0.3), ballot records concerning important decisions about the project (fig.0.4a-b), and even the original contract with Campagna for the *St Anthony*, counter-signed by the sculptor in his own hand (fig.0.5).³ Careful analysis of these documents allows the altar's construction history to be pieced together from inception to completion, presenting an unusually complete picture of a sculptural commission in Venice in this period. Moreover, these records reveal the complex, costly and frequently protracted nature of commissioning and creating sculpture. Indeed, the successful completion of such projects required patience, persistence and a healthy purse on the part of the patron, and talent, organisation, and not a little business savvy on the part of the sculptor.

¹ 'Desiderando Noi, che detta chiesa sia adornata quanto più si possibile in honor del Signor Iddio habbiamo concesso, e concedemo alli detti Orevesi e Zoglierieri libertà et autorità di far il loro altare [...]' Cat.9, doc.9.4. Unless otherwise stated, all translations are my own.

² Gardani 1966; Franzoi and Di Stefano 1975, pp.13-14.

³ Cat.9. Surviving contracts are often contemporary copies, such as those retained by notaries in their ledgers (*protocolli*).

Today, the art of Renaissance and Early Modern Venice is most often associated with painting, yet sculpture pervaded civic and sacred life. From the splendour of Piazza San Marco and the Piazzetta (fig.0.6) to the city's richly embellished churches and religious houses (fig.0.7), from the bustling trade centre at Rialto to the imposing military might of the Arsenal (fig.0.8), from the doorways and façades of the city's *palazzi* to the ubiquitous flag-bases and well-heads (figs 0.9-0.10), sculpture and sculptural decoration abounded. Inspired by the work of the nineteenth-century Venetian scholar, Pietro Paoletti, and by Susan Connell's 1976 thesis on the employment of Venetian sculptors and stonemasons in the Quattrocento, this thesis offers the first in-depth study of the business of sculpture in Cinquecento and early Seicento Venice.⁴

Based upon systematic examination and interpretation of archival sources—such as the aforementioned Goldsmiths' accounts—primary texts and key works, I have sought to answer such questions as: how was sculpture commissioned in Venice? How did contracts work, and why were some verbal, yet most written? How were sculptural materials obtained and what meanings did they carry? How did workshops operate? How should the concept of authorship be assessed, given the inherently collaborative nature of sculpture? What networks did sculptors rely on to develop their business? And how did sculptors and patrons seek to ensure quality, avoid litigation and resolve disputes? I am interested in tracing changes over time, as well as continuities of patronage choices and sculptural practice, especially in the light of the changing status of the artist during the Cinquecento.⁵

Thanks to a steady flow of diverse sculptural commissions from ambitious patrons and an influx of talented and equally ambitious sculptors, the century considered here (1525–1625) saw the business of sculpture flourish in Venice, building on the legacy of such highly successful late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century workshops as those of Antonio Rizzo (before 1440–c.1499) and Pietro Lombardo (c.1435–1515).⁶ The beginning of the period is marked by the arrival in 1527 of the highly influential Florentine sculptor and architect Jacopo Sansovino (c.1486–1570), and the decline of the Lombardo family's dominance with Tullio's death in 1532. The end is punctuated by the death of Girolamo Campagna in 1621, arguably

⁴ Paoletti 1893–7; Connell 1976, published by Garland in 1988.

⁵ Some of my findings presented here have been published during the course of my research: the Goldsmiths' Altar in San Giacomo (Jones 2011, derived from my MA thesis, Jones 2009); Campagna's rediscovered *Virtue* from the *Monument to Doge Nicolò da Ponte* (Jones 2013a); Antonio Gatto's *cappella maggiore* at San Polo (Jones 2013b); and the sourcing and supply of marble and stone (Jones 2015).

⁶ The adverse impact of the War of the League of Cambrai (1508–16) on the Venetian economy saw a drop in the number of large-scale sculptural commissions, and demand only picked up again in the early 1520s. Boucher and Radcliffe 1983, p.356. For the war and its effects on Venice: Gilbert 1974.

the last of the Serenissima's great sixteenth-century sculptors, and the arrival of Baroque sculpture from the Bernini workshop in Rome.

Structure

The first two chapters examine the various stages of the commissioning process, from the patron's initial motivations, to choosing a sculptor and drawing up a contract. These chapters address a number of key, interrelated questions: what types of sculpture were commissioned, why and for where? Who were the patrons? How were locations chosen and secured? How was a sculptor selected and contracted? Did contractual terms and conditions change over time? How much were patrons prepared to pay for sculpture and what payment methods were instituted? How were contract drawings and models used? And how did patrons seek to ensure the quality of the finished work?

Chapter 3 considers the most commonly chosen media for sculpture: marble, stone, bronze, stucco and clay in the form of terracotta, examining the issues of sourcing, supply, cost and quality assurance. The methods for transporting marble and stone into the sea-girt city are also analysed. The chapter assesses why patrons chose a particular material, and what this choice signified, acknowledging both the pragmatic reasons which informed material choices, as well as the more esoteric notions, such as aesthetics, tradition, competition and prestige.

Chapter 4 looks at the organisation of sculptors' workshops and the division and delegation of labour. It discusses the concept of authorship and the nature and meaning of signatures, bearing in mind the many hands usually involved in sculptural production. An evaluation of the importance of professional and personal networks follows, elucidated by an in-depth case-study of the life and career of Girolamo Campagna, based on new archival evidence. The chapter concludes with a discussion of how sculptors and patrons sought to resolve any problems which arose during the production process to ensure the satisfactory completion of a commission.

A catalogue of select commissions supports the text. The case-studies not only span the century in question, but also represent a diverse range of commissions in terms of patron, sculptor, genre, material, location and archival evidence. The individual entries include essential information about the commissioning and production of the sculpture, a full bibliography, and new transcriptions of pertinent documents wherever possible.⁷

Methodology

Archival evidence underpins my research. The findings presented here are based on in-depth analysis of hundreds of diverse archival documents including contracts, account-

⁷ Where these commissions are discussed in the main text, the reader should refer to the respective catalogue entries for relevant bibliographies.

books, payment receipts, notarial acts, ballot records, inventories, letters and wills. I have made numerous important archival discoveries during the course of my research, many of which are analysed here. I have also made full use of previously published documents (whether published in full, in part or merely cited) but returned to the originals wherever possible.⁸ It was essential to consider as many commissions as possible for which documentation exists in order to establish patterns and anomalies of sculptural patronage, production, and practice. Indeed, by examining these myriad published sources alongside my archival discoveries, my observations and conclusions are rendered all the more meaningful, especially as these already-known sources have not been used before now to facilitate a study of this kind: an in-depth examination of the why and how of sculptural production in Venice in this period.⁹ As Sarah Blake McHam acknowledged in her exemplary study of the Cappella dell'Arca di Sant'Antonio in the Santo, Padua: 'The unusual number of preserved records [for the chapel] provides opportunities for a variety of more specialised studies, such as an analysis of workshop procedures and other practical aspects of organisation, similar to Connell [...]'—precisely my intention here.¹⁰ An additional benefit of re-visiting these previously published sources has been the felicitous discovery of important new documents in the same *fondo*,¹¹ the correction of paleographical errors,¹² and/or a better understanding of a sculptural commission and its production processes.¹³

While many of the documents analysed relate specifically to sculptural commissions, other primary sources—such as tax returns, inventories and wills—have also been utilised, as these often contain evidence of how sculptors' workshops functioned and for artistic collaboration (fig.0.11). Given that all sculptors based in Venice were obliged to be affiliated to the Stonemasons' Guild, the guild's surviving *mariegole* (statute books) have been

⁸ I have endeavoured to consult as many documents as possible in the original. Where published transcriptions tally with my own, I cite these sources without giving the original archival reference as well.

⁹ Many have only been used in the context of monographic studies, such as Boucher 1991; or individual case-studies, such as Mason Rinaldi 1975–6 and Simane 1993.

¹⁰ McHam 1994, p.6. Michelle O'Malley's truly important study of contracts and the commissioning process for painting in Renaissance Italy also provided a pertinent precedent for me in that almost all of the archival sources she analysed had previously been published. O'Malley 2005.

¹¹ For example, cats 3 and 9.

¹² For example, cat. 1.

¹³ Scholars usually have to select how much of a document to publish—often due to word limits. This, however, can lead to swathes of useful information being omitted, both concerning the work of art itself and its broader context. See, for example, cats 1, 8 and 9.

consulted too, to determine the degree of control that the guild exercised over its members and the work they produced.¹⁴

Visual analysis of extant sculptures has been undertaken at length. Connoisseurship is vital in understanding how sculptors operated and the nature of collaboration, particularly as very few documents record the precise tasks performed by studio assistants and *lavoranti* or the degree of personal intervention by masters in specific commissions. A well-trained eye is, therefore, essential. Discerning the quality of materials and workmanship was, after all, a daily reality for sculptors and many of their patrons.

My research also makes full use of relevant published literature, including primary sources (such as diaries, treatises and guidebooks) and secondary scholarship. The latter encompasses not only studies on Venetian sculpture and general works on sculptural materials and techniques, but also wider reading about Venetian society, its economy and politics, and consumption and patronage in Renaissance Italy. Finally, I have discussed technical aspects of sculptural production with several leading conservation scientists, conservators and practitioners, and examined at first hand a number of key Venetian sculptures undergoing conservation (including Tullio Lombardo's *Adam*, the bronzes of the Cappella Zen, and Campagna's stucco figures in San Sebastiano; figs 0.12-0.14).¹⁵

Problems

I encountered two main problems during my research. The first was an embarrassment of riches: finding more archival evidence than could realistically be used within the confines of a doctoral thesis. I therefore exercised caution when evaluating documents, transcribing only those which related specifically to my research questions. The documentary evidence presented here has been selected according to strict criteria: either because it aptly illustrates the general situation and trends over time, or because it throws up interesting anomalies and exceptions.

The second problem concerns the inevitable lacunae in the archival record, such as the elusive 'libro della fabbrica' for the new *cappella maggiore* of San Polo so tantalisingly mentioned by parish priest Antonio Gatto in his will of 1591 (fig.0.15), or the lost account-books for the rebuilding of the important conventual church of San Lorenzo and its immense

¹⁴ There are two extant copies of the *mariegola* of the Stonemasons' Guild: BMCV, CI.IV, 150, and BMCV, CI.IV, 151. The guild's records in the ASV date only from 1768–1806: ASV, Arti, b.710. Sculptors in Venice did not form a separate guild until 1724: BMCV, CI.IV, 150, fol.191r-v.

¹⁵ I am grateful to Shelley Sturman, Head of Object Conservation, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.; Richard Stone, formerly Senior Conservator of Objects, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; and Andrew Lacey, sculptor and bronze-caster for enlightening discussions about Renaissance bronze production techniques and technical analysis. On the pioneering conservation of Lombardo's *Adam* at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, see Riccardelli et al 2014.

double-sided high altar (c.1615–18; fig.0.16).¹⁶ Although such losses (or discoveries still to be made?) are lamentable and often frustrating, the advantage of a broad-based study such as this over a monographic one focusing on a single patron, sculptor, sculptural genre or location, is that a much wider range of archival evidence needs to be analysed.

Caveats

I have concentrated principally on sculpture commissioned for public places—such as state buildings, churches, monastic and confraternal spaces—as opposed to pieces intended for private contexts. This is because archival evidence for the commissioning and production of domestic sculpture rarely survives, and scholarship on collecting in this period suggests that sculpture was less prevalent than paintings in the Venetian home.¹⁷ Where such evidence exists and is relevant or interesting, I have referred to it, as this can illuminate, for example, a patron's motivations for commissioning works of sculpture and/or his/her choice of a particular sculptor, and the diversity (or not) of a sculptor's output.

The majority of the sculpture examined here was made from marble, stone or bronze, although the use of stucco, terracotta (kiln-fired clay), wax and gesso is also considered. Marble, stone and bronze constitute the most common—and most thoroughly documented—choices for Venetian sculpture in this period. Wood has been omitted for two main reasons. Firstly, woodcarvers in Venice (*intagliatori* or *incisori*) were distinct from sculptors in terms of their trade and, as such, belonged to a different guild.¹⁸ Second, visual and documentary evidence shows that wood was not widely chosen for sculptural commissions in Venice at this time.¹⁹ Although wood remained the material of choice for polychromed crucifixes and portable devotional pieces, for example, it was infrequently employed for works such as altarpieces and statues and was more likely to be selected for commissions on the *terraferma*.²⁰

¹⁶ For the former, see cat.7, doc.7.6, fol.4r, paragraph beginning 'Ma prima voglio'. For San Lorenzo, a surviving *catastico* notes that the convent's archive once contained 'spese de Fabbriche, 1490–1638' (ASV, San Lorenzo, b.3, fol.395r).

¹⁷ For example, Luchs 1995, p.17, notes that: 'In Venetian experience, modern sculpture long remained a public art form, reserved for monuments to be viewed by the community or for church and palace exteriors that enriched the cityscape'. She also acknowledges the findings of Bertrand Jestaz who examined hundreds of sixteenth-century inventories in the ASV, and found few instances of sculpture in the home. Ibid., pp.126–7, note 105.

¹⁸ Initially, woodcarvers had to be members of the House Carpenters' Guild ('Arte de marangoni de case'). However, a ruling of 29 November 1564 permitted them to form their own guild ('Arte degli intagliatori'). Schulz 2011, pp.24–5.

¹⁹ For wood sculpture in Venice, see most recently, Schulz 2011.

²⁰ That said, there are exceptions, such as the polychrome wood sculptures adorning San Nicolò dei Mendicoli in outer Dorsoduro (iconostasis and nave, late sixteenth-century; Gallo and Mason 1995,

Scholarly Approaches to Venetian Renaissance Sculpture

Venetian sculpture has traditionally been held in low esteem in comparison to that of Florence and Rome. This bias was imposed by Giorgio Vasari (1511–74) through his laudatory treatment of Michelangelo, and his views have fundamentally affected how the history of Italian Renaissance art has been written ever since.²¹ Since the publication of Vasari's *Vite*, the vast majority of scholarship concerning Italian Renaissance sculpture has been devoted to that produced in Central Italy, to the detriment of northern centres, such as Venice. Indeed, Vasari overlooked Quattrocento and early Cinquecento Venetian sculpture more or less completely in both the first edition of 1550 and the second of 1568.²² The Lombardo family, who ran the most important workshop in Venice before Sansovino's arrival in 1527, for example, has only one sentence devoted to it; namely, that Tullio spent his life in Venice, and that he was 'an excellent master of *intaglio*'.²³ It is only in the second edition that Venetian sculpture is accorded any real consideration, and this was largely due to Sansovino's presence in the city, given that Vasari only wrote about sculpture and sculptors from Jacopo's time onwards.²⁴ Vasari much admired Sansovino's work, no doubt in great

pp.17, 27-8; Worthen 2014, pp.253-61) and of San Simeon Grande in Santa Croce (twelve apostles by Francesco Terilli, early seventeenth-century; Ericani 1997, p.47; Worthen 2014, p.265). Wood was probably chosen for these small churches in less affluent parts of the city due to its comparative cheapness. Wood was often painted to simulate more expensive materials: it could be blackened or gilded to resemble either bronze or gilt-bronze respectively. Notable examples are the four funerary monuments in Santi Giovanni e Paolo with gilt-wood equestrian statues: (1) Nicolò Orsini da Pitigliano (1512–14, by Antonio Minello, unknown woodcarver and Michiel Fanoli); (2) Fra' Leonardo da Prato (1512–14, by Minello and unknown woodcarver); (3) Pompeo Giustiniani (1616–20, equestrian statue by Francesco Terilli with stone figures by Girolamo Paliari); and (4) Orazio Baglioni (1620–21, attr. Girolamo Paliari). For (1) and (2), see Pavanello 2012, pp.173-5 (no.33) and 176-7 (no.34): by Anne Markham Schulz. For (3) and (4), see Pavanello 2012, pp. 378-80 (no.133) and 380-4 (no.134): by Paola Rossi. Wood could also be painted to mimic marble, for example, the high altar of San Francesco della Vigna, an Observant Franciscan church. For Terilli (who worked in wood, ivory and bronze) and his relationship with Campagna, see Chapter 4.

²¹ For Vasari's biography of Michelangelo, see Vasari 1568, vol.3, pp.713-96. For an analysis of Vasari and his writing of the *Vite*, see Rubin 1995a. For recent scholarship on the *Vite*, see Burzer 2010.

²² Vasari 1550 and 1568.

²³ 'molto pratico intagliatore', Vasari 1568, vol.1, p.523. Translation: Vasari-De Vere 1996, vol.1, p.606.

²⁴ Sansovino is the only Venice-based sculptor to receive a separate biography in the *Vite*: Vasari 1568, vol.3, pp.822-31. An expanded edition of it was published posthumously in 1570, containing new information presumably supplied by Jacopo's son, Francesco. Vasari 1789, discussed Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.161-2, 276, note 23. In Vasari's 1550 *Vite*, the principal reference to Sansovino is a

part because the sculptor was of Florentine extraction, and highly praised its impact on Venetian art and architecture (fig.0.17).²⁵

Written almost contemporaneously with Vasari's *Vite*, the Venetian guidebooks of Francesco Sansovino, Jacopo's son, sought to extol unashamedly all aspects of the Serenissima and its history, including the city's art and architecture (fig.0.18).²⁶ While certain caution must be exercised when approaching Sansovino's guidebooks²⁷—often selective in the works of art they mention and incorrect in some of their attributions—they offer, nonetheless, useful information about Venetian sculpture.²⁸ For example, Sansovino's detailed explanation concerning the iconography of the sculptural decoration of the Loggetta (1537–45) is an invaluable guide to reading its façade and is still accepted by modern scholars (fig.0.19).²⁹ Later guidebooks—ranging from Antonio Pacifico's *Cronica* of 1697 to Giannantonio Moschini's two-volume guide of 1815—also offer helpful descriptions and can help to track physical changes over time.³⁰

Interestingly, Venetian authors did not follow Vasari's example of writing artists' biographies until the seventeenth century, when Carlo Ridolfi's book on Venetian painters was published in 1648.³¹ Sculptors' biographies did not follow until the following century, when Tommaso Temanza published his magnum opus, *Vite dei più celebri architetti e scultori veneziani che fiorirono nel secolo decimosesto*, in 1778 (fig.0.20).³² A professional

single paragraph (albeit complimentary) at the end of the life of his master, Andrea Sansovino: Vasari 1550, vol. 2, p.705-06. For Vasari's life of Jacopo, see Davis 2010.

²⁵ For example, when describing the impact of Sansovino's architecture on Venice, Vasari wrote: 'intantoché che si può dire quella magnifica città oggi, per quantità e qualità di sontuosi e bene intesi edifizii, risplendere et essere in questa parte quello ch'ell'è per ingegno, industria e virtù di Iacopo Sansovino, che per ciò merita grandissima laude'. Vasari 1568, vol.3, p.830.

²⁶ Sansovino 1561, first published under the pseudonym of Anselmo Guisconi in 1556, and reprinted some fifteen times; and Sansovino 1581.

²⁷ Including the two later editions of the 1581 guidebook: Sansovino-Stringa 1604 and Sansovino-Martinioni 1663.

²⁸ A notable incorrect attribution, for example, is that of both bronze well-heads in the Palazzo Ducale courtyard to the di Conti family, despite one being clearly signed by their rivals, the Alberghetti. Sansovino 1581, p.119r. For the well-heads, see Avery 2011, pp.103-110.

²⁹ Sansovino 1561, pp.19v-22r; and Sansovino 1581, pp.111r-112r. For the Loggetta, see principally Howard 1987, esp. pp.28-35; Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.73-88, 196-8 (docs 93-101), 200-201 (docs 107-110); vol.2, pp.334-5 (cat.27); Davies 1994; Morresi 2000, pp.213-27 (cat.32); and Davies 2013.

³⁰ Pacifico 1697 and Moschini 1815. For example, in his description of Santo Stefano, Moschini records the recent transfer of the Holy Sacrament altar from the suppressed church of Sant'Angelo: Moschini 1815, vol.1, part 2, p.579.

³¹ Ridolfi 1648.

³² Temanza 1778.

architect and engineer, Temanza was a product of the Age of Enlightenment and the *Vite* combine his knowledge and analysis of archival sources with a technical appreciation of the buildings and sculpture described in each biography. As the book was published before the fall of the Republic, it is especially helpful (perhaps even more than many of the above-mentioned guidebooks thanks to its level of detail and sole concern with architects and sculptors) in recording the one-time appearance of many of the key works of sculpture and architecture that were destroyed or re-located after 1797.³³

The foundations for modern archival scholarship on all aspects of Venice and its history were laid by Venetian scholars in the nineteenth century, a response, one might argue, to the fall of the Republic and the subsequent spoliation and destruction of so much of Venice's patrimony under French and Austrian domination, and a heightened patriotic desire to record and memorialise the city's glorious past.³⁴ The scholarship is wide-ranging, from Emmanuele Cicogna's record of inscriptions in key buildings, and his detailed accompanying notes,³⁵ to Giovanni Battista Lorenzi's magisterial compendium of documents pertaining to the Palazzo Ducale, and Bartolomeo Cecchetti and Ferdinando Ongania's similarly invaluable work on San Marco (fig.0.21).³⁶ Much useful information relating to the patronage and production of sculpture in Venice can be derived from such sources. Documentary compendia have continued to be published, ranging from the general art historical, such as that by Gustav Ludwig, to the monographic, such as those by Riccardo Predelli, Victoria Avery, Anna Pizzati and Matteo Ceriana.³⁷ These compilations represent years of archival research and offer scholars a useful, readily available resource for examination, evaluation and extraction.³⁸

While nineteenth-century broad-based histories of Venice, such as Pompeo Molmenti's *La storia di Venezia nella vita privata*, first published in 1879, can be

³³ For example, his description of the *Altar of the Magdalen*, formerly in Santa Maria dei Servi (cat.1): Temanza 1778, pp.126-7.

³⁴ Cicogna exemplifies this patriotism: his first volume of inscriptions is dedicated 'Alla Patria' while his Preface begins with the explanation that he undertook eight years of 'opera faticosissima' out of 'Amor solo di patria, non oggetto di lucro'. Cicogna 1824-53, vol.1, p.5. The most reliable and thorough survey of 'Venezia scomparsa' remains Zorzi 1984.

³⁵ Cicogna 1824-53. The six volumes contain much useful information about key churches demolished in the early nineteenth century, as well as biographical information about patrons and artists. Not all of his inscriptions were published before his death in 1868: for his original notes, see BMCV, Cod.Cic.2007-2020, 'Iscrizioni veneziane inedite', and Cod.Cic.2021-2023, 'Aggiunte alle iscrizioni veneziane'. For his inscriptions (without notes) see Cicogna-Pazzi and Bergamasco 2001.

³⁶ Lorenzi 1868; Cecchetti and Ongania 1886.

³⁷ Ludwig 1911; Predelli 1908 (Vittoria); Avery 1999a (Vittoria); and Pizzati and Ceriana 2008 (Tullio Lombardo).

³⁸ They do not, however, interpret or analyse the documents as this is beyond their remit.

informative,³⁹ the most pertinent work from this period remains Pietro Paoletti's three volume masterpiece, *L'architettura e la scultura di Venezia* of 1893–7 (fig.0.22).⁴⁰ Divided into chronological sections concerning architectural and sculptural works produced in Venice between 1400 and 1530, and extensively illustrated with photographs and the author's own line drawings, it is supported by biographies of key architects and sculptors. *L'architettura* also offers a vast array of primary source material in the form of documentary references and partial transcriptions. These have provided a crucial springboard for the discovery of further archival evidence, and it is primarily for its documents, as opposed to its many interesting observations and connoisseurial insights, that the volumes are consulted today.⁴¹ There are, however, a number of difficulties presented by the work: firstly, its unwieldy size (54.5 x 35.5cm) and rarity (only 500 copies were published) and second, the fact that Paoletti frequently omitted the specific archival reference, or only provided a partial citation, can render the original document difficult to trace (especially as the archival numbering systems have also changed in the interim). The other shortcoming, for those working on the sixteenth century, is that Paoletti's research period ends in c.1530. It should be remembered, however, that Paoletti and his fellow scholars began their research with a virtually blank canvas. When this is considered together with the fact that few indices to the myriad archival *fondi* were available for them to consult, the scale of their achievements becomes even more impressive.

The nineteenth century also saw a number of broad surveys which discussed Venetian sixteenth-century sculpture from a largely connoisseurial view-point, such as Leopoldo Cicognara's *Storia della scultura dal suo risorgimento in Italia* (first published 1813–16), and Pietro Selvatico's *Sulla architettura e sulla scultura in Venezia dal Medio Evo sino ai nostri giorni* (1847).⁴² Unlike Paoletti's magnum opus, these volumes have not withstood the test of time, and are rarely consulted by today's historians of Venetian sculpture. Of the two, Cicognara's eight-volume history of Italian sculpture offers the more balanced, scholarly approach.⁴³ Cicognara was President of the Accademia di Belle Arti in

³⁹ Molmenti 1925.

⁴⁰ Paoletti 1893–7. The first volume of text and accompanying volume of plates were published in 1893, the second volume of text in 1897. For Paoletti's life and work, see Schulz 2014a; esp. pp.98–102 for an assessment of *L'architettura*'s content as well as its reception and influence at the time of publication.

⁴¹ I agree, for example, with Wolfgang Wolters' assessment that Paoletti's biography of Antonio Rizzo remains unsurpassed. Wolters 1990, p.345, note 39.

⁴² Cicognara 1824 and Selvatico 1847.

⁴³ The work is divided into five sections: Rebirth, Progress, Perfection, Corruption, and Status Quo. The volume pertinent here is *Libro quarto: Stato della scultura nel tempo del Bonarroti: epoca terza* which deals with sculpture produced in the mid- to late sixteenth century.

Venice, and his neo-classical stance reflects the aesthetic concerns of his day.⁴⁴ Cicognara maintained the Vasarian bias of Tuscan sculpture's superiority, and although he did praise sixteenth-century Venetian sculpture, he regarded it as greatly inferior to that produced by Quattrocento and early Cinquecento masters, such as Rizzo and the Lombardo family.⁴⁵ Meanwhile, Selvatico's book is dedicated solely to Venetian architecture and sculpture and comes across today as highly subjective. This is particularly evident in his vehement dislike of Mannerist and Baroque sculpture, which he described as 'delusional fantasies'.⁴⁶ Furthermore, some of his attributions and observations are incorrect, perhaps revealing an over-reliance on earlier guidebooks, such as Martinioni's 1663 edition of Sansovino's *Venetia*. A case in point is that of the sculpted reliefs on the Rialto Bridge which he erroneously attributed to Campagna, echoing Martinioni's earlier attribution.⁴⁷ These were, in fact, executed by Tiziano Aspetti (*Sts Mark and Theodore*, fig.0.23a-b) and Agostino Rubini (*Annunciation*, fig.0.24a-b).⁴⁸

The first scholarly study of the twentieth century dedicated solely to Venetian Renaissance sculpture was Leo Planiscig's 1921 monograph.⁴⁹ The Austrian museum curator's approach was, again, primarily connoisseurial, being more concerned with the style and quality of the finished object, rather than how and why it came into being. While connoisseurship is undoubtedly important and plays a key role in my own research, the 'how' and 'why' of the commissioning and production processes are fundamental to this thesis: to quote Goethe, 'one does not learn to know works of nature and art when they are finished; one must catch them as they come into being in order to understand them in some measure'.⁵⁰ It should also be noted that Planiscig privileged sculpture made in bronze, and

⁴⁴ Cicognara served as President from 1808 to 1826 during which time the Gallerie dell'Accademia opened (1817) in the former church and monastery of Santa Maria della Carità. For a biography, see Romanelli 1981.

⁴⁵ For Cicognara, the work of the older Venetian masters had 'un carattere di maggiore originalità e furono trattate con più preziosità ad un tempo e semplice esecuzione'. Cicognara 1824, vol.4, p.261. For his bias towards Tuscan sculpture see, for example, *ibid.*, vol.4, p.314.

⁴⁶ 'deliranti fantasie'. Selvatico 1847, pp.379-83, quotation at p.380.

⁴⁷ Selvatico 1847, p.400 and Sansovino-Martinioni 1663, p.365. As far as I can ascertain, Martinioni was the first author to attribute the reliefs to a particular sculptor. Stringa, in his 1604 edition of Sansovino's guidebook, mentioned the reliefs but did not specify who carved them: Sansovino-Stringa 1604, p.254v. In Selvatico's defence, previous authors had maintained this attribution to Campagna up to and including Moschini's 1815 guidebook, so it was clearly widely accepted. Moschini 1815, vol.2, p.543.

⁴⁸ For the payment records, see Benacchio Flores d'Arcais 1931, p.143 (doc. XVIII).

⁴⁹ Planiscig 1921.

⁵⁰ 'Natur- und Kunstwerke lernt man nicht kennen wenn sie fertig; man muß sie im Entstehen aufhaschen, um sie einigermaßen zu begreifen.' Letter from Goethe to Carl Friedrich Zelter, 1803.

only rarely visited Venice, preferring to work from photographs in Vienna and later in Florence, with the result that many of his attributions are flawed.⁵¹

Since Planiscig's death in 1952, some of the most valuable broad-based scholarship has been written for catalogues published to accompany exhibitions, such as the section devoted to sculpture in *The Genius of Venice* (1983), and "*La bellissima maniera*": *Alessandro Vittoria e la scultura veneta del Cinquecento* (1999).⁵² The latter is particularly helpful, as it combines succinct biographies of the principal sculptors in Vittoria's ambit with catalogue entries of all the exhibits, supported by scholarly essays covering a broad range of topics relating to the Tridentine sculptor's life and work.

General surveys of Venetian sculpture have also been published in studies reviewing Italian Renaissance sculpture as a whole, Venetian sculpture over a broad period, Venetian Renaissance art and architecture, and encyclopaedias of Venetian history.⁵³ Within the first category, the work of John Pope-Hennessy is exemplary, despite his undeniable Vasarian bias towards Central Italy, in particular Tuscany and Tuscan makers.⁵⁴ Entries for Venetian sculpture in public and private collection catalogues represent another aspect of the broader-based scholarship currently available,⁵⁵ and can include examinations of works relevant to my own research, such as sculptural models, and original elements, for example, the Getty's bronze *Infant*, attributed to Campagna, which was most likely the original crowning figure of the Goldsmiths' altar (fig.0.25).⁵⁶

In the first half of the twentieth century, valuable biographical studies of lesser sculptors working in Venice were provided by Italian scholars such as Malvina Benacchio Flores d'Arcais for Tiziano Aspetti (1565–1606) and Luisa Pietrogrande for Francesco Segala (documented 1559–92), based on an analysis of the sculptors' extant work and

Goethe 1887–1919, vol.4, part 16, p.265. Also quoted (unreferenced and with a slightly different translation) by Wackernagel 2011, p.297.

⁵¹ As noted by John Pope-Hennessy and other scholars since, there are numerous over-optimistic attributions of small Venetian bronzes to renowned sculptors such as Sansovino, Vittoria, Campagna and Aspetti, often in Viennese private collections. See, for example, Pope-Hennessy 2000, p.456 and p.514, with regard to Sansovino and Aspetti respectively.

⁵² London 1983, pp.355-91, sculpture introduction and entries by Anthony Radcliffe and Bruce Boucher; and Trent 1999.

⁵³ Such as Mariacher 1987; Bacchi 2000a; and Huse and Wolters 1990. For encyclopaedia essays, see Boucher 1994 and Schulz 1994.

⁵⁴ There have been four editions of *Italian Renaissance Sculpture* and *Italian High Renaissance and Baroque Sculpture*: see Pope-Hennessy 1996 and Pope-Hennessy 2000.

⁵⁵ For example, Pope-Hennessy and Lightbown 1964; Radcliffe et al 1992; and Warren 2014.

⁵⁶ Fogelman and Fusco 1988 and Fogelman 2002b, pp.122-7 (cat.16). See also Jones 2011.

archival documents.⁵⁷ Beyond Italy, the Vasarian legacy only really began to be addressed from the 1960s onwards, with key studies on late Quattrocento and early Cinquecento sculptors by American scholars such as Sarah Blake McHam, Alison Luchs, Anne Markham Schulz and Wendy Stedman Sheard.⁵⁸ Schulz's considerable and continuing body of work on these sculptors, for example, has been influential, combining extensive, accurate, archival transcriptions and new photographic campaigns.⁵⁹ Furthermore, she has sought to establish biographies for lesser-known sculptors based on sound archival research, such as Giammaria Mosca (c.1495/9–before December 1573) and Giovanni Battista da Carona (active c.1520–c.1532).⁶⁰ However, as remarked in some reviews, Schulz's methodological approach and resulting attributions are at times questionable, and this aspect of her work should therefore be approached with caution.⁶¹

Important research on Venice's later generation of sculptors has also been undertaken in the last fifty years by scholars such as Manfred Leithe-Jasper, Wladimir Timofiewitsch, Bruce Boucher, Victoria Avery, Claudia Kryza-Gersch, Lorenzo Finocchi Gherzi and Thomas Martin.⁶² Most of these have tended to be monographic in approach. The value of the traditional monograph cannot be overstated and the work mentioned above has filled significant lacunae in our knowledge, particularly as it combines in-depth archival research with finely-honed connoisseurship. Such studies provide a foundation for more broad-based holistic examinations of patronage and sculptural practice, such as the present thesis.

Others have considered Venetian Cinquecento sculpture in terms of material, most notably bronze.⁶³ The scholarship surrounding Venetian bronzes and how they were produced is considerable, and ranges from broad surveys and collection catalogues, to

⁵⁷ Benacchio Flores d'Arcais 1930, 1931, 1932, and 1934–9; and Pietrogrande 1942–54, 1955, and 1961.

⁵⁸ For example, Wilk 1978 (McHam's thesis on Tullio Lombardo); Luchs 1995; Schulz 1991; and Stedman Sheard 1971 respectively.

⁵⁹ Most recently, Schulz 2014b, with access to high quality images via VISTAS (Virtual Images of Sculpture in Time and Space) at http://www.vistasvisuals.org/books/the_sculpture_of_tullio_lombardo (accessed April 2016).

⁶⁰ Schulz 1998 and Schulz 2000.

⁶¹ For example, Pope-Hennessy's review of Schulz 1983: Pope-Hennessy 1984.

⁶² Leithe-Jasper 1963; Timofiewitsch 1972; Boucher 1991; Avery 1996; Kryza-Gersch 1996; Finocchi Gherzi 1998; and Martin T. 1998.

⁶³ In addition to steeple bells and artillery, Venice's bronze industry produced innumerable small-scale often highly decorated functional bronze artefacts, beyond the scope of this thesis. Many were made for speculative sale by the bronze-founders themselves, and had no direct involvement from sculptors: Avery 2011 and 2013.

studies of functional and small-scale bronzes, and technical analyses.⁶⁴ Interestingly, the use of marble and stone as sculptural materials in sixteenth-century Venice has not been accorded the same attention as bronze but, as architectural materials, they have been extensively examined—both in broader terms and through scientific analysis and conservation.⁶⁵ More pertinent to my own research is Joachim Strupp's 1993 article, in which he examined the use and appreciation of marble in Venice in c.1500, and Fabio Barry's research on the symbolism of coloured marble.⁶⁶ However, the question of why Venetian patrons chose a particular material for the sculpture they commissioned has yet to be properly addressed, and is considered here in Chapter 3.⁶⁷

In addition to the approaches examined above, there have been a number of important examinations of specific types of sculpture in Renaissance Venice. As diverse as fireplaces, portrait busts and sculptural decoration for architectural contexts, the most apposite to my own research are those studies concerning sculpted altars, tombs and exterior façade monuments.⁶⁸ Most of these studies formulated approaches similar to my own, namely, combining archival research with an examination of published primary sources and visual analysis in order to understand why and how commissions came into being. These scholars have advanced our knowledge with important archival discoveries, such as Simane's examination of the Ziliol papers for the *Monument to Doge Nicolò da Ponte* formerly in Santa Maria della Carità, and Martin's research on the high altar of Santa Maria Formosa.⁶⁹ Gaier's catalogue of exterior façade monuments, meanwhile, presents an effective model that was influential when compiling the catalogue of works presented here.⁷⁰

Venetian Renaissance sculpture has featured significantly in monographs devoted to specific buildings or large-scale chapels, such as Bertrand Jestaz's seminal work on the

⁶⁴ For example, see Avery 2011 (broad survey); Berlin 2003 (collection catalogue); Mariacher 1962a (small bronzes); Sturman and Smith 2008 and 2013 (technical analyses).

⁶⁵ For the former, see, for example, Connell 1988, pp.89-108 (Istrian stone), 109-43 (marble), 143-52 (treatment of stone and marble). For the latter, see Lazzarini 1981 and Lazzarini 2003.

⁶⁶ Strupp 1993b and Barry 2006. The latter is a broad chronological and geographical study, examining both the visual arts and literature.

⁶⁷ Avery has recently researched the choice of bronze (or lack of it) for doges' tombs: Avery 2016 forthcoming.

⁶⁸ Attardi 2002 (fireplaces); Luchs 1995, Martin T. 1998 and Avery 2007a (portrait busts); Wolters 2007 (architectural contexts); Strupp 1993a, Martin S. 1998 and Buonanno 2014 (sculpted altars); Munman 1968, Hiesinger 1971, Simane 1993, and Paul 2016 forthcoming (funerary monuments); and Gaier 2002a (façade monuments).

⁶⁹ For the da Ponte Monument, see Simane 1993, pp.82-95. Simane published only short excerpts from the documents. See cat.6 for full transcriptions. For Santa Maria Formosa's high altar, see Martin S. 1998, pp.274-8 (cat.26).

⁷⁰ Gaier 2002a, pp.453-559.

Cappella Zen in San Marco, and the monograph published to coincide with the conservation of Santa Maria dei Miracoli.⁷¹ Of particular relevance to my own research, in terms of its chronology and documentation, is Blake McHam's in-depth study of the Cappella dell'Arca in the Santo, Padua, for which some of the sculpture was produced in Venice.⁷² While the earlier part of this ambitious complex lies beyond the chronological limits of my thesis (begun c.1497), the employment of many of Venice's leading sculptors over the course of the project's history (completed 1594), including Sansovino, Cattaneo, Campagna and Aspetti, and the detailed surviving documents, render it wholly relevant. More recently, the catalogue raisonné of works of art in Santi Giovanni e Paolo has provided an invaluable summary of up-to-date knowledge combined with specially-commissioned colour photography.⁷³

Individual case-studies, published in academic journals and edited volumes, form a considerable body of research on Venetian sculpture and its makers, and the approaches and concerns vary widely. Some authors have focused on the reconstruction of a particular commission.⁷⁴ Others, however, have presented newly-discovered archival documents or works of sculpture, or sought to assign new attributions or establish provenance.⁷⁵ Many of these case-studies include documentary transcriptions, while others present exemplary examples of best practice, even if beyond the chronological limits of this thesis, such as Charles Davis's treatment of the account-books for the construction of the Cappella Bernabò in San Giovanni Crisostomo (1499–1507; fig.0.26).⁷⁶

While much of the scholarship discussed above inevitably touches upon issues of patronage,⁷⁷ there are several studies that concentrate exclusively on these areas. Erasmus Weddigen's evaluation of the egocentric physician and obsessive patron, Tommaso Rangone, is a prime example of thorough archival scholarship, which sheds light on the motivations of a man keen to embellish prominent sites in Venice with his own image (fig.0.27).⁷⁸ Michel Hochmann is one scholar in particular whose extensive archival research

⁷¹ Jestaz 1986 and Piana and Wolters 2003 (especially McHam 2003 and Rossi 2003).

⁷² McHam 1994.

⁷³ Pavanello 2012.

⁷⁴ See Timofiewitsch 1965 on the Goldsmiths' altar in San Giacomo, based on the guild's surviving account-book (cat.9, doc.9.1). Although Timofiewitsch considered how much money was spent on the altar, he overlooked how it was financed, despite detailed accounts recording this information. This oversight has been addressed by the present author: see Jones 2011 and Chapter 2 here.

⁷⁵ For example, Rigoni 1938; Boucher 1977; and Fogelman and Fusco 1988 respectively.

⁷⁶ Davis 2007a and Davis 2007b.

⁷⁷ The motivations and/or expectations of patrons are often examined as part of a broader remit, such as monographic studies (e.g. Boucher 1991) and those concerned with a particular type of sculpture or commission (e.g. Simane 1993; Martin T. 1998; Gaier 2002a).

⁷⁸ Weddigen 1974.

has focused on both patronage and collecting across the arts,⁷⁹ most recently in the collaborative project examining *collezionismo* in Venice over several centuries, but sculpture forms only a small part of this.⁸⁰ Although there has been no broad overview of the patronage of Italian Renaissance sculpture along the lines of Bram Kempers' study on painting, *Patronage and Italian Renaissance Sculpture* (edited by Kathleen Wren Christian and David Drogin), has attempted to fill this lacuna.⁸¹ While the latter volume does go some way towards addressing the book's title, the essays are essentially individual case-studies connected by a common theme, and are therefore not truly comparable to works such as Kempers'. It is hoped that my consideration of why and how patrons commissioned sculpture in Venice (Chapters 1 and 2) will significantly augment currently available scholarship.

Despite the fact that the 'business of sculpture' in sixteenth-century Venice has not yet been examined *per se*, comparable studies do exist. Martin Wackernagel's seminal work, *The World of the Florentine Renaissance Artist* (first published 1938), considered the commissioning of sculpture and workshop practice alongside the production of art in other media, but he concentrated exclusively on Florence, and sculpture formed only a small part.⁸² Hannelore Glasser discussed artists' contracts in impressive detail in her 1968 thesis, but she was based in Florence, and concentrated mainly on Central Italy.⁸³ More recently, scholars such as Anabel Thomas and Michelle O'Malley have scrutinised the logistics of artistic commissions and workshop organisation in the Renaissance, but the emphasis has been on painting and, again, principally on Central Italy.⁸⁴ Martin Kemp has also examined the topic in *Behind the Picture*, offering a useful survey of contracts and the expectations of patron and maker during the Italian Renaissance, but here too his concern was exclusively with painting.⁸⁵ Following on from the ground-breaking work of Richard Goldthwaite and associated conference proceedings, the economics of art in Italy continues to be examined, but as ever the emphasis has been on painting.⁸⁶

This is ironic given that sculpture, with its multiplicities of genre, scale, material, and setting, offers greater scope for investigations into commissioning and production processes than does painting; and by deliberately concentrating on Venetian sculpture, this thesis aims

⁷⁹ For example, Hochmann 1992 and Hochmann 2001.

⁸⁰ For the Cinquecento volume, see Hochmann et al 2008.

⁸¹ Kempers 1992 and Christian and Drogin 2010.

⁸² Wackernagel 2011.

⁸³ Glasser 1968.

⁸⁴ Thomas 1995 and O'Malley 2005. The latter study, despite its title *The Business of Art*, is only concerned with painting.

⁸⁵ Kemp 1997, esp. pp.32-78.

⁸⁶ Goldthwaite 1993 and Fantoni et al 2003. More recently, Spear and Sohm 2010 (seventeenth-century Italy) and O'Malley 2013 (fifteenth-century Florence).

to counter the prevailing bias towards Central Italy. Connell's thesis on the fifteenth-century employment of sculptors and stonemasons in Venice remains a landmark study,⁸⁷ but her research did not extend to sixteenth-century Venice, a critical period during which the status of the artist changed considerably. Like Connell's research, my thesis considers not only well-known masters, such as Sansovino, Vittoria and Campagna, but also lesser-known, and in some cases completely unknown, sculptors and stonemasons whose names crop up in the archival record. In this way, I aim to present a more accurate picture of the industry in sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Venice.

As outlined above, close examination of the sculptures themselves has been central to my research, unlike Connell, who clearly stated that such considerations were beyond her remit.⁸⁸ Yet an awareness of the varying quality apparent in any sculptor's œuvre is surely essential. Only when archival research is coupled with visual analysis and an appreciation of qualitative differences can one fully understand how the business of sculpture in the Serenissima functioned and flourished as it did, and why a handful of sculptors were favoured over the many *maestri* whose names appear not on works of sculpture or in history books but only in dusty documents languishing in the archives of Venice.

⁸⁷ Connell 1988.

⁸⁸ Connell 1988, Preface, p.iv.

I. PATRONS: SCULPTURAL GENRES, MOTIVATIONS, LOCATIONS

I wish [...] to be buried in my tomb, in my *cappella maggiore* built and decorated all at my own expense, from my own money, gained through my own honest and just efforts.
Antonio Gatto, 21 May 1591¹

Antonio Gatto (d.1591), parish priest of San Polo, began the ambitious rebuilding and decoration of the chancel of his beloved church in 1585 (fig.1.1).² Once finished, it included a new high altar adorned with a painted *pala* and a pair of almost life-size bronze statues of St Paul and St Anthony Abbot (figs 1.2-1.3), a floor tomb in which he was to be interred and, along the north wall, a sculpted cenotaph of marble and *paragone*, complete with two marble angels bearing inscriptions and a marble portrait bust by Alessandro Vittoria (1524/5–1608).³ As the redecoration of the chancel was not quite finished when Gatto wrote his will in May 1591, he used this document as a means to guarantee its successful completion (fig.0.15). Prioritising this project over the many other bequests and good works for which he pledged his estate to provide, Gatto outlined how the remaining work was to be financed, explained that the bronze *St Paul* remained to be finished, described at length the desired sculptural decoration of his funerary monument, and even named those whom he expected to finish the job: Vittoria, fellow-sculptor Agostino Rubini (c.1558/60–d. before February 1595) and *proto* Simon Sorella (1532–99).⁴

While Gatto's detailed testamentary instructions are somewhat unusual, it is not surprising that he took such care. Sculpture was not a form of art patronage to be undertaken lightly: on account of the lengthy production processes involved, it required money (often a lot of it), determination, dedication and patience. But what type of sculpture was commissioned in Venice and for where? Who commissioned it and why? And why did patrons choose particular locations for their commissions, and how did they secure these spaces?

Types of Sculpture and Locations

Sculpture has both a temporal aspect (permanent or ephemeral) and a physical one (static or mobile), and the types of sculpture and sculptural decoration commissioned in Venice were

¹ 'Voglio [...] esser sepolto nella mia archa nella mia capella maggiore fabricata et ornata a tutte mie spese del mio proprio danaro acquistato con le mie honeste et iuste fatiche.' Cat.7, doc.7.6, fol.1v.

² Cat.7, docs 7.2-7.3.

³ Modernised in the early nineteenth century, the chancel was modified further in the early twentieth. For its sixteenth-century appearance, see Sansovino-Stringa 1604, pp.151v-152r.

⁴ Rubini was Vittoria's nephew and was specified as such in Gatto's will. Cat.7, doc.7.6, fol.4r-v.

many and varied, as were their intended locations. The sculpture discussed here was commissioned to be long-lasting and, for the most part, intended for a fixed, permanent location. Devotional sculpture was found in both public and private settings, but primarily in ecclesiastical and confraternal spaces. Statues, statuettes and reliefs were made to adorn altars (fig.1.4), sacramental tabernacles (fig.1.5), fonts and holy water stoups (figs 1.6a-c, 1.7). Although not always strictly devotional, sculpted funerary monuments likewise adorned many churches, particularly the larger religious houses, such as Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari (Franciscan) and Santi Giovanni e Paolo (Dominican), the latter well-known as the pantheon of Venice's doges (fig.1.8).⁵ Devotional statuary and reliefs were also commissioned to embellish the exteriors and interiors of these buildings, such as Pietro da Salò's relief of *St George Slaying the Dragon* (1551–2) above the main entrance of the Scuola di San Giorgio degli Schiavoni (fig.1.9), and Vittoria's stucco *Evangelists* (1574) on the counter-façade of San Giorgio Maggiore (fig.1.10).⁶ Religious sculpture was placed in non-devotional contexts too, such as on the exterior of the Palazzo Ducale (fig.1.11) and the Arsenal gateway (fig.1.12).⁷ Devotional sculpture was also found on way-side shrines (fig.1.13), well-heads (fig.1.14), flag-staff bases (fig.1.15) and, of course, in the home. Domestic devotional sculpture ranged from high-end one-off pieces destined for the wealthy, such as Sansovino's bronze *Madonna with sleeping Christ Child* owned by the physician, astronomer and humanist scholar, Tommaso Rangone (1493–1577; fig.1.16); to cheaper pieces likely made in some numbers for speculative sale, such as small bronze statuettes and plaquettes of popular saints made in batches via the indirect lost wax casting process (fig.1.17) and the painted *carta pesta* reliefs of the *Madonna and Child* produced in moulds by Sansovino's workshop (fig.1.18a-b).⁸

Secular sculpture was likewise commissioned for public and private contexts. Statues and reliefs were often made to decorate the exteriors of buildings, such as those found on the Biblioteca Marciana (fig.1.19) and the Palazzo Ducale (fig.1.20), and on many private palaces. Less common were secular statues made for internal settings, although examples do exist, such as the allegorical overdoor figures in the Sala delle Quattro Porte of the

⁵ By 1581, Sansovino noted in his guidebook that 'in questo Tempio giacciono sedici Principe di Venetia'. Sansovino 1581, fol.17r.

⁶ For the former, see Perocco 1964, pp.224-5. For the latter, see Cooper 1990, pp.265-6; and Avery 1996, vol.2, pp.480-1 (cat.65).

⁷ The latter is crowned with Campagna's *St Justine* (1978). Timofiewitsch 1972, pp.76-82, 236 (cat.3).

⁸ For Rangone's *Madonna and Child*, see Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.106-7, vol.2, p.346 (cat.42). For small bronzes produced for speculative sale, see Avery 2011, pp.128-9 and Avery 2013. For Sansovino's *carta pesta* reliefs, see Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.107-110, vol.2, pp.346-51 (cats 44-56).

Palazzo Ducale (fig.1.21).⁹ On a smaller scale, portrait busts were fashioned and medals struck, such as the three bronze busts by Tiziano Aspetti for the Sala delle Armi in the Palazzo Ducale made to celebrate military heroes of the Republic (fig.1.22).¹⁰ Sculpture of a secular nature was also made for domestic spaces: busts (portraits, likenesses of historical figures, and idealised; fig.1.23), medals (fig.1.24), and statuettes (fig.1.25), not to mention copies of antiquities, such as the bronze made after the much-admired marble *Vitellius* (fig.1.26).¹¹

Many functional objects may be considered as works of sculpture in their own right, such as marble fireplaces and lavabos, and bronze candlesticks and doorknockers (fig.1.27), firedogs (fig.1.28), inkwells and hand-bells (fig.1.29). Elaborate stucco relief sculpture also became fashionable from the mid-sixteenth century onwards for fireplace overmantels and to adorn the vaults and walls of rooms and staircases, often in combination with frescoes, in both public and private buildings (fig.1.30).¹²

The physical and political nature of Venice meant that there was little or no demand for certain genres of sculpture popular in other great artistic centres, such as Florence and Rome. Fountains, for example, were not practicable in the lagoon city, and public, free-standing monuments to heroes of the Republic (dead or alive) in external spaces were frowned upon (the equestrian monument to Bartolomeo Colleoni being the exception; fig.1.31a-b).¹³ Of course, both the State and private patrons found ways to overcome the latter prohibition: the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries saw a number of notable monuments erected on the exterior façades of numerous churches, such as that to Vincenzo Cappello (after 1541–c.1569, Santa Maria Formosa, fig.1.32), as well as interior equestrian

⁹ For the iconographic programme for the Palazzo Ducale's redecoration following the fire of 1577, see BMCV, Cod.Cic.585, 105; and Wolters 1966, pp.314-8 for a full transcription.

¹⁰ Marc'Antonio Bragadin (defeated at Famagusta, Cyprus, d.17 August 1571), Sebastiano Venier and Agostino Barbarigo (both Battle of Lepanto). Trent 1999, pp.430-31 (cat.97; by Kryza-Gersch).

¹¹ The marble *Vitellius* came to Venice in 1523 as part of Cardinal Domenico Grimani's famous antiquities collection (now Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Venice, inv.no.20). Favaretto et al 2004, p.116. For the Grimani collection, see Perry 1978. For the bronze version, see Avery 2007a, pp.91-4 and Avery 2011, pp.133-4.

¹² For fireplaces, see Davis 1996 and Attardi 2002; for sculptural decoration generally including fireplaces, see Wolters 2007.

¹³ In 1623, for example, the Senate got wind of a bronze statue in Belluno commissioned 'in memory of our civil and military Governor'. The decree ordered that it was to be melted down and used for cannon at the Arsenal, if it had already been cast, and that 'in future the making of statues, coats of arms, banners and other similar things in memory of our representatives is to be banned'. Bistort 1912, p.282, translation: Jennifer Fletcher in Chambers and Pullan 2001, p.410. For the Colleoni, see Covi 1983; Butterfield 1997, pp.159-83, 232-6 (cat.26); and Avery 2011, pp.114-7.

monuments to favoured *condottieri* and other war heroes, such as those erected in Santi Giovanni e Paolo (fig.1.33).¹⁴

The Patrons

Despite the expense and time involved in its production, sculpture was commissioned by a wide range of Venetians: by individuals, such as wealthy patricians, well-off members of the *cittadino* class, and some clerics; and by corporations, such as ecclesiastical entities, lay confraternities and trade guilds. The State, too, embarked on sculptural projects throughout the period as part of its ongoing promotion of the Serenissima. Without patrons' desire to devote considerable funds to the embellishment of their homes, churches, state buildings and public spaces, the business of sculpture in Venice would not have flourished as it did.

Individual patrons

The most richly documented sculptural commissions by individuals, be they patricians, citizens or clerics, are those for ecclesiastical contexts, for example, chapels, altars and funerary monuments. Certain patrons were sufficiently organised and motivated to oversee such projects during their lifetime, such as Doge Nicolò da Ponte (1491–1585; r.1578–85; fig.1.34). Before his election as doge, da Ponte had been a Procuratore di San Marco de Ultra (elected 1570), and was involved in the early years of the litigious and highly problematic project for the *Monument to Doges Lorenzo and Girolamo Priuli* (c.1573–c.1603) in San Salvador.¹⁵ Having seen at first hand the problems that could arise from leaving the construction of one's memorial to executors, da Ponte no doubt concluded that he was more likely to get the monument he wanted (and constructed in a timely fashion) if he commissioned it himself. His imposing monument, overseen by Marc'Antonio Barbaro (1518–95), was erected in Santa Maria della Carità in only two years (1582–4; fig.1.35).¹⁶

¹⁴ For the Cappello Monument, see Gaier 2002a, pp.178-206, 465-70 (cat.4). For external church façade monuments generally, see Gaier 2002a. For the State-funded equestrian monuments in Santi Giovanni e Paolo, see Gaier 2008 and relevant entries in Pavanello 2012.

¹⁵ For da Ponte's involvement, see, for example, the following documents published in Avery 1999a: doc.92(x) dated 22.11.1575, p.259; doc.92(xvi) dated 31.12.1575, p.264; doc.92(xvii) dated 9.1.1576, pp.264-5; doc.92(xix) dated 1.2.1576, pp.266-7; doc.92(xx) dated 3.2.1576, pp.267-8; doc.92(xxv) dated 9.3.1576, pp.270-1; doc.92(xxvii) dated 16.5.1576, p.272; and doc.92(xxviii) dated 19.5.1576, pp.272-4. See also Ludwig 1911, p.27, document dated 16.4.1576. For the Priuli monument's commissioning history, see Simane 1993, pp.49-64; and Avery 2016 forthcoming. For da Ponte's life: Da Mosto 2007, pp.297-305; Brown 1974; Gullino 1986; and Howard 2011, pp.122-31 (including an in-depth discussion of his own tomb and Barbaro's involvement).

¹⁶ Cat.6. It has hitherto gone unremarked that da Ponte was already planning his monument by February 1581. In a letter of 21 February 1581 about supplying Carrara marble for the Santo's new

Marino Grimani (1532–1605) was another wealthy patrician whose political career ended with the dogeship (r.1595–1605; fig.1.36).¹⁷ Thanks to considerable family wealth—both his own and that inherited by his wife, Morosina Morosini (1545–1614)—Grimani was able to commission architecture, sculpture, painting and the decorative arts extensively, much of which was meticulously recorded in his account-books (fig.1.37).¹⁸ In terms of sculpture, there are payments for medals and portrait busts,¹⁹ for work in the family-patronised church of San Giuseppe di Castello,²⁰ as well as accounts for the extravagant coronation of his wife as dogaressa on 4 May 1597, for which elaborate ephemeral structures with sculptural decorations were designed by Scamozzi, including a large *Neptune* by Campagna (fig.1.38).²¹ Like da Ponte, Grimani ensured that his funerary monument in San Giuseppe was built during his lifetime (fig.1.39). The rich documentary record for this enormous, multi-media memorial to the doge and dogaressa recounts the lengthy and complex process behind its creation (fig.1.40).²²

But it was not only patricians who commissioned sculpture in their lifetime; certain well-off members of the citizen class also did so. A truly exceptional *cittadino* patron was Tommaso Rangone. Originally from Ravenna, Rangone made Venice his home, and during his lifetime he amassed a sizeable art collection containing medals and bronze statuettes, and actively sought to make his mark on numerous churches and confraternity buildings

high altar, Campagna advised that da Ponte would certainly favour sending a boat from Venice to Carrara to fetch marble ‘perché ne à bisogno per far la sua sepoltura’. Cat.6, doc.6.1.

¹⁷ For Grimani’s life, see Gullino 2002.

¹⁸ Such as Grimani-Barbarigo, b.20, ‘Notatorio 1589–1604’. For Grimani’s account-books and art patronage, see Hochmann 1992.

¹⁹ Grimani-Barbarigo, b.20, under 19 June 1598: payments to one Tommaso di Savi for cleaning two medals; and to Cesare Groppo for 112 bronze medals, likely based on ‘doi ritrati da medaglia’ of the doge and dogaressa made by Giulio del Moro. The medals were presumably made for distribution as gifts: Hochmann 1992, pp.45, 51, note 46. In Grimani-Barbarigo, b.29, Grimani’s receipt book (entitled ‘MCLXX Riceveri’), under 6 August 1573, notes the final payment to Vittoria for the marble bust of Girolamo, Marino’s father. First published Martin T. 1991, p.826. For the bust, see Martin T. 1998, pp.70-2, 107-8 (cat.8).

²⁰ Grimani-Barbarigo, b.20, ‘Notatorio 1589–1604’, under 1 November 1601. First published Hochmann 1992, pp.47-8, and 51, notes 61-3. See also Grimani-Barbarigo, b.33, ‘Libro spese e salariadi di casa’, fol.281a-b and fols 309a-11b for the renovation/redecoration payments for the *cappella maggiore*. First published Martin T. 1991.

²¹ The coronation was recorded in Giacomo Franco’s engravings and Giovanni Rota’s meticulous account: Rota 1597, esp. pp.16-18, for the ephemeral architecture and the *Neptune*. For Scamozzi’s involvement, also see Sansovino-Stringa 1604, pp.431v-432r; Temanza 1778, p.448; Urban 1998, pp.210-15; Wilson 1999; Tondro 2002; and Vicenza 2003, pp.377-81.

²² The records were retained and bound separately from the expenses cited above. Fully transcribed here for the first time, see cat.8.

across his adopted city through ambitious, self-aggrandising architectural projects, sculptures, and paintings.²³ He too ensured that his own memorial on the external façade of San Giuliano (1554–9) was in place before his death (figs 0.27a-b and 1.41).²⁴

Other patrons preferred to leave instructions in their wills, effectively enjoining a third party in the form of their executors (usually close family or friends) to oversee the completion of a commission already begun, or to start a project from scratch, most often a funerary monument. Doge Francesco Venier (1489–1556, r.1554–6) obtained the space for his monument in San Salvador on 1 April 1555 (fig.1.42).²⁵ His codicil of 25 September 1555 states that ‘we wish that at least 1,000 ducats, and not more than 1,500 ducats be spent on the making of our sepulchre and adornment of the wall-façade and floor’, indicating that work on the monument had not yet begun.²⁶ Although the codicil suggests that Venier intended to get the project underway during his lifetime, he added the oft-used proviso that a family member—in this case his brother Piero (or failing him, one of Piero’s sons)—should ensure the commission’s completion if it remained unfinished at his death.²⁷ Indeed, Vittoria’s payment receipts for his workshop’s input, dating from November 1557 to May 1558, indicate that it was Piero’s son, Giovanni, who bore the responsibility of having the monument built (fig.1.43).²⁸

The two doges who followed Venier, brothers Lorenzo (1489–1559, r.1556–9) and Girolamo Priuli (1486–1567, r.1559–67), on the contrary, appear not to have left any written instructions for a memorial. Lorenzo merely stated that he wished to be buried in the family tomb in San Domenico di Castello, alongside his parents, and made no provision for a separate cenotaph, whereas Girolamo asked to be buried in San Cristoforo, Murano.²⁹ In fact, it was Lorenzo’s son, Giovanni, and Girolamo’s son, Lodovico, who decided to

²³ For his life, see principally Weddigen 1974 and Gaier 2002a, pp.207–36.

²⁴ See principally Weddigen 1974, pp.64–7; Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.113–8, 214–7, docs 182–90, vol.2, pp.338–9 (cat.31); Gaier 2002a, pp.207–36; 477–84 (cat.7); and Avery 2011, pp.124–6.

²⁵ Cat.4, doc.4.2. For his life and dogeship: Da Mosto 2007, pp.259–62.

²⁶ ‘Volemo che per el fare de la ditta nostra archa et adornamento nella faza del muro et nel salizado sia speso al meno ducati mille, et cusì etiam non più de ducati mille et cinquecento’. Cat.4, doc.4.3.

²⁷ Cat.4, doc.4.3, from ‘ad arbitrio de nostro fratello’ to ‘sia fornida’.

²⁸ Cat.4, docs 4.5 and 4.7.

²⁹ Lorenzo declared in his will of 1 October 1555 (drawn up the year before he became doge) that ‘El corpo mio volgio che sia posto nela nostra archa, a San Domenego dove sono le osse de nostri, maxime de nostro padre et madre’. NT, b.1209, no.562, fol.1r. San Domenico was demolished in the early nineteenth century, but Sansovino records the Priuli family chapel as being close to the high altar: Sansovino 1581, p.5v. For Girolamo’s burial request, see Lodovico’s will: NT b.1259, no.623, fol.1v. For the doges, see Da Mosto 2007, pp.262–8 (Lorenzo) and *ibid.*, pp.268–70 (Girolamo).

memorialise their fathers with an imposing double funerary monument, erected in San Salvador at vast expense (fig.1.44).³⁰

Other than family members or friends, an individual patron could nominate a corporate body as his/her executor, such as a lay confraternity or the Procuratori di San Marco de Citra and de Ultra. The testamentary instructions left by patrons planning chapels, altars, or funerary monuments were frequently quite vague, often only confirming how much money could be spent.³¹ Instead, most patrons tended to focus on where they were to be interred, how they were to be dressed, any requirements for their funeral and the number of masses to be said for their soul. A few patrons, however, were much more exacting and gave detailed instructions in their will about the iconography and materials to be employed, such as Antonio Gatto discussed above.

The Procuratori di San Marco de Citra and de Ultra as third party patrons

During this period, the Procuratori di San Marco as collective entities were important patrons and facilitators of sculptural commissions. State-appointed, the procurators were divided into three categories: 'de Supra', 'de Citra' and 'de Ultra'. The 'de Supra' procurators had a number of responsibilities, including maintaining the fabric of the ducal church of San Marco, the Piazza and its buildings, as well as the care of orphans without guardians.³² The 'de Citra' and 'de Ultra' procurators acted as executors of wills and managers of trusts when nominated to do so by private individuals in their wills. They could also be given this role at a later date, either following the death of a testator's last surviving executor, or in the event of disagreements arising amongst executors about a testator's wishes. The 'de Citra' procurators were responsible for estates within the three *sestieri* (or districts) on the San Marco side of the Grand Canal, and the 'de Ultra' for the three on the other side. From 1443, there were three procurators in each division, making a total of nine. However, as the sixteenth century progressed, their numbers increased with the election of supernumerary procurators—a means for the State to raise funds in straightened times.³³ Being a Procuratore di San Marco was the highest public office a patrician could hold beneath that of

³⁰ This assertion is supported by the fact that the space for the monument in San Salvador was not conceded until January 1569, two years after Doge Girolamo's death, and by the tenor of the instructions given in Lodovico's will. For the unpublished concession, see San Salvador, b.41, fol.117r. For a copy: San Salvador, b.32, fasc.83, fols 196r-199r, cited and discussed Simane 1993, p.50, note 5). For Lodovico's will: NT, b.1259, no.623; part-published and discussed Simane 1993, pp.50-1, note 6.

³¹ In such cases, patrons may have left verbal instructions.

³² For the 'de Supra' procurators as patrons of sculpture, see below, pp.36-7.

³³ This practice began following the financial difficulties caused by the War of the League of Cambrai. Howard 1987, p.9.

doge, and like the dogeship, it was a position retained until death (unless later elected doge).³⁴ The esteem in which this role was held is underscored by the fact that of the 20 doges elected during this period, only four had not been procurators.³⁵

The 'de Citra' and 'de Ultra' procurators supervised a number of important sculptural commissions in their role as executors during the course of the sixteenth century. Most notably, the 'de Citra' were responsible for the lavish bronze and marble Cappella Zen in San Marco (1504–21, fig.1.45) on behalf of the late Cardinal Giovanni Battista Zen (d.1501),³⁶ the *Altar of the Magdalen* in Santa Maria dei Servi (1523–4, fig.1.46-1.48) financed by the estate of Verde della Scala (d. by 28 February 1393),³⁷ the Cappella Emiliana in San Michele in Isola (1527–43, fig.1.49) for Margherita Vitturi Emiliani (d.1455),³⁸ and the Montefeltro Altar in San Francesco della Vigna (1557–64, fig.1.50) for *condottiere* Nicolò da Montefeltro (d.1397).³⁹ Meanwhile the 'de Ultra' were embroiled in the long and drawn-out construction of the aforementioned Priuli memorial.⁴⁰

How long it took the procurators to initiate a commission or to ensure its completion varied considerably. It is highly unlikely that, for example, Montefeltro had expected the procurators to take over 150 years to construct his chapel when he appointed them his executors—the instructions and money for which were recorded in a document of 23 May 1397.⁴¹ Yet this is exactly what happened. Montefeltro stated that the Procuratori di San Marco were to erect a chapel dedicated to St Anthony Abbot in either San Marco or San

³⁴ For the Procuratori generally, see Sansovino 1581, pp.106r-111r; Mueller 1971; and Chambers 1997.

³⁵ Francesco Venier, Lorenzo Priuli, Pietro Loredan and Nicolò Donà. Sansovino-Martinioni 1663, pp.299-300. Venier tried five times to be elected to the Procuracy: Da Mosto 2007, p.260.

³⁶ Cecchetti and Ongania 1886; Jestaz 1986; Avery 2011, pp.117-24; and Avery 2012.

³⁷ See cat.1 and below.

³⁸ Strupp 1993a, Chapters 2-3, passim, and pp.169-76 (cat.2.2.1); and Schulz 2000.

³⁹ Leithe-Jasper 1963, pp.112-18; Avery 1996, vol.2, cat.53, pp.458-60; Finocchi Ghersi 1998, pp.133-41; and Trent 1999, pp.314-18 (cat.66, by Sponza).

⁴⁰ The project was taken over by the 'de Ultra' procuracy in August 1574 due to unresolved disagreements between Lodovico's original executors. PSM de Ultra, b.225, fasc.40, fol.49r-v; and *ibid.*, fasc.38, fols 33r-35v; both unpublished. For further discussion of this take-over: Simane 1993, p.52.

⁴¹ PSM, Misti, b.12A, 'Procuratori di S. Marco de Citra II^o Commissaria Montefeltro (da) Nicolò qd. Federico civis Venetiarum', fasc.1, 'Carte relative al testamento ...', no.20, with extracts found in nos 21 and 31. Cited Finocchi Ghersi 1998, p.134; part-published Avery 1999a, p.222, doc.52(i). All previous scholars have erroneously called the 1397 document Montefeltro's will. It was, in fact, a *condizione* for Montefeltro's state loan investment, as recorded in the *catastico* of the Officio degli Imprestiti. Alongside the procurators' obligation to have an altar made, it recorded other terms and conditions concerning the use of his money.

Francesco, using a third of the funds invested in the Monte Vecchio (fig.1.51).⁴² For reasons unknown, the procurators did not begin the commission until February 1551, when they secured the concession for a chapel in the recently reconstructed church of San Francesco della Vigna (fig.1.52).⁴³

On occasion, the procurators were able to exercise a certain freedom when it came to using a testator's bequest, the aforementioned Verde della Scala being a case in point.⁴⁴ The procurators became the executors for Verde's estate in 1395, after the demise of her last executor. She had requested burial before an existing altar of her executors' choice in Santa Maria dei Servi, which had been duly carried out in the fifteenth century, with a carved tomb slab marking her final resting place. Although Verde had not stipulated that an altar to the Magdalen be erected, she did leave 200 ducats to be used for the fabric of the Servite

⁴² '... unius capellae construendae per dominos procuratores sancti Marci civitatis, et communis Venetiarum in ecclesia sancti Marci vel sancti Francisci de Venetiis, sub vocabulo sancti Antonii.' PSM, Misti, b.12A, fasc.1, no.21. Some 2,000 *lire grossi* had been invested: *ibid.*, no.31. The Monte Vecchio was a state forced loan fund into which Venetians with a certain amount of wealth were obligated to invest and from which they received a guaranteed annual interest of 5%. Lane 1973, p.150. Similar schemes, the Monte Nuovo, the Monte Nuovissimo and the Monte Sussidio, were instituted by the end of the period. Pezzolo 2014, p.270.

⁴³ Although the concession was initially negotiated between the PSM and the friars of San Francesco on 17 February 1550, the fact that the formal agreement was not drawn up and notarised until the following year, on 28 February 1551, has gone unremarked. For the procurators' copy, see PSM, Misti, b.12, 'Commissaria Montefeltro', loose vellum document. Published Avery 1999a, pp.222-3, doc.52(ii). For the notary's copy, see NA, b.8098, fols 103v-104v. For the friars' own record, see ASV, San Francesco della Vigna, b.4, 'Copie testamenti, registro di sentenze giudiziarie emesse da vari magistrati veneti, 1257-1557', p.69 onwards, as cited by Leithe-Jasper 1963, p.146, note 3; and Finocchi Gherzi 1998, p.135, note 24. I have been unable to consult the latter as the *busta* is missing. Avery gives the concession date as February 1552: Avery 1996, vol.1, p.152; and Avery 1999a, pp.222-3, doc.52(ii). However, Vettor Maffei, the notary, used the *anno a nativitate Domini* dating system (i.e. new year starts on 25 December) as the first lines of the concession demonstrate: 'In Xpi [Christi] nomine amen, anno nativitatis eiusdem millesimo quingentesimo, quinquagesimo primo indictione nona, die vero sabbati vigesimo octavo, et ultimo mensis februarij.' Avery's error is likely due to accepting an archivist's pencilled notation on the verso of the concession: '1552, 28 II' as the correct date. Presumably the archivist mis-read the document and thought that either the 'ab incarnatione' dating system was being used (i.e. year starts on 25 March, the date of Christ's conception) or the *more veneto* one (i.e. year starts on 1 March). Either system would mean that February 1551 was actually February 1552 in the modern calendar. For San Francesco's reconstruction, see Foscari and Tafuri 1983.

⁴⁴ Cat.1.

church, and the procurators used this money to commission one, renovating her tomb slab in the process.⁴⁵

Corporate patrons

Corporate patrons in Venice included parish churches and religious houses, lay confraternities and trade guilds.⁴⁶ Although there are notable examples of religious houses and churches commissioning sculpture, such as the Benedictines at San Giorgio Maggiore, most art patronage (especially sculpture) in ecclesiastical institutions was undertaken by external patrons, such as individuals and families, or confraternities, such as *scuole piccole* and trade guilds. Such patrons were accorded the right to use a designated space for a particular purpose, such as a chapel, altar, funerary monument and/or floor tomb with sculpted stone cover, in return for a donation.⁴⁷ When corporate patrons did commission sculpture, it was generally the wealthier, highly motivated entities who did so, such as the Benedictines at San Lorenzo, the Scuola Grande di San Rocco, and the Goldsmiths' Guild at San Giacomo. This is not surprising given the costly and generally time-consuming nature of having sculpture made.

Ecclesiastical patrons I: Parish churches

There were some seventy parishes in Venice, with the parish church at the centre of local daily life.⁴⁸ The churches themselves were run by the *capitolo* or chapter (composed of the clergy) with the parish priest (*pievano* in Venetian) at its head, and a team of lay procurators to assist in the maintenance of the fabric, and the management of any investments and church-owned properties. The election of the parish priest was the responsibility of the parish's college of parishioners, with formal approval from the Patriarch (under whose ultimate authority parish churches resided).⁴⁹ Lay procurators—usually local patricians and *cittadini*—were appointed by the chapter and reported back to it.⁵⁰ Patrician Angelo Maria Priuli (1504–51), as lay procurator for San Geremia, for example, oversaw the commission of

⁴⁵ 'Item ecclesiae dictorum fratrum servorum pro fabrica ducatos ducentos auri de prode meorum imprestitorum'. Cat.1, doc.1.1. For the tomb slab renovation, see cat.1, doc.1.3, [72].

⁴⁶ For an overview of these patrons' art patronage, see Matthew 2007.

⁴⁷ These spaces were always formally delineated in a notarial act. For concessions, see below, pp.43–8.

⁴⁸ This number varied slightly at different times: in the seventeenth century, 72 parishes existed. Cristellon and Menchi 2014, pp.382–3.

⁴⁹ The heads of property-owning families resident in the parish elected the priest. For Gatto's election as parish priest of San Polo on 6 January 1563, for example, see ASPV, Archivio Segreto, Clero. Benefici, Beneficiorum collatimum, reg.23, 1562–1657, fols 25v–30v.

⁵⁰ Many such appointments can be found throughout the notarial acts in the ASV. For lay procurators as patrons of art in Venice, see Sherman 2013.

a marble statuette of St John the Baptist for the church's font from the young Vittoria in 1550 (figs 1.53).⁵¹ Being a lay procurator could ease the way for a keen patron to pursue his own personal projects, as testified by Rangone's go-getting endeavours.⁵² His lay procuratorship of San Geminiano, San Giuliano and San Sepolcro (not to mention his membership of the Scuola Grande di San Marco) surely facilitated his ambitions to leave his mark (and his own image) on the Venetian cityscape via his artistic patronage at these institutions.⁵³

All work undertaken—whether on behalf of the church or by an individual patron—had to be approved by the chapter and, depending on the extent of the work, rubber-stamped by the Patriarch. Thus, a document of 25 May 1585 records that chapter approval had been given to priest Antonio Gatto to rebuild the *cappella maggiore* of San Polo—using a combination of his own funds and a substantial bequest of 300 ducats that patrician Francesco Soranzo (d.1563) had left explicitly for this purpose—and notes that such work was necessary due to the presbytery's 'antiquity and defects' (fig.1.54).⁵⁴ Another document, meanwhile, confirms that the Patriarch had approved the project.⁵⁵ Surviving notarial acts for such concessions suggest that once permission had been granted, patrons' projects could proceed without further input from either the chapter or the patriarch.⁵⁶ Such artistic licence is implied, for example, in the document confirming patriarchal approval of Gatto's presbytery project. Herein, Gatto's original petition is repeated: that he be allowed to 'rebuild it [*cappella maggiore*] from scratch, changing it into a more beautiful and gracious form than it is at present, being able to remove and put in place whatever seems appropriate to me, to build a tomb for myself before the high altar, with coat-of-arms and inscriptions' (fig.1.55).⁵⁷ If the patriarch or chapter had wished to curtail Gatto's patronal freedom, then they would surely have appended caveats to the notarised agreement.

On occasion, however, procuratorship for the church fabric could be taken on by a chapter member. Gianmaria Lazzarini, deacon of San Giovanni in Bragora, was elected procurator in charge of the church fabric on 15 June 1563, but did not retain the position for

⁵¹ Cat.3.

⁵² For Rangone as a lay procurator, see Sherman 2013, pp.20-25.

⁵³ For further discussion, see below, p.38.

⁵⁴ 'per le sua antiquita et deffetti ha bisogno di redificatione'. Cat.7, doc.7.3, fol.302v. For Soranzo's will, see cat.7, doc.7.1. Soranzo had also been a lay procurator of the church. He is named as such in Gatto's election record, as cited in note 49 above. For Gatto's original petition of 10 April 1585, see cat.7, doc.7.2.

⁵⁵ Cat.7, doc.7.2, fol.305r.

⁵⁶ It is possible, of course, that the chapter would have asked to see a drawing or model of the proposed work. For the role of drawings and models, see Chapter 2, pp.72-6.

⁵⁷ Cat.7, doc.7.2, fol.305r, from 'fabricarla da nuovo' to 'far inscriptions'.

very long.⁵⁸ Parish priest of Sant'Angelo, Marc'Antonio Gaetano, on the other hand, held onto the role with considerable gusto from 1577 until at least 1614, and likely until his death in 1617.⁵⁹ That Gaetano oversaw the commissioning of sculpture is known from a baptismal font, with its costly *paragone* basin and crowning marble *St John the Baptist* made by Giulio del Moro (c.1555–c.1616, fig.1.56) and installed in 1612.⁶⁰

Ecclesiastical patrons II: Religious houses

By this period, Venice was awash with religious houses, many of which had significant funds at their disposal that could be used for the decoration of their churches.⁶¹ As with parish churches, religious houses (particularly female convents and closed orders) relied on lay procurators to intercede on their behalf with the world outside.⁶² By 1525, some of these older institutions had already undertaken major rebuilding work, such as the ancient, wealthy Benedictine nunnery of San Zaccaria, which had overseen the major reconstruction of its

⁵⁸ NA, b.2571, fols 111v-112r. Lazzarini would go on to become the parish priest (I have been unable to confirm his election date but he was in post by April 1567, when he became Vittoria's brother-in-law, on the sculptor's marriage to his sister, Veronica).

⁵⁹ Gaetano recalls in his 1614 will that he took up the procuratorship in 1577, before he was parish priest. NT, b.57, no.399, n.p. For a copy, see NT, b.58, nos 244-6, fols 249v-255v. Gaetano became parish priest between February 1585 (when he was 'secundus presbyter') and April 1596 (when he was recorded as 'piovano'). NA, b.504, fol.1r; and NA, b.558, fol.118r respectively. In certain documents, such as his will, the full procuratorship title is given (i.e. procurator for the funds received for the church fabric): 'Et perche dall'anno 1577 fin hora presente son statto procurator della intrada della fabrica della giesia, qual ho ministrada con quella realta, et fidelta, che nostro Signor et il mio Prottetor San Michiel sono cognitori, et ogni anno li mie libri di dar et haver sono statti visti dalli miei Reverendi Fratelli del Capitolo et sotto scritti, li quali sono tutti in esser, nel scrigno delle scritture della giesia'. In others, such as a 1596 investment document, he is simply called 'procuratore della fabrica di essa chiesa'. NA, b.558, fol.118r.

⁶⁰ Sant'Angelo was closed in October 1810 and demolished in 1837. Zorzi 1984 pp.309-11. Alvise Angeli, then parish priest, was able to take the font, along with other art-works, to Santo Stefano when he became its parish priest. Cicogna 1824–53, vol.3, pp.178-9, no.82. The font and statue are now in the Contarini chapel. An inscription records Gaetano's patronage: MARCO ANT. CAIETANO PLEB. ANNO II. / MDXCII AERE ECCLESIAE. Gaetano was also closely involved in the new altar of the Holy Sacrament, also by del Moro, completed in 1610. Most of this likewise went to Santo Stefano (Cappella del SS. Sacramento). For del Moro at Sant'Angelo, see Comastri 1988, p.93.

⁶¹ Monastic houses received frequent bequests of money (often in the form of interest-producing investments in State forced loan schemes), of properties within and without Venice, and of farmland on the *terraferma*, the management and/or rental of which was an excellent source of income. Further income was derived from concession and mansionary fees, for which see below, pp.43-8.

⁶² Venetian notarial acts abound with appointments of lay procurators by religious houses (called *procure*). See, for example, Giovanni and Federico Figolin's *atti* for San Lorenzo: NA, b.5642 onwards.

fabric throughout the fifteenth century, including the building of a public pilgrimage church that was intentionally separate from that used by the nuns (fig.1.57a).⁶³ The beautiful pink and white façade of the public church is decorated with charming sculptural details, such as the pair of panels flanking the entrance portal, each of which contains two high-relief prophets set within roundels, encased by a rectangular frame adorned with rambunctious Donatellesque *putti* holding aloft bountiful cornucopias and swags (fig.1.57b-c).

By the end of the sixteenth century, another ancient female Benedictine convent, San Lorenzo, had realised an ambitious project to rebuild its church.⁶⁴ Begun in 1592, under the aegis of Abbess Paula Priuli (sister of Patriarch Lorenzo), and completed a decade later, the church was designed by Sorella as a vast single-naved structure divided centrally, with one side for the laity and one for the nuns (fig.1.58). At its centre, separating the two spaces, a soaring dual-aspect high altar was built under the direction of Abbess Andriana Contarini (c.1615–18). This was decorated with over life-size Carrara marble statues of Sts Lawrence and Sebastian and a sumptuous sacramental tabernacle richly ornamented with coloured marbles and bronze statuettes, all by Campagna and his workshop (fig.0.16).⁶⁵

Just prior to San Lorenzo's reconstruction, the monastery of San Giorgio Maggiore (a male Benedictine counterpart) had undertaken a comparable project to erect a modern church (fig.1.59), designed by Andrea Palladio (1508–80).⁶⁶ Begun in 1566 and eventually completed in 1610, the new building also boasted an impressive double-sided high altar with statuary by Campagna, this time solely in bronze (1592–4, fig.1.4).⁶⁷ The monks of San

⁶³ For the patronage of San Zaccaria's nuns, see Radke 2001 and Aikema et al 2016.

⁶⁴ For San Lorenzo's history, see Cicogna 1824–53, vol.2, pp.371-4.

⁶⁵ The closed church still stands with some of its internal structure intact, although it has been subject to extensive archaeological excavations. Some of the high altar sculpture is still *in situ* but in parlous condition, as is the tabernacle. The bronze statuettes are now in the Museo Correr. For the high altar, see Timofiewitsch 1972, pp.173-95, 297-9 (cat.33); and Martin S. 1998, pp.166-71, 265-70 (cat.24). For a fulsome description of the altar in its hey day, see Sansovino-Martinioni 1663, pp.80-1. Campagna also had a daughter at San Lorenzo, Suor Girolama, as confirmed by an unpublished financial document of 1624, although when she entered the convent is unknown. NA b.614, fols 80r-81v.

⁶⁶ For San Giorgio's history, see Cooper 1990. For its Palladian reconstruction and relevant bibliography, see most recently Cooper 2005, pp.111-45; and Vicenza 2008, pp.172-5 (Andrea Guerra).

⁶⁷ Campagna was later contracted with carving a *Madonna and Child with Child Angels* for a side altar (12 March 1595). For this and the high altar contract, see SGM, b.21, proc.10A: 1591–1644, 'Libro fabbrica della chiesa', fols 30r-v and 1r-2r respectively. Published Timofiewitsch 1972, pp.264-5 (cat.17); and 258-9 (cat.15) respectively. For the *Madonna*, see Ibid., pp.123-33; 263-6 (cat.17); Cooper 1990, pp.358-61; and Martin S. 1998, pp.233-6 (cat.17). For the high altar, see Timofiewitsch 1972, pp.134-68, 257-62 (cat.15); Cooper 1990, pp.214-43, 251-77; Martin S. 1998, pp.153-66, 230-3

Giorgio continued to augment the church's interior decoration with yet more bronze sculpture, commissioning Niccolò Roccatagliata (active 1593–1636) to produce pendant statuettes of *Sts George and Stephen* (31 January 1594, figs 1.60–1.61), 22 bronze *putto* wall sconces (15 March 1594, fig. 1.62) and a pair of highly-figured bronze candelabra (22 April 1596, jointly contracted with Cesare Groppo, his one-time master, fig. 1.63).⁶⁸ This 'bronzing' of the church continued into the seventeenth century, with Niccolò's son, Sebastian, and his bronze-caster colleague, Pietro Bosello, employed to make a pair of life-size *Angels* to flank the central elements of the high altar (15 July 1636, fig. 1.64).⁶⁹

Confraternities I: Scuole grandi and piccole

Devotional in nature and with a broad membership, Venice's *scuole grandi* and *piccole* were lay confraternities that aimed to provide charity for members in need and, in many instances, for their wider communities.⁷⁰ There were six *scuole grandi* in this period, each dedicated to a specific saint or an aspect of the Virgin Mary: the Scuole Grandi di San Giovanni Evangelista, di San Marco, di San Rocco and di San Teodoro; and di Santa Maria della Carità and di Santa Maria Valverde della Misericordia.⁷¹ Each *scuola grande* was composed of *cittadini* and noblemen and was administered by a board (*banca*) of sixteen non-patrician members elected annually: the *guardian grande* (head), the *vicario* (deputy head), the

(cat. 16); and Avery 2004, pp. 241–2. The monks also commissioned highly sculptural, intricately carved wooden stalls from Gasparo di Pietro Gatti da Bassano (structure) and Albert van der Brulle (narrative scenes): Cooper 1990, pp. 122–77.

⁶⁸ SGM, b. 21, proc. 10A, 'Libro fabbrica', fol. 15r (*Sts Stephen and George*), fol. 16r–v (wall sconces); and fols 34v–35r (candelabra). For further discussion, see Cooper 1990, pp. 178–84 and Kryza-Gersch 1998.

⁶⁹ SGM, b. 21, proc. 10A, 'Libro fabbrica', fol. 62r–v. First published Avery 2011, pp. 467–8, doc. 307. For further discussion, see *ibid.*, pp. 27, 62, 91.

⁷⁰ As Lane succinctly stated, they 'existed for common worship, assistance, and banqueting'. Lane 1992, p. 72. For *scuole*, see Pullan 1971, esp. pp. 33–193; Pullan 1981; Brown 1996b; and D'Andrea 2014 with bibliography. See also Howard 1987, pp. 96–100 for the *scuole grandi*. For *scuole piccole*, see Mackenney 1981, pp. 85–8; Mackenney 1986; Mackenney 1994; and Mackenney 2000. The exhaustive compendium of sources for *scuole piccole* found in Vio 2004 is a useful starting point for archival research, but caution should be exercised as there are numerous errors. For sodalities in sixteenth-century Italy, see Black 1989.

⁷¹ The *scuole grandi* sprang from a flagellant movement that emerged in Italy in 1260. The first four to be established in Venice were San Giovanni Evangelista, Santa Maria della Carità, San Marco and the Misericordia. San Rocco and San Teodoro were accorded *grandi* status in 1480 and 1552 respectively. Three more confraternities would later join their ranks: the Scuola di San Fantin in 1687, and the *scuole* of Santa Maria del Rosario and Santa Maria del Carmine in 1765 and 1767. For a sixteenth-century discussion of the *grandi*, see Sansovino 1581, pp. 99r–103r.

guardian da mattin (responsible for processions), the *scrivan* (scribe) and twelve *degani* (two for each *sestiere*, in charge of distributing charity). A separate body called the *zonta* (established 1521) oversaw the accounts drawn up by the *banca*. The *scuole grandi* were answerable to the Council of Ten, which reserved the right to authorise their membership and additions/amendments to their statute books (*mariegole*). Like the religious houses above, the *grandi* had substantial wealth at their disposal, thanks to membership dues and sizeable monetary, property and land bequests.

The *scuole piccole* were far greater in number and comprised those devoted to a particular saint, the Holy Sacrament or the Rosary; those encompassing a particular nationality resident in Venice, such as the Albanians and Slavs; and those concerned with the welfare of the marginalised and ostracised of Venetian society, such as the Scuola di San Fantin which ministered to criminals condemned to death by the State.⁷² *Scuole piccole* were a significant feature of parish life and retained the right to an altar dedicated to their patron saint (or the Eucharist) and a floor tomb for members in their local church.⁷³ It was here that brethren would hear mass, attend funerals for deceased members, celebrate their saint's annual feast day, and hold chapter meetings (if they did not have a *sede* of their own). Their membership was composed largely of *cittadini* and *popolani*, and their management structure was comparable to that of the *scuole grandi*.⁷⁴ The majority of the *piccole* reported to the Provveditori di Comun, which had to approve any major changes, such as amendments to *mariegole* or the transfer of worship and assembly from one location to another.⁷⁵ Membership of these sodalities allowed many more people to participate in art patronage than their personal finances would otherwise have permitted, and an individual could be a member of several *scuole* at any one time.

Thanks to their greater wealth and membership, the *scuole grandi* were well-placed to exercise extensive art patronage, most significantly architecture and elaborate painting cycles for which they are renowned, but they also commissioned sculpture and the decorative arts, such as intarsia-work and gold- and silver-wares.⁷⁶ The façade of the Scuola Grande di San Marco's meeting-house (begun by Pietro Lombardo with Giovanni Buora in 1488, and completed by Mauro Codussi by 1500), for example, is richly decorated in coloured marbles, acroterial and relief sculptures, the most notable of which are the four beautiful ground-level Lombardo reliefs of *St Mark healing Anianus*, *St Mark baptising*

⁷² It has been estimated that over one hundred were active at any one time. D'Andrea 2014, p.426.

⁷³ For the commissioning of altarpieces by *scuole piccole*, c.1500, see Humfrey 1988.

⁷⁴ For parish-specific confraternities, such as the *scuole del SS. Sacramento*, members were drawn from within their parish only. Sodalities representing different nationalities, such as the Scuola di San Giorgio degli Schiavoni, drew their brethren from across the city.

⁷⁵ For an overview of the Provveditori di Comun, see Da Mosto 1937, vol.1, p.178.

⁷⁶ For example, Scuola Grande di San Rocco's treasury. See Wiel 2011.

Anianus, and a pair of *Lions*, cleverly set in fictive arcades (figs 1.65-1.69).⁷⁷ Throughout the period the *grandi* would continue to commission a range of sculptural works, from smaller pieces, such as the intricately-modelled bronze pedestal for the Scuola Grande di San Teodoro's processional cross made by Andrea Bresciano (active c.1550–75) in the early 1560s (fig.1.70); to the monumental, such as the fourteen marble figures for the new high altar of the upper meeting room of San Rocco's *albergo*, commissioned from Campagna in February 1607 (fig.1.71).⁷⁸

Generally far less wealthy than their *grandi* counterparts, a number of *scuole piccole* did commission sculpture.⁷⁹ Particularly noteworthy is the statuary produced by Vittoria in the 1580s for the new *sede* of the wealthy and ambitious Scuola di Santa Maria della Consolazione e San Girolamo deputato alla Giustizia (known as the Scuola di San Fantin, thanks to the confraternity having previously worshipped in the adjacent eponymous church).⁸⁰ In addition to a large Istrian stone relief and three acroterial statues for the building's façade (fig.1.72-1.73), Vittoria made two grandiose sculpted altars for the Oratory, the *scuola*'s principal ground floor chamber. The first, the *Altar of the Crucifix*, was produced to house the *scuola*'s most prized possession: a fifteenth-century black-painted wooden crucifix with supposed miraculous properties, which the brethren would process through Venice while accompanying those condemned to death (fig.1.74). The altar complex—a Mannerist *tour de force* of grief and mourning—comprised an imposing altar frame of black *paragone*, with three-quarter life-size black-patinated bronze figures of the *Mourning Virgin* and *St John the Evangelist* flanking the wooden crucifix (figs 1.75-1.77).⁸¹ The whole was

⁷⁷ For the *scuola*'s construction history, see Sohm 1981. For the façade, see Schofield 2006. See also Stedman Sheard 1984; and Schulz 2014b, pp.86-9, who follows the former's attribution of the *Healing* to Antonio and the *Baptism* to Tullio (Stedman Sheard 1984, pp.153, 162). For the suggestion that these reliefs were made following designs by the Bellini, see Arcangeli 1996. For the fictive architecture, see Trevisan 2006. The confraternity planned other sculptural projects, but these never came to fruition. For the high altar's unfinished sculpted *pala* (commissioned 1498), see Paoletti 1893–7, vol.2, p.105; and Sohm 1981, pp.276-7. For the abortive bronze doors project (c.1532–45), see Avery 2011, pp.99-101.

⁷⁸ For the pedestal, see Avery C. 2003, pp.55-6 and Avery 2011, p.128. For San Rocco's high altar, see Timofiewitsch 1972, pp.169-3, 181-3, 191-202, 289-7 (cat.31); and *ibid.* 1996. Campagna only worked on five of the statues: four (in various states of completion) are now *in situ* before the high altar, the fifth (*San Rocco*) is placed within a smaller altar on the ground floor.

⁷⁹ The *piccole* tended to opt for painted *pale*, which cost much less than sculpted ones.

⁸⁰ For the *scuola*'s history, see Traverso 2000.

⁸¹ The altar is now in the Cappella dei Morti, Santi Giovanni e Paolo, to the right of the high altar, but with an incongruous white marble Baroque crucifix by Francesco Cavrioli as its centrepiece. It was moved here in 1816 after the *scuola*'s suppression in 1806. The original crucifix went to the parish church of Codroipo, approximately 70 miles north-east of Venice, in the province of Udine, following a

crowned by a pair of black-patinated bronze recumbent angels and two marble *putti*, also painted black (fig.1.78a-c). The second altar was dedicated to the confraternity's two patron saints and adorned with a life-size penitential *St Jerome* and a relief of the *Assumption of the Virgin* above, both carved from white marble (fig.1.79).⁸² While such large-scale projects are the exception among the *piccole*, many of those *scuole* dedicated to the Holy Sacrament sought to embellish their altars with elaborate tabernacles, often surmounted with bronze statuettes, such as that completed for Sant'Angelo in 1610 by del Moro (fig.1.80a-c).⁸³

Confraternities II: Trade guild patronage and the Goldsmiths' Guild at San Giacomo

The Venetian *scuole delle arti* combined two separate entities: *arte* and *scuola*.⁸⁴ The *arte* or guild was a trade association established essentially as a means of State control, which artisans who wished to practise in Venice were obliged to join. They were regulated by the *Giustizia Vecchia*, a magistracy before which artisans had to swear to abide by their particular trade's statutes. The Goldsmiths' Guild was legally recognised in 1233,⁸⁵ making it one of the oldest in Venice, and its statutes can be found in two copies of their *mariegola*.⁸⁶ Although theoretically separate institutions, by the end of the thirteenth century each trade's *arte* and *scuola* had become closely intertwined, being answerable to the same magistracy, and with obligatory membership of the appropriate *scuola* in most cases.⁸⁷ The structure of every guild was broadly similar, headed by an annually-elected *gastaldo*, answerable more to

petition by Leandro Tiritelli, the confraternity's last priest. Demanio, b.418, fasc.IV, 2/9, culto, crocefisso, loose undated letter (pre-6 October 1808). For the altar, see Pavanello 2012, pp.263-4 (cat.s63, by Finocchi Gheresi).

⁸² Pavanello 2012, pp.261-3, 265 (cats 62 and 64, by Finocchi Gheresi). The *St Jerome* and *Assumption* are also now in Santi Giovanni e Paolo, occupying the architectural framework of the *Altar of the Magdalen* of 1523-4.

⁸³ See note 60. For the artistic patronage of this category of *scuola*, see Cope 1979 and Hills 1983.

⁸⁴ Lane 1992, pp.72-3. For Venetian trade guilds, see Mackenney 1981 and Mackenney 1987. *Scuole delle arti* are frequently considered a category of *scuola piccola*: for example, Humfrey and Mackenney 1986, p.317; Vio 2004; Matthew 2007, p.106; and D'Andrea 2014, p.426. However, in my opinion, their high numbers and specific nature of close trade association arguably render them quite separate. Also implied by Mackenney 1987, pp.61-2.

⁸⁵ Dal Borgo 1991, p.45.

⁸⁶ BMCV, Cl.IV, 205 (begun 1693) and CL.IV, 139 (begun 1740). See Vanin and Eleuteri 2007, pp.145-6 and 100-101 respectively. A third *mariegola* (BMCV, Cl.IV 140) contains the statutes for the guild's *sovegno* (mutual welfare scheme) instituted on 22 October 1560. For the Goldsmiths' early formation and statutes, see Cecchetti 1872, pp.242-9; and Monticolo 1896-1914, vol.1, pp.115-34; pp.257-63, and vol.3, pp.291-322.

⁸⁷ Lane 1992, pp.72-3. Over time, the terms '*arte*' and '*scuola*' became interchangeable in trade guild records, see Pullan 1981, p.9.

the State than to his fellow guildsmen, and supported by an elected management committee (*banca*).⁸⁸ As with many other trade guilds, the Goldsmiths' was, by this date, divided into various sub-sections or *colonnelli*, according to particular specialisations.⁸⁹

The artistic patronage of Venetian trade guilds was much more modest than that of other *scuole*, particularly the *grandi*, and certainly than that of their counterparts in Florence, whose economic and political power was far greater.⁹⁰ By the fifteenth century, the guilds' focal point was their altar, for which they usually held the concession, and which was normally situated in a church close to their centre of operations.⁹¹ As with the *scuole piccole*, guild altars were dedicated to their patron saint.⁹² Also like the *piccole*, guilds tended to commission paintings for their altars, as these were much cheaper than sculpture.⁹³ The Goldsmiths were, therefore, exceptional among both their fellow trade guilds and *scuole piccole*, not only in their choice of large-scale sculpture, but also for favouring bronze over less costly sculptural materials. Indeed, the only other guilds to commission sculpted altarpieces during this period were the Mercers (1579–84, fig.1.81) in San Giuliano; the Pork-butchers (1588–1604, fig.1.82) in San Salvador (both combine a painted *pala* by Jacopo Palma il Giovane with flanking statues by Vittoria); and the Cheesemongers (c.1601–02, fig.1.83) also in San Giacomo (marble and mosaic, by Vittoria and his workshop).⁹⁴

⁸⁸ Lane 1992, pp.72-80.

⁸⁹ Brunello 1981, p.42, and Gramigna and Perissa 2008, p.37. For a contemporary description of the Goldsmiths' art, see Garzoni 1589, pp.481-5.

⁹⁰ Humfrey and Mackenney 1986, p.317. It was, for example, unusual for guilds to have a separate meeting-house before the end of the sixteenth century, unless they were particularly well-off. The Goldsmiths would not erect one until 1696 (in Campo Rialto Novo). ASV, Arti, b.420, 'Arte degli Orefici e Gioiellieri: Libro della Prima Introdizione per far la scolla del arte di oresi et zogelieri'. For Florentine guilds and their art patronage, see Wackernagel 2011, pp.207-19.

⁹¹ For a map of churches, guilds and their altars by *sestiere* (c.1250-c.1650), see Mackenney 1987, pp.244-8. For an overview of individual *arti*, see Manno 1995.

⁹² Fifty altarpieces were commissioned by Venetian guilds between c.1460 and c.1610. Humfrey and Mackenney 1986, pp.325-30.

⁹³ While some guilds commissioned altarpieces from leading painters, such as the Bellini, Cima and Titian, most opted for lesser known, more affordable artists. Humfrey and Mackenney 1986.

⁹⁴ For the Mercers' altar, see Leithe-Jasper 1963, pp.185-92; Mason Rinaldi 1975, pp.197-9, 202-4; Avery 1996, vol.2, pp.507-12 (cat.80); Finocchi Gherzi 1998, pp.165-70; and Lanzoni 2008. For the Pork-butchers', see Leithe-Jasper 1963, pp.211-13; Avery 1996, vol.2, pp.512-14 (cat.81); Finocchi Gherzi 1998, pp.176-9; and Lanzoni 2005, pp.70-84. For the Cheesemongers', see Avery 1996, vol.2, pp.564-5 (cat.109).

The State

In addition to individuals and corporations, the Venetian State was a notable patron of sculpture, with the Palazzo Ducale being the most obvious example (fig.1.84).⁹⁵ Seat of the Government and home of the doge, the palace overflows with statuary and sculptural decoration both externally and internally, all made to perpetuate the ideal of Venice as a Republic of political stability, justice and wealth, divinely favoured by God (often commissioned with the bonus of self-glorification to the incumbent doge).⁹⁶ The palace's external ornamentation alone exemplifies this: the pink and white chequerboard façade with intricately carved capitals, reliefs and acroterial statues, the magnificent land entrance of the Porta della Carta (fig.1.85), the Arco Foscari (fig.1.86), the Scala dei Giganti (fig.1.87), and the pair of monumental bronze well-heads in the courtyard (fig.1.88).⁹⁷ The sculptural decoration continues unabated inside with the sumptuous stone, marble and stucco *scala d'oro* (fig.1.89); marble fireplaces with statues holding aloft intricately carved mantelpieces (fig.1.90), gilded stucco overmantels, and overdoor statuary (fig.1.91).⁹⁸

The Procuratori di San Marco de Supra

As outlined above, the Procuratori di San Marco de Supra were responsible for maintaining the basilica of San Marco and its property around the Piazza. The de Supra procurators commissioned a great deal of sculpture throughout the period, not only for the adornment of San Marco, but also for other buildings they oversaw, such as the Library in the Piazzetta (begun 1537, fig.1.19) and the Loggetta (1537–45, fig.0.19) around the base of the campanile, both projects designed and directed by Sansovino, who had been appointed *proto* to the procuracy on 7 April 1529.⁹⁹ The Library's Istrian stone façade, for example, is richly decorated with reliefs of reclining river gods, winged victories, abundant swags and

⁹⁵ Other examples include the Arsenal gateway (1460); Il Redentore (1577–88, consecrated 1592) with bronze high altar figures by Campagna (1589–90); and the Rialto Bridge (1588–91) with relief sculpture by Aspetti and Rubini (1590).

⁹⁶ For the so-called myth of Venice, see Grubb 1986; Rosand 2001; and Crouzet-Pavan 2002.

⁹⁷ For the façade, see Bashir Hecht 1977. For the capitals: Manno 1999. For the Porta della Carta: Venice 1979. For the Arco Foscari: Pincus 1976. For the Scala dei Giganti pre-Sansovino's crowning statues: Muraro 1982 and Schulz 1983, pp.88-90, 99-106, 109-13, 145-52 (cat.8). For Sansovino's *Giganti*: Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.134-41; vol.2, pp.341-2 (cat.35). For the well-heads: Avery 2011, pp.103-110.

⁹⁸ For the palace's external and internal decoration in general, see Sansovino 1581, pp.118v-133v; Franzoi et al 1990 and Wolters 2010. For the *scala d'oro*, see Leithe-Jasper 1963, pp.79-87; Avery 1996, vol.1, pp.187-99; vol.2, pp.439-41 (cat.38); Finocchi Ghersi 1998, pp.125-33; Finocchi Ghersi 1999; and Morresi 2000, pp.308-10 (cat.56).

⁹⁹ He held this role until his death in 1570. For further discussion of Sansovino as *proto*, see Howard 1987, pp.8-37.

keystone heads (figs 1.92-1.94).¹⁰⁰ Meanwhile, the Loggetta, magnificently enrobed in white Carrara marble, *verde antico*, and red Verona stone, and with carved reliefs and bronze statuary, has been aptly described as ‘a great piece of sculpture’ rather than a diminutive work of architecture (figs 1.95-1.97).¹⁰¹ As with sculpture made for the State, that commissioned by the Procuratia de Supra extolled Venice as an ideal, prosperous and divinely-favoured Republic.

The most important sculpture produced for the procuracy during the period examined here is arguably that commissioned under Sansovino’s aegis, which continued within San Marco itself (fig.1.98). Here, the procurators saw fit to augment the sculptural decoration of the already sumptuously ornamented ducal chapel and burial place of Venice’s beloved patron saint, particularly with works in bronze, such as the reliefs for the singing galleries (1536–44, fig.1.99), the statuettes of the *Evangelists* (1550–52, fig.1.100), and the Sacristy Door (1546–69, fig.1.101).¹⁰² Importantly, the sculptural projects for the basilica and Piazza buildings employed numerous sculptors, affording them significant opportunities to impress, especially during the early years of their careers. Vittoria for one benefited particularly from procuratorial patronage: he gained increasingly important commissions for the Library, from his early river gods for the façade (c.1550, fig.1.102a-b), to the beautiful *Feminoni* flanking the entrance portal (c.1553–5, fig.1.103), and culminating in the glorious stucco staircase leading to the reading room (c.1559–60, fig.1.104).¹⁰³

External patrons

As with other major artistic centres in Cinquecento Italy, there was no shortage of patrons outside of Venice eager to commission work from sculptors based in the Serenissima. The

¹⁰⁰ Much has been written about the Library’s construction, arguably Sansovino’s greatest architectural achievement. See especially Sansovino 1581, pp.112r-115r; Howard 1987, pp.17-28; Morresi 2000, pp.191-213 (cat.31); and Davies 2013 with concise bibliography. The Library was not completed during Sansovino’s lifetime, but was finished by Scamozzi (1588–91). It was under Scamozzi’s direction that the Library’s balustrade figures were made by sculptors including Aspetti and Campagna. See Ivanoff 1964. For the iconography of the Library’s sculptural decoration, see Ivanoff 1968.

¹⁰¹ Howard 1987, p.35. For bibliography, see Introduction, note 29.

¹⁰² For the *pergole*, see Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.57-62, vol.2, pp.329-30 (cat.22). For the *Evangelists*: *ibid.*, vol.1, pp.63-5, vol.2, pp.333-4 (cat.26). For the Sacristy Door: cat.2. For the bronzes of San Marco generally: Avery 2011, *passim*.

¹⁰³ For the river gods: Leithe-Jasper 1963, pp.9-11; Avery 1996, vol.1, pp.39-43; vol.2, pp.390-1 (cat.1); and Finocchi Ghersi 1998, pp.31-5. For the *Feminoni*: Leithe-Jasper 1963, pp.64-6; Avery 1996, vol.1, pp.110-14; vol.2, pp.420-1 (cat.25); and Finocchi Ghersi 1998, pp.95-6. For the staircase: Leithe-Jasper 1963, pp.87-93; Avery 1996, vol.1, pp.187-99; vol.2, pp.441-5 (cat.39); Finocchi Ghersi 1998, pp.125-33; and Finocchi Ghersi 1999.

Santo in Padua, for example, was a major patron of Venetian sculpture throughout the sixteenth century, particularly in its monumental reconstruction of the *arca* of St Anthony of Padua (c.1497–c.1594), which saw the employment of the Lombardo brothers, Sansovino, Danese Cattaneo (c.1512–72) and Campagna to name but a few (fig.1.105).¹⁰⁴ Moreover, the Duke of Urbino was so keen to employ a sculptor from Venice to carve a portrait statue of his forebear, Federico da Montefeltro (1604, fig.1.106), that he was prepared to settle for his third choice, Campagna, after his preferred sculptors were unavailable: Aspetti (absent) and Vittoria (too decrepit).¹⁰⁵

Why Commission Sculpture?

There were numerous reasons why a patron might actively choose sculpture over painting, any or all of which could have been influential. The considerable expenditure sculptural commissions required conveyed magnificence, honour and prestige. The Renaissance concept of *magnificenza* was of great importance to certain patrons in this period,¹⁰⁶ and lavish expenditure on appropriate projects was considered the epitome of great virtue and magnanimity by many humanists.¹⁰⁷ Someone who was astutely aware of this was Rangone whose dogged desire for honour and prestige resulted in a number of high profile architectural and sculptural commissions dotted around Venice. As Allison Sherman observed, Rangone's projects were placed at key points around Piazza San Marco, the civic heart of the city: San Giuliano (rebuilding of the church with external façade funerary monument and seated portrait statue, fig.0.27a-b), San Sepolcro (façade with statue of Rangone as St Thomas, fig.1.107), and San Geminiano (secondary entrance with portrait bust, fig.1.108).¹⁰⁸ The concomitant benefits of such 'sign-posting' and 'signalling' on a patron's reputation and standing were surely major considerations when undertaking any kind of artistic patronage.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁴ McHam 1994. The Santo re-employed Campagna in 1579 to make a new high altar framework for Donatello's bronzes and a vast sacramental tabernacle, for which see Chapter 2.

¹⁰⁵ See the letters of 26 July and 15 November 1603 from Giulio Brunetti (the Duke's agent in Venice) to Giulio Giordani (the Duke's advisor). Gronau 1936, pp.241-2, docs CCCLXXX-I.

¹⁰⁶ This notion was derived from Aristototele's *Nichomachean Ethics*. Aristotle-Rowe and Broadie 2002, IV, 1122a19-1122a33. For the Renaissance theory of magnificence, see Jenkins 1970; Rubin 1993; Cole 1995, especially pp.17-35; Rubin 1995b; and Guerzoni 1999. For the related discussion of 'conspicuous consumption', see Goldthwaite 1987; Goldthwaite 1993; and Allerston 2007.

¹⁰⁷ Philosopher and Humanist, Alessandro Piccolomini (1508–79), for example, wrote at length about magnificence stating that 'one could say that the Magnificent man is one who makes great things through expenditure' ('tal che Magnifico si può dire colui, che spendendo fa cose grandi'). Piccolomini 1542, fols 106r-107r. Cited Guerzoni 1999, pp.337-8.

¹⁰⁸ Sherman 2013, pp.20-25, which also discusses other aspects of Rangone's patronage.

¹⁰⁹ For further discussion of 'sign-posting' and 'signalling', see Nelson and Zeckhauser 2008a.

Sculpture was also commissioned as a sign of thanksgiving, commemoration and/or celebration, such as the votive *Altar of the Nativity* in San Giuseppe di Castello (fig.1.109). This was commissioned in c.1572 from Domenico da Salò (active 1550–70s) by Giovanni Vrana (d. after 30 September 1575), a Dalmatian-born former Admiral of the Venetian fleet, who had fought in the Battle of Lepanto (October 1571), sailing on the *Capitania* alongside Sebastiano Venier (1496–1578), High Commander of the Venetian navy.¹¹⁰ Beneath the large-scale, high-relief, Istrian stone *pala* of *The Nativity with St John the Baptist and a Shepherd*, a low-relief predella contains a scene of the returning triumphant Venetian fleet: two galleasses flanking a galley proudly displaying two captured Turkish flags (fig.1.110). Separating the predella and altarpiece is an inscription recording that Vrana with Venier returned triumphant to Venice after their victory over the Turks (see fig.1.110).¹¹¹ The antependium contains a further sculpted commemoration of the event: a low relief scene of ships in battle formation, clearly a stylised rendering of the battle itself (fig.1.111).¹¹² The subject matter of the principal *pala* was likely chosen as a memorial to both Vrana (via the inclusion of his name-saint, *St John the Baptist*) and his son, Giuseppe (the Nativity allowing for St Joseph's presence), as well as a demonstration of piety and devotion. It was probably a similar combination of memorialisation and piety that had prompted the aforementioned Nicolò da Montefeltro to dedicate his altar to St Anthony Abbot (fig.1.50). St Anthony was not his name-saint, but that of his son, who may have been dead by the time that Montefeltro decided to leave funds for an altar.¹¹³

Piety was undoubtedly the principal impetus for the Scuola di San Fantin when it commissioned the aforementioned altar from Vittoria to house its processional crucifix (figs 1.74-1.75). By the third quarter of the sixteenth century, the crucifix was widely believed to possess miraculous powers. Indeed, it had become an object of such public veneration that the *scuola* had to petition the Doge and Signoria on 28 May 1569 for permission to celebrate

¹¹⁰ Cat.5. In sixteenth-century Venice, the battle was called the 'battaglia delle Curzolari', after the archipelago in which the most fierce fighting occurred. 'Battle of Lepanto' is a nineteenth-century appellation. Morin 1985, p.210. The literature concerning Lepanto is considerable. For an authoritative account, see Capponi 2006. For contemporary accounts of the battle and subsequent celebrations published in Venice, see De Benedetti 1571 and Groto 1572. For the Venetian perspective in the lead-up to, during and after the battle, see Fenlon 2007, pp.153-73, 175-91.

¹¹¹ See Cat.5, under Inscriptions.

¹¹² This derives from printed sources widely available in the aftermath of the battle, for which see Fenlon 2007, pp.263-4. For art commissioned in Venice in response to Lepanto, see Venice 1986, especially Mason 1986 and associated catalogue entries, pp.19-31.

¹¹³ In his will of 25 May 1392, he leaves the bulk of his estate to his son, Antonio, although there is no mention of him in the later document of 1397 recording his wish for an altar. PSM, Misti, b.12A, fasc.1, nos 20, 21 and 31.

more masses.¹¹⁴ Herein, the gastaldo and his fellow brethren explained ‘that already in about four months this devotion has increased so much that before the image of this Blessed Christ of this Scuola there is a very great crowd of nobles, citizens, and poor persons of this city who come to make their devotions’.¹¹⁵ Such was the draw of the crucifix, the *scuola* complained, that the parish priest of San Fantin was disturbing their Friday masses by deliberately having the church bells rung so that the faithful inside the *scuola* could not hear the service.¹¹⁶ The priest was obstructive, they wrote, because he wanted the crucifix’s devotional following for his own church.¹¹⁷ The numerous silver votive offerings still attached to the crucifix certainly attest to its great devotional following.¹¹⁸ Although there may well have been other factors, the crucifix’s growing popularity as a devotional object across all strata of Venetian society and its centrality to the *scuola*’s role in aiding the condemned were no doubt instrumental in motivating the confraternity to commission such a monumental and costly new altar.

Piety and devotion to St Anthony Abbot were certainly important to the Goldsmiths when it came to their new altar in San Giacomo (fig.0.1). When the members discussed borrowing money in December 1602 to finish the project, they expressed the need to demonstrate their devotion to God and their intercessory saint, and to give proper thanks for past protection from fire, in the hope that this would insure against any future catastrophe.¹¹⁹ This same document shows that competition was an equally compelling factor: they wished to keep up with their fellow trade guilds, which had been building ‘altars, and *scuole* [i.e. meeting-houses] of great wonder and expense’.¹²⁰ Tradition, an ever-present factor in Venetian society, and the emulation of forebears could also be considerations for the patron. Sculpture may, of course, have been chosen simply because the patron preferred it to painting.

¹¹⁴ Avery 1999a, pp.301-02, doc.116(i).

¹¹⁵ ‘[...] che già quattro mesi in circa tal devotione sia talmente accresciuta, che avanti la imagine di quel Christo benedetto di essa Scola vi è un concorso grandissimo di nobile cittadine, et povere persone di questa città quale vengono per far le sue devotioni.’ Ibid., p.301.

¹¹⁶ ‘[...] mentre il Capellan nostro dice la messa in detta scuola nostra all’altare; lui Piovano [di San Fantin] fa sonar le campane doppie talmente che nulla di quello che esso nostro Capellan dice si sente.’ Ibid., p.302.

¹¹⁷ ‘E perche si vede esser talmente augmentata et ogni giorno andarsi ad augmentando; de qui è che il Reverendo Piovano di san Fantino predetto si ha imaginato sotto pretesto di voler la esecuzione della sudetta terminatione, tirar nella chiesa sua tal divotione [...]’ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ Traverso 2000, p.108.

¹¹⁹ Cat.9, doc.9.6, fols 1v-2r. Fire was the great fear of all Venetians, especially for artisans like goldsmiths, who used it on a daily basis.

¹²⁰ ‘altari, et schole di gran maraviglia e spesa.’ Cat.9, doc.9.6, fol.2v.

There were, of course, good practical reasons for favouring sculpture. Depending on the work's intended function, or its final location, sculpture may have been the only option. Statuettes were the obvious choice to decorate holy water stoups or fonts, such as the bronze *St Agnes* by Campagna and the marble *Baptist* by Sansovino, both in the Frari (figs 1.7, 1.112). Likewise, in the case of the Scuola di San Fantin wanting to embellish the pediment of its new meeting-house in the 1580s, its brethren could only have chosen sculpture: the end result being the soaring figures of the Virgin and flanking angels crowning the pediment, and a relief of *The Assumption of the Virgin* below (figs 1.72-1.73). It was certainly a more sensible choice for the external decoration of buildings than fresco, which quickly deteriorated in Venice's damp and humid climate.¹²¹ The fact that sculpture was long-lasting meant that it was not only a pragmatic choice for patrons wanting something that would endure far beyond their own lifetime (or death), but it was also perfect for commemorative purposes, either in the form of funerary and equestrian monuments, altars, portrait busts, or medals. Indeed, its durability recalled Antiquity and the ideals of antique sculpture (much appreciated and collected in Venice), thereby providing solid intellectual grounds for choosing sculpture over painting.¹²² As Tullio Lombardo (c.1455–1532) explained to his patron, Marco Casalini, in 1526:

[...] painting is an ephemeral and unstable thing, sculpture is much more without comparison, and not to be compared with painting in any way, because from antiquity until our times one finds sculpture, of paintings truly one can see nothing.¹²³

Tullio's defence of sculpture alludes to the sixteenth century's ongoing *paragone* debate about which was superior: sculpture or painting.¹²⁴ How much Venetian patrons of sculpture were aware of this discussion and, if so, were actually engaging with it, is hard to determine. However, given the belief among some sixteenth-century art theorists that the debate had begun in Venice in c.1500, and the dissemination of theories surrounding the issue through

¹²¹ For Venetian painted façades, see Valcanover et al 1991; Schmitter 2002; and Brown 2004, pp.46-7.

¹²² For the collecting of antique sculpture in Venice, see Brown 1996a, pp.59-64, 245-52; and Favaretto 2008.

¹²³ '[...] la pittura è cosa caduca et instabile, la scoltura è molto più senza comparatione, et non da parangonar con pittura per niun modo, perché de antiqui se ritrova fino alli nostri tempi de le sue sculture, de pitture veramente nulla si pol vedere.' Letter of 18 July 1526. Pizzati-Ceriana 2008, p.178, doc.214.

¹²⁴ For Tullio and the *paragone* debate, see Luchs 1995, pp.71-6; Collareta 2007, pp.183-5; and Luchs 2009, p.14. It should be noted that the term 'paragone' was not applied to the dialogue about the relative merits of sculpture and painting until 1817, in Manzi's edition of Leonardo's *Trattato della pittura*. Farago 1992, pp.8-14.

published treatises and books, it seems likely that patrons well-versed in literature and the arts would have been familiar with the discourse.¹²⁵

Choosing a Location

A combination of esoteric and practical factors undoubtedly determined the selection of a specific location, including devotion, honour, prestige, the desire to send particular signals about one's self to the wider world, and the degree of visibility the location afforded. Indeed, the choice of location was indicative of a patron's self-perception and how he/she wished to project an image and idea of him/herself and/or his/her family at that moment and for posterity. Francesco Venier, for example, was undoubtedly well aware of the message that his choice of burial place would send when he altered his plans on becoming doge in June 1554, and the honour and prestige that the new location would confer on both him and his family.¹²⁶ Instead of the simple burial originally requested in San Francesco della Vigna in 1550, he now opted for a large, central space in the more historically important, centrally-situated San Salvador (fig.1.113).¹²⁷ Reputedly one of the first churches to be founded in Venice, San Salvador held the relics of St Theodore (Venice's first patron saint), occupied a prime location in Rialto, the city's economic centre, and was close to San Marco, its civic and spiritual heart. A further bonus was that, following the church's reconstruction (begun 1506), its design recalled that of San Marco itself, as Francesco Sansovino remarked.¹²⁸

For some patrons, maintaining or reinforcing a family connection was a further consideration, as was the case with the Priuli family, also at San Salvador. Erecting a funerary monument to the Priuli doges here, rather than in the family chapel in far flung San Domenico di Castello, was clearly preferable to Girolamo's son, Lodovico, who obtained a

¹²⁵ Both Paolo Pino in his *Dialogo di Pittura* (Venice, 1548) and Vasari in the 1568 edition of *Le Vite* recalled that, after discussions concerning painting and sculpture before the Colleoni monument in Campo Santi Giovanni e Paolo, Giorgione was moved to produce a painting of a figure depicted from several sides. Pino in Barocchi 1960, vol.1, p.131; and Vasari 1568, vol.2, pp.14-15. For further discussion, see Pardo 1984, p.367; Mendelsohn 1982, p.151; and *ibid.* 2007, p.16. Perhaps the most famous discussion of sculpture versus painting published in the period was Benedetto Varchi's *Due Lezioni* (Florence, 1550), which contained the results of his famous questionnaire sent out to four painters and four sculptors. Varchi 1550; and for further discussion, Mendelsohn 1982.

¹²⁶ As Boucher observed, Venier's codicil acknowledges the need to respect the traditional expectation for a doge to have a suitable burial place and monument. Boucher 1991, vol.1, p.119. For the codicil of 25 September 1555, see cat.4, doc.4.3, particularly from 'Et perché è conveniente che circa la nostra sepultura' to 'et in tutto eseguito'.

¹²⁷ For Venier's 1550 will, see cat.4, doc.4.1. For the San Salvador concession awarded on 1 April 1555, see cat.4, doc.4.2. For his codicil, see cat.4, doc.4.3.

¹²⁸ Sansovino 1581, p.47v. For the rebuilding of San Salvador, see Tafuri 1983; Concina 1988; and Concina 2009.

substantial plot in January 1569, namely a double bay at the west end of the north nave wall (fig.1.44).¹²⁹ This resulted in the Priuli family occupying the entire north nave wall up to the side door, as the doges' forebear the renowned diarist Girolamo Priuli 'dalle Porte' (1476–1547) had already created the Mercerie doorway (c.1530) with organ loft above (fig.1.114) and paid for the adjacent *Altar of St Jerome* (c.1528–46, fig.1.115).¹³⁰

Securing a Location

But how were such concessions obtained? Essentially a notarised agreement was drawn up between the institution offering the space and the patron paying for it via a so-called 'donation'. In the case of a church under the *jus patronatus* of the doge, such as San Giacomo, dogal approval had to be sought.¹³¹ In other cases, once the religious institution had granted use of the space, such requests had to be rubber-stamped by the patriarch. This was the case, for example, for female monastic churches, such as San Giuseppe.¹³² Considering the vast amount of floor space that was available within most ecclesiastical buildings, it is unsurprising that the most common type of concession was for floor tombs. These were covered with a marble or stone tomb slab and normally engraved with an

¹²⁹ Lodovico had initially obtained the space just for his father's memorial but by 3 March 1569, when he wrote his will, he had amended his plans to have a memorial made to both doges. For the original concession from San Salvador, dated 19.1.1569, see San Salvador, b.41, fol.117r; NA, b.8160, fols 605v-607r; and PSM de Ultra, b.223, fasc.20, fols 1r-2r (all unpublished). See also San Salvador, b.32, fasc.83, fols 196r-199r, cited Simane 1993, p.50, note 5. For his will, see NT, b.1263, vol.3, fols 21v-28r, and fol.25r for his wish for a double dogal monument.

¹³⁰ The altar has been attributed to the *proto* and stonemason Guglielmo de' Grigi (responsible for the *Altar of the Magdalen*, cat.1), and dated to c.1528. The statue of *St Jerome* is later and is attributed to Tommaso Lombardo, Sansovino's erstwhile assistant. Although usually dated to c.1547, I believe that the statue must have been in place by the date of Priuli's final, highly detailed will (27.3.1546) as he left no instructions to have the figure finished and installed, whereas he *did* leave some 400 ducats for the construction of the sacristy and 600 ducats for the choir. San Salvador, b.41, vol.85, fols 112v-114r, at fols 112v-113r. For the altar, see Bertoli and Romanelli 1997, pp.23-4; for the *St Jerome*, see Boucher 1994, p.940. For the organ loft, see Bisson 2012, pp.108-19. Priuli was a keen supporter of San Salvador, see Merkel 1999b; Bohde 2001, pp.455-6, note 13; and Pichi 2009, pp.44-5. He was called 'dalle Porte' thanks to his propensity for building church portals across Venice, including the main entrances of San Giuseppe di Castello and Spirito Santo on the Zattere. For a biography, see BMCV, Cod.Cic.3784, no.413, Girolamo Priuli, 'Arbore della nobilissima Famiglia Priuli' (1616), pp.164-5; cited and discussed by Martin T. 1991, p.831.

¹³¹ For example, the dogal concessions to the guilds of the Grain Sifters and Packers (Scuola delli Garbeladori e Ligadori), the Cheesemongers, and the Goldsmiths in the newly-rebuilt San Giacomo: cat.9, docs 9.2-9.4.

¹³² For the patriarch's decree and the nuns' concession to Doge Grimani for his funerary monument of November 1598, see cat.8, docs 8.1-8.2.

inscription and/or coat-of-arms identifying the owner. The fee paid usually ensured perpetual use of the tomb by one or more occupants, such as husband and wife, entire families, or lay confraternity members, with an additional small charge levied each time the sepulchre had to be opened. The Augustinian Regular Canons of San Salvador, for example, regularly sold off spaces for floor tombs, as records attest. Surviving notarial acts show that the cost of concessions of all types varied depending on the type of institution (i.e. space tended to cost more in more prominent churches), on how much space was being allocated, and where this space was, with proximity to the high altar demanding a special premium. So a patron in San Francesco della Vigna, for example, might pay 300 ducats for use of an entire chapel, but only 50 ducats for a small altar space with floor tomb.¹³³

An examination of surviving concessions for San Salvador further highlights the price differential between spaces.¹³⁴ By the early 1600s, the going rate for a floor tomb (most of which were newly available plots situated between the Priuli and Dolfin monuments) was either 50 or 70 ducats.¹³⁵ The price for an altar or wall monument (with or without floor tomb) was naturally more expensive, as these occupied much larger and more prominent devotional spaces. Such locations appear to have cost approximately 300 ducats, with payment upfront.¹³⁶ San Salvador was flexible, however, and also accepted the transfer of

¹³³ The PSM de Citra, for example, paid 300 ducats on 28 February 1551 for the Montefeltro chapel discussed above: NA 8098, fol.104v. Merchant Matteo Goretto, meanwhile, paid 50 ducats on 12 July 1576 for the right to erect an altar and *arca* for his family, to match the *Altar of San Lorenzo* opposite: NA 3295, n.p., under date. For an invaluable list of the principal chapel and *arca* concessions, see Howard 1987, p.159.

¹³⁴ For a discussion of the archival records and physical remains of floor tombs and altars in San Salvador, especially those conceded to *cittadini* families, such as the Pizzoni, Cornovi and d'Anna, see Bohde 2001. For the latter two families, see De Maria 2010 *passim*.

¹³⁵ NA b.7985, n.p., under 14.1.1603 (Francesco Palavicino and Fortezza Bonadei, his wife); 17.3.1603 (Marchio de Zuane Armeno and Lugretia Contarini, his wife); 2.4.1603 (Andrea Bochín); 17.5.1603 (Daniele de Prudenti); 28.5.1603 (Giorgio Vualter Alemano); 5.8.1603 (Zorzi del q. Teodoro Armeno); 7.8.1603 (Orazio Milan); 24.9.1603 (Francesco di Rossi, Stefano and Alessandro Ghedrini); and NA 7986, n.p., under 4.3.1604 (Bartolomeo, Domenico and Giuseppe Imberti); 29.4.1604 (Cristoforo and Bernardo Baroncelli); and 30.4.1604 (Bortolo Polferini). A plot in one of the cloisters was cheaper, costing only 20 ducats: NA b.7986, n.p., under 8.4.1604 (Fabrizio Raspan). From evidence provided by concessions of the mid-late Cinquecento, the price of floor tombs in the main body of the church appears to have risen from c.25 ducats in 1562 to 50 ducats by 1592: NA b.3269, fol.136r (Paolo Andrea Stringario) and b.3315, n.p., under 28 February 1592 (Zuan'Antonio Boneri). For fine copies of some of these, see San Salvador, b.41, vols 84-5, *passim*.

¹³⁶ A donation of 300 ducats was paid by Jacopo Pizzoni in April 1520 for rights to an altar and floor tomb (San Salvador, b.41, vol.84, fol.258r-v). Zuanne and Daniele d'Anna paid the same in July 1559 (San Salvador, b.41, vol.85, fols 87v-88v); as did Antonio Cornovi della Vecchia (*ibid.*, fol.95r-v). Lodovico Priuli paid 300 ducats for the double monument space in January 1569 (San Salvador, b.41,

investments in State loan schemes. In 1525, Giorgio Corner (1454–1527) exchanged ownership of an 800-ducat investment in the Monte Nuovissimo for exclusive use of the terminal walls of the north and south transepts for funerary monuments to his late sister, Caterina Corner (1454–1510), queen of Cyprus, and his recently-deceased son, Cardinal Marco (1478–1524), and the use of two adjacent altars (figs 1.116–1.117).¹³⁷ In 1555, the canons accepted a 400-ducat deposit in the same fund from Doge Venier for his memorial space, opposite the Mercerie entrance—highly desirable given its visibility on entering the church from this busy thoroughfare.¹³⁸

Concessions frequently included mansionary agreements for the number, type and frequency of masses to be said on behalf of the patron and/or specified others.¹³⁹ Although these represented additional expenses for the patron, mansionaries offered the reassurance that masses would be said for as long as payments were forthcoming.¹⁴⁰ In turn, mansionaries were a useful source of income for those to whom they were awarded, be it the religious institution as a whole or a named cleric. The reports submitted to the Soprintendente alle Decime del Clero in 1564, for example, detail the payments that the incumbent priests received in return for performing these mansionary services.¹⁴¹

On occasion, the request for a space in which to erect a work of sculpture was unsuccessful. In 1562, for example, the indomitable Rangone asked the Scuola Grande di San Marco for permission to erect a portrait-statue, complete with an identifying inscription on the exterior façade of its meeting-house, facing Campo Santi Giovanni e Paolo, to mark his term as Guardian Grande (fig.1.65).¹⁴² Unsurprisingly, given Venice's deep-rooted conservatism concerning any kind of auto-celebration, the confraternity was unwilling to allow the flagrant promotion of an individual member above the rest of the brethren, and so the

fol.117r), as did Andrea Dolfin in August 1595 for the plot opposite for the monument to himself and his wife (San Salvador, b.41, vol.85, fols 149v-150r).

¹³⁷ Ibid., fols 44v-45v, and fols 59r-60v for a copy. For the complex history of these intended funerary monuments and those eventually built, see Gaier 2002b.

¹³⁸ Cat.4, doc.4.2, fol.75r.

¹³⁹ For example, the mansionary agreement in the above concession for the Venier monument (cat.4, doc.4.2) and that for the Priuli monument, both in San Salvador: San Salvador, b.41, fol.117r (25 ducats to be paid annually).

¹⁴⁰ Mansionaries could either be paid for upfront with a lump sum, through a yearly payment, or via annual interest paid from an investment in one of the State loan funds, such as Venier's.

¹⁴¹ The Decima del Clero was essentially an ecclesiastical tax return, instituted by the State at irregular intervals. For the 1564 Decima, see ASV, Soprintendente alle Decime del Clero, bb.32-3. For San Polo's 1564 submission, under the direction of Antonio Gatto, see *ibid.*, b.33, fasc.106, fols 1r-10v.

¹⁴² Gaier 2002a, pp.215-16.

request was ultimately declined.¹⁴³ Rangone had already been turned down by the Senate, when he sought to erect a statue of himself on the exterior façade of San Geminiano (facing the basilica of San Marco) in 1552.¹⁴⁴ A later bid for self-memorialisation at the prestigious church in Piazza San Marco was granted in 1571, but he had to make do with a mere portrait bust set over a more discreet side entrance.¹⁴⁵

There were occasions when the opposite occurred and a patron requested that a concession be revoked. This happened with Doge Lorenzo Priuli's son, Giovanni, who had been granted use of the counter-façade of San Geminiano in Piazza San Marco to erect a monument to his late father in January 1560.¹⁴⁶ In August 1570, Giovanni persuaded the chapter of San Geminiano to cancel the concession with no financial penalty, as his cousin, Lodovico (son of the other Priuli doge, Girolamo) had by then obtained the above-mentioned space in San Salvador and was keen to memorialise the brother doges together.¹⁴⁷ In return for its kind understanding, San Geminiano received the crimson velvet cloth that had been covering the temporary deposit of Doge Lorenzo's remains.¹⁴⁸ The chapter was clearly unconcerned about being able to fill the space, and may already have had an alternative patron to hand, as only three weeks later, Melchior Michiel (c.1489–1572), a Procuratore di San Marco de Supra who lived next door, was awarded the exact same space for his own memorial and floor tomb at a cost of 100 ducats.¹⁴⁹

It was not unknown for patrons to relocate, at least in terms of the use of an altar, either to a completely different church or within the same one, when a space they deemed better became available. Such relocations were quite common for *scuole piccole* and *arti*, particularly the *scuole del SS. Sacramento*, some of which transferred to their church's *cappella maggiore* in response to post-Tridentine recommendations concerning the

¹⁴³ Ibid. As Gaier observed, while there is a late fifteenth-century representation of a Guardian Grande in the lunette above the main portal, it shows an anonymous man, kneeling humbling before St Mark, alongside fellow *scuola* members. It was no doubt Rangone's desire for his bold, solitary self-depiction with inscription that was the real stumbling block for the *scuola*.

¹⁴⁴ Gallo 1957, p.96.

¹⁴⁵ Gaier 2002a, pp.213-14, 476-7 (cat.6).

¹⁴⁶ This included the right to a floor tomb just in front of the counter-façade, by the main entrance. NA, b.8165, fols 35v-36v, dated 14.8.1570. Unpublished.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., fol.36r-v.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., fol.36v.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., fols 54v-56r. Unpublished. That Michiel lived next door is confirmed by the 1571 concession from San Geminiano to Rangone permitting him to build a new entrance portal on the side of the church 'versus domum Clarissimi Domini Melchioris Michael Equitis, et Procuratoris'. NA, b.8168, fol.131r. See also the 1571 contract between Rangone and Francesco Smeraldi, stonemason-cum-*proto*, to construct the doorway 'sotto il portico presso la casa di Marchio Michiel Cavalier, et Procurator'. NA, b.8168, fol.157r. Both published Avery 1999a, pp.245-8, docs 80(i-ii).

sacrament.¹⁵⁰ One such was the Scuola del SS. Sacramento in Santa Maria Formosa: it moved to the *cappella maggiore* in 1592, at which time it instituted a costly renovation programme under the management of *proto* Francesco di Bernardin Smeraldi (c.1540–1614, fig.1.118).¹⁵¹ The church chapter swiftly conceded the *scuola*'s former chapel to the local patrician Querini family in February 1594, in exchange for a payment of 100 ducats and a new white damask cope.¹⁵²

The financial benefits of these concessions to religious institutions were not only the monetary donations and the regular income received from mansionaries, but also that the costly and time-consuming responsibility for decorating large swathes of their churches was shouldered by someone else. However, there were downsides to this 'contracting out'. Patrons failing to complete a project in a timely fashion was a common problem and this obviously caused considerable inconvenience. After all, no chapter wanted their consecrated space to be a perpetual building site. One patron who badly let down the canons of San Salvador was the merchant d'Anna family.¹⁵³ It is well-known that in 1559, Zuanne and Daniele d'Anna were accorded the right to erect an altar with a painted *pala* by Titian, and a family floor tomb, in accordance with the wishes of their late father, Martino, but they failed to finish the project.¹⁵⁴ The canons began to send notarised complaints to Zuanne's son, Paolo d'Anna in June 1581, following negative comments about the parlous state of the unfinished altar recorded by the Apostolic Visitation earlier that year.¹⁵⁵ Until now, it was not known exactly when the canons removed the d'Anna family's rights to the altar, but an unpublished document of January 1588 records its re-allocation to the Pork-butchers' Guild, with permission to change the dedication from St John to St Anthony Abbot (the guild's patron)

¹⁵⁰ In Milan, for example, Carlo Borromeo had ordered that the sacrament should be reserved only on the high altar. For his views on sacramental tabernacles, see Borromeo 1577, book 1, chapter XIII. As Hills observed, such a decree was not made in Venice as Patriarch Trevisan did not wish to offend the *scuole del SS. Sacramento*. Indeed, whether a *scuola* moved to occupy the *cappella maggiore* largely depended on how much money had already been spent on decorating their existing chapel. Hills 1983, pp.38-9.

¹⁵¹ NA 5647, fols 518r-519v.

¹⁵² NA 5647, fol.67r-v.

¹⁵³ For the d'Anna family, see De Maria 2010 *passim*.

¹⁵⁴ Bohde 2001, pp.460-3; and De Maria 2010, pp.70-3.

¹⁵⁵ For this unpublished complaint to Paolo d'Anna, see NA, b.3298, n.p., under 20.6.1581. It was previously thought that the canons waited a further three years before issuing a complaint to Paolo. Bohde 2001, p.462; and De Maria 2010, p.73. For the Visitation's report and notes, see ASPV, Archivio Segreto, Visite Apostoliche, Visita Apostolica 1581, protocollo, fol.197v; and filze, fasc.41, fol.462r. Cited Bohde 2001, p.462, note 38.

and to build two floor tombs for their brethren (fig.1.82).¹⁵⁶ The canons must have been desperate by this point, as they granted the concession for this large, highly visible space in return for an annual donation of only 6 ducats.¹⁵⁷ The canons appear to have learnt from this disaster: on conceding the space for a funerary monument to patrician Andrea Dolfín for him and his late wife, Benedetta Pisani, in August 1595, they issued Dolfín with a 15-year completion deadline (fig.1.119).¹⁵⁸

For the State, the decision as to where to place sculpture was more often than not concerned with propaganda, usually seeking to reinforce the myth of Venice discussed above. Vittoria's two personifications of Venice (c.1578–9) on the Piazzetta and Molo façades of the Palazzo Ducale, for example, declared to all approaching the seat of government from land and sea that Venice was the perfect embodiment of a just and fair State (figs 1.120-1.121).¹⁵⁹ Throughout Venice and its territories, the installation of a sculpted winged Lion of St Mark was an instantly recognisable and durable symbol of the Serenissima, and emblematic of the Republic's earthly power and divine favour (fig.1.122).¹⁶⁰

Giovanni Vrana and San Giuseppe di Castello

Several factors probably prompted Giovanni Vrana to choose San Giuseppe for his altar and floor tomb, the most obvious being that this prominent church was very close to where he and his family lived (fig.1.123). Indeed, an unpublished inventory of his belongings drawn up in 1580, records that his house was situated next door to the church.¹⁶¹ The fact that the church and monastery had been built close to the Arsenal, as a votive offering by the State during an earlier period of notable conflict, namely, the War of the League of Cambrai (1508–

¹⁵⁶ NA, b.3311, n.p., under 10.1.1588. As discussed by Avery 1996, vol.2, pp.512-14 (cat.81), the dating of Vittoria's statues of *Sts Roch* and *Sebastian* for this altar has always been problematic, due to a lack of documentation. She dated the figures to c.1585–6, based on compelling visual analysis and circumstantial evidence. However, given that this new document mentions only an Istrian stone 'cornison' (that the guild was permitted to remove) and no other decoration, it seems likely that Vittoria's statues were not started until at least 1588. Lanzoni posited a *terminus post quem* of 1588 for the altar based on circumstantial evidence, but found no record of the guild having access to the altar until 1595. Lanzoni 2005, pp.72-4.

¹⁵⁷ NA, b.3311, n.p., under 10.1.1588. The canons confirmed that they would write to the d'Anna heirs to inform them of the altar's transfer.

¹⁵⁸ San Salvador, b.41, vol.85, fols 149v-150r. For the notary's copy, see NA, b.7977, n.p., under 30.8.1595. The latter was first published in Timofiewitsch 1972, pp.274-6 (cat.22).

¹⁵⁹ On the Piazzetta side, Venice is shown with lion and sceptre; on the Molo side, as *Justice*. See Avery 1996, vol.1, pp.491-2 (cat.71).

¹⁶⁰ For the Lion of St Mark in Venice and its territories, see Rizzi 2012.

¹⁶¹ NA, b.448, fols 1v-7r, at fol.1v. The inventory was for probate purposes after Vrana's widow's death in December 1580.

16), with a Venetian galley purposefully used in its construction, may have offered further incentive.¹⁶² For a retired admiral of the Venetian navy wishing to give thanks for and to commemorate the State's highly prized victory at Lepanto, San Giuseppe was therefore a wholly appropriate location. A more poignant, personal reason was that Joseph was the name-saint of his son.¹⁶³ To be able to commission an altarpiece depicting the holy family in the only Venetian church dedicated to his son's *onomastico* must have been a considerable inducement to Vrana's patronage here.

The Goldsmiths' Guild and San Giacomo di Rialto

Before their move to San Giacomo in 1601, the Goldsmiths had used an altar dedicated to St Anthony in the nearby church of San Silvestro.¹⁶⁴ But why did the guild choose to move from San Silvestro to San Giacomo, given the expense and effort that such a move would entail, and the fact that the two churches were only minutes apart? A number of factors appear to have prompted the relocation. First, San Giacomo had distinct geographical advantages over San Silvestro. Located at the foot of the Rialto bridge, adjacent to the offices of the Camerlenghi and opposite the *Pietra del Bando*, from which all new decrees of the Republic were read, San Giacomo occupied a higher profile site, in the commercial heart of Venice and the Goldsmiths' legally-designated trading centre (fig.1.124).¹⁶⁵

Second, unlike San Silvestro, San Giacomo was of enormous historical importance,¹⁶⁶ and greatly revered by Venetians who believed it was the first church built in Venice, founded at the city's legendary inception, the Feast Day of the Annunciation (25

¹⁶² The decision to employ an old galley was recorded on 12 June 1513. Gilbert 1974, p.278, note 10, citing ASV, Maggior Consiglio, Deliberazioni-25-Deda, fol.102v. Marin Sanudo also noted the decision: Sanudo-Barozzi et al 1879–1903, vol.16: 366–7. For St Joseph as an intercessor during times of war in Renaissance Italy, especially Venice, including Sanudo's references to the saint, see Wilson 2004.

¹⁶³ Giuseppe is recorded as dead in the aforementioned inventory of Vrana's belongings (December 1580), which records a deposit at the Banco Dolfìn in the name of 'quondam Messer Isepo suo fiol'. NA, b.448, fol.3v. Vrana makes no mention of his son in his will of September 1575: cat.5, doc.5.7. To not have mentioned his son is highly unusual in a will, and so I wonder if Giuseppe was already dead by this date.

¹⁶⁴ The altar was recorded as still in use in the Apostolic Visitation of 1581: ASPV, Archivio Segreto, Visite Apostoliche, Visita Apostolica 1581, protocollo, fols 55r–59r.

¹⁶⁵ Following a ruling of the Maggior Consiglio on 3 July 1315, the Goldsmiths were legally bound to work solely in the Rialto: Monticolo 1896–1914, vol.1, p.125, note 3.

¹⁶⁶ Gallicciolli 1795, vol.2, pp.337–80; Gardani 1966; Franzoi and Di Stefano 1975, pp.13–14; Concina 1995, pp.130–3; and Howard 2002, pp.15–17.

March) 421.¹⁶⁷ As a result, San Giacomo fell under the *jus patronatus* of the doge, a privilege awarded by Pope Clement VII in 1536, after the successful petitioning of Doge Andrea Gritti.¹⁶⁸ It was also the destination of an annual ducal procession on Maundy Thursday, the feast day on which all who visited the church received plenary indulgences.¹⁶⁹ Indeed, according to Sansovino, the ‘whole populace’ would attend the church on this occasion.¹⁷⁰ A further significant link to both the doge and Venice’s past lay in the church’s design. With its Greek cross plan and ancient history, it was evocative of San Marco, the doge’s chapel and shrine of Venice’s patron saint,¹⁷¹ a fact not lost on Venetians as proved by Sansovino’s statement that ‘one could say that it was the model for the church of San Marco’.¹⁷² This connection would certainly have been obvious to prospective patrons keen to enhance their status and maximize their display of piety and devotion to their earthly and heavenly audiences.¹⁷³ Furthermore, the church was regarded as divinely favoured because it had escaped destruction in the great Rialto fire of 1514. As Sanudo vividly recorded:

All of Rialto burned [...] Only the church of San Giacomo di Rialto [...] remained standing, even though it was in the middle of the fire; so it was God’s wish that it be spared. For this was the first church built in Venice, begun on March 25, 421, as may be read in our chronicles, and God did not wish a ruin so great as to destroy with fire the first church [of Venice].¹⁷⁴

As discussed earlier, destruction by fire was a major concern for the Goldsmiths, who needed it for their work.¹⁷⁵

The importance of the church is emphasised further by the fact that the State saw fit to rebuild San Giacomo completely in 1600-01 on new, higher foundations, re-using the

¹⁶⁷ The importance accorded San Giacomo is made clear by Giovanni Doglioni in his 1603 guidebook (written while the Goldsmiths’ altar was in mid-production) who stated that it was ‘la più antica, & la prima di tutte l’altre [chiese], che siano fabricate in questa città’. Doglioni 1603, p.155.

¹⁶⁸ Gallicciolli 1795, vol.2, p.374.

¹⁶⁹ BMV, Ms. It. Cl. VII 1639=7540, Ceremoniale del Doge (1594), fol.36r; Sansovino-Martinioni 1663, vol.1, pp.519-20; Urban 1998, p.77; and Fenlon 2007, pp.69, 118, 119. The indulgences were first granted by Pope Alexander III in 1177. Sansovino 1581, p.72v.

¹⁷⁰ Sansovino 1581, p.72v.

¹⁷¹ Howard 2002, p.17.

¹⁷² ‘... può dirsi che ella fosse il modello della Chiesa di San Marco’. Sansovino 1581, p.72v.

¹⁷³ For further discussion of earthly and heavenly audiences, see Nelson and Zeckhauser 2008b, pp.28-31.

¹⁷⁴ Sanudo-Barozzi et al 1879–1903, 17:461 (10 January 1514). Translation: Labalme and Sanguinetti White 2008, p.346.

¹⁷⁵ See p.40 above.

columns and much of the stone from the earlier building.¹⁷⁶ The opportunity to obtain altar-space within a divinely-protected, prominent, newly reconstructed church, therefore, would have rendered the Goldsmiths' move and construction of a new altar a genuine necessity—the same motivating factor which Patricia Fortini Brown plausibly suggested prompted the *scuole grandi* in their own artistic patronage—and would have conferred much-desired honour, prestige and dignity on the guild.¹⁷⁷ Indeed, the Goldsmiths must have thought themselves very lucky when an altar became available during San Giacomo's re-building at the end of the Cinquecento.¹⁷⁸ The guild received the concession for the chapel to the left of the main entrance, together with the right to a sepulchre for members, from Doge Marino Grimani in April 1601.¹⁷⁹ In recognition of this honour, the Goldsmiths promised to give the doge a pair of partridges every year on St Stephen's Day. The guild proceeded to have a mansionary agreement drawn up with the priest of San Giacomo confirming the number and frequency of masses to be said, its right to meet in the church, the annual celebration of St Anthony's feast day, and the fees payable for these services.¹⁸⁰ Thus began the Goldsmiths' ambitious plans for their new altar.

The patrons of sculpture in Venice were many and varied, as were the sculptural genres chosen and the works' intended function and location: in the most basic terms, devotional or secular, public or private. But having decided to proceed with a sculptural commission and having secured the desired location, what happened next? As we shall see in the next chapter, so began the not always straightforward process of choosing a worthy sculptor, and instituting the contracting process.

¹⁷⁶ For further discussion, see Howard 1994 and Howard 2016/7 forthcoming. I am most grateful to Professor Howard for kindly allowing me to consult this essay prior to its publication. The newly reconstructed church was much praised by Stringa in his 1604 edition of Sansovino's guidebook. Sansovino-Stringa 1604, p.155v.

¹⁷⁷ Brown 1987.

¹⁷⁸ Being a ducal concern, the church's renovation was overseen by the Provveditori al Sal using State funds. ASV, Cancelleria inferiore, 'Chiesa annesse a quella di S. Marco', b.200, fasc. marked 'Pro Rev:mo D. Angelo Benoli Plebano Sancti Iacobi Rivoalti', fol 15r-v, as cited by Avery 1996, vol.2, p.564 (cat.109).

¹⁷⁹ Cat.9, doc.9.4.

¹⁸⁰ Cat.9, doc.9.5.

II. SCULPTORS: CONTRACTS, FEES, QUALITY

Take account of my work on the Miracles of St Anthony of Padua, where the principal men in the world have worked: Sansovino, Silvio Pisano, Tullio Lombardo and Pietro Lombardo, Moschino, sculptor to the King of Poland and other celebrated sculptors: nevertheless my own work, done at the age of 22, was considered not unworthy to be alongside that of these others. To reward my good and honourable service, the task was given to me, and not to Vittoria, nor to any of the others who competed, to make the [Santo's] High Altar and tabernacle at a cost of 5,000 *scudi*, and I was given 1,200 *scudi* more than any of the others wanted.

Girolamo Campagna to Francesco Maria II della Rovere, Duke of Urbino.¹

In his letter of 19 June 1604, Campagna pleaded with his illustrious patron to give him another chance to prove himself. The sculptor had just heard that his model of the Duke's forebear, Federico da Montefeltro, had arrived in Urbino in pieces and that the Duke and his circle were not at all impressed with his work once it had been reassembled. It was in response to this distressing news that Campagna wrote his long, heart-felt plea, blaming the poor reception of his model—catastrophically damaged by its long journey—on the shoddy workmanship of the artisan who had pieced it back together. In what turned out to be a successful bid to keep the commission, Campagna proceeded to enumerate his most prestigious commissions (including those for the Santo in Padua cited above), to boast of the high praise he had received in Tommaso Garzoni's *Piazza Universale* (1585), and to assure della Rovere that he could completely trust the opinion of the painter Federico Zuccari (c.1542–1609) who had seen much of his work.²

Campagna's evocative exhortation is a vivid example of one of the many ways in which a patron might be influenced when choosing—or, in this case, retaining—a sculptor. Although Campagna had a formal contract by this point, he was, quite rightly, concerned that he could lose the commission.³ In addition to how a patron chose and contracted a sculptor, his letter highlights the use of models and the prices sculptors could command: all crucial

¹ From 'Rendi conto testimonio' to 'di quello volevano ogn'altri'. Cat.8, doc.8.25. 'Silvio Pisano' is Silvio Cosini (c.1495–c.1549). 'Moschino' is Giammaria Mosca.

² For the Montefeltro statue, see Gronau 1930 and Timofiewitsch 1972, pp.281-4 (cat.26). For Campagna in Garzoni's compendium of professions, see Garzoni 1589, p.682. For Garzoni (1549–89) and his book's popularity, see Niccoli 1999. For Zuccari, see Acidini Luchinat 1998–9.

³ There were, in fact, two contracts drawn up for this statue: for the first dated 26.4.1604 (unpublished), see NA, b.3378, fols 255v-256r; and for the second dated 8 May 1604, see ASF, Fondo Urbino, Cl.1, divis.B, filza 8a, as cited by Calzini 1899, pp.21-2, note 2, doc.I.

elements in the following stages of the commissioning process. Moreover, Campagna's missive raises other key questions to be analysed here: how were commissions paid for? And how did patrons seek to ensure the quality of the end result?

Choosing a Sculptor

Sculptors in Venice operated in a situation quite different from those based in centres with a dominant, ruling court and the concomitant employment of court artists, such as those of the Medici in Florence, and the papacy in Rome. Although this meant that sculptors in Venice did not benefit from the security of a fixed salary, they arguably enjoyed greater flexibility and freedom, able to accept commissions from a wide range of patrons within and without the Serenissima.⁴ Free, therefore, to be approached by any patron, what made one sculptor more attractive than another?

Reputation was undoubtedly a prime factor. This could be founded not only on a sculptor's inherent talent and skill, the style and quality of his work, and the high regard in which his œuvre was held, but also on his perceived facility for working with a particular material (such as Vittoria and stucco) and/or for producing a particular type of sculpture (such as Campagna and religious figures, or Vittoria and portrait busts). Sansovino, for example, was employed by the *massari* of the Arca del Santo in Padua to work on two marble reliefs of the Miracles of St Anthony for the saint's new chapel, precisely because they held him in such high regard.⁵ The first commission awarded was the *Miracle of the Child Parisio* (fig.2.1), which had been left unfinished by Antonio Minello (1465–1529) at his death. Payment receipts show that Sansovino took delivery of the relief in July 1529, and despite a written promise in December 1532 to complete it within four months, he did not actually do so until June 1536.⁶ It was at this time (3 June 1536) that the *massari* decided to

⁴ The notable exception in this period is sculptor-architect Jacopo Sansovino, who was employed as *proto* to the Procuratori di San Marco de Supra from 7 April 1529 until his death on 27 November 1570. However, he secured this post, first and foremost, thanks to his skills as an architect in the restoration of the domes of San Marco. Howard 1987, p.2. For another unusual working relationship, that of Aspetti with Giovanni Grimani, see below, pp.56-7. That Venice was an enticing prospect for sculptors is confirmed by the fact that almost all of the most successful sculptors operating in the city in this period were not Venetian-born. For example, Aspetti came from Padua; Campagna—Verona; Cattaneo—Carrara; Sansovino—Florence; Vittoria—Trent.

⁵ Indeed, Sansovino's reputation was such that, on his arrival in Venice, the painter Lorenzo Lotto described him as a 'grande homo dopo Michel Agnolo' in Rome and Florence. Lotto-Chiodi 1968, p.47. Letter cited Howard 1987, p.2. The *massari* were 'members of the board of overseers' at the Santo (McHam 1994, p.2), i.e. the close equivalent of ecclesiastical lay procurators, as discussed in Chapter 1, pp.27-9.

⁶ When he received final settlement: McHam 1994, pp.213-15, docs 40-45. For this relief, see Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.94-5, vol.2, 336-7 (cat.29) and McHam 1994, pp.52-4.

have Sansovino carve a second relief, showing the *Miracle of the Maiden Carilla* (fig.2.2), and it is in the initial documents for this commission that his great reputation becomes apparent.⁷ Herein, the *massari* refer to Sansovino as ‘Messer Jacopo Sansoin [*sic*], Florentine, most excellent sculptor, resident in Venice’, and state that he is ‘obliged to place his carved name under the said relief’.⁸ As Sarah Blake McHam observed, the stipulation for Sansovino to sign the relief is further proof of the esteem in which the *massari* held him. The only reliefs in the chapel to have been signed thus far were those by Tullio and Antonio Lombardo but the inclusion of their signatures had not been a contractual obligation.⁹ Unfortunately for the Santo, work on the Carilla relief progressed slowly as Sansovino was, by this time, busy juggling the exacting demands of his role as *proto* to the Procuratori di San Marco and numerous commissions in Venice.¹⁰ After much nagging and agonising by the *massari*, not to mention long, drawn-out settlement negotiations, the relief was finally installed at the end of 1563, some 27 years after it was first commissioned.¹¹ Significantly, the *massari* had not included a completion deadline in the contract with Sansovino and this oversight likely hindered their efforts to have the relief finished within a reasonable time-frame.¹² If anything, it gave Sansovino a handy loophole to exploit, as without a mutually agreed deadline, he could not be held legally accountable for the delay. The documentary record shows that the tardy completion of sculptural commissions was not at all uncommon—although 27 years is a longer delay than most. Indeed, patrons often ended up

⁷ For this relief, see Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.95-9; vol.2, pp.337-8 (cat.30) and McHam 1994, pp.56-8.

⁸ ‘Messer Iacopo Sansoin, fiorentino, schultore exelentissimo, sta in Venetia ... obligato a meter el suo nome scholpito soto dito quadro ...’ McHam 1994, p.221, doc.63. This relief replaced an earlier one assigned to Tullio Lombardo that remained unexecuted on his death in November 1532. On 27 December 1532, Sansovino agreed to use the marble block still in Tullio’s workshop to carve a new relief. In this initial agreement he is lauded as ‘Magnifico Maestro Giacomo Sansovino fiorentino, scultor eccellentissimo in Venetia’. Ibid., p.220, doc.61.

⁹ Ibid., p.56.

¹⁰ With the Santo located on the mainland, and not in Venice, it was easier for Sansovino to defer completion of the relief, as the patron was not on his doorstep and was thus easier to ignore. That Sansovino sought to avoid confrontation is inferred by a document of 1557, when Santo representatives went to Venice to retrieve the relief, without success. Ibid., p.222, doc.67. Moreover, the Procuratori had priority over Sansovino’s time due to the generous salary they paid him, and the close working relationship they had with him. Furthermore, Vasari suggested that Sansovino was very friendly with several of the procurators, which presumably further ensured his loyalty to the Procuracy.

¹¹ McHam 1994, pp.221-3, docs 65-70, episode discussed p.58.

¹² Ibid., p.221, doc.63. In 1554, the *massari* decided to issue Sansovino with an unsuccessful ultimatum to finish the relief or repay the money received thus far: ibid., p.221, doc.65.

affording sculptors considerable latitude when it came to getting their projects finished, even with a contracted deadline in place.¹³

A reputation for working well in a particular material or producing a specific genre of sculpture could result in a patron employing more than one sculptor to work on a single commission if it encompassed diverse types of material and/or sculpture. A case in point is the *Monument to Doge Nicolò da Ponte* (1582–4), which combined a magisterial portrait bust of the doge by Vittoria with numerous allegorical statues by Campagna (figs 1.34, 2.3).¹⁴ As Vittoria was famed for his unrivalled execution of portrait busts by this time, it is understandable that da Ponte should have chosen to be immortalised by him. Why Campagna was charged with producing the other statuary is not known, but he may have been introduced to both Marc'Antonio Barbaro (who oversaw the project) and Scamozzi (who designed the monument) through his friendship with nobleman Giacomo Contarini.¹⁵ That Campagna also had a close working relationship with the da Ponte monument's stonemason and *proto* Cesare Franco, with whom he had been jointly contracted to produce the new high altar and tabernacle for the Santo in July 1579, can only have helped. Franco was commissioned on 30 July 1582 to execute the monument's architectural framework, only two weeks before Campagna signed the contract for its statuary.¹⁶

Choosing a sculptor via personal recommendation—from another patron or someone familiar with his work, or through his network of family, friends, fellow artists and artisans—was without doubt a helpful aid to patrons and sculptors alike. The scurrilous writer and art critic Pietro Aretino (1492–1556) is well-documented as having promoted a number of artists in Venice as evidenced by his profuse letter-writing, including his great friend Sansovino, and the young Vittoria, whom he regarded as a protégé and son.¹⁷ Indeed, in 1537, shortly after Sansovino received the commission to carve the Carilla relief, Aretino wrote to the sculptor extolling the positive impact that his presence had had on Venice:

The execution of the works brought forth at the height of your genius now completes the splendour of the city [...] Behold from the evil of the sack of

¹³ For one of many examples, see the Montefeltro Altar in San Francesco della Vigna. Vittoria was contracted on 12.11.1561 to supply three statues (*St Anthony Abbot*, *St Roch*, and *St Sebastian*) by September 1562, but they were collected from his workshop in August 1564, almost two years late. Avery 1999a, pp.224–5, doc.52(iv) for the contract and 226, doc.52(ix) for the payment to transport the statues.

¹⁴ Cat.6.

¹⁵ For this previously unknown association, see Chapter 4, pp.148–9.

¹⁶ For Franco's contract, see cat.6, doc.6.2. For Campagna's (dated 17 August 1582): cat.6, doc.6.3. In addition to their Santo collaboration, Franco had subcontracted the carving of *The Dead Christ* relief for the new Cappella del SS. Sacramento in San Giuliano to Campagna, shortly after 1 July 1578. For further discussion, see below, p.62.

¹⁷ For Aretino's letters concerning art and artists, see Aretino-Camesasca et al 1957.

Rome good has come forth, because you [now] make your sculpture and architecture in this godly place. [...] What of our Lady of the Arsenal? What of the wonderful Mother of Christ who proffers the crown to the protector [St Mark] of this unique fatherland, whose history you have shown to us in bronze on the singing-gallery in his dwelling place [i.e. in the choir of St Mark's]? For this you deserve the rewards and honour awarded to you by the generosity of the most serene spirit of his devoted followers.¹⁸

Campagna, meanwhile, benefited from his network of fellow Veronese artists living in Venice, especially in the early years of his career, as his friendship with Paolo Veronese (1528–88) attests.¹⁹ Although undocumented, it was almost certainly through Veronese, for example, that he gained the commission for the stucco *Annunciation* group and pair of *Sibyls* for San Sebastiano (1582, figs 2.4-2.7).²⁰

Some patronal connections, once forged, were carefully maintained, as demonstrated by Giovanni Grimani (1506–93), Patriarch of Aquileia, who employed Tiziano Aspetti as his personal 'live-in' sculptor at the Palazzo Grimani at Santa Maria Formosa (fig.2.8a-b).²¹ This was an exceptional arrangement for a Venice-based sculptor, who would usually have operated his own workshop with assistants and apprentices.²² Grimani even ensured after his death that the Paduan sculptor would continue to receive his patronage and financial support. In his codicil of 28 November 1592, Grimani enjoined his executors to have Aspetti

¹⁸ 'Hora si che l'essecuzione de l'opre uscite da l'altezza del vostro ingegno dan' compimento a la pompa de la cittade [...]. Eco dal male del Sacco di Roma è pur'uscito il bene; che in questo luogo di Dio fa la vostra Scultura, e la vostra Architettura. [...] la Nostra Donna del'Arsenale dove quella mirabile Madre di Christo, che porge la Corona al Protettor di questa unica patria, l'Historia del quale fate vedere di bronzo con mirabile contesto di figure, nel pergolo de la sua habitatione: onde meritate i premi, e gli honori dativi da le Magnificenza del Serenissimo animo de i suoi riguardati divoti.' For the whole of this widely-discussed letter of 20 November 1537 (published in June 1538), see Aretino 1538, pp.152r-153r. Translation: Jennifer Fletcher in Chambers and Pullan 2001, pp.390-1. Sansovino is not known to have made a statue of the Virgin crowning St Mark. Fletcher suggests that Aretino may have seen an earlier design for the *Madonna and Child*, now in the Chiesetta in the Palazzo Ducale (ibid., p.391, note 11). For the *Arsenal Madonna*, see Boucher 1991, vol.2, p.324 (cat.14); and for the reliefs of the Miracles of St Mark for the San Marco *pergole*, see ibid., vol.1, pp.57-62; vol.2, pp.329-30 (cat.22).

¹⁹ For further discussion, see Chapter 4, pp.146-7.

²⁰ For this commission, see Timofiewitsch 1972, pp.244-5 (cat.5). Veronese's extensive work for San Sebastiano is well known. For the conservation work funded by Save Venice Inc., see Conn and Rosand 2011, pp.18-41.

²¹ For Aspetti's career, see most recently Kryza-Gersch 1996 and Trent 1999, pp. 416-21 (by Kryza-Gersch).

²² Chapter 4, pp.129-36.

finish not only the two bronze allegorical figures for his chapel in San Francesco della Vigna (figs 2.9-2.10), but also produce the colossal, pendant bronze statues of *Moses* and *St Paul* for the niches on the church's exterior façade (figs 2.11-2.12).²³

If a sculptor were young or something of an unknown quantity, letters of recommendation might be provided, or the patron might seek opinions about him and his work before drawing up a contract. This was certainly the case when the 24-year-old Campagna sought to complete the relief of the *Miracle of the Resuscitated Youth* for the Cappella dell'Arca in the Santo (fig.2.13), which had originally been commissioned from his master, Danese Cattaneo, on 27 December 1571 and left unfinished on his death in autumn 1572.²⁴ From the Arca's ballot record of 18 December 1573 in which the *massari* voted unanimously in favour of employing Campagna, we learn that Cattaneo had, on his death-bed, implored his priest, Baldissare of Padua, then *guardian* of the Arca, and his friend, one Giacomo Bambagion, to give the commission to his former pupil.²⁵ The document records that the *massari* had diligently gone to Venice to scrutinise Campagna's work and had received references about his suitability from various people, including numerous unnamed noble Venetians.²⁶ Indeed, a draft of the letter that was used to elicit these assurances is recorded in a document of 10 November 1573, in which the *massari* explain that they would like feedback about Campagna from 'an honourable gentleman experienced in sculpture or an expert in similar things', as they wished to ensure that the relief would 'be excellently finished for the honour of the church of this glorious saint and of this magnificent city'.²⁷ Although the intended recipient of the letter is not noted, circumstantial evidence suggests that one had been sent to the esteemed Paduan academic and collector Marco Mantova Benavides (1489–1582), as the painter Giuseppe Salviati (c.1520–after 1575) wrote to him later that month to recommend Campagna unreservedly for the commission.²⁸ Herein, he promises that Campagna is:

²³ For the codicil, see Benacchio Flores d'Arcais 1931, pp.144-5, doc.XX.

²⁴ McHam 1994, p.226 (doc.76), commission discussed pp.58-61.

²⁵ McHam 1994, pp.230-1, doc.86. While McHam calls this a contract, it is actually a record of the *massari*'s discussion and subsequent ballot to appoint Campagna (7-0 in favour).

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ 'acciochè esso quadro si riduchi in somma eccellenza per honor anco et della chiesa di esso glorioso santo et di questa magnifica città, Vogliamo pregarla essere insieme con qualche gentilhuomo honorato pratico di scultura, over qualche perito in simil cose'. McHam 1994, p.228, doc.82.

²⁸ Letter of 27 November 1573. McHam 1994, pp.228-9, doc.83. For Mantova Benavides and relevant bibliography, see Tomasi and Zendri 2007. For Giuseppe Porta, known as Salviati, see McTavish 1981. McHam suggested that the letter was sent directly to Salviati, as opposed to a third party first. McHam 1994, p.59.

someone capable of finishing the said work honourably, and of imitating more [closely] the style of his master, and with more affection and hard work than anyone else, given that he desires to honour his predecessor and himself, and I say furthermore that had the late Messer Danese finished it [the relief] that most of it would have been done by this young man because he is up to the job and I have seen [the extent of] his experience in other important works, so that I can recommend him to you, not only for himself, but also for the honour of Messer Danese, such that this work [would] be finished as he intended.²⁹

The fact that Salviati refers to Cattaneo as his 'dearest friend' in the letter implies that he wished Mantova Benavides to have complete confidence that he was best placed to know who Cattaneo would have wanted to take over the commission.³⁰

The Arca records show that several other sculptors had also put themselves forward for the prestigious commission, including Paduan Francesco Segala (active 1558–92) and his compatriot, the little-known Antonio Gallini, both of whom had been paid back in November 1572 to evaluate Cattaneo's work on the relief—Segala by Campagna for the late sculptor's family and Gallini for the *massari*.³¹ Segala's wonderfully grandiloquent, patriotic, and yet rather doleful plea to complete the relief appears to have been a late bid to secure the commission.³² With an air of false modesty, he begins by saying that he had not even considered competing for the job, but that he did so now for two reasons: his 'zeal for the honour of the *patria*' and his 'zeal' for his own honour.³³ He proceeds to list all the 'excellent Paduan sculptors' who had thus far produced work for the Santo (Minello, Riccio, Dentone,

²⁹ 'le faccio fede che è persone sufficiente a finir honoratamente la detta opera, e d'imitar più la maniera del suo maestro, et con più affectione et studio che nissunaltro, essendo che desidera l'onor del precettore et di se stesso, et le dico tanto più che essa opera quando m. Danese l'havesse finita, che la maggior parte sarebbe stata fatta da questo giovane perchè è sufficiente et ho visto l'esperientia di lui in altre cose d'importantia sì che non tanto lo raccomando a V.S. per lui solo, ma anco per l'honore di m. Danese acciò che tal opera sia finita secondo che era la sua intentione [...].'
McHam 1994, p.229, doc.83.

³⁰ 'mio carissimo amico'. Ibid., p.229, doc.83. For Salviati's friendship with Cattaneo, see Rossi 1995, pp.143-52.

³¹ McHam 1994, p.59. For Segala, see Pietrogrande 1942–54, 1955, and 1961; and Trent 1999, pp.386-91 (by Bacchi).

³² McHam 1994, pp.229-30, doc.84. This is undated, but it was probably sent no later than 27 November 1573, as a letter from Segala is referenced in the Latin preamble in the Arca's record of Salviati's letter championing Campagna (McHam 1994, pp.228-9, doc.83).

³³ 'Non era mio pensiero di concorer per haver il quadro di marmo, che hora si trata da quelle di far finire; et due cause mi han forciato, ancor che un'altra mi trattenesse, le due sono: il zello dell'honor della patria, et l'altra il zello dell'honor proprio.' First published Pietrogrande 1942–54, pp.134-6. Transcription used: McHam 1994, p.229, doc.84.

and Mosca), and counselled the *massari* that—although he did not wish to bore them—they should consider for how long the work of Paduan sculptors had surpassed that of foreigners, and that the glory of the *patria* should not be so diminished by failing to employ them now.³⁴ He proceeds to explain that the ‘zeal of my honour for the little virtue that the Lord God has given me’ had moved him to bid for the commission, giving details of some of his œuvre as proof of his suitability and to counter anything that had been said against him.³⁵ These include the many works in the collection of his ‘lord and benefactor’, the Patriarch of Aquileia (the above-mentioned Grimani), and the bronze *St John the Baptist* for the baptismal font in San Marco in Venice (fig.2.14).³⁶ He gives these examples not out of vanity, of course, but to defend himself against those who have maligned him.³⁷ He concludes by offering not only to make whatever new models might be desired, but also to provide a beautiful piece of marble, to finish Cattaneo’s relief by the due deadline, and furthermore, to make another model, so that those who evaluate the completed work can determine which is the most successful.³⁸

Word of this appears to have reached Campagna, who in turn wrote to the *massari* to reassure them that, as the ‘disciple and affectionate servant to the good memory of Signor Danese Sculptor’ he would not only complete the relief perfectly, but also make the lunette destined to go above the relief for the same price that Cattaneo had intended to make the relief alone.³⁹ Furthermore, for the ‘honour and reputation’ that he sought to gain from the task, and because ‘they might have some doubts as to his likely success’, if his work were not judged worthy then he would ‘repay any money paid out, make good the damages and interest incurred by the Arca, and ensure that the necessary guarantee and securities are in place’.⁴⁰ After invocations to God and St Anthony that his work be well received by the whole

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ ‘questa è la seconda causa, che mi ha mosso a far la presente scrittura, che è il zello dell’honor di quella pocha virtù donatami dal signor Dio.’ Ibid.

³⁶ ‘il studio dell’ill.mo patriarcha d’Aquileia mio signore et benefattore, nel quale sono tante mie opere andare bono forse più ritenuti et similmente [...] il s. Gio. Batista di bronzo alto quasi come il vivo posto sopra il batisterio in chiesa di s. Marco in Venetia.’ Ibid.

³⁷ ‘Però non credino V. R.tie et Mag.cie ch’io habbia nominate qui sopra le opere mie per vanità, ma sì bene per necessità mosso da iusta causa per mia difesa contra li maligni.’ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ ‘Io Geronimo Campagna Discepolo et affetionato servitore della bona memoria del Signor Danese scultor.’ McHam 1994, p.230, doc.85.

⁴⁰ ‘Poi ancora per l’honor et reputatione che in tale impresa cercarò di acquistare, et perchè le S.V. potrebbero haver qualche dubbio della mia riuscita in questa cosa, mi offerisco, che se il quadro finito, che sarà da me, sarà giudicato tale, che non meriti ragionevolmente stare nel numero de gli altri, che si ritrovano in detta Capella oltre la perdita del mio tempo, mi offerisco restituir il denari havuti et rifare danni interesse di essa Arca, et di più bisognando darvene piezaria et segurtade.’ Ibid. McHam

of Padua, Campagna hoped that the *massari* would remain happy with their decision to have chosen him, promised that he would fulfill his obligations to satisfy Cattaneo's heirs, and pledged to finish the commission perfectly in under two years, asking for only 10 *scudi* a month until the work was completed.⁴¹

Letters of recommendation could also come in an open form for sculptors to use in speculative applications for work. The little-known sculptor, Pompeo da Salò, son of Pietro, was provided with an effusive notarised reference in January 1567 when he left Venice to find work in the city of Linz.⁴² Co-signed by Cattaneo, Zuanne Negro, parish priest of San Biasio, and one Zuanne Zapa, a Comandador Pubblico, this fascinating, newly discovered letter begins by praising the skill, achievements, personality, wife and progeny of his late father, Pietro.⁴³ It then explains that it was from Pietro that Pompeo had learned the art of sculpture in Venice and had continued to practise it successfully after his father's death, alongside his brothers Domenico and Andrea, for both the Venetian government and many private nobles, including 'Girolamo Grimani Knight and Procurator of St Mark, another, the Most Renowned Knight Mocenigo, Mr Leonardo formerly Ambassador to Emperor Ferdinand, and another, the Most Renowned Georgio Cornaro, of the Royal family'.⁴⁴ By

transcribed 'pieearia[?]' when clearly 'piezaria' was intended. For contractual guarantees ('piezaria') and security ('segurtà'), see pp.67-9 below.

⁴¹ McHam 1994, p.230, doc.85.

⁴² For this unpublished letter, dated 16 January 1567, see NA, b.3279, fols 39r-40r.

⁴³ 'Che Misser Piero di Gratioli honorata fameglia della nobil terra detta Salo, posta sopra le rive del famoso Lago di Garda da gli antichi chiamata Benacho, fu Scultore cioe Statuario & Architetto eccellente, il qual qui in Venezia fui dalla sua pueritia s'e allevato & esercitatori honoratamente la scoltura e, l'architettura. Item ha scolpito & edificato molte statue, e, fabriche con sua gran laude sii per l'Illustrissimo Dominio Veneto, come per altri Signori e, gentilhomini si come in detta inclita citta di Venezia apparisse nelle chiesie, palazzi & edificii publici e, privati. Et in altre citta suggete à quella. Et e, vissuto sempre con reputatione e, buona gratia di qualunque signore, gentilhomo & altra persona che l'habbia conosciuto, essendo oltra l'eccellentia che haveva in se de si nobil professione, de costumi gentili, di grata lingua, presenza e, di grande sincerita. Tra molti virtuosi & honorati figlioli che ha di legitimo matrimonio generati di Madona Chaterina sua degna consorte [...]' Ibid.

⁴⁴ 'Pompeo Scultore e, Intagliator, il qual dal suo honorato padre de buona memoria ha imparato in Venezia l'arte e, l'ha seco esercitata anchora, e, da se solo dappo la sua morte insieme con Domenico & Andrea sui fratelli in servitio si della Illustrissima Signoria come de molti nobili signori privati, ne senza sua laude e, satisfatione del tali signori: de quali uno e il Clarissimo et Illustrissimo Signor Girolamo Grimani Kavalier e, Procurator Dignissimo de San Marco, un'altro il Clarissimo Kavalier Mocenigo Misser Leonardo gia stato Ambasiator à Ferdinando Imperatore, & un'altro Il Clarissimo Misser Georgio Cornaro di famiglia Reale.' Ibid.

Girolamo Grimani (1496–1570), father of Marino, the future doge, built the family's palace at San Luca (begun by Michele Sanmicheli in 1556, completed by Giangiacomo de' Grigi, after the former's death in 1559). It is plausible that the da Salò workshop had undertaken work on the palace,

name-dropping such illustrious Venetian patricians, Pompeo's canny supporters were clearly aiming to attract comparable patrons for him. The letter then confirms that there were many other *signori* and gentlemen still in Venice who could testify to Pompeo's virtues as both a sculptor and decorative carver, and concludes:

Thus one can deservedly say that the said Pompeo di Grazioli Sculptor, though youthful in experience, is worthy of praise for his art, and likewise for his good manners, and for the very high hope [he holds] of always being a worthy son in relation to the works of his above-mentioned excellent father.⁴⁵

How useful the letter was to Pompeo's career prospects is unknown, but such a glowing affidavit would surely have gone some way towards opening doors in the Habsburg city.

There were, of course, practical considerations to take into account when choosing a sculptor, such as his availability, his reliability (for example, a proven track record of meeting deadlines), his competitiveness in terms of prices charged, and what the patron could afford to pay. As discussed in Chapter 1, the Duke of Urbino had to settle for Campagna in 1604 as there was no better sculptor available.⁴⁶ Interestingly, when it came to prices, the lowest quote did not necessarily clinch the deal. Just as companies today often put a project out to tender, so too did patrons during the period examined here. When the Santo decided to renovate its high altar to redisplay Donatello's bronzes and include a sumptuous new

especially as Pietro had worked for Sanmicheli previously on the *Monument to Alessandro Contarini* in the Santo. For Grimani's life, see Dal Borgo 2002. For the Contarini monument, see Davis 1995. For Sanmicheli generally, see Davies and Hemsoll 2004.

Leonardo Mocenigo, before his death in 1575, had begun rebuilding the female monastic church of Santa Lucia, including the *cappella maggiore* for his family. Sansovino-Martinioni 1663, pp.140-1 and Bassi 1997, p.198.

Giorgio Corner is more problematic to identify as Giorgio was a much-used Corner family name, but he was probably the son of Giacomo, Procuratore di San Marco (son of Giorgio Corner, brother of Caterina, Queen of Cyprus), who had been entrusted by his father to finish the family chapel in Santi Apostoli (this remained unfinished by the time he wrote his will in 1587: NT, b.658, no.376). Alternatively, he could have been Giorgio, Bishop of Treviso, but if it had been him, the authors of Pompeo's letter would surely have mentioned his ecclesiastical position, as they had done with the significant posts of the other two patrons.

⁴⁵ 'E ne sonno altri signori e gentiluomeni anchora qui in Venezia, che possono far fede del valor dil soddeto giovane – per esser stati honoratamente da lui serviti nella scoltura e, nello intaglio per ornar le fabriche loro. Onde si puo meritamente dire chel detto Pompeo di Grazioli Scultore sia giovane d'esperienza degno di lode nell'arte sua, e di buoni costumi medesimamente, et di molto bona speranza di dover sempre apparir degno figliolo con l'opere del suo eccellente padre sopradetto.' As note 42.

⁴⁶ Chapter 1, p.38.

tabernacle, it employed this tendering process to choose the sculptor (fig.2.15).⁴⁷

Regrettably, the four bids tendered have not yet come to light, but the Santo's ballot record to select the sculptor is known, and this records that Vittoria, Segala, Campagna and Francesco Franco all submitted quotes.⁴⁸ Campagna had offered to undertake the work for 4,800 ducats, Segala and Franco for 4,600, and Vittoria for the significantly lower sum of 3,300. At the last minute, Campagna lowered his price to 4,700 ducats and Franco to 4,400, undoubtedly both hoping to render their bids more competitive.⁴⁹ As the first round of voting resulted in a tie between Campagna and Segala (with Vittoria second, and Franco last), the Santo held a second ballot, for the sculptors in joint first place.⁵⁰ Despite his bid being slightly more expensive, Campagna narrowly beat Segala, who must have been heartily disappointed to have lost out once again to his Veronese rival.⁵¹

In fact, a patron did not always know who would execute the sculptural elements of a commission due to the frequent practice of sub-contracting. For example, the Scuola del SS. Sacramento in San Giuliano, in its detailed contract of 1 July 1578 with Cesare Franco (documented 1578–99), did not specify who was to carve the sculptural centrepiece for its new chapel in San Giuliano, but rather entrusted this important decision to Franco, who in turn awarded it to Campagna (fig.2.16).⁵²

Giovanni Vrana and Domenico da Salò

There is no documentary evidence to account for Giovanni Vrana's choice of Domenico da Salò (brother of Pompeo) to execute the *Altar of the Nativity* in San Giuseppe (fig.1.109), but several of the factors discussed above could plausibly have influenced his choice.⁵³ First,

⁴⁷ For this project, see Guidaldi 1931–2b; and Timofiewitsch 1972, pp.20, 237–45 (cat.4).

⁴⁸ Guidaldi 1931–2b, pp.285–6, doc.VI.

⁴⁹ Although not recorded, it seems probable that the bids were sealed.

⁵⁰ The voting in the first ballot was: Campagna: 5 for, 2 against; Segala: 5 for, 2 against; Vittoria: 3 for, 4 against; and Franco: 1 for, 6 against.

⁵¹ Campagna: 5 for, and 2 against; Segala: 3 for, and 4 against.

⁵² 'Nel presente giorno li Magnifici Gastaldo et compagni della scola del Santissimo Sacramento di San Giuliano, sono convenuti con Maestro Cesaro di Francho Tagliapietra, stà à San Benetto chel li habbia à far un'altare à tutte sue spese di pietra, et fattura di quadro, di taglio, et ancho di scoltura, farlo giustamente secondo il disegno fatto al proposito di esso altare.' BMCV, CI.IV, no.164, 'Mariiegola della scuola del SS. Sacramento a San Giuliano', fols 32–4, at fol.32. First published Mason Rinaldi 1975–6, pp.453–4, doc.3, who also first observed the issue of sub-contracting the sculpture for this commission: *ibid.*, p.444.

⁵³ Cat.5. Little is known about da Salò. See Fioravanti 1567, fol.48r-v; Selvatico 1847, p.313; Planiscig 1935; Bacchi 2000e; and Finocchi Ghersi 2002b. Only three independent commissions have been securely assigned to him: the standing figure of Cappello on the eponymous monument at Santa Maria Formosa, the *Altar of the Nativity* discussed here, and the signed portrait bust of Marc'Antonio

artistic reputation: Vrana would have known da Salò's *Monument to Vincenzo Cappello* (after 1541–c.1569) on the façade of Santa Maria Formosa (fig.1.32), with its imposing full-length figure of the deceased naval hero, military trophies and depictions of Venetian battle-ships (fig.2.17), and he may have wished to employ the same hand who had successfully immortalised Cappello.⁵⁴ Secondly, personal acquaintance: it has been suggested that Vrana may have known of Domenico through his father's involvement with the Scuola di San Giorgio degli Schiavoni, the lay confraternity of the Dalmatian community in Venice for which Pietro produced the relief of *St George and the Dragon* in 1551 (fig.1.9), and of which the admiral may have been a member.⁵⁵ Thirdly, Domenico's association with a celebrated sculptor: he had spent several years working in Sansovino's workshop, most notably on the state-commissioned colossal statues of *Mars* and *Neptune* (begun 1554, figs 2.18-2.19) which crown the courtyard staircase of the Palazzo Ducale.⁵⁶ Da Salò's involvement in such an illustrious project would surely have been a further recommendation. Fourthly, practical considerations: namely, the physical proximity of Domenico's workshop to San Giuseppe. Situated in the nearby parish of San Martino, in the same *sestiere* of Castello, transportation of the finished sculpture from Domenico's workshop to the church would have been relatively straightforward and inexpensive.⁵⁷ There may have been other factors, of course, to induce Vrana to employ da Salò: he may have been available to undertake the commission immediately, his work may have been cheaper than that of other sculptors, or he may have been personally recommended to Vrana by a trusted third party.⁵⁸

The Goldsmiths' Guild and Girolamo Campagna

By June 1604, the Goldsmiths' Guild had definitively decided to erect a sculpted altarpiece for their new altar in San Giacomo, and on 9 July commissioned Campagna to produce the bronze *St Anthony Abbot* (fig.0.2).⁵⁹ But what prompted the guild to choose him? By this

Ruzzini (Statens Museum fur Kunst, Copenhagen, inv.no.DEP42).

⁵⁴ Pavičić 2007, p.245 also makes this point.

⁵⁵ Pavičić 2007, p.245.

⁵⁶ For Domenico's work on the so-called *Giganti*, see Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.138, 140, 225, doc. 232.

⁵⁷ Domenico's workshop is noted as being in 'calle del taiapiera' in the 1567 edition of Leonardo Fioravanti's *Dello specchio di scientia universale*. Fioravanti 1567, fol.48r. It seems likely that he would have simply taken over his father's workshop after his death, which is known to have been in the parish of San Martino from Pietro's will of 1561. NT, b.210, no.281, fol.1r.

⁵⁸ Although da Salò's work is regarded today as decidedly and justifiably inferior to that produced by his peers (such as Vittoria and Campagna), he was certainly held in higher esteem during his lifetime, as his employment on the Cappello monument and Fioravanti's high praise of him prove.

⁵⁹ Cat.9, doc.9.9 for the contract with Campagna. This also records that the guild had made their decision to commission a bronze statue from Campagna in a meeting of the *banca* and four 'aggiunti' on 15 June.

date, Campagna was firmly established as Venice's leading sculptor, having created the prestigious bronze high altars of Il Redentore (1589–90, fig.2.20) and San Giorgio Maggiore (1592–4, fig.1.4). The Goldsmiths' choice of sculptor (and material) for their altarpiece may well have been in conscious emulation of both the State and the wealthy Benedictine monks, respective patrons of the aforementioned altars. Campagna's involvement may also have been encouraged by Scamozzi, whom the guild had employed as designer and *proto* for the altar framework, and with whom Campagna had successfully collaborated on a number of notable projects, including the da Ponte monument in Santa Maria della Carità (1582–4, fig.1.35), the completion of Sansovino's Library (for which the sculptor produced some of the crowning statuary, 1588–91, fig.1.19), the atrium of the State Mint (for which he carved one of the colossal figures, 1590–2, fig.2.21), the ephemeral architecture and sculpture for the coronation of Dogaressa Morosina Morosini (1597, fig.1.38), and the high-profile Grimani monument in San Giuseppe (first sculptures commissioned in 1601; fig.1.39).

Contracts

Given the costly and labour-intensive nature of sculptural commissions, and the desire to avoid problems arising along the way, shrewd patrons and sculptors would always come to a mutually acceptable agreement concerning the sculpture to be made. Contracts could come in the form of verbal agreements, but how common these were is hard to determine. Verbal contracts were almost certainly used between the Procuratori di San Marco de Supra and their *proto*, Sansovino. Despite the many extant documents recording Sansovino's work for the procuracy, there is no evidence of any formal written contracts ever having been drawn up. This is interesting given that written contracts were made for commissions outsourced to freelance sculptors, such as that of 18 April 1545 with Tiziano Minio (1511/12–52) and Desiderio da Firenze (fl.1532–45) for the bronze font cover in San Marco's Baptistery (fig. 2.22; for the cover itself: fig.1.6a-c).⁶⁰ This is presumably because Sansovino's role as *proto* precluded the need: the procurators certainly assumed that any duties he undertook fell firmly within the remit of this salaried post.⁶¹ This is confirmed by their indignant statement of

⁶⁰ Formal decisions about work to be undertaken, and subsequent payments for such work were noted down in the Procuracy's registers and account-books, some of which survive and are now in the ASV. For the font-cover contract, see PSM de Supra, b.77, proc.180, fasc.1, fol.14r (and fol.13r for a copy). First published Cecchetti and Ongania 1886, p.43, doc.222. For Minio and the font-cover, see Trent 1999, pp.226–9 (by Leithe-Jasper). For Desiderio, see Warren 2001; Jestaz 2005; and Leithe-Jasper 2008.

⁶¹ Sansovino did, however, have to provide estimates for all repairs to the buildings under the procurators' management, in order to obtain approval to proceed. Howard 1987, pp.9–10. The value over which such estimates had to be approved was initially 2 ducats, and from 1531, this rose to 3 ducats. Ibid., p.10, note 12. In terms of Sansovino's salary, it rose from 80 ducats per annum in 1529

21 June 1571, issued during the tricky posthumous litigation instigated by Sansovino's son, Francesco, who claimed that his father had not been satisfactorily paid for his artistic input into the Sacristy Door in San Marco (fig.1.101).⁶² The procurators may have come to regret this reliance on verbal agreements with Sansovino, as Francesco's rather relentless pursuit against them for the Sacristy Door and the so-called 'Madonna di marmo' must have been a drain on their time, patience and purse-strings.⁶³

Bearing such difficulties in mind, it is understandable that the main avenue for formulating agreements for sculptural projects in this period was via a written counter-signed and witnessed contract that combined a range of obligations, incentives and penalties. Indeed, it seems improbable, especially in the case of larger-scale, more costly projects, that patrons and sculptors would have proceeded without written guarantees in place enshrining and protecting the expectations of both parties. Contracts were frequently but not always drawn up by notaries; agreements between artists and *scuole*, for example, were often not notarised, but the documents were still considered to be legally binding.⁶⁴ Surviving contracts for Venetian sculpture largely conform to the standards of the period in their format and language.⁶⁵ They include: the names of the two parties concerned; the artist's trade ('scultor'); an outline of what was to be made and the intended destination; size of the sculpture and materials to be used; a statement as to whether the materials were to be

(plus accommodation in Piazza San Marco) to 180 ducats in 1530. Ibid., p.9; and pp.8-37 for his work as architect and *proto* for the Procurators. That his salary should have risen so much and so quickly is a measure of the esteem in which he and his work were held: this annual salary fell back down to 80 ducats per annum when Simon Sorella was appointed *proto* on 4 May 1572 (following Sansovino's death in November 1570). PSM de Supra, b.74, 'Chiesa, cariche ed impieghi della Procuratia', proc.170, fol.1v, under date—the drop reflecting Sorella's comparable lack of talent and expertise.

⁶² 'Perché essendo il quondam suo padre salariato et pagato delli dinari et entrate della gesia di San Marco amplissimamente, si conveniva ancora che fosse in obbligo di essercitarsi et metter ogni sua industria a far quanto occorreva et facea bisogno per ditta gesia.' Cecchetti and Ongania 1886, p.47, doc.238.

⁶³ For Francesco's unsuccessful lawsuit over the *Virgin and Child with Angels* (now Chiesetta, Palazzo Ducale), see Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.240-3, docs 295-303, discussed pp.102-04.

⁶⁴ Contracts were legally binding even if not notarised. The inherent benefit of using a notary, however, was that there was a permanent record involving a respected independent third party whose role was to protect the interests of both signatories. For further discussion of this aspect in the context of contracts for paintings, see O'Malley 2005, pp.3-4. *Scuole* often recorded such agreements in their memoranda books, rather than engaging a notary. Connell 1988, p.196; and Kemp 1997, pp.42-3.

⁶⁵ For artists' contracts in Renaissance Italy, see Glasser 1968, especially pp.21-59; Thomas 1995, pp.101-03; Kemp 1997, pp.32-78; and O'Malley 2005. The published scholarship has largely concentrated on contracts for paintings, although Glasser included a few examples of fifteenth-century sculpted commissions. For contracts with stonemasons and sculptors in fifteenth-century Venice, see Connell 1988, pp.185-208.

provided by the patron or sculptor; the sculptor's fee; and the requisite date of completion. To safeguard against possible problems of poor workmanship and production delays, further stipulations were usually included: a requirement that the statue be well-made, from high-quality materials; any attributes or other iconographical details required; adherence to an approved drawing and/or model; an outline of the method of payment; and a threat of financial penalties in the event of non-delivery by the due deadline.⁶⁶

Many contracts further stipulated that the work had to be by the sculptor's own hand—the so-called 'sua mano' clause. Research has shown that this was, however, a standard phrase in Renaissance artists' contracts, and was one which the patron would have understood did not preclude the involvement of assistants, especially as sculptural commissions were by their very nature collaborative.⁶⁷ This understanding is made explicit, for example, at the end of the detailed 1504 contract for the Cappella Zen (1504–21) between Alessandro Leopardi, Antonio Lombardo and the Procuratori di San Marco de Citra (figs 2.23-2.24). Although outside the period examined here, it is worth citing as it clearly demonstrates the patrons' understanding of the complex production processes involved. Towards the end of the lengthy contract, the procurators stated that Leopardi and Lombardo should employ as many masters and journeymen as the commission demanded to ensure its satisfactory and swift completion, given that producing work in bronze—beautifully and quickly—required more masters and journeymen.⁶⁸

Furthermore, the patron frequently insisted that the finished work be assessed by experts ('periti') either to evaluate its artistic merit and therefore to fix the final fee (if not agreed at the start), or to determine whether it actually deserved the fee agreed, or indeed a bonus payment. In April 1565, when Segala was contracted to make the bronze *St John the*

⁶⁶ There has been much discussion about the degree of knowledge and input the Renaissance patron would have had in the design and composition of the works of art he/she commissioned. Hope 1981 and Gilbert 1998 argued against patrons having an in-depth iconographical and compositional awareness, citing some well-documented examples. While the examples given are valid, this aspect of Renaissance patronage should ideally be examined on a case by case basis, thereby avoiding generalisations. For a compelling counter-argument to Hope and Gilbert, see Nelson and Zeckhauser 2008b.

⁶⁷ For further discussion of the 'sua mano' clause, see Glasser 1968, pp.73-8, and O'Malley 2005, pp.91-6.

⁶⁸ '[...] afar diti lavori di [fol.45a] continuo haver maistri & lavoranti al bisogno per far diti lavori azo siano compidi integral & polidamente al meglio sia posibile & piui tosto si pora perche tuti questi lavorieri sopra nominadi die esser facti tuto di bronzo al qual metalo bisogna siano piui maistri & lavoranti che se puol per far lopra [sic] bellissima & piui presto se puol come e dito.' PSM de Citra, b.242, fasc. 'Z XXV no.4', fols 41b-45b, at fol.45a-b. For a full transcription, see Jestaz 1986, pp.185-9, doc.19.

Baptist for San Marco's baptismal font (for a fee of 70 ducats, excluding the 'metallo'), the patrons used this method of financial threat and incentive (figs 2.14, 2.25), stating that:

when this figure is finished, their Most Esteemed *Signorie* will have it judged so that if it is valued at less than these 70 ducats then he must redo as much as is deemed to be lacking, and if it is valued as worth more than these 70 ducats, he [Segala] will leave it to the good will and good grace of their Most Esteemed *Signorie*.⁶⁹

Of course, some agreements could be even more detailed and a careful patron might insert additional conditions and caveats. Patrons frequently insisted on a guarantee for the sculptor's work and/or any financial or material outlay made in advance; the standard terms being 'piezaria' (guarantee), 'piezo' (guarantor), and 'segurtà' (security or surety). As Connell has observed in her research on the fifteenth century, the appointment of a guarantor for any advance payment was standard practice in Venice,⁷⁰ and a number of surviving contracts and related documents show that this practice continued throughout the sixteenth century and into the early seventeenth.⁷¹ If surety were a requirement, then the contract would either state that the sculptor had to provide it without specifying who would offer it (a subsequent document would record this once surety had been secured), or the sculptor's guarantors would be included in the contract, usually as co-signatories. Cattaneo, for example, counter-signed Segala's contract for the bronze *St John* in this capacity.

The relief of the *Miracle of the Resuscitated Youth* for the Cappella dell'Arca in the Santo, awarded to Cattaneo at the end of 1571, is an example of surety being confirmed after contracts had been signed. In this case, the contract of 27 December states that Cattaneo had to provide security for the initial monies paid out to him, and a later declaration of 9 April 1572 confirms that this was provided by Giacom'Alvise Cornaro.⁷² On the transfer of the commission to Campagna after Cattaneo's death, as discussed earlier, the fastidious *massari* continued in the same fashion. The ballot record of 18 December 1573, in which the *massari* voted to give Campagna the job, stipulated that he had to provide security within 15

⁶⁹ 'che quando sarà finita essa figura, Sue Signorie Clarissime la facino giudicare acciò che se sarà estimata valer meno di essa ducati setanta lui debbi rifar tanto quanto sarà estimata di meno, et se sarà estimata ancho di più di essi ducati setanta si rimete alla buona volontà et buona gratia di Sue Signorie Clarissime.' PSM, b.77, proc.180, fasc.1, fol.19r. First published Cecchetti and Ongania 1886, p.78, doc.307. Contracted to complete the figure by January 1566, Segala also agreed to a 20 ducat penalty if it was delivered late.

⁷⁰ Connell 1988, p.198.

⁷¹ This condition was not exclusive to sculptural commissions. See, for example, the contract of 28 September 1575 with stonemason Bortolo Calziner to execute the architectural structure of the Priuli monument. Ludwig 1911, pp.25-6.

⁷² 'Et anco esso Mess. Danese sii obligato a dar segurtà del danaro che se gli darà per capara.' McHam 1994, pp.226-7, doc.76. For Cornaro's involvement, see *ibid.*, p.228, doc.80; discussed p.60.

days.⁷³ Although this deadline was not met (perhaps the *massari* were willing to cut the young sculptor some slack over the festive period), Marco Mantova Benavides put himself forward as Campagna's guarantor one month later on 17 January 1574.⁷⁴ Five years later, in July 1579, when Campagna won the competition to make the Santo's new high altar, surety was again furnished at the patron's behest, although this time by several supporters, probably because the overall value of the commission was so much higher.⁷⁵ From a newly discovered document of 9 August 1579, we learn that Giuseppe Cucina, a Venice-based merchant and friend of stonemason Cesare Franco (Campagna's collaborator on the project), had agreed to stand surety before the contract had even been signed.⁷⁶ In the detailed contract of 12 November 1579 between Campagna, Franco and the Santo authorities, further guarantees were made by Reverend Zuandomenico Boschetto; Paduan nobleman Egidio Cumano (represented by notary Rizzardo Strassoldo); one Giacomo Violco, also from Padua; Battista Franco (Cesare's brother and fellow stonemason who lived in the Paduan parish of San Leonardo); and Paduan-based Veronese painter Dario Varotari (1539–96) represented by Callisto dei Libri.⁷⁷ On 17 August 1582, when Campagna was commissioned to produce no fewer than eight statues for Doge Nicolò da Ponte's funerary monument, another Veronese painter, Francesco Montemezzano (1555–after 1602) guaranteed the initial downpayment of 80 ducats.⁷⁸ Demands for such guarantees were not

⁷³ Ibid., pp.230-1, doc.86.

⁷⁴ Ibid., p.231, doc.87.

⁷⁵ The agreed fee for the relief (with the lunette thrown in for three) was 650 *scudi d'oro* (approx. 734 ducats), while that for the high altar was 4,700 ducats.

⁷⁶ '[...] Mistro Cesaro [Franco], et Mistro Matthio Campagna per nome del detto Mistro Hieronimo suo fiol, per il qual promette de rato, hanno ricercato, et ricercano il spl. Messer Isepo Cucina del q. spl. Messer Piero mercante in Venetia in contrà di Santa Croce che voglia farli la sicurtà, et piezaria iur.s. Però esso Messer Isepo come amico del detto Mistro Cesaro volendoli gratificare spontaneamente e liberamente si hà costituito piezo, et sicurtà per li detti Mistro Cesaro, et Mistro Hieronimo simul, et insolitudine, che fornirano detta opera, et osserverano quanto per detta scrittura si han offerti di fare alla detta Fraterna di Sant' Antonio di Padoa alla qual scrittura, et convention si habbi relazione dicendo detto Messer Isepo haverli vista, eletta, et esserli ben noto il tutto, obligandosi per cio, e tutti i sui beni presenti e futuri.' NA, b.447, fol.247r-v. This unpublished surety document was offered only two weeks after the vote to award Campagna the commission. For the Cucina family in general, see De Maria 2010, passim, although Giuseppe does not feature.

⁷⁷ For this contract, see Sartori-Fillarini 1976, pp.41-3, at p.41 for the guarantors. Varotari was a former pupil of Veronese. He worked closely with Aliense, and fellow Veronese painter, Francesco Montemezzano (both of whom had also trained under Veronese), and was father to Alessandro Varotari, called Padovanino.

⁷⁸ Cat.6, doc.6.3. Montemezzano lived in the parish of Sant'Angelo, the adjacent parish to San Samuele, where Campagna was living. For further discussion of Campagna's network, see Chapter 4, pp.145-51.

restricted to 'early career' sculptors, as might be expected. Campagna, for example, had to provide guarantors regularly throughout his career, despite being well-established as Venice's leading sculptor by the end of century.⁷⁹

Interestingly, when more than one independent master was commissioned to produce work within a single contract, documentary evidence indicates that they could—presumably only with the patron's tacit approval—act as guarantors for each other. In the 1504 Cappella Zen contract, discussed earlier, the bronze-caster Leopardi and sculptor Lombardo both agreed to guarantee each other's work (fig.2.26).⁸⁰ Likewise, in the joint contract of 20 January 1592 for San Giorgio's new high altar between Campagna, his brother and fellow sculptor Giuseppe (d.1626), the bronze-caster Francesco Mazzoleni (documented from 1585–d. by 1610), and the monastery, the sculptors and bronze-caster stood surety for each other's work (figs 2.27-2.28).⁸¹

Another possible contractual caveat was that the sculpture be similar to an earlier prototype. The 1504 Cappella Zen contract, for example, demanded that various aspects of the commission resemble existing works of sculpture and architectural elements, most notably that Zen's bronze tomb-chest and its sculptural decoration be like that of the fifteenth-century marble *Funerary Monument to Orsato Giustinian* in Sant'Andrea della Certosa (figs 2.29-2.30).⁸² In a similar fashion, when the Santo employed Tullio Lombardo in 1528 to carve a relief of the *Miracle of the Mule* for the Cappella dell'Arca, the *massari* were quite insistent that he take into account Donatello's bronze precedent on the high altar,

⁷⁹ For the guarantors for Campagna's bronze *St Anthony* for the Goldsmiths' altar and the statue of Federico da Montefeltro for the Duke of Urbino, both commissioned in 1604, see below.

⁸⁰ 'Io Alessandro de Liompardi sum contento de far el soprascripto lavor cum le condition de la poliza, in compagnia con mio compagno Antonio Lombardo, per ducati doa millia e sie cento e cinquanta, et constituisome piezo de Antonio mio compagno soraditto [...] Io Antonio Lombardo sum contento de quanto el mio compagno a soprascripto e constituisome piezo per lui [...]. PSM de Citra, b.242, fasc. 'Z XXV no. 4', fol.45b. It is generally accepted that Leopardi and Lombardo formed a 'compagnia' or partnership for the express purposes of the Zen commission. See Avery 2011, p.64. This is unsurprising given the enormous undertaking that the project presented.

⁸¹ 'per patto exspresso obligandossi ambe due essi parti, et precipue detti fratelli Campagna et Mazzoleni l'uno per pezaria dell'altro'. SGM, b.21, proc.10A, 'Libro fabbrica', fol.1v. For Campagna and Mazzoleni, see Chapter 4, pp.150-51.

⁸² PSM de Citra, b.242, fasc. 'Z XXV no.4', fols 44b-45a. For further discussion, see Jestaz 1986, pp.50-52; and Avery 2011, pp.118-19. Sant'Andrea was an important Carthusian monastery located on an island close to San Pietro di Castello at the eastern end of the city. Demolished in 1810, nothing remains of the church and only fragments of the Giustinian monument survive. For a contemporary description, see Sansovino 1581, pp.79v-81r. For further discussion, see McAndrew 1969 and Zorzi 1984, pp.393-401.

stating in the contract that they would arrange for a gesso cast and drawing of the relief to be sent to him in Venice (fig.2.31).⁸³

Finally, contracts allowed patrons to specify not only what was to be executed by the contractee, but also what was *not*. The contract for the *Altar of the Magdalen* (6 December 1523; figs 1.46-1.47) between the stonemason, Guglielmo de' Grigi (c.1480–c.1550), and the Procuratori di San Marco de Citra, for example, made clear that while de' Grigi was to produce the altar framework, flanking inscriptions and coats-of-arms, they would pay separately for the sawing of alabaster, marble and precious stones, and would employ another master to carve the *Magdalen* (figs 2.32-2.34).⁸⁴ Sawing marble and stone was a specialised job, the remit of professional 'segadori' and the procurators presumably decided to employ sawyers directly, because the commission encompassed a great deal of costly coloured marble and stone and they wished to retain responsibility for the integrity of these materials as much as possible. Although the work was entrusted to a number of *segadori*, the principal sawyer was one Bortolo Garbin.⁸⁵ The carving of the *Magdalen*, meanwhile, was awarded to the gifted sculptor Bartolomeo Bergamasco (active 1518–28) on 17 January 1524 (figs 1.47, 2.35).⁸⁶

Later in the period, the scrupulous nobleman Francesco Tiepolo stipulated that Angelo di Zuanne Tentin—the stonemason responsible for the new altar and sepulchre for his family chapel of San Sabba in Sant'Antonin—was to produce everything except for two marble *putti* for the lid of the sarcophagus destined to hold the saint's relics (figs 2.36-2.38a-b).⁸⁷ These cherubs were later commissioned from Vittoria in c. January 1592 (fig.2.39).⁸⁸ Tiepolo continued in a similar vein, when he re-employed Tentin in December 1592 to carve the twin monuments for himself and his late father, Alvise, for the chapel's lateral walls (fig.2.40).⁸⁹ In this case, Tentin was to carve the architectural surround but neither the inscriptions nor portrait busts: the former were later commissioned from an unnamed

⁸³ McHam 1994, p.209, doc.209, discussed briefly p.47. McHam observes here that the relief does not appear to have ever been started by Tullio.

⁸⁴ Cat.1, doc.1.2 and doc.1.3 [43]. For the employment of other trades in the execution of sculptural commissions, see Chapter 4, pp.136-40.

⁸⁵ For payments to Garbin, see cat.1, doc.1.3 [51]-[55], [62], [63], [65], [68], [69], [71], [76]-[79], [81], [86], [92], [95], [115], [118], [125], [127], [128].

⁸⁶ For a summary of Bartolomeo's contract, see cat.1, doc.1.3 [143]. For his career, see Schulz 1984a.

⁸⁷ 'eccettuado li anzoletti che sono sopra ad esso casson quali sua signoria Clarissima fara fare.' Tiepolo 'Spese', fol.3r. For the contract of 8 August 1591, see *ibid.*, fols 2r-5v. Published Avery 1999a, pp.332-3, doc.133(i), discussed Avery 2010, pp.160-1.

⁸⁸ Avery 2010, p.160. Vittoria received final settlement (80 ducats) for the *putti* on 26 July 1592. Tiepolo 'Libro dei Conti', fol.2a. Published Mason Rinaldi 1976-7, p.204.

⁸⁹ Contract of 29 December 1592. Tiepolo 'Spese', fol.33r-v. Published Avery 1999a, pp. 334-35, doc. 133(iv).

epigrapher and the latter from Vittoria.⁹⁰ While it is understandable that Tiepolo was loathe to entrust important sculptural elements, such as the portrait busts, to a stonemason, it is perhaps surprising that Tentin was not to carve the inscriptions (especially given the amount of detailed carving that he had already undertaken elsewhere within the chapel). However, close reading of the documents reveals that this was Tiepolo being his usual careful and pragmatic self, as Tentin was illiterate, requiring others to sign the various contracts and payment receipts on his behalf.⁹¹ Although stonemasons had recourse to lettering and Roman numeral patterns for inscriptions, it was clearly risky to entrust an illiterate one with such a task.

The 1604 contract between the Goldsmiths' Guild and Girolamo Campagna

The contract between the Goldsmiths' Guild and Campagna for the bronze *St Anthony Abbot* is a typical agreement for sculpture in Venice in this period (fig.0.5).⁹² Drawn up between Campagna and the guild on 9 July 1604, without the involvement of a notary, it records how on 15 June 1604 the *Gastaldo*, *banca*, and four guildsmen overseeing the project had resolved to commission a bronze statue of *St Anthony* from Campagna for 350 ducats: 100 ducats to be paid immediately, and the balance upon completion, subject to the fulfilment of certain conditions. First, it set out how the *scuola* wanted its patron saint to be portrayed: he was to be five and a half Venetian feet tall (c.191cm), fully in the round, carrying a crozier and wearing a mitre. Moreover, the statue was to be cast from a brassy alloy, well-made without blemishes, properly cleaned and perfectly finished, all at the sculptor's expense. The guild further stipulated a completion date of 17 January 1605—the saint's feast day—and failure to meet this deadline would result in a 50-ducat penalty. The contract also contains a most unusual requirement for a Venetian sculptural commission, namely that Campagna was obliged to inform the *Gastaldo* when he planned to cast the figure, presumably so that a guild member could attend the pour to ensure that both the alloy used and the casting procedure

⁹⁰ 'Dechiarando che detto Maestro Anzolo non é in obbligo a mettere le piere di parangon, ne meno le teste che li vanno sopra, ne meno le lettere che li vanno dentro.' Ibid., fol.33r. For final payment for the inscription for Alvise's monument, see Tiepolo 'Libro dei Conti', fol.8a. Published Mason Rinaldi 1976–7, p.208. For payments for the busts, see Tiepolo 'Libro dei Conti', fol.8a-b (published Mason Rinaldi 1976–7, p.208) and Tiepolo 'Spese', fol.43r-v (published Avery 1999a, p.335, doc.133[vii]); discussed Avery 2010, pp.163–4.

⁹¹ See, for example, the contract for the memorials of 29 December 1592: 'per non sapere scrivere il detto Maestro Anzolo, Missier Luca Marzoppini si sottoscrivera per suo nome presenti li sotto scritti testimoni questo di et anno sopra detto in Vinetia'. Tiepolo 'Spese', fol.33v. Avery 2010, p.161, comments on Tentin's illiteracy but does not suggest this as a possible reason for his not having been entrusted with carving the inscriptions.

⁹² Cat.9, doc.9.9.

employed were satisfactory.⁹³ After all, unlike most patrons, the Goldsmiths would have had a perfect grasp of the complex processes involved in working with molten metal. The contract, personally signed by Campagna, was counter-signed by two goldsmiths, Piero de Ruggeri and Zuanpiero dal Orso, who agreed to act as guarantors for the sculptor.⁹⁴

Contract Drawings and Models

Drawings and models were an integral part of the commissioning process, and it seems logical that neither a careful patron nor a business-savvy sculptor would have wished to proceed without an agreed design in place. After all, most patrons would surely have wanted assurances that their intentions could be realised by the sculptor, and sculptors would presumably have wanted a clear understanding of a patron's wishes to avoid wasting valuable time and materials, and the possibility of subsequent litigation. As mentioned above, adherence to a mutually agreed drawing and/or model was often stipulated in contracts for sculpture in this period.⁹⁵ Interestingly, as Table 1 reveals, of the 25 contracts examined for sculpture produced in Venice in this period, seven refer to a drawing, seven to a model of some sort, and three to both.⁹⁶ Of these, ten were executed by the sculptor, while six were the responsibility of a third party.⁹⁷ While eight make no reference to either, it seems likely that in these instances an undocumented drawing and/or model would have been approved by the patron at some point, in order to know what he/she was paying for.⁹⁸ Indeed, for sculptural commissions from the time of Donatello onwards, the provision of a model (normally on a reduced-scale but sometimes full-scale) was commonly expected.⁹⁹ In the case of the Goldsmiths' deal with Campagna for the bronze *St Anthony*, for example, the omission of a drawing or model in the contract does not mean that one was not provided. The quite specific iconographical details enshrined in the written agreement may well have

⁹³ For further discussion of this and of the guild's specific requirements for the alloy, see Chapter 3, pp.126-7.

⁹⁴ De Ruggeri had already acted as guarantor for Campagna on 26 April 1604, when he countersigned the first contract for the Montefeltro statue. NA, b.3378, fols 255v-256r, at fol.256r. It is possible that de Ruggeri was a relative of Campagna through the sculptor's second marriage to Laura, daughter of one Francesco de Ruggeri. However, this must remain a hypothesis in the absence of documentary evidence.

⁹⁵ These figures exclude contracts with stonemasons for the oft-related architectural structures, such as those of funerary monuments and altars.

⁹⁶ Appendix, table 1: nos 2, 10, 12, 14, 19, 20, 22 (drawing only); 1, 5, 13, 16, 17, 18, 21 (model only); 11, 24, 25 (both).

⁹⁷ Table 1: nos 1, 2, 5, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21 (sculptor); 12, 14, 20, 22, 24, 25 (third party).

⁹⁸ Table 1: nos 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 15, 23.

⁹⁹ Glasser 1968, p.133.

been supplemented with a visual aid.¹⁰⁰ At the very least, the guild would probably have seen and approved the finished full-scale wax model prior to casting.

In terms of which was preferable, there were clear benefits for both parties in having a three-dimensional model—rather than just a drawing—as this enabled a patron to envisage more accurately how the finished sculpture would look, and the sculptor to demonstrate his concept. Several drawings and models were, in fact, likely made for any one commission and retained as part of the design process to work out issues of composition, ponderation and balance.¹⁰¹ However, documentary evidence suggests that when a drawing and/or model was mentioned in a contract, it was the final design signed off by both parties. This then accorded the drawing and/or model legal status alongside the counter-signed and witnessed contract. Drawings and models were also essential when it came to choosing a sculptor and/or a design, particularly if several individuals were competing for a commission, as was the case for the Santo's new high altar, where four bids were made and then voted on by the church's governing body.¹⁰²

Sometimes contracts were quite specific and not only demanded strict adherence to a model, but also included additional iconographical details. The Procuratori di San Marco de Citra adopted this 'belts and braces' approach with Bergamasco, for example, when they commissioned him to carve the marble figure of the *Magdalen* for Verde della Scala's altar in Santa Maria dei Servi (fig.2.41). In the contract of 21 August 1524, they stated that Bartolomeo:

was obliged to make a figure from our marble of St Mary Magdalen approximately 5 ¼ feet tall, which must have her coiffure styled in twisted braids, with a lock [? of hair] on her shoulder, with her jar in her hand, dressed in long drapery in the antique style, in accordance with the clay model.¹⁰³

The finished statue shows that Bartolomeo closely followed these instructions: the *Magdalen*'s hair is lifted away from her face in gentle waves, with a flowing lock falling softly over the left shoulder (fig.2.35). Her right hand bears her traditional attribute of a jar of costly unguent, while her left hand gently lifts the voluminous folds of her dress to accentuate the carved swathes of fabric that outline the contours of her body.

Given that sculpture was frequently commissioned as part of a larger project, such as figures for altar complexes or funerary monuments, a third party was often employed to

¹⁰⁰ Cat.9, doc.9.9.

¹⁰¹ For the production, use, and importance of models, including sketch models ('bozzetti') in Renaissance Italy, see Lavin 1967; Avery C. 1981; Avery C. 1984; Wittkower 1999, pp.89-90, 151-4; Avery C. 2007; and Fiorentini 2007.

¹⁰² See above, pp.61-2.

¹⁰³ From 'era obligato a far una figura' to 'uno modelo afato di chrea'. Cat.1, doc.1.3, [143]. Pace Wolters 1990, p.131, who referred to the model as made of wax.

conceive the overall design. The documentary record shows that architects, *proti* and occasionally stonemasons could all be called upon to do this: the design and erection of the altar for Bartolomeo's figure of the *Magdalen*, for example, was undertaken by stonemason Guglielmo de' Grigi, who executed the altar's architecture (fig.1.46).¹⁰⁴ Only occasionally do we know of instances in this period where the sculptor also designed the whole architectural framework, the exceptionally talented architect and sculptor Sansovino being the obvious example, as demonstrated by his *Monument to Doge Francesco Venier* (fig.1.42).¹⁰⁵ Most often, especially by the latter half of the period, a professional architect or *proto* would design the structure, and provide the requisite *sagome* (architectural templates) and guidance; a stonemason and his workshop would then carry out the work. Scamozzi did this for both the da Ponte monument destined for Santa Maria della Carità and the Goldsmiths' altar in San Giacomo (figs 1.35, 0.1).¹⁰⁶

Normally, the sculptural components would be conceived and designed by the sculptor contracted to execute them. Occasionally, however, this responsibility fell to a third party. The painter, Antonio Vassilacchi, called Aliense (1556–1629) is known to have provided the initial design for the elaborate high altar of San Giorgio Maggiore, the commission for whose sculptural elements went to Campagna, his brother Giuseppe, and his frequent collaborator, bronze-caster Francesco Mazzoleni in January 1592 (fig.1.4).¹⁰⁷ The painter and biographer Carlo Ridolfi recounted in *Le maraviglie dell'arte* (1648) that the Benedictines had been presented with a number of designs for the project, but unsure about

¹⁰⁴ See cat.1, especially doc.1.2 for the Procurators' contract with him.

¹⁰⁵ Cat.4. Although no contract has thus far emerged for this monument, its design has long been accepted as by Sansovino. My recently discovered documents recording litigation instigated by his son Francesco in March 1571 against Venier's descendants now irrefutably confirm this attribution: cat.4, docs 4.8-4.11. In the decades preceding the period covered by this thesis, Venice-based artisans combining the skills of architect, sculptor and stonemason were more frequently responsible for the principal aspects of the design and execution of projects which encompassed architecture and sculpture, such as Bartolomeo Bon, Antonio Rizzo, and the Lombardo workshop under both Pietro and his son, Tullio. The period examined here witnessed a much greater separation and specialisation of skills. For further discussion, see Chapter 4, pp.137-40.

¹⁰⁶ The contract of 30 July 1582 with Cesare Franco for the da Ponte architectural structure states that he had to follow the 'sagome da esser fatte di mano de Messer Vincenzo Scamozzi da Vicenza'. Cat.6, doc.6.2. The Goldsmiths' account-book, meanwhile, records payments to Scamozzi for providing the design and *sagome* for the altar: cat.9, doc.9.1, fol.125r, [1] (drawing); [9], [13]; fol.126r, [7]; fol.129r, [10] (*sagome*).

¹⁰⁷ Aliense was also one of the witnesses for the contract, for which see SGM, b.21, proc.10A, 'Libro fabbrica', fols 1r-2r, at fol.2r.

any of them, had then asked Aliense to come up with a new idea.¹⁰⁸ These initial designs were seemingly then fleshed out and refined by Campagna, as seen in a surviving drawing convincingly attributed to him by David McTavish (fig.2.42).¹⁰⁹

Archival evidence indicates that contract drawings were normally retained by either the patron or his/her representative, and often counter-signed, while the contract model was usually kept by the sculptor until the work was finished. The counter-signing of drawings was probably done to prevent an unscrupulous artist or artisan from fraudulently producing a second set of drawings and then presenting these as the originally agreed design, either later on or once the commission had been finished (thereby allowing unauthorised changes to slip through). The existence of a counter-signed drawing provided useful, incontrovertible evidence of the intended design if the completed sculpture differed greatly and litigation threatened. The 1582 contract with Franco for the da Ponte monument, for example, records that both the drawings and *sagome* were counter-signed by Marc'Antonio Barbaro (the doge's overseer for the project), and that the doge reserved the right for all of these to be kept by whomsoever he wished.¹¹⁰ This caution was extended to the allegorical figures commissioned from Campagna two weeks later. In the contract for them, the project drawing is mentioned, and Campagna is then enjoined to carve the eight figures following clay models that he was to make and which were to be 'signed' by Barbaro (perhaps by impressing the unfired clay with his personal seal).¹¹¹ In this case, the models were to be retained by Campagna until he had finished the statues (presumably as an aide-mémoire) but were then to revert to the doge, or to whomsoever da Ponte wished them to go.

The safeguarding of drawings and models was, of course, equally beneficial to the sculptor as these could provide incontrovertible proof that he had adhered to the original design, should a patron query the end result. That the careful conservation of models was considered a worthwhile security measure for both sides is reflected in San Giorgio Maggiore's 1595 contract with Campagna for the *Madonna and Child with Child Angels*, in which the sculptor promised to 'keep and conserve [the model] until the end of the work as a

¹⁰⁸ Ridolfi 1648, vol.2, pp.214-6. McTavish 1980, p.165. As is well-known, Ridolfi had been Aliense's pupil.

¹⁰⁹ McTavish 1980.

¹¹⁰ Cat.6. doc.6.2, from 'il qual disegno è sottoscritto dal Clarissimo Signor Marco Antonio Barbaro Procurato' to 'resteranno anco quelle in mano de chi haverà il disegno'.

¹¹¹ Cat.6, doc.6.3, from 'le otto figure che deveno esser poste nel deposito del Serenissimo Principe soprascritto alla Carità' to 'le qual figure deveno esser à satisfattione di esso Clarissimo Barbaro Procurator, ò Marco suo Figliolo'. Cesare Ziliol, the notary who drew up the contract, erroneously referred to Barbaro's son as Marco (the Franco contract correctly calls him Francesco: cat.6, doc.6.2). Barbaro had no son called Marco. For his family tree, see Howard 2011, p.16.

guarantee for each party' (figs 2.43a-b and 2.44).¹¹² By this time, drawings and models were not only kept by patrons for pragmatic and legal reasons, but they were also often cherished as works of art in their own right. Although its current whereabouts is unknown, the model for Campagna's *Madonna and Child* was conserved by San Giorgio Maggiore in a gilded case until at least the early eighteenth century.¹¹³ A terracotta model by Campagna that does survive (of a comparable subject) is the *Madonna and Child with Angels and the Infant St John the Baptist*, possibly an early study for the Dolfin altar in San Salvador.¹¹⁴

Cost

As outlined above, the overall fee agreed with the sculptor was usually set out in the contract, with a down payment made at the time of signing the agreement in order to secure the sculptor's services and to encourage a prompt commencement.¹¹⁵ Further payments were then either made as work progressed, or the sculptor could agree to receive the remainder once the sculpture was finished. Overall fees were generally recorded either in ducats (with the qualification that the rate per ducat was 6 *lire* and 4 *soldi*) or *scudi d'oro* (at a rate of 7 *lire* per *scudo* towards the end of the period), while instalments were set down in surviving ledgers in monies of account for book-keeping purposes (either *lire di piccoli*, or *lire di grossi*).¹¹⁶ In the 1582 contract with Campagna for eight allegorical figures for the da Ponte monument, for example, he was to receive a total of 500 ducats (excluding materials which were to be supplied to him) with 80 ducats upfront.¹¹⁷ Further instalments were to be paid as his work progressed upon approval from Marc'Antonio Barbaro or his son, Francesco.¹¹⁸

The final settlement payment could simply be the final amount owing from the total fee agreed at the beginning of the project, or it could be this plus an additional amount (unspecified in the contract) based on timely completion, and an evaluation of the work's artistic merit and quality of finish. Both of these could be determined by one or more independent third-party experts, known as 'periti'. While most *periti* were fellow sculptors, architects, or *proti*, a *perito* could also be a non-professional considered to have sufficient

¹¹² 'qual modelo mi obligo mantener, et conservar sino al fin dell'opera per cautione delle parti.' SGM, b.21, proc.10A, 'Libro fabbrica', fols 30r-v, at fol.30r.

¹¹³ Cooper 1990, p.358.

¹¹⁴ Now the Getty Museum, Los Angeles (inv.85.SC.59). See Fogelman 2002a.

¹¹⁵ See p.66 above.

¹¹⁶ For an explanation of *lire di piccoli* and *lire di grossi*, see the notes in the Appendix. For typical accounts in *lire di piccoli*, see cat.1, doc.1.3; cat.8, doc.8.26; and cat.9, doc.9.1. For accounts in *lire di grossi*, see those for the Montefeltro chapel in San Francesco della Vigna: PSM, b.12, fasc.1, 'Procuratori di S. Marco de Citra l'º Commissaria Montefeltro (da) Nicolò qd. Federico civis Venetiarum', account-book entitled '1423–1590' in pencil.

¹¹⁷ Cat.6, doc.6.3, fol.292r.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

knowledge.¹¹⁹ The 1536 contract with the Santo for the relief of the *Miracle of the Maiden Carilla* (fig.2.2), for example, stated that Sansovino would be paid 300 ducats and 'much more as the Magnificent Messer Giacomo Cornaro and the Magnificent Messer Federico Priuli see fit if he [Sansovino] should produce a work that merits it'.¹²⁰ Although considerable difficulties were encountered in reaching the final settlement, due to the length of time taken by Sansovino to finish the relief, a bonus payment was finally agreed in March 1562.¹²¹ In the final agreement, the *massari* confirmed that the total amount to be paid to Sansovino would be 450 ducats, in other words, 150 ducats more than the original fee.¹²²

Slightly different from this type of settlement was the possibility of a bonus payment, set out as a contractual incentive to encourage the timely completion of a high quality piece of work. The Abbot of San Giorgio Maggiore, for example, offered such a bonus in the contract of 31 January 1594 with Niccolò Roccatagliata for two bronze statuettes of *Sts George and Stephen* (figs 1.60-1.61).¹²³ To this agreement the Abbot appended a promise of two bushels of flour and a cask of wine as a sign of 'pure loving kindness and courtesy', so long as Roccatagliata completed the figures by the agreed deadline of the end of Lent 1595.¹²⁴ Sansovino, on the other hand, had received an uncontracted bonus for the statues of *Hope* and *Charity* for the Venier monument in San Salvador (figs 2.45-2.46). From an unpublished document of 15 May 1571, it transpires that he received a bonus of 20 ducats for the two statues (fig.2.47).¹²⁵ Although the original contract for the monument has not yet

¹¹⁹ Such experts were also frequently employed to evaluate sculpture when litigation arose between sculptor and patron. See, for example, Domenico da Salò versus Giovanni Vrana over the completion of the *Altar of the Nativity* in San Giuseppe: cat.5, docs 5.1-5.6, discussed Chapter 4, pp.157-8.

¹²⁰ 'per pregio de ducati tresento a Lire 6 soldi 4 per ducato et tanto più quanto parerà al magnifico Messer Iacomo Cornaro et al magnifico Messer Federicho di Priuli se lui havesse fato tal opera che'l meritase [...]' McHam 1994, p.221, doc.63.

¹²¹ For the documents concerning the settlement negotiations, see Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.208-10, docs 159-67. The deaths of the original *periti* in the interim cannot have helped matters either.

¹²² Dated 17 March 1562. Boucher 1991, vol.1, p.209, doc.164. Giacomo Leoni and Giovanni di Sant'Uliana were the replacement representatives who concluded the appraisal of Sansovino's relief, in discussion with both the *massari* and the sculptor. As Warren observed, di Sant'Uliana was actually a friend of Sansovino's, which may have made the haggling over the bonus rather problematic: Warren 2016, vol.1, p.278.

¹²³ For these figures, see Trent 1999, pp.444-7 (cats 100-1, by Kryza-Gersch).

¹²⁴ 'Nota che il Reverende Padre Abate sodetto, oltre li ducati 60 di accordio, promette a detto Misser Nicolo stara 2 farina et una baril di vino de sechii numero 6 et questo per pura amorevoleza e cortesia di detto Reverende con questo pero che detto Misser Nicolo dia dette figure compite nel termine del sodetto tempo altrimenti non intende darli cosa alcuna.' SGM, b.21, proc.10A, 'Libro fabbrica', fol.15r.

¹²⁵ Cat.4, doc.4.11.

come to light, the affidavit records that the 20 ducat sum was an unanticipated bonus, awarded in addition to the 160 ducat fee originally agreed for the two figures.

Conversely, a sculptor might accept less money than stipulated in the contract or include additional elements for free, as a sign of affection, devotion, a goodwill gesture, or to impress a new customer with a view to securing future work. Presumably for devotional reasons, Vittoria refused to accept money from the Scuola del SS. Sacramento in San Giuliano for numerous jobs that he had undertaken for the confraternity's new chapel (fig.2.48).¹²⁶ To thank him, the brethren gave him 15 *lire* of fine white linen ('renso'), imported from Reims, France. Likewise, Campagna agreed to donate 30 ducats of his 150 ducat fee for eight relief *Victories* and a *God the Father* 'as alms' to the Scuola del Rosario, based in Santi Giovanni e Paolo, which had commissioned him to carve these marble figures for the tympanum of the high altar of their ambitious, new chapel in May 1593 (fig.2.49).¹²⁷ Perhaps Campagna chose to give alms not only as a devotional offering, but also as a goodwill gesture to encourage the *scuola* to give him more work. If this was his intention, it certainly worked as he was later contracted to produce two marble statues of *St Thomas Aquinas* and *St Catherine of Siena*, eight bronze *putti*, and four bronze angels for the same altar.¹²⁸

But what fees could sculptors expect in this period? And did prices change over time? Before addressing these questions, there are several problems that should be taken into consideration. As the prices surveyed in Table 2 demonstrate, the commissions for which we know the total prices paid vary in terms of genre, size, material, the amount of sculpture made, and whether labour was combined with the cost of materials. It is tricky, for example, to compare the price of a relief sculpture with that of a statue carved fully in the round. The reputation of the sculptor and the type of patron should also be considered. A sculptor might have accepted a lower fee from a devotional body, for instance, but expected a higher one from a wealthy individual. This is aptly demonstrated by Vittoria's and Campagna's willingness to forgo some level of remuneration from lay confraternities, as discussed above. Likewise, a well-established, sought-after sculptor could presumably have commanded a higher price than a sculptor just starting out or one who was perceived as less talented.¹²⁹

¹²⁶ 'detto [23 April 1584] per Lire 15 renso donai a Misser Alesandro Vitoria et fu per ricompenso de molte fatture lui aveva fatta alaltar del Santissimo Sacramento dela qual non vol danari — L 15 s —.' Avery 1999a, p.298, doc.114(x). For this commission, see Timofiewitsch 1972, pp.35-46, 235-6 (cat.2); Mason Rinaldi 1975-6; Avery 1996, vol.2, pp.547-9 (cat.100); Finocchi Ghersi 1998, pp.165-6; and Martin S. 1998, pp.26, 247-53 (cat.20).

¹²⁷ 'Dechiarando però che il sudetto Misser Ierolamo Campagna Scultor, dona, alla sudetta Sola [*sic*] per elemosina Ducati 30.' Avery 1999a, p.324, doc.128(ix).

¹²⁸ The marble Dominican saints joined two already finished by Vittoria (*St Dominic* and *St Justine*). For these, see Avery 2001a.

¹²⁹ Sansovino's fee of 160 ducats for the Venier *Hope* and *Charity* of c.1561 is higher than prices paid for comparable figures by other sculptors later in the period.

Bronzes, meanwhile, were almost always costed to include the materials and casting, therefore making it impossible to know what the sculptor himself received in terms of his *ingegno* and labour.¹³⁰

That said, a steady rise in prices for approximately life-size carved statues (a commonly-commissioned size based on archival and visual evidence) can be identified. In 1524, Bergamasco was paid 40 ducats for the Verde della Scala *Magdalen*; in 1561 Vittoria was promised 50 *scudi* (approx. 60 ducats) for each of the three saints for the Montefeltro altar; in 1582 Campagna agreed to c.62 ducats for each statue for the da Ponte monument; in 1591 Vittoria received 100 ducats for each saint for the Cappella del Rosario; and Campagna got the same amount in the early seventeenth century for each of the companion pair of Dominican saints for the same chapel. By the early seventeenth century, there appears to have been a hike in prices—at least for patrons outside of Venice—judging from Vittoria's advice proffered to the Duke of Urbino's agent, Giulio Brunetti, when he was seeking out a Venice-based sculptor to carve a statue of Federico da Montefeltro. In a letter of July 1603, Brunetti informed the Duke's advisor back in Urbino that Vittoria had told him to expect to pay 200 *scudi* (c.225 ducats) for a statue of this kind.¹³¹ Despite this advice, when the Duke contracted Campagna for the commission the following April, the fee agreed was 300 ducats, some 75 ducats higher, indicating some shrewd bargaining on the part of the sculptor.¹³²

It is usually impossible to work out the individual prices of differing types of sculpture commissioned in a single contract, as only a global price was recorded. However, the statement of account for numerous pieces commissioned from Campagna by Doge Marino Grimani for his funerary monument in San Giuseppe gives these details, even though the original contract of 16 September 1601 does not. So, although the contract outlined the different items to be made and simply stipulated an overall price of 660 ducats (fig.2.50a-b),¹³³ the statement of account listed each piece and its individual price (fig.2.51).¹³⁴ From this we know, for example, that the 'four figures [to go] above the columns' cost 180 ducats, and that the 'devotional relief with the Madonna and Our Lord with the Doge and Dogressa, and other figures' cost 130 ducats.¹³⁵

¹³⁰ Casting bronze was almost always subcontracted out to a skilled founder unless the commission was contracted jointly to a sculptor and a caster. For bronze-casting in Venice, see Avery 2011. For trade specialisation as well as the issue of *ingegno*, see Chapter 4, pp.137-42.

¹³¹ 'Il Vittoria mi dice, che appresso a poco quest'opera potrà costare intorno a ducento scudi di manifattura'. Gronau 1936, p.241, doc.CCCLXXX. One *scudo* was worth 7 *lire* in Venice at this time.

¹³² NA, b.3378, fols 255v-256r at fol.256r.

¹³³ Cat.8, doc.8.10.

¹³⁴ Cat.8, doc.8.42. This outline precedes the date and amount of each increment paid to Campagna.

¹³⁵ Cat.8, doc.8.42, [3]-[4]. See also Table 2, no.36.

Surprisingly, two of the commissions surveyed had no set fee at all in their respective contracts, but rather stated that instalments would be paid from time to time, presumably as work progressed.¹³⁶ This would have required the patron or his/her representative to assess the work-rate on the sculpture at regular intervals, in the same fashion as contracted instalments were evaluated.

Financing

But how were sculptural commissions in this period actually paid for? While this very much depended on the type of patron, it is worth considering some of the sources upon which a patron might draw. For individuals who commissioned sculpture in their lifetime, there is little concrete evidence but we can assume that they accessed monies such as the income derived from whatever business they were involved in, inherited wealth, dowries and/or the proceeds of funds such as those mentioned in testamentary instructions for comparable projects. This could include investments in the compulsory State loan funds and monies received from the rental of properties and land.¹³⁷ Antonio Gatto, for example, gave detailed instructions about the funds to be used both for the completion of his *cappella maggiore* in San Polo, and the fulfilment of his monetary bequests in his will of May 1591 (fig.2.52).¹³⁸ He informed his executors that the cash in his desk was to be used for his tomb, and if this did not suffice then the proceeds from selling off any belongings not bequeathed as gifts could also be used (fig.2.53). Furthermore, he had 4,000 ducats invested in the Monte Nuovissimo and just over 1,000 ducats in the Monte de Sussidio. He ordered that the proceeds of these investments be used to finance his monetary bequests and charitable acts, namely, to dowry poor Venetian-born girls living in San Polo, and to pay for a doctor and barber-surgeon to care for the sick of this and four other parishes nearby. However, before financing the dowries, he wished 'the remaining [funds] to pay for the bronze figure, that is the St Paul, to be finished, which is to go on the high altar' as well as for his funerary monument, complete with marble portrait bust by Vittoria and flanking marble angels (fig.2.54).¹³⁹

Decisions about fund-raising, and associated book-keeping ledgers occasionally survive for corporate commissions, the most pertinent example here being the account-book

¹³⁶ (1) 1528 contract with Tullio Lombardo for the *Miracle of the Mule* relief for the Santo; (2) 1607 contract between Campagna and the Scuola Grande di San Rocco. Table 2, nos 2 and 41 respectively.

¹³⁷ For the State loan funds, see Chapter 1, note 42. Notarial acts in the ASV abound with rental agreements and investment contracts. For a discussion of Patrician investments and income, see Pullan 1974.

¹³⁸ Cat.7, doc.7.6.

¹³⁹ 'dell remanente di pro scuoderenno [...] sia finita la figura di bronzo cioe il San Paolo va sopra l'altar maggiore.' Cat.7, doc.7.6.

and related documents for the Goldsmiths' altar (fig.0.3).¹⁴⁰ While the project initially started with voluntary donations, the altar fund ran short no fewer than three times during construction. The first time, in December 1602, the wealthy goldsmith, Andrea Occioni, offered to loan the guild 500 ducats. The guildsmen, unwilling to compromise on the end result, voted overwhelmingly to accept the money and pledged that it would be repaid via compulsory contributions levied from members.¹⁴¹ In February 1606, it took out a second loan from a certain Signora Dirosi that was presumably to be repaid under a similar scheme.¹⁴² As guild membership was compulsory (and a goldsmith could not legally operate in Venice without it), the brethren could not default on their allotted contribution without risking official sanction by the Giustizia Vecchia, the guild's supervisory magistracy. This made the obligatory subscriptions unavoidable.

The third occasion that the Goldsmiths' Guild ran out of money was when they came to settle their bill with Campagna. By January 1605 Campagna had received 100 ducats of his original 350 ducat fee for the completed bronze *St Anthony*, but was still owed 250 ducats, a considerable sum. A fascinating motion and ballot record of 26 January 1605 records how all who had seen the finished statue were very pleased but that only 50 ducats remained in their coffers (fig.0.4a-b).¹⁴³ The motion proposed that the 200-ducat balance be paid in kind, '*delli beni nostri*'. This received almost unanimous approval, with the motion carried by 52 votes to 4.¹⁴⁴ What constituted these '*beni*' is unknown, but presumably they were the kinds of goods and materials that the Goldsmiths would have had readily available, namely gemstones, gold or silver objects, or metal.¹⁴⁵ Payments in kind, such as these, were considered acceptable currency and were not uncommon for the settlement of artists' fees when a patron did not have ready money.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁰ Cat.9, docs 9.1 (account-book), 9.6 (ballot to take out a loan), 9.7 (loan agreement), 9.10 (payment in kind agreement).

¹⁴¹ Cat.9, doc.9.6. Contributions appear to have been calculated in correlation with what members could afford to pay.

¹⁴² Cat.9, doc.9.1, fol.133v, [2].

¹⁴³ Cat.9, doc.9.10.

¹⁴⁴ Cat.9, doc.9.10. It was ratified by Antonio Giustinian and Pietro Barbarigo, Provveditori at the Giustizia Vecchia, on 28 January 1605 (ibid., fol.1v).

¹⁴⁵ It is tempting to think that Campagna may have received items similar to the sapphire and silver bucket, which the Goldsmiths gave to the prior of Poveglia in 1599 as an inducement to sell 35 pieces of stone and two marble columns for use in their new altar framework. Cat.9, doc.9.1, fol.124r, [12], [16], [17].

¹⁴⁶ When the monks of Santo Spirito in Isola commissioned a bronze Paschal candelabra (now Santa Maria della Salute) from Andrea de' Alessandri, called Il Bresciano (c.1530–c.1569) for 1,000 ducats in the early 1560s, they were unable to pay him in cash. Instead, he was paid in kind with a variety of valuable objects and wheat from their harvest. For this settlement document discovered by Victoria

Ensuring quality

While the contractual terms and conditions and the payment methods outlined above were the principal ways in which patron and sculptor could seek to protect their investment in a commission, the patron had additional tools at his/her disposal to ensure the quality of the end result. First, it was common to engage the services of a project manager to oversee projects, especially larger ones, if the patron could afford to do so. Such overseers were most often *proti*, such as the architect-cum-stonemason Giangiacomo de' Grigi (fl.1550–72), who was employed by the Procuratori di San Marco de Citra to supervise the construction of the *Montefeltro Altar* in San Francesco della Vigna (fig.1.50). The surviving accounts demonstrate that it was de' Grigi's responsibility to approve the incremental payments made to Vittoria as his carving of the three saints progressed (fig.2.55).¹⁴⁷ One assumes that had the quality and/or rate of Vittoria's work been unacceptable then de' Grigi would not have authorised the payments.¹⁴⁸

Secondly, the patron could insist in the contract that the sculptor sign his work.¹⁴⁹ While this was clearly a measure of the regard in which a sculptor was held, it surely also encouraged work of a higher quality. After all, a sculptor would only have wanted to place his name on a worthy piece of sculpture.¹⁵⁰ As discussed above, the *massari* at the Santo required Sansovino to sign the *Miracle of the Maiden Carilla* (fig.2.2); they also commanded Cattaneo to do so on his relief, commissioned in 1571.¹⁵¹ Likewise, Sansovino was required

Avery, see NA, b.432, fol.236r-v. First published Avery C. 2003, pp.46-61. For non-Venetian examples, see Kemp 1997, pp.35-6, and O'Malley 2005, pp.134-5.

¹⁴⁷ PSM, b.12, fasc.1, 'Procuratori di S. Marco de Citra l^o Commissaria Montefeltro (da) Nicolò qd. Federico civis Venetiarum', account-book entitled '1423–1590' in pencil, fols 23a, 24a. Giangiacomo was the son of Guglielmo de' Grigi, the *proto*-cum-stonemason responsible for the *Altar of the Magdalen*, discussed in this thesis, cat.1, and passim.

¹⁴⁸ That payments could be withheld if there was little or no progress is corroborated by the incidence of monies paid to Sansovino for the Carilla relief discussed earlier in this chapter. As Boucher observed, records show that two-thirds of the fee was paid between 1536 and 1557, and the remainder not until the final settlement was agreed in 1562. Boucher 1991, vol.2, p.337, cat.30.

¹⁴⁹ For further discussion of signatures, see Chapter 4, pp.141-4.

¹⁵⁰ Conversely, a canny sculptor would surely have *wanted* to sign any work he was proud of, especially if it were a prestigious commission, as this was essentially free advertising.

¹⁵¹ The contract with Cattaneo, for example, stated that 'esso mess. Danese sij obligato ad intagliar il suo nome sopra il quadro predetto'. McHam 1994, p.226, doc.76. This is the relief that Campagna completed after his master's death, see above, pp.57-60. No contract with Campagna is known, so we do not know whether the *massari* specifically asked him to sign the relief or not, although he did so prominently on the cloth covering the dais on which the resuscitated youth reclines (HIERONIMVS CAMPAGNA / VERON . SCVLP.).

to sign the two figures of *Hope* and *Charity* for the Venier monument (figs 2.45-2.46), as the new documentation shows (fig.2.47).¹⁵²

Thirdly, a sculptor's desire for future commissions from the same patron may well have prompted him to produce high quality work for a reasonable price and in a timely fashion. It has been suggested that Sansovino may have agreed to complete the *Miracle of the Child Parisio* for the Santo (fig.2.1; begun by Antonio Minello, a much less-gifted sculptor), precisely because he wanted to get a foot in the door with this important patron on the Venetian *terraferma*.¹⁵³ Vittoria certainly seems to have benefited in this way from the self-obsessed Rangone, judging from the numerous commissions he received; from bronze portrait medals (various from c.1551 to c.1558–9; fig.2.56) and the portrait statue for the façade of San Giuliano (1556–7; figs 1.41, 2.57a), to the standing figure of *St Thomas* for the doorway of San Sepolcro (c.1570, fig.1.107) and the bronze portrait bust that crowned the side door of San Geminiano (c.1575, fig.1.108).¹⁵⁴

Finally, there was the psychological incentive of competition. It was not uncommon for more than one sculptor to be employed on a single commission, particularly in larger, more ambitious projects. This practice was undoubtedly motivated by a number of reasons, including the desire/need to complete a commission quickly; economic factors (for example, selecting a more talented sculptor who charged more to execute the key elements and a 'jobbing', cheaper sculptor for the peripheral parts, as with the Cappella di San Sabba in Sant'Antonin); or choosing a sculptor to make whatever he was most gifted at (as with the da Ponte monument).¹⁵⁵ Two notable examples of this practice are the Cappella del Rosario, in Santi Giovanni e Paolo (begun mid-1580s) for which the *scuola* simultaneously employed the rival workshops of Vittoria and Campagna (fig.2.58), and the balustrade figures for St Mark's Library (1588–91, fig.1.19), for which nine sculptors were contracted, including Campagna, Aspetti and Camillo Mariani (c.1565–1611).¹⁵⁶ However, this division of labour could benefit

¹⁵² Cat.4, doc.4.11.

¹⁵³ Boucher 1991, vol.1, p.95.

¹⁵⁴ For the medals, see Trent 1999, pp.267-9 (cats 41-4, by Leithe-Jasper). For the San Giuliano commission, see the references in Chapter 1, note 24. Although there is no documentation for the *St Thomas*, the doorway concession was given to Rangone on 20 April 1570: NA, b.8184, fols 668v-669r. First cited Gallo 1957, p.105; first published in full Avery 1999a, p.241, doc.76. For the San Geminiano bust, see Martin T. 1998, pp.123-4 (cat.20); and pp.125-6 (cat.21) for the surviving terracotta model which Rangone retained until his death. The doorway was designed by Vittoria and executed by Francesco de Bernardin Smeraldi. For the 1571 contract, see NA, b.8168, fol.157r-v. First published Avery 1999a, pp.247-8, doc.80(ii).

¹⁵⁵ See above, pp.70-71; and 55 respectively.

¹⁵⁶ For the Rosary Chapel, see Avery 2001a, and Pavanello 2012, pp.284-327 (various authors). For the library balustrade statues, see Ivanoff 1964, pp.107-12. The sculptors were: Tiziano Aspetti,

the patron even further: pitting rival sculptors against one another could no doubt help to deter poor workmanship and dilatoriness, as one sought to outdo the other. That rivalries existed is confirmed by Campagna's letter of 1604 which opened this chapter, in which he memorably boasts of having beaten Vittoria (and the other bidding sculptors) to re-make the Santo's high altar.¹⁵⁷ While Campagna's work for the Santo was arguably crucial in launching his long and successful career, it is perhaps a little surprising that his triumph over Vittoria should still have resonated with him so strongly, some 25 years after having won the commission, and many prestigious projects later, especially as his esteemed rival was by then an enfeebled old man, who had officially stopped carving almost a decade earlier.¹⁵⁸

As we have seen, choosing and contracting a sculptor could prove tricky terrain and was a process that required a degree of trust between patron and sculptor. Having reached this point, the patron now had to secure the necessary materials. But what factors did the patron have to consider when making his/her material choices? The next chapter assesses the potentially complex processes of sourcing and supplying sculptural materials, as well as their significance to both the patron and to wider Venetian society.

Girolamo Campagna, Francesco Caracha, Francesco Casella, Bernardin de' Quadri, Antonio Gazin, Camillo Mariani, Agostino Rubini and Vigilio Rubini.

¹⁵⁷ See note 1.

¹⁵⁸ It is widely recognised that the Santo commissions which Campagna gained in the early years of his career were essential to his career development. See, for example, Boucher 1991, vol.1, p.171; and McHam 1994, p.61. That Vittoria had stopped carving by 1604 is confirmed by his removal from the members' list of the Stonemasons' Guild on 21 February 1597. Avery 1999a, p.339, doc.140.

III. MATERIALS: SOURCING, SUPPLY, SIGNIFICANCE

[...] a beautiful and marvellous building-material is the hard stone which is brought from Rovigno and Brioni, a citadel on the Dalmatian coast. It is white in colour and like marble, but sound and strong, of a kind that resists frost and sun for a very long time. Therefore they make statues from it which are polished with felt to look like marble; then they are rubbed with pumice and resemble marble. Entire church and palace façades are embellished with tall columns as thick and long as one desires, made from single blocks because these Rovigno quarries have an abundance of this kind of stone which writers call Istrian or 'Liburnica'.¹

Francesco Sansovino, *Venetia città nobilissima et singolare*, 1581

Istrian stone—the ubiquitous limestone of Venice's architecture and sculpture—was the material of choice for building projects throughout the period, and was used extensively for figurative and ornamental sculpture in both internal and external settings.² It was not, of course, the only material favoured by patrons and sculptors: sculpture, after all, afforded patrons a greater range of choices than painting and the material used was inextricably linked to the choice of genre, scale and setting. The practicalities behind patrons' material choices are an important, if neglected aspect of commissioning sculpture in Venice.³ In addition to Istrian stone, the most commonly employed sculptural materials were marble, bronze and other types of stone sourced from the *terraferma*, and the focus of this chapter reflects this. How marble and stone were sourced and supplied is considered, as well as

¹ 'Ma bella & mirabil cosa è la materia delle pietre vive, che sono condotte da Rovigno, & da Brioni, castella in riviera della Dalmatia, sono di color bianco, & simili al marmo: ma salde & forti di maniera che durano per lunghissimo tempo a i ghiacci, & al sole: onde ne fanno statue: le quali polite col feltro a guisa del marmo, poi che sono pomciate, hanno sembianza di marmo. Et di queste così fatte si incrostano le faccie intere delle chiese & de i palazzi, con colonne alte, grosse, & lunghe di un pezzo quanto si vuole: perché le cave di Rovigno abbondano di questa sorte di pietra, chiamata Istriana, & Liburnica da gli scrittori.' Sansovino 1581, pp.140v-141r (translation: Jennifer Fletcher in Chambers and Pullan 2001, p.24). As Strupp observed, it is perhaps unsurprising that Francesco, son of Jacopo Sansovino, should have been sensitive to the practical and aesthetic qualities of materials used in sculptural and architectural contexts. Strupp 1993b, pp.7-8.

² Istrian stone was used to clad brick-built structures in Venice, and was also employed for architectural elements, such as door and window frames, lintels and gutters.

³ Not the case with architecture and the building trade, where these practical issues have received greater attention, particularly for the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. See, for example, Connell 1988; Dalla Costa and Feiffer 1981; Gianighian and Pavanini 1984; Caniato and Dal Borgo 1990; and Goy 2006.

quality assurance and the associated costs of acquiring and transporting these materials to the lagoon city. A comparable, in-depth analysis of bronze follows, with a briefer overview of the less prestigious and less frequently used stucco and clay. The chapter concludes with an assessment of the pragmatic, aesthetic and societal factors that may have influenced a patron when selecting sculptural materials in the Serenissima.

The Materials and the Practicalities

Marble and Stone

In sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Venice, white marble, Istrian stone and a white limestone known as *bronzo da Verona* were the most popular marble and stone for figure sculpture, while coloured, veined and variegated varieties were extensively employed for architectonic and ornamental elements.⁴

White marble

One of the most favoured materials for figure sculpture in sixteenth-century Venice was white marble. While translucent Parian marble from Greece was greatly revered and by the sixteenth century had achieved an almost mythical status,⁵ the marble quarried in the environs of Carrara in the Apuan Alps was much more readily available (figs 3.1-3.2).⁶ Carrara marble was highly valued for its 'milky tone', to paraphrase Vasari, and general lack of veining and imperfections.⁷ It had been used for figure sculpture in Venice since the fourteenth century, but gained rapidly in popularity from the late fifteenth century onwards,⁸ featuring prominently, for example, in funerary monuments and sculpted altars (fig.3.3).

⁴ For a geological summary of the marble and stone commonly used in architectural and sculptural contexts in Venice, see Lazzarini 1986, pp.93-100.

⁵ The Florentine sculptor, Benvenuto Cellini, for example, described Parian marble as being 'la più unita, la più gentile et la più bella che si possa lavorare'. Cellini 1568, p.55v. Sansovino, in his 1581 guidebook, commenting on Greek marbles used in architectural contexts in Venice, noted that 'Ci sono anco delle faccie coperte di marmi fini, ma grechi, portati dall'Isoli dell'Arcipelago, & spetialmente di Paro, ma non cosi bianco come il comune, & differente assai dal marmo di Carrara in Toscana'. Sansovino 1581, p.141r. Greek marbles had long been imported into Venice from the eastern Mediterranean as well as appropriated and recycled from ancient cities on the *Terraferma*. Connell 1988, p.111. For further discussion of Parian marble, see *ibid.*, p.115; and Gnoli 1988, pp.261-2.

⁶ For the business of marble quarrying in Carrara, see Klapisch-Zuber 1969. For its geological composition and usage, see Rodolico 1953, pp.260-4; and Gnoli 1988, p.265.

⁷ 'the most abundant kind is pure white and milky in tone.' Vasari 1568, vol.1, p.16 (translation: Vasari-Maclehose 1960, p.45).

⁸ Connell 1988, pp.114-5, 142; and Strupp 1993b, p.10.

Likewise, it was often the material of choice for ideal, real and historicising portrait busts and reliefs (fig.1.23).⁹

Istrian stone

Istrian stone, a fine-grained, compact limestone imported exclusively into Venice from the coastal quarries of Venetian-controlled Istria (modern-day Croatia) was a common choice. In terms of quality, abundance and size of block, the best that could be excavated was known as Rovigno stone, coming from quarries near Rovigno and at Orsera (fig.3.4). The second-best came from Pola and the nearby Brioni islands, and the third-best from Cittanova and Porto di Quieto.¹⁰ Turning bright white when exposed to the elements, it was well-suited to external use, and was able to withstand the vagaries of the lagoon climate much better than marble, with the best sort virtually waterproof.

Bronzo da Verona

Bronzo da Verona, another fine-grained, white limestone, came from Verona and was praised by Vasari as 'that white hard stone which from the sound it makes when it is worked is called bronze. And truly this is the most beautiful type of stone, after fine marble, that has been found to date, being completely hard and without holes or blemishes that ruin it'.¹¹ It was particularly favoured for statuary, as Scamozzi attested in his architectural treatise of 1615, describing *bronzo da Verona* as 'marvellous for making statues, like the two Colossi in the vestibule of the Zecca' (figs 2.21, 3.5).¹² Indeed, Scamozzi thought it was 'much more beautiful' than Istrian stone.¹³ It was used both externally and internally, as can be seen in the *Christ* of c.1581 by Vittoria on the exterior façade of Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari

⁹ For the development of ideal portrait sculpture in Venice, see Luchs 1995. For 'real' portrait sculpture, see Martin T. 1998.

¹⁰ The stone quarried at Cittanova and Porto di Quieto was generally used to make lime. For further discussion of Istrian quarries and the different grades of stone, see Scamozzi 1615, vol.2, Book 7, Chapter 8, pp.198-9; and Chapter 9, pp.204-5; Rodolico 1953, pp.198-207; Connell 1988, pp.89-94; and Goy 2006, p.80.

¹¹ 'Quella pietra viva e bianca, che per lo suono che rende quando si lavora, è [...] chiamata bronzo. E nel vero questa è la più bella sorte di pietra che dopo il marmo fino sia stata trovata insino a'tempi nostri, essendo tutta soda e senza buchi o macchie che la guastino.' Vasari 1568, vol.3, p.518. Part-cited Davis 2003a, p.98.

¹² 'Queste sono meravigliose per far statue, e come i due Colossi nel Vestibulo della Zecca quì in Venetia.' Scamozzi 1615, vol.2, Book 7, Chapter 8, p.199. Part-cited Davis 2003a, p.98. For the colossal figures by Aspetti and Campagna at the Scamozzi-designed entrance to Venice's Mint, see Benacchio Flores d'Arcais 1931, pp.111-15; and Timofiewitsch 1972, pp.32, 33, 256-7 (cat.14).

¹³ 'molto più belle.' Scamozzi 1615, vol.2, Book 7, Chapter 8, p.199.

(fig.3.6); and the *Madonna and Child with Angels* of 1595 by Campagna in San Giorgio Maggiore (fig.2.44).¹⁴

‘Pietra di paragone’

‘Pietra di paragone’ is a uniformly black stone, known as touchstone in English. The *paragone* employed in Venice originated from a variety of regions, including the hills above Bergamo in the Venetian *terraferma* and from Flanders.¹⁵ On occasion, it was used for statuary, as exemplified by the over life-size figures of *St Lawrence* and *St Jerome* on the Priuli monument in San Salvador (figs 3.7-3.8).¹⁶ It could be highly polished and featured frequently in commissions in the latter part of the sixteenth century, particularly in funerary monuments, for epitaphs, and tomb slabs. It was employed to great dramatic effect in Vittoria’s *Altar of the Crucifix* for the Scuola di San Fantin (c.1582) where it provided the architectonic structure for the confraternity’s much revered late fifteenth-century black-painted wooden crucifix and Vittoria’s flanking darkly-patinated bronze figures of the *Mourning Virgin* and *Mourning St John the Evangelist* (figs 1.75-1.77).¹⁷ As the *scuola*’s state-appointed role was to provide spiritual comfort to those condemned to death and ensure a suitable funeral and burial post-execution, the choice of sombre ‘pietra di paragone’ was utterly appropriate.

Other marble and stone

Other types of marble and stone were also used extensively for architectural and ornamental elements of sculptural commissions. Those that appear most frequently in the archival records and contemporary descriptions, and which can still be seen throughout Venice include Verona stone, coloured and veined marbles, and precious stones, such as red porphyry and green serpentine.

¹⁴ For the former, see Avery 1996, vol.2, pp.549-50 (cat.101). For the latter, see Chapter 1, note 67.

¹⁵ Ferber 1776, p.217; and Ure 1840, p.801 for the stone quarried at Bergamo. For greater specificity about sources for this stone on the Venetian mainland and further afield, see Lazzarini 1986, pp.93-4. The surviving records for the late Cinquecento rebuilding of San Giorgio Maggiore, for example, include a contract of February 1597 for ‘pietra di paragone’ ordered by the Benedictines from one Antonio Beltrame from Salò (close to Bergamo and Brescia). SGM, b.21, proc.10a, ‘Libro fabbrica’, fol.36r. Scamozzi praised the mountains in the Riviera di Salò region for its abundant supply of ‘marmi nerissimi, [...] che ricevono un pulimento, e lustro mirabile’: Scamozzi 1615, vol.2, Book 7, Chapter 5, p.190.

¹⁶ For relevant bibliography, see Chapter 1, note 15.

¹⁷ For this commission, see Chapter 1, pp.33-4, 39-40.

Verona stone

Verona stone—or Verona marble as it is often called—ranges from red-pink to creamy-grey in colour. Originating from the Adige valley, north of Verona, it was widely used all over Venice for architectural mouldings, paving, and steps, for example, in public and private settings.¹⁸ Red-pink Verona stone coupled with either the creamy-grey variety or with Istrian stone was a popular choice for the chequerboard paving found in many churches, such as that in Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, San Giorgio Maggiore, San Giuseppe di Castello and San Lorenzo (fig.3.9-3.10).¹⁹ The red-pink varieties take on a much brighter hue when polished but fade after prolonged exposure to the elements. Perhaps most famously, red Verona stone (turned pink through weathering) was combined with gleaming white Istrian stone to dazzling effect on the façade of the Palazzo Ducale (fig.1.20).²⁰ It also serves as a particularly beautiful and eye-catching backdrop to the aforementioned *bronzo da Verona Madonna and Child with Angels* by Campagna (fig.2.44).

Coloured, veined and variegated marbles and precious stones

Coloured, veined and variegated marbles were used extensively, usually for columns, capitals and bases, revetments and other architectural and ornamental details, with the most prominent example being the marble-clad ducal chapel of San Marco (fig.3.11).²¹ In the late fifteenth century, there were numerous building projects making lavish use of such marbles, such as Santa Maria dei Miracoli (1481–9; fig.3.12a-b) and the Scuola Grande di San Marco

¹⁸ As Sansovino noted: ‘Le pietre poi da Verona ci sono in stima, perché essendo rosse: & con macchie diverse, apportano vaghezza à gli edifici, & di queste si fanno i suoli delle Chiese, & de i palazzi, à guisa di Scacchi, & se ne fanno altri lavori, che riescono molto gentili, come acquari, camini, cornici, & cose altre somiglianti’. Sansovino 1581, p.141r. Part-cited Strupp 1993b, p.14.

¹⁹ The flooring in the now semi-derelict San Lorenzo was replaced in the twentieth century, but some of the much thicker, higher quality Verona stone slabs from the early seventeenth-century paving remain on the steps of the double-sided high altar. Cicogna 1824–53, vol.2, p.372, notes that this flooring was installed under the governance of Abbess Andriana Contarini (in post 1615–18), who also oversaw the production of the high altar. I am most grateful to Dino Verlato for kindly facilitating access to San Lorenzo in December 2013.

²⁰ Discussed further by Hills 1999, pp.65-8.

²¹ The Venetian patrician, Pietro Contarini, in his *Argo voluptas* of 1541, for example, highly praised the coloured marbles embellishing San Marco: Contarini 1541, pp.25v-36r. For an Italian translation, see Contarini 1542, Book 3 (n.p.). For further discussion, see Connell 1988, pp.109-10 and Barry 2006, p.501. For the Venetian taste for coloured marble and stone, see Connell 1988, pp.109-37 (fourteenth and fifteenth centuries); Strupp 1993b (the situation c.1500); Barry 2006, pp.361-418 (San Marco), 458-69 (chapels up to c.1530), 507-14 (palaces); and Howard 2013, pp.97-8. For marble revetments in Renaissance Venice, see Wolters 2007, pp.54-66. For the Venetian love of colour generally, see Hills 1999.

(1488–1500; fig.1.65).²² Further embellishment was often added through the insertion of smaller pieces of more precious stones, such as alabaster, red porphyry and green serpentine.²³ A prominent late fifteenth-century example of this sort of lavish decoration is the now destroyed Chapel of the Saviour (completed 1494) formerly in Santa Maria della Carità.²⁴ Lauded by the Venetian diarist Marin Sanudo (1466–1536) as one of the most notable things to see in Venice in the mid-1490s, and by the patrician writer and art collector Marcantonio Michiel (1484–1552) in the sixteenth century,²⁵ the chapel was still considered worthy of high praise when Sansovino published his guidebook almost a century after its completion.²⁶ This predilection for coloured marbles and stone in architectural and sculptural settings continued well into the sixteenth century, as can be seen in the lavish high altar of San Rocco (1517–24),²⁷ the exterior of the adjacent Scuola Grande di San Rocco (1517–60; fig.3.13),²⁸ the Cappella Emiliana at San Michele in Isola (1528–43; fig.1.49),²⁹ and the *Monument to Doge Francesco Venier* in San Salvador (1555–61; fig.1.42).³⁰

Sourcing and supply

Documentary evidence shows that patrons approached the sourcing and supply of marble and stone in a number of ways. A common route was to charge a principal contractor with the task. This could be the *proto* (if the patron had employed one to oversee the project), the lead stonemason, or very occasionally for the sculpted elements, the sculptor. In July 1578,

²² For the former, see Piana and Wolters 2003. For the latter, see Sohm 1981.

²³ For alabaster in the broader European context, see Penny 1993, pp.60-7; and Sanderson and Cheetham 2009. For porphyry in Venice, see Lazzarini 1986, p.96; more generally, see Gnoli 1988, pp.122-44; and for the revived art of porphyry carving in Renaissance Florence, see Butters 1996. For green serpentine, see Lazzarini 1986, p.99.

²⁴ The chapel's altar was further adorned with a bronze figure of *Christ the Redeemer*, now in the Museo Poldi Pezzoli, Milan, for which see Avery 2011, p.112.

²⁵ Sanudo-Caracciolo Aricò 1980, p.50; and Frimmel 1896, pp.231-2. For further discussion of this commission and Michiel's response to it, see Lauber 1999, pp.147-8.

²⁶ Sansovino described the chapel as 'notabilissima fra tutte l'altre della città, edificata da Domenico di Pietro gioielliero ricchissimo, & antiquario, con marmi, con porfidi, & con serpentini molto alla grande'. Sansovino 1581, p.96v.

²⁷ Schulz 1984, pp.257-62; and Strupp 1993a, pp.28-30, 119, 124-5, 221-4. For the archival documents, see Paoletti 1893-7, parte 2, p.124.

²⁸ For the *scuola*'s construction history, see Guidarelli 2003; Guidarelli 2004; and De Maria 2010, pp.51-63.

²⁹ The chapel's extensive conservation, undertaken by Venice in Peril (1999–2006), revealed that 37 types of coloured marble and stone were used in its construction and decoration. See <http://www.veniceinperil.org/projects/san-michele-in-isola-cappella-emiliana>. Accessed 14 June 2014.

³⁰ Cat.4.

for example, the Scuola del SS. Sacramento of San Giuliano contracted the stonemason-cum-*proto*, Cesare Franco, to provide all the marble and stone for its new altar and to execute the architectural and ornamental carving, as well as the sculpture (fig.2.16).³¹ An advance of 100 ducats was paid out of the agreed fee of 480 so that Franco could purchase the necessary stone.³² It was standard practice throughout the period to advance money for such materials in agreements of this sort.

A second route patrons could follow was to oversee the sourcing and supply of stone and marble more personally, and employ the stonemason and/or sculptor on a labour-only basis. This is how the Procuratori di San Marco de Citra chose to proceed in December 1523 when they commissioned the *Altar of the Magdalen* for Santa Maria dei Servi (fig.1.46).³³ The surviving account-book records in great detail the various acquisitions of Istrian stone and marble, as well as pieces of alabaster, porphyry and serpentine (fig.3.14).³⁴

A third, quite common route for the patron was a combination of the two outlined above: namely, delegating the purchase of some materials, such as the cheaper, more readily available Istrian stone, while selecting and purchasing others directly, especially the more costly marbles and precious hard stones. Surviving documents suggest that this was often the case for large, complex commissions, such as the Cappella del Rosario in Santi Giovanni e Paolo (begun mid-1580s; fig.2.58) and the Cappella di San Sabba in Sant'Antonin (begun 1591; fig.2.36).

While most stonemasons would have held a certain amount of stone as stock-in-trade in their yards in Venice, larger volumes—and certainly more costly marbles—would have been shipped in as needed from stonemasons and traders on the *terraferma* (for example, from the quarries around Verona) and Istrian territories, or from further afield, such as the quarries of Carrara.³⁵ There was, after all, limited physical space in Venice and even the most successful stonemason or sculptor would not have wanted all his capital tied up in

³¹ 'Nel presente giorno li Magnifici Gastaldo et compagni della scola del Santissimo Sacramento di San Giuliano, sono convenuti con Maestro Cesare di Francho Tagliapietra, stà à San Benetto, chel li habbia à far un'altare à tutte sue spese di pietra, et fattura di quadro, di taglio, et ancho di scoltura.' BMCV, CI.IV, 164, Mariegola della scuola del SS. Sacramento a San Giuliano, fol. 32. First published Mason Rinaldi 1975–6, pp.453–4, doc.3.

³² '[...] che al presente sue magnificie li diano ducati cento alla mano al ditto Mistro Cesare per comprar pietra et altro.' BMCV, CI.IV, 164, fol.33.

³³ Cat.1.

³⁴ Cat.1, doc.1.3. For example, see entries: [12]–[21] Istrian stone; [70], [80] marble; [6] porphyry, serpentine and other 'piere [sic] fine'; and [168] gift of marble, serpentine, alabaster and porphyry.

³⁵ For the supply of stone and marble into Venice in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, see Connell 1988, pp.96–108 (Istrian stone), 140–2 (Verona stone), and 142 (Carrara marble). See also Dalla Costa and Feiffer 1981, pp.75–84 (Istrian and Verona stone); and Goy 2006, pp.79–81. For a general discussion of sourcing and supplying marble across Renaissance Italy: Bresc-Bautier 2007.

materials: it was simply not economically expedient to do so. Whatever the supply route, documents show that if a patron so desired, marble and stone could be procured from the point of origin either rough-hewn, dressed, or blocked out,³⁶ and even ready carved in the case of architectural or decorative elements.³⁷ The advantage of having marble and stone undergo a certain amount of preparation in advance meant less weight and thus lower transport costs.³⁸

In addition to these supply methods, there is ample evidence of other avenues for obtaining marble and precious stone. Some Venetian patricians personally traded in marble, stone and other building materials, although to what extent is hard to determine. Richard Goy, in his research on fifteenth-century Venetian building practices, noted the involvement of branches of the Dolfin, Morosini, Corner, Barbarigo, and Trevisan families in these trading activities, to cite but a few.³⁹ In the sixteenth century, some of these families' names continue to crop up: one Zuanne Corner sold marble for the Cappella di San Sabba in December 1591,⁴⁰ while members of the Dolfin family are documented as having supplied Carrara marble for both Campagna's renovation of the Santo high altar in 1581,⁴¹ and his statue of Federico da Montefeltro for the Duke of Urbino in 1604.⁴²

Evidence suggests that the sale of single pieces of marble, such as blocks, slabs and columns, by vendors outside the stone and marble trading business was common. Highly-valued Greek marble (usually in the form of columns) and pieces of porphyry, serpentine and alabaster tended to be purchased from within Venice and her islands, as opposed to patrons

³⁶ For a general discussion of rough-hewn and dressed Istrian stone up to the early sixteenth century, see Connell 1988, pp.98 and 100.

³⁷ In 1590, the Scuola Grande di San Rocco went so far as to order four columns from Carrara ready carved and polished, for which see note 56 below.

³⁸ In 1598, for example, when Marino Grimani ordered white and variegated marble from Carrara and Seravezza for his funerary monument, he had his marble supplied blocked out. For reference to this 'marmi fatti cavare et abbozzare', see cat.8, doc.8.6, [1].

³⁹ Goy 2006, p.79.

⁴⁰ Tiepolo 'Libro dei conti', fol.1a. First published Mason Rinaldi 1976–7, p.203. See also Tiepolo 'Spese', fol.6v. First published Avery 2010, p.170, doc.14.

⁴¹ A letter of 21 February 1581 from Campagna to Bartolomeo Selvatico in Padua and a notarial act of 27 December 1581 confirm negotiations with 'Procurator Delfin [sic]' for the supply of Carrara marble for the Santo high altar. See cat.6, doc.6.1 and Sartori-Fillarini 1976, p.44 respectively.

⁴² The first contract of 26 April 1604 between Campagna and the Duke of Urbino for the Montefeltro statue figure records that the Duke's agent would pay the Dolfin 150 ducats for the requisite marble: 'Et il marmoro esso Signor Abbate [Giulio Brunetti, the Duke's agent] doverà pagar alli Clrissimi Signori Dolfini, il pretio del quale è ducati cento cinquanta da lire 6 soldi 4 per ducato.' NA, b.3378, fols 255v-256r, at fol.256r. For a similarly worded agreement dated 8 May 1604 for the same commission, see Calzini, 1899, pp.21-2, note 2, doc.I.

actively seeking them from elsewhere.⁴³ While the origin of these materials is rarely recorded, they may well have been surplus from a recently completed commission, or remnants from a demolition or renovation project. Certainly, much of the precious marble and stone would have come to the city as *spolia*, removed from ancient sites across Venice's dominion, such as Aquileia and Dalmatia, or via its trade routes throughout the *stato da mar* and the Middle East (figs 3.15-3.16).⁴⁴

In addition to patricians, it was not unusual for parish priests, religious houses and lay confraternities to sell off pieces of unwanted marble and stone. On 9 April 1499, for example, the parish priest of Sant'Agnese sold two columns of Greek marble to the overseers of the Cappella Bernabò in San Giovanni Crisostomo (fig.0.26).⁴⁵ A century later, in August and September 1599, the Prior of San Vitale on the lagoon island of Poveglia sold some 35 pieces of stone and two marble columns to the Goldsmiths' Guild, which was then planning its new altar (figs 3.17-3.18).⁴⁶ State magistracies might also sell off materials surplus to requirements. In 1524, for example, the Salt Office sold a large piece of marble worth 20 ducats to the Procuratori di San Marco de Citra for the Magdalen statue that was destined for Verde della Scala's new altar at the Servi (figs 1.47, 2.35).⁴⁷ On occasion, especially in the case of corporate patrons, the materials may have already been *in situ*. This was the case in July 1554 when the overseers of the fabric of the Palazzo Ducale decided that two enormous pieces of marble previously earmarked for the doge's private apartments should instead be transformed into a pair of colossal statues representing *Mars* and *Neptune* to adorn the courtyard's grand staircase, with the prestigious commission being awarded to Sansovino (figs 1.87, 2.18-2.19).⁴⁸

Quality Assurance

But how could a patron ensure the quality of the marble and stone he was buying? A trusted mechanism was the written contract and a number between patrons and suppliers of marble and stone survive. While some are more detailed than others—usually an indication of the

⁴³ On 17 December 1523, for example, one Anzola Priuli, widow of the nobleman Carlo Priuli sold the Procuratori di San Marco de Citra 21 pieces of porphyry and serpentine for the *Altar of the Magdalen* in the Servi for 9 ducats. Cat.1, doc.1.3, [6].

⁴⁴ For Venice's early appropriation of a vast range of *spolia*, and a discussion of some of the pieces used to embellish San Marco, see Brown 1996a, pp.3-6, 17-24.

⁴⁵ Davis 2007b, p.57, entry [2]. For this commission, see Davis 2007a.

⁴⁶ Cat.9, doc.9.1, fol.124r, [16]-[17].

⁴⁷ Cat.1, doc.1.3, [80].

⁴⁸ 'Ritrovandosi in questa città dui pezzi di marmoro de longhezza de piedi X incirca luno, fatti qui condur per quelli che hebbero il carico di far la stantia del palazzo che habita li Serenissimi Principi, con animo di far fare in quelli due figure de ziganti da esser posti per adornamento di esso palazzo [...].' Boucher 1991, vol.1, p.224, doc.226.

fastidiousness of the patron—they all describe the requisite qualities of the materials to be supplied. On 13 March 1595, for example, the Benedictines of San Giorgio Maggiore drew up an agreement with Alessio Cecchin, a stonemason from Verona, to supply a variety of stone for the altar of the sacristy of their new church as well as a large piece of *bronzo da Verona* for Campagna's aforementioned *Madonna and Child* (fig.2.44), which had to be 'white, beautiful and without any blemishes'.⁴⁹ This contract was witnessed by Campagna (who had been contracted to produce the *Madonna and Child* on 12 March 1595) and Bortolo di Domenico, a stonemason and long-term employee in the construction of the new church (who had been commissioned to make the sacristy altar on 11 March 1595).⁵⁰ The presence of both sculptor and stonemason was presumably deliberate, given that they had the requisite knowledge and skill to advise on the specifics of the stone required and would have been able to confirm upon delivery whether the stone supplied fulfilled Cecchin's contractual obligations.⁵¹ A patron might also insist on examining the marble and stone before it was installed, as Maria Massa did in her contract of 20 August 1570 for the now-destroyed monument to her late father, the physician Niccolò Massa (1489–1569), with the stonemason-cum-*proto*, Francesco di Bernardin Smeraldi, in San Domenico di Castello.⁵²

The best way, of course, to ensure maximum control over the quality of stone and marble supplied was to cut out the middleman and go direct to the source. As Connell observed with regard to the supply of Istrian stone in the fifteenth century, opting for this method could give the patron access to better quality materials at a cheaper price.⁵³ In this case, the patron might nominate a trusted third party to oversee the selection of marble and stone on his/her behalf. This might be the *proto* or the project's principal stonemason, or someone independent of the actual commission, such as another stonemason or sculptor. In 1559, for example, Cattaneo was sent by the Procuratori di San Marco de Supra to Caneva to fetch two pieces of marble intended for two statues for San Marco.⁵⁴ Forty years later, the Goldsmiths' Guild paid two stonemasons, 'Zuane Tagliapietra' and 'Domenigo Tagliapietra',

⁴⁹ '[...] un pezzo di pietra di bronzo di longhezza piedi sei, larghezza piedi tre, di grossezza piedi duoi, bianca, bella, e senza macula alcuna.' SGM, b.21, proc.10a, 'Libro fabbrica', fol.25v. Part-published Timofiewitsch 1972, p.264.

⁵⁰ For the contract with Campagna, see SGM, b.21, proc.10a, 'Libro fabbrica', fol.30r-v. For that with Bortolo, see *ibid.*, fol.24v.

⁵¹ For Bortolo's role at San Giorgio, see Cooper 2005, p.115.

⁵² 'Con patto espresso, che inanci che le ditte pierre et collone siano poste in oppera sia obligago à farli veder [...] à chi à essa piacerà, se saranno della qualita, et bontà ut supra'. IRE, Sacco no.2, Q. Maria Massa, ZIT E 29, 7. I am grateful to Victoria Avery for kindly bringing this document to my attention.

⁵³ Connell 1988, p.103.

⁵⁴ Cecchetti and Ongania 1886, p.216, doc.877. Cattaneo may have been recommended for the job by his friend and erstwhile master, Jacopo Sansovino, *proto* to the procurators.

to accompany some of their brethren on a visit to Poveglia to assess the marble and stone before committing to buying them.⁵⁵

For large quantities of materials coming to Venice from further afield, such as marbles from the Apuan Alps, the services of an agent might be employed, as Doge Marino Grimani did when planning his funerary monument in San Giuseppe di Castello (fig.1.39). A certain Orazio Bargellini, who lived in Florence, acted as Grimani's agent, overseeing the selection, preparation and supply of white marble from Polvaccio and variegated marbles from Seravezza.⁵⁶ In his lengthy report to the Cancelliere grande, Galeazzo Secco, Bargellini listed all of the marbles purchased, sorted by their provenance and proposed usage (for example, columns, capitals, friezes and sarcophagi), together with their respective sizes and prices (figs 3.19-3.20).⁵⁷ Bargellini also detailed his efforts in negotiating prices, arranging transportation, and haggling over taxes, as well as the travel and living expenses for him and his assistants over the 20-month period it had taken to do the job (fig.3.21).⁵⁸ The doge, who from his voluminous account-books appears to have been a meticulous man, also paid the Paduan sculptor, Tiziano Aspetti, to examine the marbles alongside Bargellini.⁵⁹

It should be remembered that it was not the sole responsibility of the patron to ensure the supply and use of good quality stone and marble. The Stonemasons' Guild—to which all sculptors active in Venice had to belong—had rules governing the quality, supply and use of stone. Indeed, any member found to be in contravention of these State-approved statutes could face sanction from the guild, or when larger sums of money were involved, from the Giustizia Vecchia, the guild's supervisory magistracy.⁶⁰ Statute 39, for example, decreed that

⁵⁵ Cat.9, doc.9.1, fol.124r, [4]-[5].

⁵⁶ Cat.8, docs 8.3, 8.4 and 8.6. As observed by Timofiewitsch, Bargellini had previously been employed by a Venice-based patron in 1590 when the Scuola Grande di San Rocco charged him to supply the aforementioned four columns for its new high altar. Timofiewitsch 1996, p.199, note 15.

⁵⁷ Cat.8, doc.8.6, [1]-[20].

⁵⁸ Cat.8, doc.8.6, [22]-[45].

⁵⁹ Cat.8, doc.8.6, [31]. Aspetti seems to have inspected the marbles being purchased by the Scuola Grande di San Rocco at the same time. In a letter of 26 July 1603 from the Duke of Urbino's Venetian agent, Giulio Brunetti, to the Duke's secretary, Giulio Giordani, about obtaining marble for a statue of Federico da Montefeltro, he mentions that 'il sodetto Titiano [Aspetti] andò [to Carrara] per quei di San Rocco'. Gronau 1936, p.241, doc.CCCLXXX. For the marble ordered by the Scuola at the same time as Grimani's, see note 76 below.

⁶⁰ For the Giustizia Vecchia and its supervision of trade guilds, see Mackenney 1987, pp.9-10. For particular reference to the Stonemasons' Guild, see Caniato and Dal Borgo 1990, pp.35-6; and Goy 2006, p.37.

stonemasons should sell stone with its place of origin and quality made explicit to buyers or risk being penalised by the *Giustizia Vecchia*.⁶¹

Cost

It is difficult to assess the cost of marble and stone accurately over the period in question, as there are so many variables to take into account. Quite apart from the fragmentary nature of the archival record, the wide range of people and places from which marble and stone were procured and the differing regional systems of currency and measurement make meaningful comparisons of prices problematic to say the least. Nor does it help that the surviving archival documents are riddled with inconsistencies in terms of how purchases were actually recorded. For example, many documents omit the size and/or weight of the marble and stone acquired—often only recording the number of pieces bought, from whom and what they cost.⁶² Nor do they always specify the exact type of stone or marble being acquired, so it is not always evident, for example, whether it was the better Istrian stone from Rovigno or the cheaper sort from Pola.⁶³ Whether the marble and stone had been purchased through an intermediary or imported directly into Venice by the patron would equally have affected the price. Marble and stone imported for re-sale would surely have been more expensive for the patron as the seller would have wanted to turn a profit and recoup his importation costs. Other factors, such as fluctuating levels of supply and demand, inflation, political and economic upheaval, outbreaks of war, disease, and bad weather no doubt also affected the price of marble and stone as they did other raw materials, especially copper and tin used in

⁶¹ 'Anchora volemo et ordinemo che ciascadun dela predita arte sia tegnudo et debia quando el vende piere, overo alcun lavorier de piera vender quello con el suo proprio nome, cioe de Puola, de Parenzo, o de Ruigno, o sia de ciascadum altro luogo, o, natura. Et similmente vender salde per salde, vitiade per vitiade, e rotte per rotte cum pena ala voluntade et arbitrio deli Signori Iusticier.' BMCV, CI.IV, 150, *Arte dei Tagliapietra*, fols 26v-27r. Also see Connell 1988, pp.93-4 (citing Monticolo's published transcription). For the original Latin guild statutes (drawn up in 1307), see Monticolo 1896–1914, vol.3, pp.249-58; for part-publication of the Italian translations and later additions, see *ibid.*, pp.259-64. The latter were also part-published in Sagredo 1856, pp.281-310. For further discussion of the Stonemasons' Guild and its statutes, see Caniato and Dal Borgo 1990, pp.159-78.

⁶² For example, the account-book entry for the Goldsmiths' Guild's purchase of marble and stone from Poveglia discussed above only records the number of pieces bought (35), not their weight. Cat.9, doc.9.1, fol.124r, [16].

⁶³ For example, the contract of 29 December 1592 between Francesco Tiepolo and stonemason Angelo Tentin to provide and install the Istrian stone for the two funerary monuments in the Cappella di San Sabba, Sant'Antonin. This detailed contract specifies only that the stone should be 'tutto di piera Istriana bella'. Tiepolo 'Spese', fol.33r-v. First published Avery 1999a, pp.334-5, doc.133(iv). This oversight is atypical for Tiepolo, whose surviving records for the chapel project show him to have been a particularly thorough and demanding patron.

the production of bronze.⁶⁴ Finally, as with any business transaction, there may have been verbal negotiations and deals struck, the details of which have been lost or were never committed to paper. That price negotiations were attempted is confirmed by a letter of 21 February 1581 in which Campagna explained to the *massari* of the Santo that Procuratore Dolfen had refused to sell Carrara marble for their new high altar at 15 ducats per *mier*, and was sticking resolutely to 20 ducats per *mier*.⁶⁵

Despite all of these unquantifiable variables, the bottom line is that marble, especially that from Carrara, was much more expensive than Istrian stone.⁶⁶ Not only was marble held in much higher regard aesthetically, but it was also far more costly and time-consuming both to supply and to carve than the more readily available Istrian stone. In a letter of 1528 to Federico II Gonzaga about a request for six marble columns with Doric capitals, Tullio Lombardo informed the Duke that there was currently no marble to be had, that the columns could take two years to supply, and that the undressed marble alone would cost 1,000 ducats.⁶⁷ Lombardo therefore advised the Duke to opt instead for the best Rovigno stone, as the columns and capitals (inclusive of stone and labour) could be supplied 'smoothed, pumiced and polished' by his workshop in about six months for only 54 ducats each.⁶⁸ This disparity between marble and Istrian stone is further supported by a statement of 17 December 1575 made by two state-employed *proti*, Bernardino Contin and Marchesin de Marchesini, in relation to the problematic commission of the Priuli monument in San Salvador (fig.1.44). Herein, the *proti* declared that not only was Carrara marble a quarter heavier than an equivalent block of Rovigno stone, but it also took a third longer to carve.⁶⁹ From other documents for this commission, we learn that at this time marble cost 20 ducats per *mier* while Rovigno stone was a fraction of the price at only 1 ducat per *mier*.⁷⁰ Interestingly, when Doge Grimani was buying the materials for his monument in 1600, either prices had dropped or he was able to negotiate a much better deal: he paid less than 1 ducat per *mier* for Rovigno stone and only 13 ducats 15 *denari grossi* per *mier* for marble.⁷¹ That it was

⁶⁴ For further discussion, see pp.114-17 below.

⁶⁵ 'Quando à piaciuto a Dio siamo stati risolti dal Procurator Delfin che non vol darlo per 15 ducati il miliar, ma sta saldo su li vinti.' Cat.6, doc.6.1.

⁶⁶ For a survey of Carrara marble prices, see Klapisch-Zuber 1969, pp.208-18 and 313-4 (Table 3).

⁶⁷ Pizzati and Ceriana 2008, p.206, doc.263.

⁶⁸ 'fregade, pomegade et lustrate.' Ibid. For this commission, see Brown 1989-90.

⁶⁹ Avery 1999a, p.263, doc.92(xiv).

⁷⁰ Avery 1999a, p.259, doc.92(ix). The prices cited here do not indicate whether transportation was included. A currently untraced contract of 28 September 1575 for the same monument records that stonemason Bortolo Calziner had agreed to supply Rovigno stone at 1 ducat per *mier*, including transportation from Istria: Ludwig 1911, pp.25-6.

⁷¹ Cat.8, doc.8.30, [1] and doc.8.29, [15] respectively. As the doge's marble order seems to have been combined with one from the Scuola Grande di San Rocco, this may have helped to keep the price

considered more economical to buy marble direct from Carrara is borne out by advice given by Vittoria to the Duke of Urbino's agent in July 1603. As discussed previously, the duke was seeking a Venetian sculptor to carve a statue of Federico da Montefeltro (fig.1.106). His agent, Brunetti, asked Vittoria about possible candidates as well as the supply and cost of marble. Vittoria advised that the requisite block of marble (c.6 Venetian feet tall) would cost about 100 *scudi* and suggested that, although the stone would take some time to arrive as the journey was so long, there were deals to be had if the duke went straight to Carrara.⁷²

Transportation

Transporting marble from Carrara to Venice was a lengthy and complex process, and an idea of the various stages can be gained from the extant documentation for the Grimani monument.⁷³ These documents record that four marble columns of 'mistio di Seravezza', along with other variegated marbles, were excavated and prepared at Seravezza, transported to the nearest marina, and then shifted across the beach onto a Genoese boat.⁷⁴ This same boat had already collected the white marble quarried at Polvaccio from the beach at L'Avenza.⁷⁵ The whole lot was taken to Portovenere in the Gulf of La Spezia, whence it was transferred to a ship—the St Francis of Assisi—that Bargellini had chartered from a Frenchman by the name of François Vion, at a rate of 3 ducats, 16 *denari grossi per miera* of marble (fig.3.22).⁷⁶ Before the ship left, there were additional expenses to be paid to Genoese Customs, namely fees levied to transport the marble through the Gulf of La Spezia

down. It was certainly a factor in the transportation costs for the marble, for which see note 76 below. The fact that Grimani was doge may well have been another factor.

⁷² 'Il Vittoria mi dice, che appresso a poco quest'opera potrà costare intorno a ducento scudi di manifattura, et cento il marmo [...] et forse metterà conto farlo venir da Carrara [...], che se bene il viaggio è tanto lungo et di tanto giro per mare, nondimeno se vi sarà niente di tempo, non mancheranno buone occasioni.' Gronau 1936, p.241, doc.CCCLXXX.

⁷³ Cat.8, docs 8.3-8.6.

⁷⁴ Cat.8, doc.8.6, [1], [2]-[16], [25], [27]. For excavation and transportation methods at Carrara, see Klapisch-Zuber 1969, pp.61-76, 186-97. For a useful map showing sea routes for Carrara marble exports across Italy and Europe, see *ibid.*, pp.184-5.

⁷⁵ Cat.8, doc.8.6, [1], [17]-[23], [25], [27]. This was the standard means and route for transportation: see Bresc-Bautier 2007, pp.286-7.

⁷⁶ Cat.8, doc.8.6, [1]; doc.8.26, [25]. This latter entry records that the doge's marble was transported with 311 *miera* of marble for the Scuola Grande di San Rocco. In his report, Bargellini outlined his negotiations to obtain the best price possible for the transportation of the marbles for both the doge and the *scuola*. Cat.8, doc.8.6, [44]. The *scuola*'s marble was intended for its aforementioned new high altar, for which see Timofiewitsch 1996.

and duty against the total value of the cargo.⁷⁷ The documents indicate that the marble had left for Venice on its long sea journey around the coast of Italy by 26 August 1600,⁷⁸ and arrived at Malamocco (just outside Venice) by 5 October, when it was transferred to smaller boats to proceed to the Arsenal.⁷⁹

The means of transporting Istrian stone to Venice was more straightforward, given that it came from Venetian-held territory and had a shorter sea journey to reach the city (fig.3.4). Thanks to Scamozzi's *L'idea della architettura* and modern scholarship about the supply of Istrian stone in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, much is known about the process.⁸⁰ As with Carrara marble, there were the complexities of moving the excavated stone down from the quarries, but these were situated relatively close to the coastline. The stone was loaded onto ships and taken across the Adriatic into Venice, where it was transferred to smaller boats.⁸¹ Documents show that this stone—significantly lighter than marble—consequently cost less to transport. In 1600, for example, around 100 *miera* of Istrian stone could be shipped to Venice for about 15 ducats.⁸² The journey from Istria to Venice, however, was not without danger, and on occasion disaster could strike in the form of storms or pirates, resulting in the loss of an entire shipment of stone. This is exactly what happened in summer 1550, when a boat carrying Istrian stone worth some 3,000 ducats sank, including a huge block that had been ordered for a colossal *Hercules* commissioned by

⁷⁷ Cat.8, doc.8.6, [22]. This fee was to be repaid by the ship-owner, but as he did not have the means to do so at the time of transportation, Bargellini advised the Cancelliere grande to deduct it from the ship-owner's fee. Bargellini reported the doge's share of the customs duties payable on the shipload of marble to be 9 *scudi* 14 *lire* 7 *denari*. Cat.8, doc.8.6, [24]. The key associated transport costs were customs and excise duties ('datio'), freight costs ('nollo'), and insurance ('segurtà'). Maritime insurance was a profitable business in Venice in this period and merchants were unlikely to risk transporting valuable goods without it in place. For further discussion, see Tenenti 1959; Tenenti 1967, pp.101-3; Lane 1973, pp.380-1; and Tucci 1981, pp.145-60.

⁷⁸ Cat.8, doc.8.5.

⁷⁹ Cat.8, doc.8.26, [20].

⁸⁰ Scamozzi 1615, vol.2, Book 7, Chapter 8, p.198; Dalla Costa and Feiffer 1981, pp.75-84; and Connell 1988, p.102.

⁸¹ Lane 1992, p.53, note 57, notes that the ships used for transporting stone from Istria in the fifteenth century were *marani* (long, wide, lateen-rigged, without forecastles and with a capacity of c.200 tons) but that by the late sixteenth century, most goods transported across the Adriatic were carried by larger *marciliane* (capacity of c.240 tons). For further discussion of the fifteenth-century use of *marani* for transporting Istrian stone, see Connell 1988, p.105; and Goy 2006, p.80.

⁸² The Grimani monument account-book records that it cost 15 ducats 1 *lira* (excluding customs duties) to ship 102 *miera* of Istrian stone from Rovigno to Venice. See cat.8, doc.8.26, [55], [62]; and doc.8.30, [3]-[4].

the Duke of Ferrara from Sansovino (fig.3.23).⁸³ Sansovino feared that no ship-owner would risk transporting another single block of such large dimensions from Istria to Venice, but luckily for all concerned, the Venetian patrician, Vettor Grimani, later generously gifted a replacement block of stone for the statue from supplies he already had in Venice.⁸⁴

Moving blocks of stone across Venice seems to have been relatively inexpensive, using barges (usually called 'barche' or 'piatte' in the documents) and teams of porters ('fachini' or 'bastaxi').⁸⁵ The number of porters required depended on the weight of stone being transported and the difficulty of moving it at either end of the journey. In July 1524, for example, the marble for the Servi *Magdalen* had to be transported from the courtyard of the Palazzo Ducale, where it was being kept, to Sant'Aponal, close to the Rialto, and then on to de' Grigi's workshop at San Cassiano.⁸⁶ The procurators record that it took six porters to move this block of marble, estimated to weigh some 5½ *miera*.⁸⁷ In addition, they had to shift a large amount of Istrian stone out of the way, as well as load the marble onto a barge and unload it again at the other end. The cost of this service was 7 *lire* 10 *soldi*: relatively inexpensive considering that the marble block had cost 124 *lire*, or 20 ducats.⁸⁸ In 1600, after Doge Grimani's Carrara marble had been safely delivered to the Arsenal, a boatman, one Serafin Piater, moved the cargo to nearby San Giuseppe at a cost of 3 ducats, 1 *lira*, 8

⁸³ In a letter of 13 August 1550 to the Duke of Ferrara, Girolamo Feruffino, his Venetian agent, reported that Sansovino had not begun work on the statue due to the loss of the requisite stone at sea: '[...] et ancora non l'ha encomenzata per non haver la pietra de rovigno a suo mano, che quella che egli in li principii faceva condurre da Capo d'Istria si perse cum altre piere marmoree in una barca che si affondò cum dano del mercante de 3,000 ducati in circa che le faceva condurre.' Boucher 1991, vol.1, p.220, doc.201. For this commission, see *ibid.*, vol.1, pp.130-4, 220-4, docs 201-25; vol.2, p.341 (cat.34).

⁸⁴ In a missive of 11 September 1550 to the Duke, Sansovino lamented that 'serà molto difficile far condurre una altra pietra de la grandezza ch'era quella, perché non si trova chi voglia più torsi l'impresa, temendo che il disconcio peso di sì gran pietra non faccia di novo affondar loro i navilii.' Boucher 1991, vol.1, p.220, doc.204. In a letter of 14 October 1550 to Feruffino, the Duke of Ferrara acknowledged Grimani's generous gift: '[...] et visto quanto cortesemente il Clarissimo Signor Vettor Grimani ha voluto che quella pietra sia data senza pagamento per far quella nostra statua et di più con tante amorevoli parole ne restano molto obbligo a Sua Signoria.' Boucher 1991, vol.1, p.221, doc.206.

⁸⁵ 'Piatte' were flat-bottomed, stable boats used for transporting heavy loads throughout the lagoon and inland to the *terraferma*. Martin L. 2001, p.174.

⁸⁶ Cat.1, doc. 1.3, [80]. Other documents confirm that de' Grigi's workshop was at San Cassiano. See, for example, cat.1, doc.1.3, [146], a payment to de' Grigi for having overseen the transportation of the finished *Magdalen* 'da San Cassan dala sua bottega' to the Servite church.

⁸⁷ Cat.1, doc.1.3, [80]. 5½ *miera* equates to 2,623.5 kg (5,780.5 lbs).

⁸⁸ Cat.1, doc.1.3, [80]. Strupp 1993a, p.257, mis-transcribed this payment as 2 *lire* 10 *soldi*.

soldi.⁸⁹ Finally, on 15 October, the 67 *miera* of marble was unloaded at the church by a portorage company, Mazzuola and Co. of Sant'Angelo, for a mere 20 *soldi per mier*.⁹⁰

BRONZE

Bronze was the most expensive commonly-available sculptural material in Renaissance and Early Modern Italy. Its great cost was due to the relative scarcity of copper and tin (from which the alloy is largely made) and to the complex production processes, which not only required great skill, but also huge amounts of labour.⁹¹ Bronze had a wide range of uses in this period, from steeple bells and ordnance (figs 3.24-3.25), to functional objects (which were usually highly decorated in Venice) such as candlesticks, inkwells and oil-lamps (fig.3.26), and statuary of all sizes and types (figs 3.27-3.28). This extensive and diverse employment was due largely to its great versatility: its tensile strength, and the resulting complex forms that could be created; its impermeability and hardness; the ease of replication it offered through the indirect casting method; and the range of hues that could be attained through surface patination and gilding.⁹²

Generally speaking, bronze contains between 5 and 14% tin,⁹³ often with added lead (making a copper-tin-lead compound called a ternary alloy), or lead and zinc (making a copper-tin-lead-zinc compound called a quaternary alloy) to ease the casting process and render the cast bronze easier to work afterwards.⁹⁴ Alloys varied the ratios of copper to tin according to the type of object being made and its purpose, with three main types discussed in contemporary treatises: bell-metal, gun-metal and statuary metal.⁹⁵ Bell-metal, for example, had a higher tin content (c.20-23%) in order to ensure a better sound when the bell was struck; whereas gun-metal had a lower tin content (c.10%) because tin causes brittleness, an undesirable characteristic in ordnance, which needed to be as robust as possible to withstand the huge internal stresses.⁹⁶ Statuary metal differed still further, at least according to contemporary treatises, with Pomponius Gauricus (c.1481–1530), for example,

⁸⁹ Cat.8, doc.8.26, [21].

⁹⁰ Cat.8, doc.8.26, [22].

⁹¹ See, for example, the case of Sansovino's Sacristy Door, discussed Chapter 4, pp.137-8.

⁹² For a succinct explanation of the lost wax casting method (both direct and indirect), see Bassett and Fogelman 1997, pp.54-6.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p.13.

⁹⁴ Widely discussed, but see, for example, Bassett and Fogelman 1997, p.13; and Motture 2001, pp.19 and 54, note 8.

⁹⁵ For the raw materials and composition of bronze, with reference to alloy recipes in Medieval and Renaissance treatises, see Motture 2001, pp.18-23.

⁹⁶ For bell-metal, see Motture 2001, pp.19 and 22-3; gun-metal, *ibid.*, p.22. High levels of tin in a bronze alloy also preclude cold work.

outlining different recipes for statues, plaquettes and seals in his *De Sculptura* of 1504.⁹⁷ Technical analysis—for example, through the non-invasive method of X-Ray Fluorescence spectrometry (XRF)—has indicated that alloys employed for statuary in this period could vary quite significantly.⁹⁸ Indeed, many Renaissance bronzes are actually brass (i.e. primarily a copper-zinc amalgam, rather than copper-tin).⁹⁹

Sourcing and supply

There is much less evidence for the sourcing and supply of bronze for sculptural commissions in Venice than for those in marble and stone. This is at least partly due to simple numbers: marble and stone were used more frequently than bronze as contemporary guidebooks and physical evidence attest, thereby increasing the likely survival of archival documents for such commissions.¹⁰⁰ The surviving contractual evidence for bronze commissions suggests that most patrons paid the sculptor and/or founder to provide the alloy alongside the labour costs rather than procure the metal themselves. This was presumably because they lacked the specialised knowledge to do so, and because the sources for purchasing the constituent raw materials were fewer and less accessible to the lay person than those for marble and stone. Rangone, for example, chose this combined route of

⁹⁷ Gaurico-Cutolo 1999, pp.228 (original Latin), 229 (Italian translation). For further discussion of Gauricus' treatise, see Varotto 2006.

⁹⁸ Technical analysis of Italian Renaissance bronzes, using a range of methods, has been undertaken by object conservators and conservation scientists for some decades now in museums and galleries across the USA, UK and Europe, as well as *in situ* in Italy (often as part of major conservation and/or research projects, such as the work on Ghiberti's *Doors of Paradise* in Florence completed in 2007 and the Venetian Renaissance Bronzes Project in Venice in 2006–8). At the forefront have been the staff of the Victoria and Albert Museum, London; Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (spear-headed by Richard Stone); National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. (led by Shelley Sturman); Harvard University Art Museums, Cambridge, MA (Francesca Bewer); Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (Robert van Langh); and the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge (Jo Dillon). Although published findings have generally been aimed at fellow conservation scientists/object conservators, there is more accessible material, such as the technical sections in Motture 2001, pp.51-2; London 2002, pp.240-303; Atlanta 2007, pp.141-55; and Washington 2011, pp.157-85. For Venetian sculpture particularly, see Morigi and Morigi 2008; Sturman and Smith 2008 and 2013.

⁹⁹ In this period, zinc content in brass ranged from 10-28%. Bassett and Fogelman 1997, p.12. For 'bronzes' being brasses and vice versa, see Motture 2001, pp.19-20. See also Bewer 2012, pp.26-7. For a Venetian patron specifying a brassy alloy for a bronze statue, see the Goldsmiths' altar below, pp.126-7.

¹⁰⁰ Small-scale sculpture and functional objects in bronze were produced in great numbers in Venice, but little documentary evidence for their production in terms of contracts and payment records has thus far come to light. For further discussion, see Avery 2011, pp.127-41.

material supply plus labour for the production of his portrait-statue for the façade of San Giuliano (figs 1.41, 2.57).¹⁰¹ On 27 August 1554, he commissioned the State gun-founder Giulio Alberghetti (c.1536–72) to supply the metal and cast Sansovino's wax model for a fee of 110 ducats.¹⁰² When Alberghetti failed to produce the statue, after numerous problems (including having to have a second wax model made), Rangone had Vittoria produce a completely new model and, on 2 March 1556, charged two different bronze-founders, the little-known Tommaso dalle Sagome and the State gun-founder Giacomo Il di Conti (d.1558) with casting it, again drawing up an agreement in which the founders were obligated to supply both materials and labour.¹⁰³

This combined route of material and labour supply was also followed by the Benedictines of San Giorgio Maggiore when they commissioned five life-size bronze figures of the four Evangelists and God the Father for their new high altar from Girolamo Campagna, Giuseppe Campagna, and bronze-founder Francesco Mazzoleni on 20 January 1592 (fig.1.4).¹⁰⁴ Unlike the later commission of 1595 for the carved *Madonna and Child* (fig.2.44), which was awarded to Campagna and for which the Benedictines sourced the stone directly, here the Campagna brothers and Mazzoleni were responsible not only for the manufacture but also for the supply of the materials.¹⁰⁵ The Benedictines continued to pay sculptors/founders for both supplying the bronze for sculpture and functional objects *and* producing them, while simultaneously sourcing the marble and stone themselves for carved sculpture and related elements such as altar tables and frames. In contracts for a variety of bronzes drawn up between January 1594 and July 1636, for example, the Benedictines

¹⁰¹ For relevant bibliography, see Chapter 1, note 24.

¹⁰² '[...] il prefato Messer Giulio promette, et si obliga a proprie spese sue, si di mettalo, come di qualunque altra cosa gettar di buon mettalo da esser approbato per il detto Messer Giacomo Sansovino, detta figura qual sii netta in tutte sue parte, et non maculata ma ben gettada et nettada.' NA, b.8105, fols 632v-633r, at fol.632v. First part-published Gallo 1957, p.102. Published in full Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.214-5, doc.182.

¹⁰³ 'che intendendo detto eccellente Misser Thomaso [Rangone] far gettar la sua immagine de bronzo. quale va sopra la porta della fazzada, della chiesa de San Juliano iuxta la forma di tal figura fatta per Misser Alexandro [Vittoria] da Trento, loro Maestro Thomaso [dalle Sagome], et Misser Jacomo [di Conti] insolidum ut supra prometteno, et si obligano gettar tal figura di buon mettalo, iuxta la forma di cera li sera consignata per detto eccellente Misser Thomaso netta, et non maculata in parte alcuna, ponendo loro il mettalo del suo proprio, et facendo ogni spesa occorera.' NA, b.8109, fols 202v-203r. First part-published Gallo 1957, p.103. Published in full Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.215-6, doc.187. The cost of casting Vittoria's model was higher than Sansovino's at 180 ducats. Avery has suggested that this was likely due to the model being bigger, and thereby requiring more bronze. Avery 2011, pp.125, 166, note 144.

¹⁰⁴ SGM, b.21, proc.10A, 'Libro fabbrica', fols 1r-2r.

¹⁰⁵ For the *Madonna and Child* contract, see *ibid.*, fols 30r-v.

entrusted the sculptors/founders of bronzes with both materials and labour,¹⁰⁶ whereas in contemporary contracts such as that of 25 June 1594 for the high altar structure (on which the Campagna/Mazzoleni bronze statuary was to be placed) the monks supplied all the requisite marble and stone, employing stonemason Bortolo *tagliapietra* on a labour-only basis.¹⁰⁷

There are certain instances when a patron would supply the alloy himself and employ the sculptor/caster on a labour-only basis, but these mainly seem to have been patrons in significant State roles, such as the Procuratori di San Marco. On 8 January 1504, in the contract between Leopardi and Antonio Lombardo and the Procuratori di San Marco de Citra for the highly lavish Cappella Zen (figs 1.45, 3.27), for example, the procurators stated that they would supply all of the metals, marbles, and gold (for gilding).¹⁰⁸ The Procuracy continued to supply bronze for numerous works commissioned to embellish San Marco throughout the period, including the baptismal font cover contracted to Tiziano Minio and Desiderio da Firenze on 18 April 1545 (figs 1.6a-c, 2.22);¹⁰⁹ the font's crowning statue of *St John the Baptist* awarded to Francesco Segala on 10 April 1565 (figs 2.14, 2.25, 3.28);¹¹⁰ and the gates before the Altar of the SS. Sacramento ordered from the sculptor-cum-founder Girolamo Paliari (1579–1634) in 1607.¹¹¹

In terms of where the principal elements of the alloy came from, copper and tin naturally had to be imported into the lagoon city. The European copper market from the late fifteenth century onwards was dominated by the wealthy Fugger family of Augsburg, and

¹⁰⁶ For example, contract of 31 January 1594 with Nicolò Roccatagliata for two statuettes of *St George* and *St Stephen* for the choir balustrade: SGM, b.21, proc.10A, 'Libro fabbrica', fol.15r. Contract of 15 March 1594, again with Roccatagliata, for 22 *putto* wall-sconces: *ibid.*, fol.16r-v. Contract of 22 April 1596 with Cesare Groppo and Roccatagliata for two bronze candelabra: *ibid.*, fols 34v-35r. Finally, a contract of 15 July 1636 with Sebastian Nicolini and Pietro Bosello for two *Adoring Angels* to adorn the high altar: *ibid.*, fol.62r-v.

¹⁰⁷ SGM, b.21, proc.10A, 'Libro fabbrica', fol.21r. Part-published Timofiewitsch 1972, p.260.

¹⁰⁸ 'Tuti veramente metali, marmori, et oro siano da et desegna per i Signori Procuratori et quanto avanzasse de chadauna di queste cosse, tute romagna ai ditti maestri per el prexio costera ai ditti Procuratori a conto de suo marchado.' PSM de Citra, b.242, fasc. Z XXV 4, fols 41a-45b, at fol.45a. Published Jestaz 1986, pp.185-9, doc.19.

¹⁰⁹ PSM de Supra, b.77, proc.180, fasc.1, fol.13r. First published Cecchetti and Ongania 1886, p.43, doc.222.

¹¹⁰ PSM de Supra, b.77, proc.180, fasc.1, fol.19r. First published Cecchetti and Ongania 1886, p.78, doc.307.

¹¹¹ The final settlement of 22 April 1607 records that Paliari had received 'dalla Procuratia il metallo da getarle ['le portele de bronzo']'. Cecchetti and Ongania 1886, p.89, doc.369. This is the altar behind the high altar in the Presbytery, not the current Altar of the Holy Sacrament in the south transept, which was dedicated to the SS. Sacramento in 1810.

copper came into Venice from Austria and Hungary, from such great mining centres as Schwaz in the Tyrol (fig.3.29) and Neusohl in Hungary (Banksá Bystrica, in modern-day Slovakia).¹¹² It was also sourced from copper veins within the boundaries of the Venetian *terraferma*, such as at Agordo near Belluno and Val Trompia, close to Brescia (fig.3.30).¹¹³ In terms of the Venetian State's procurement of copper, Victoria Avery's research into the city's bronze industry has shown that the precious commodity was obtained not only from mines within its own territories, but that a more highly-prized copper (called 'rame da Sboz' in the documents) was also frequently bought from German merchants at the Fondaco dei Tedeschi and Italian suppliers based in Venice.¹¹⁴ Some of this copper would have been supplied as rosette copper in the form of cakes ('migliacci'), as noted by the metallurgist and practitioner Vannoccio Biringuccio in his 1540 treatise on metallurgy and casting techniques.¹¹⁵

The best tin in Europe came from England.¹¹⁶ Tin appears to have been obtained by the Venetian State in much the same way as copper, imported for the most part by German merchants, but also by mining small veins of tin on the *terraferma*.¹¹⁷ As Avery has observed, the Serenissima was keen to maintain good stocks of copper and tin throughout the Cinquecento in order to ensure the uninterrupted production of bronze ordnance for use on land and sea throughout the Venetian empire.¹¹⁸

¹¹² For the Fugger family and their involvement in the European metal trade in this period, see Häberlein 2012, *passim*. From 1516, copper from the Tyrol was reserved for the Southern German and Italian markets, and that from Neusohl for the Netherlands and Northern Germany: *ibid.*, p.57. For a contemporary guide to mining, refining and smelting metals, including copper and tin penned by the physician and humanist Georg Bauer, see Georgius Agricola's *De Re Metallica* of 1556: ed. consulted Agricola-Hoover and Hoover 1950.

¹¹³ Braunstein 1965; Braunstein 1977; and Avery 2011, p.17.

¹¹⁴ Avery 2011, pp.17-18. Avery was unable to establish Sboz's location, but it was the aforementioned Tyrolean mining centre of Schwaz. For confirmation, see a 1530 description of 'Sboz', located in the Tyrol (passed by on the journey from Innsbruck to Munich) 'dove si cavano le minere di argento, piombo, rame in gran copia'. Laemmer 1861, pp.36-7. I am most grateful to Marco Morin for kindly bringing this reference to my attention.

¹¹⁵ For rosette copper, called 'rame peloso' (or 'hairy copper', due to its production process), which Biringuccio deemed 'very pure and beautiful', see Biringuccio 1540, III, p.60r (Biringuccio-Smith and Gnudi 1942, p.172). For how it was smelted, see Agricola-Hoover and Hoover 1950, pp.535-8. For its status in Venice, see Böstrom 1995, p.815. See also Motture 2001, p.20.

¹¹⁶ Biringuccio 1540, V, p.74v (Biringuccio-Smith and Gnudi 1942, p.211). Also cited by Motture 2001, p.21.

¹¹⁷ Avery 2011, pp.19-20.

¹¹⁸ Avery 2011, pp.16-7.

In addition to importing newly mined copper and tin into Venice, the alloy was also obtained by melting down obsolete bronzes. This was a particularly common fate for old broken or cracked bells, as it was widely believed that using recycled bell-metal in a new bell improved the end result.¹¹⁹ Old bells were not the only objects melted down: it became the norm in the sixteenth century to recycle broken or defunct artillery, and the State even purchased other types of used bronze, such as broken bells for reuse at the Arsenal gun-foundries.¹²⁰ Copper and tin were costly commodities that were not always readily available and it was therefore only logical to recycle old bronze wherever possible. Records for independent bronze-founders and bell-makers also indicate that redundant bronzes, be they bells or functional objects, were kept for future re-use. The 1527 probate inventory of the bronze-founder Giacomo Calderari's workshop lists broken bells and numerous used or damaged functional objects, such as basins and mortars, which he had no doubt retained for recycling purposes.¹²¹

There is less documentary evidence for where the metal employed for non-military bronzes, such as statuary and functional objects originated. Where there is an indication of who supplied it, the documents usually only note that the bronze was furnished by the founder who cast the work, or was obtained from a third party, such as another bronze-founder or a metal merchant. Accounts submitted to the Procuratori di San Marco de Supra by their *proto*, Sansovino, for bronzes executed for San Marco are a good example. A note of expenses for Sansovino's material and labour costs for the reliefs for the first singing-gallery dated 12 December 1537 state that the bronze-founder Zuanne Campanaro and sculptor Tiziano Minio had supplied an unspecified amount of 'bronzo' at a cost of 78 ducats, which also included labour.¹²² In 1562, Pietro Campanato is documented as having supplied metal and having cast sections of Sansovino's Sacristy Door, probably using his own stock.¹²³ Workshop inventories show that Venetian founders did keep reserves of copper and tin (presumably sourced in much the same way as the State but on a smaller scale) and discarded and broken bronze and copper objects for recycling. The 1555 inventory of the

¹¹⁹ Avery 2011, p.80.

¹²⁰ Avery 2011, pp.21-2.

¹²¹ Avery 2011, p.465, doc.301, for example: [1] 'Metali di campane rotte', [2] 'Lavesi et bronzi vechi et rotti', [6] 'Pignate et lavesi di bronzo usati'. For Calderari (c.1562–1622), see Avery 2013.

¹²² '[...] cioè a Mistro Zuane Campanaro et a Titiano per bronzo et loro fatiche ducati 78.' PSM de Supra, b.77, proc.181, fasc.1, fol.7r. First published Cecchetti and Ongania 1886, p.194, doc.88. Zuanne Campanaro is also documented as having cast the 'San Marco' relief for the second singing-gallery in February 1544.

¹²³ Cat.2, doc.2.1 [8] and doc.2.4, and below. This Pietro di Zuanne Campanato is not to be confused with the Pietro di Zuanne Campanato who cast the bronzes for the Cappella Zen (and who died in October 1542). Avery 2011, p.159, note 5.

home and workshop of the late bell-maker and bronze-founder Zuanbattista Campanato, for example, lists numerous vessels containing copper as well as sacks of 'bronze'.¹²⁴

When bronze was not available from independent founders and/or metal merchants, State patrons would presumably have been able to purchase supplies from the stocks held at the Arsenal, at least in times of relative peace and prosperity. This was certainly the case for the bronze well-heads produced in the mid-1550s for the courtyard of the Palazzo Ducale by members of the two great Venetian gun-founding dynasties, the di Conti and the Alberghetti (fig.1.88).¹²⁵ On four occasions in 1555, for example, the Council of Ten ordered the Arsenal authorities to sell 14 *miera* of copper to the overseers of the fabric of the Palazzo Ducale for the casting of the well-heads, as well as to buy three *miera* of tin for the same purpose.¹²⁶ It would seem that the raw materials for bronze could also be bought from another State institution—the Mint—at least Doge Grimani was able to purchase one *mier* of copper 'tolto in Cecca' on 31 October 1602, which was used to cast the two reliefs for his funerary monument in San Giuseppe (figs 3.31-3.32).¹²⁷

Quality Assurance

So how could patrons assure the quality of the bronze alloy? The 'quality' of bronze in this period can usefully be considered in three distinct ways, depending on who was seeking it. There was the ideal quality of the alloy as expounded in treatises written by scholars, artists and metallurgists. Then there was the physical quality of the raw materials used to make bronze (principally copper and tin) as assessed and understood by the relevant State authorities, mining experts and master bronze-founders.¹²⁸ Finally, there was the aesthetic quality of the material sought after by patrons, the requirements for which were usually set

¹²⁴ Avery 2011, p.403 (doc.159), under 'In la bottega de getto'. For the Campanato bell-founding dynasty, see *ibid.*, especially pp.56-67.

¹²⁵ For the well-heads, see Avery 2011, pp.103-10. For the di Conti and Alberghetti families, their employment and output, see *ibid.*, *passim*.

¹²⁶ 22 April (6 *miera* of copper), 5 September (4 *miera* of copper) and 3 October 1555 (4 *miera* of copper). On 28 September 1555, 3 *miera* of tin for the well-heads and artillery were bought from the German merchant Cristoforo da Istetter. Avery 2011, pp.400-2, docs 152, 154, 158 and 157 respectively; discussed *ibid.*, p.106.

¹²⁷ Cat.8, doc.8.26, [446] and the corresponding entry in doc.8.44, [4]. The cost of this copper (160 ducats) was deducted from the total fee of 400 ducats agreed with the bronze-founder Cesare Groppo for the reliefs on 18 November 1601. Groppo had presumably negotiated that the doge's agent would pay the Mint directly for the copper, given that he was being paid in much smaller incremental amounts as his work progressed. See cat.8, doc.8.44 for the account summary of Groppo's work.

¹²⁸ And also, where expressed, in treatises. For example, Biringuccio's opinion that English tin was the best, as referenced in note 116 above.

out in written contracts, and which were almost always applied to the finished work rather than to the alloy in its raw or molten state.

There were numerous texts written in the Renaissance period which addressed the technology of bronze manufacture and some of these offered advice on the ideal qualities of the alloys required for various types of objects, principally *De Sculptura* of 1504 by the humanist scholar Pomponius Gauricus, *De la Pirotechnia* of 1540 by metallurgist Vannoccio Biringuccio (1480–c.1539), and the preface to the *Vite* in which Vasari surveyed artists' materials and techniques (first published 1550).¹²⁹ As Peta Motture has observed, Gauricus was clearly familiar with Pliny the Elder's *Natural History* and his classification of different bronze alloys for different types of object when he set out his recipes for statuary metal, recommending a different alloy for statues, plaquettes and seals.¹³⁰ For statues, for example, he recommended a mixture of 12 pounds of tin for every one hundred pounds of copper, of which one third was recovered (i.e. from incorporating melted down objects).¹³¹ He recommended that lead not be melted with the copper, as might have been expected, but rather added later to obtain the desired colour of the patina.¹³² While Biringuccio did acknowledge that a different type of bronze was required for statuary than for other types of bronze objects, he did not explicitly state what the ideal recipe was. He advised simply that: 'In order to alloy it [copper] into the species of bronze, eight, nine, ten, up to twelve pounds of tin are put with every hundred pounds of copper'.¹³³ Vasari, on the other hand, advised a

¹²⁹ Gauricus 1504; Gaurico-Cutolo 1999 (dual text of original Latin with Italian translation). Biringuccio 1540 (original Italian); Biringuccio-Smith and Gnudi 1942 (English translation). It should be noted that all three authors vary in terms of the alloy compositions recommended and degree of detail given. Gauricus discussed the requirements for bell- and statuary metal in some detail: Gaurico-Cutolo 1999, pp.228 (Latin), 229 (Italian). Biringuccio commented generally on copper alloys, for statuary, artillery, bells and functional objects, before offering more specific ratios of copper to tin for bells: Biringuccio 1540, V, p.74r (Biringuccio-Smith and Gnudi 1942, p.210). Vasari, meanwhile, briefly outlined the ideal alloys for statuary metal, bell-metal and gun-metal: Vasari 1568, vol.1, p.39 (Vasari-Maclehose 1960, pp.163-4). Benvenuto Cellini's 1568 treatise on goldsmithing and sculpture has a great deal of information about the art of bronze-casting from making models to furnace construction but none on alloy composition. Cellini 1568, pp.45r-55r.

¹³⁰ Motture 2001, pp.21-2. For Pliny's discussion of different types of bronze and their uses in his *Natural History*, see Pliny-Jex-Blake 1896, pp.8-17. For the influence of Pliny's *Natural History* on Renaissance artists, scholars and patrons, see McHam 2013.

¹³¹ 'Statuaria haec: duodenae stagni in centenas libras aeris, tertia parte collectanei.' Gaurico-Cutolo 1999, p.228 (Italian: p.229).

¹³² Ibid. For further discussion of his recommendations for achieving different hues, see Motture 2001, p.22.

¹³³ Biringuccio 1540, V, p.74r (Biringuccio-Smith and Gnudi 1942, p.210). Part-cited Motture 2001, p.22 (under *Bombard bronze*). Biringuccio noted elsewhere that bronze was a 'compound material of

ratio of two parts copper to one part brass for statuary metal ‘according to the Italian rule’, which would technically make the alloy brass rather than bronze.¹³⁴

The physical quality of the constituent parts of the alloy were, of course, essential to the Serenissima, especially when it came to the manufacture of state-of-the-art ordnance for the protection of Venice and her dominions. As mentioned earlier, Avery’s research has shown that Schwaz copper was deemed to be much better than that extracted on the Venetian mainland, for example from the mines at Agordo, as it was believed to produce stronger artillery.¹³⁵ High-grade copper was also a valuable commodity for Venice with its trading partners in the East.¹³⁶ With regard to tin, the State considered the best, yet again, to come from beyond the *terraferma*. This ‘tin from the west’ (*stagno da ponente*) most likely came from the mines of Cornwall and appears to have been imported into Venice almost exclusively by German merchants.¹³⁷

The aesthetic quality of bronze desired by patrons of sculpture was inextricably linked with the final appearance of the piece. The principal means for ensuring this sort of quality was through the written contract and the terms and conditions stipulated therein. Unlike the contracts for marble and stone discussed above, in which the requisite qualities of the unworked materials were almost always specified (such as ‘white, beautiful and without any blemishes’), patrons rarely referred to the qualities of the alloy in its raw state, declaring only (if at all) that the ‘bronze’ or ‘metal’ had to be ‘good’. The greater emphasis was always on the appearance of the finished work.¹³⁸ This is not surprising. After all, most patrons would not have possessed the ‘know-how’ to be able to assess bronze in its ‘raw’ state and indeed, they would most likely not have expected to be able to do so. As a result, contracts were invariably drawn up in such a way that the onus was always on the sculptor and/or foundryman to produce an acceptable product; if deemed unsatisfactory, then it fell to him to rectify the situation entirely at his own expense. Ultimately, the only thing that mattered to the

copper with tin and brass or lead’ and that from this ‘statues are made, guns and many other works’. Ibid., VII, p.109r (Biringuccio-Smith and Gnudi 1942, p.300).

¹³⁴ Vasari 1568, vol.1, p.39 (Vasari-Maclehose 1960, p.163). See also Motture 2001, p.22.

¹³⁵ Avery 2011, pp.18, 370, doc.63, and 373-4, doc.76.

¹³⁶ For copper exports to Egypt and Syria, see Arbel 2004, pp.46-9. For the Venetian copper trade generally, see Braunstein 1977 and Tucci 1977.

¹³⁷ Avery 2011, pp.19-20, 393, doc.129.

¹³⁸ There is the occasional exception where a patron was more expansive. For example, on 8 June 1594, Aspetti was charged with making bronze gates to go before the new altar of the Cappella dell’Arca in the Santo (which he had been commissioned to produce including 11 bronze statues the previous year). The ever punctilious *massari* required the gates to be made ‘dello stesso metallo delle figure nella bellezza et miglior maniera’. Benacchio Flores d’Arcais 1931, p.150, doc. XXVIII. Aspetti never produced the gates, and they were eventually commissioned from Girolamo Paliari in 1603. Guidaldi 1931–2a, pp.193-5, 201-3, docs IX-X; and Avery 2011, p.40.

patron was the end result and the nature of bronze-casting meant that any minor casting flaws or defects could be repaired and then completely masked through surface patination, which in Venice tended to be very dark. The physical quality of the raw materials discussed above was therefore much more important to the sculptor/founder as he would have wanted to ensure a successful outcome from the pour, given that making repairs was costly in terms of additional materials, time, and potentially his reputation. It was therefore in the sculptor/founder's best interests to ensure that high quality raw materials were employed in the alloy to reduce the risk of failure, and the patron would have known this.

A pertinent example in which the quality of the finished casting was emphasised more than the quality of the bronze alloy is the portrait-statue of Rangone discussed above (figs 1.41, 2.57).¹³⁹ Both the first contract of 27 August 1554 with Alberghetti and the second of 2 March 1556 with dalle Sagome and di Conti merely stated that the figure had to be cast from 'good metal'.¹⁴⁰ However, both contracts made a point of stipulating that the figure had to be well cast and finished, without any blemishes.¹⁴¹ Moreover, in both documents, the finished statue was to be judged by experts: in the first contract, by Sansovino, and in the second, by two unnamed assessors. The 1554 agreement stressed that, in the event of defects, Alberghetti would be obliged to make a new wax model exactly like the original at his own expense, the inference being that he would then have to recast it.¹⁴² And, in the 1556 contract, Rangone was even more explicit: if the figure did not resemble the wax model, was defective in any way, had blemishes, or was deemed to have been cast from poor metal, then no money would be disbursed and the founders would be obliged to return an identical wax model to the patron within one month.¹⁴³

¹³⁹ pp.102-03.

¹⁴⁰ 'di buon mettalo'. NA, b.8105, fol.632v and *ibid.*, b.8109, fol.203r.

¹⁴¹ See notes 102-103 above.

¹⁴² 'Dechiarando che in caso che detta figura venise deffetiva in qualche sua parte che il prefatto Messer Giulio [Alberghetti] sii obligato a tutta quella spese occorerà in far un simil forma, et figura, di cera.' NA, b.8105, fol.632v.

¹⁴³ 'Dichiarando che quando per detti dui eletti fusse detto et dechiarito detta figura seu Immagine gettada non esser conforme alla Immagine seu forma [fol.203r] di cera consignateli, seu fusse trovata maculata, o deffetiva, overo non essere di buon mettalo, che in tal caso detto eccellente Messer Thomaso non sia obligato à pagamento di sorte alcuna per conto di fatica ò spesa che detti fonditori havessero fatto per tal causa, Immo per patto expresso siano tenuti, et obligati di ritornarli una figura di cera, simile à quella li sera stata consignata à proprie spese de loro fondatori fra termine de uno mese all'hora immediate sequente.' NA, b.8109, fols 202v-203r. As Avery observed, the resultant statue was ironically riddled with casting flaws and holes but Rangone must have decided to accept it anyway, as he paid the founders in full. I concur that he may well have reckoned that any defects would not have been easily visible, given the figure's lofty position over the church entrance. Avery 2011, p.126.

Interestingly, in the 1592 contract for the high altar bronzes of San Giorgio (fig.1.4), the Benedictines made no comment at all on the quality of metal to be used (fig. 2.27). Instead, the emphasis was wholly on the finished appearance of the bronzes. Thus, the contract stated that the figures had to adhere to the drawing provided in terms of ‘proportion, measurement and size, quality and quantity’ and that they had to be ‘well and excellently made and worked by good and competent masters so that they have no defects, or anything missing’.¹⁴⁴

This lack of specificity about the quality of the alloy is reflected in the terminology found in the majority of documents for bronze sculptural commissions, including statuary, relief sculpture, and large-scale functional works such as one-off candelabra and Sansovino’s Sacristy Door. Of the contracts and payment records surveyed for this thesis, the alloy is usually simply referred to as either ‘bronzo’ or ‘metallo’.¹⁴⁵ This lack of precision is not peculiar to Venice. Indeed, the terms used for bronze in Renaissance and early modern Italian sculpture were largely generic, and as mentioned above, many Renaissance bronzes are actually brass, despite being referred to as bronze in documents and contemporary descriptions. Despite the fact that bronze alloys were generally recorded imprecisely in contracts and account-books, it is evident that sculptors and founders *did* carefully consider the composition and quality of the alloys they employed for different types of sculpture. It was certainly not a case of one recipe being suitable for all.

Sansovino’s Sacristy Door (1546–69) is a case in point (fig.1.101). The survival of detailed documents charting the door’s complex and lengthy production process means that a great deal is known about how and by whom it was made, as well as the costs involved.¹⁴⁶ The documents comprise a *post-factum* summary of expenses drawn up in February 1570 (the year of Sansovino’s death) which details the purchase of materials and payments made to those involved in its manufacture and a number of account-book entries and payment

¹⁴⁴ ‘...di fabricar, et far a tutte loro spese di ogni sorte le sopradette figure cinque de bronzo cioe el Dio Padre et li quatro Evangelisti a ghetto della proportione misura et grandezza qualità et quantita et altri requisiti come si vede et e dechiarito nel desegno assignatoli da esso Reverendo Padre, qual tutte figure siino et debano esser bene et ottimamente fabricate et lavorate da buoni et sufficienti maestri si che non habbiano difetto, ò mancamento alcuno...’ SGM, b.21, proc.10A, ‘Libro fabbrica’, fol.1r.

¹⁴⁵ Interestingly, Biringuccio differentiated between alloys with up to 12% tin and those between 12 and 25%, calling the former ‘bronzo’ and the latter ‘metallo’, by which he meant bell-metal. See Biringuccio 1540, VII, pp.109r-v (Biringuccio-Smith and Gnudi 1942, p.300). He concluded that: “‘bronze’ and ‘metal’ are the same thing, but they are called thus in order to distinguish the differences according to the works’. Ibid. Although it is unclear, it seems unlikely that those contracts for statuary and functional objects which stipulated that ‘metallo’ be used (as opposed to ‘bronzo’) actually meant bell-metal: after all, the high tin levels would have made cold work very difficult and the bronze prone to cracking.

¹⁴⁶ Cat.2. For the artists and artisans involved in the door’s production, see Chapter 4, pp.137-8.

receipts to and from artisans, including Agostino Zoppo (c.1520–72), Pietro di Zuanne Campanato, and Bartolomeo di Zuanpietro dei Cavedoni who between them undertook the casting (fig. 3.33).¹⁴⁷

There are two separate sets of records for each bronze-founder's work: an individual payment receipt and a corresponding entry in the 1570 summary.¹⁴⁸ Thus, for Zoppo, his payment record details the incremental monies paid to him from 9 August 1553 to 4 February 1564 for casting the most important sections, namely 'the histories [i.e. narrative reliefs] and figures of the door' (figs 3.34, 3.35, and 3.36d).¹⁴⁹ In the 1570 summary, his work is noted with a single total sum as follows:

1563. And further, on 9 August, to Master Agostino Zotto [sic] Sculptor of Padua for having cast all the figures, and heads, and reliefs [i.e. the two main panels of *The Deposition* and *The Resurrection*], and *putti* of the said door in total, equals 310 *lire*.¹⁵⁰

Beneath that entry, the bronze required for Zoppo's work is then accounted for:

And further for 340 pounds of metal excluding the *calo* [loss through casting] that the said figures, heads, reliefs and *putti* weighed, at 35 *soldi* per pound, which comes to, in total, 595 *lire*.¹⁵¹

Campanato's work is recorded in a receipt presented by him dated 15 July 1562 for 'six decorative pieces that go around the edges of the door' weighing 185 pounds. His charge for supplying the metal (which he records as 'ottone' or brass) as well as undertaking the casting, excluding the *calo*, is 30 *soldi* per pound of metal, totalling 277 *lire* 10 *soldi*.¹⁵² In the 1570 summary this is similarly noted (although here it is called 'bronzio' and not 'ottone'), again with the combined materials/labour rate of 30 *soldi* per pound included in the entry (figs 3.35 and 3.36d).¹⁵³ Cavedoni's receipt of 15 November 1562, meanwhile, specifies that he

¹⁴⁷ Cat.2, docs 2.1-2.5 respectively.

¹⁴⁸ Cat.2, doc.2.3 (Zoppo); doc.2.4 (Campanato); and doc.2.5 (Cavedoni). Cat.2, doc.2.1 (the 1570 account summary): [8] Campanato; [9] Cavedoni; [10] Zoppo's labour; and [11] the metal used for Zoppo's casts.

¹⁴⁹ Cat.2, doc.2.3.

¹⁵⁰ Cat.2, doc.2.1, [10]. The date here is incorrect and is one of two errors I have identified in this document drawn up by an unknown hand on Sansovino's behalf. Zoppo actually began work on 9 August 1553. According to his original payment receipts, he had completed the work by 4 February 1564 (recorded as *1563 more veneto*). The author of the 1570 summary had clearly conflated the two dates.

¹⁵¹ Cat.2, doc.2.1, [11]. For the *calo*, see pp.116-17 below.

¹⁵² Cat.2, doc.2.4.

¹⁵³ Cat.2, doc.2.1, [8]. I disagree with Boucher who interpreted the documents for Campanato to mean that he had only supplied the bronze alloy (as a result of which he deduced that Cavedoni had cast all of the remaining elements). Boucher 1991, vol.1, p.147. The original payment receipt of 15 July 1562

supplied 251 pounds of 'latone' (brass) framing elements and door roses, excluding the *calo*, and received 51 ducats for his efforts, without stating the rate per pound of metal (figs 3.35 and 3.36d).¹⁵⁴ The corresponding entry in the 1570 summary is, however, more specific and states that Cavedoni was paid at a combined materials/labour rate of 30 *soldi* per pound of bronze and the total is given in *lire* and *soldi*: 316 *lire* 4 *soldi*.¹⁵⁵

It would appear from the documents, therefore, that Campanato and Cavedoni were paid at the same rate per pound of bronze, i.e. 30 *soldi* per pound. From this evidence, it could reasonably be inferred that both men were using a bronze alloy of comparable quality. Indeed, as far as I am aware, this same combined rate of pay recorded in the 1570 summary has never been questioned. However, close examination of the payments reveals that Cavedoni was actually paid just over 25 *soldi* per pound of metal, and not 30 *soldi*.¹⁵⁶ It would appear that the as-yet-unidentified individual who drew up the summary (it is not in Sansovino's hand) simply assumed that Cavedoni had been paid at the same rate per *libbra* of metal as Campanato and jotted this down without bothering to check that the sums added up correctly. This discovery is significant as it means that three completely different prices were paid for the alloys employed. This price differential surely indicates that three alloys of differing qualities were quite deliberately chosen for different sections of the door, with the most important elements (i.e. the principal figural elements cast by Zoppo) being accorded the highest quality bronze. Moreover, the fact that the metal used for Zoppo's work was accounted for separately from his labour charge *and* at a higher rate per *libbra* (35 *soldi*) than the combined materials and labour rate expended for the rest of the door (30 and c.25 *soldi*) makes the difference in quality between the alloy chosen for Zoppo's work and those selected for the remainder of the door even greater.¹⁵⁷

clearly indicates that Campanato undertook the casting as well: 'cioè, soldi trenta / ottone *et fonditura* [my emphasis] monte lire dusento settantasette soldi 10.' Cat.2, doc.2.4. Sturman and Smith 2008, p.452; Avery 2011, p.102; and Sturman and Smith 2013, p.170 also interpreted the documents to mean that Campanato undertook the casting work.

¹⁵⁴ Cat.2, doc.2.5. Boucher 1991, vol.1, p.202, doc.112, note 2, identified 'broche' as 'roses or projecting nails of the door frame'. These are clearly visible on the door.

¹⁵⁵ Cat.2, doc.2.1, [9]. 316 *lire* 4 *soldi* equates to 51 ducats as recorded in the payment receipt.

¹⁵⁶ This is deduced from the fact that 251 pounds of metal at 30 *soldi* per *libbra* does not equal 316 *lire* 4 *soldi*.

¹⁵⁷ In May 2012, I was able to share my initial observations on the prices paid for the metal with Shelley Sturman, Head of Object Conservation at the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., in relation to the XRF analysis she had undertaken of the door and the conclusions she had reached about the alloys with her colleague and fellow conservator Dylan Smith (fig.3.36a-d). At the time, I had not yet reached the conclusion presented here about the even greater qualitative difference between the cost of the bronze for Zoppo's work and that of Campanato's and Cavedoni's input. Sturman and Smith 2013, pp.170, 174, note 53.

This reappraisal of the documentary evidence complements the earlier technical research of Shelley Sturman and Dylan Smith (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.), who used the results of their initial XRF analysis of the Sacristy Door undertaken in 2006 alongside close-reading of the documentary transcriptions in order to confirm, or in the case of Campanato establish, the attributions of individual door sections as suggested by the archival records.¹⁵⁸ By analysing 40 different spots across the door (fig.3.36c), they identified three main types of alloy: quaternary bronze (two main narrative panels, the three reclining prophets, the six portrait busts and three of the *putti* panels); quaternary bronze with additional lead (three of the horizontal elements framing the narrative panels); and a leaded brass (the four *Evangelists* and one of the *putti* panels), which basically correspond to the documented contributions of the three foundry-men: Zoppo, Cavedoni and Campanato respectively (fig.3.36d).¹⁵⁹

That the casting of a single work of art should have been divided between three foundrymen who operated independently of each other is most interesting and was no doubt done for pragmatic reasons. As Boucher observed, Zoppo (a Paduan-based professional sculptor-cum-foundryman) was clearly chosen to execute the largest, most important and complex elements because he was felt by Sansovino to possess the requisite levels of skill and experience.¹⁶⁰ The Venice-based Campanato and Cavedoni, on the other hand, were employed for the less significant sections, presumably because Sansovino considered it economically inexpedient to pay a bronze-caster with Zoppo's skills to cast the more minor, decorative elements that a jobbing founder could do just as well but for significantly less money. If their surnames are anything to go by, Campanato specialised in bell-making while Cavedoni produced fire-dogs and other functional bronzes.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁸ Their preliminary findings were published in Sturman and Smith 2008, with subsequent refinements in Sturman and Smith 2013.

¹⁵⁹ Sturman and Smith 2013, pp.169-70. As acknowledged by Sturman and Smith, further technical analysis is required to confirm these initial findings as not every section of the door was tested due to time constraints. Moreover, due to an increasing understanding of how molten metal behaves during the casting process, it is becoming clearer that alloy identification through XRF analysis is only really reliable if a sufficient area of the bronze's surface is tested (i.e. the greater number of spots tested the more accurate the resulting data-set).

¹⁶⁰ Boucher 1976, p.160.

¹⁶¹ From a document published in Avery 2011, p.392, doc.125, it is clear that Campanato was trained as a bell-maker as he states in a sworn affidavit that he had been apprenticed to the late bell-maker Pietro di Zuanne Campanato for 7 years. However, as his master had cast the Zen bronzes, Campanato's training would likely have encompassed the casting of other types of bronzes as well. For a general discussion of the reliability (or not) of surnames being an indication of particular specialisations within the bronze industry and reference to Cavedoni, see Avery 2011, p.62.

Cost

As with its supply, the cost of bronze can be broken down into two categories: (1) the raw materials (copper and tin) and (2) the alloy itself. From information collated from a wide range of documents, it is possible to chart the prices for copper, tin, and bronze alloy for at least part of the period (Tables 3-5).¹⁶² As the figures show, copper and the more expensive tin were generally accounted for in ducats per *mier*. Where it proved possible to separate bronze prices from labour charges, the cost of bronze was either factored in ducats per *mier*, like copper and tin; in *lire* and *soldi* per *libbra*; or as seen with the Sacristy Door, in *soldi* per *libbra*. While most copper and tin purchases recorded both the price per *mier* and the total weight of metal bought, this was not always the case with bronze: sometimes only the total price of the alloy was documented with no mention of the price per unit weight, nor the total weight of bronze used.¹⁶³ Given that most of the copper and tin prices analysed here are taken from State records for purchases at the Arsenal, a greater level of precision and consistency is perhaps to be expected.

Copper appears to have held a relatively steady price between 1517 and the mid-1550s, averaging at 74 ducats per *mier* (Table 3).¹⁶⁴ By 1568, however, prices had jumped to 125 ducats per *mier* for superior Schwaz copper, and were at their highest by 1602, when Doge Grimani paid 160 ducats for one *mier* of copper from the Mint. Although there is less information for tin, English tin ('da ponente') rose steadily between 1543 and 1582, from 124 ducats to 160 ducats per *mier* (Table 4). The going rate for bronze alloy, meanwhile, appears to have increased over the sixteenth century (Table 5): only logical given the concomitant rises in the prices of both copper and tin. In 1533, when the Scuola Grande di San Marco decided to commission a new bronze door for its meeting-house, the price per *mier* was reckoned to be 50 ducats.¹⁶⁵ Nine years later, the confraternity lamented that the price of bronze had increased to an unaffordable 80 ducats per *mier*.¹⁶⁶ As prices for copper appear to have been relatively stable during this time (66 ducats per *mier* in 1528 and 72 ducats per

¹⁶² Prices for obsolete bronzes ear-marked for recycling were too few to be useful and so have not been tabulated.

¹⁶³ For example, in 1524, the accounts for the two Grimani portrait busts recorded only that 19 *lire* 10 *soldi* had been spent on bronze. Similarly, towards the end of the period, only the total monetary value of the bronze provided for the statuettes of the *Four Doctors of the Church* was given (390 *lire*). In neither case was the weight of the metal recorded. See Table 5.

¹⁶⁴ As Table 3 indicates, copper increased from 43 ducats in 1497 to 75 ducats per *mier* in 1517, probably due (at least in part) to the effects of the War of the League of Cambrai (1508–16) during which time Venice experienced a great many economic difficulties, not least Emperor Maximilian forbidding trade between his subjects and Venice. Häberlein 2012, p.50.

¹⁶⁵ Avery 2011, p.385, doc.112. For this abortive project, see *ibid.*, pp.99-101.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p.385, doc.112.

mier in 1542), the increase is likely to have been caused by a sharp rise in the cost of tin.¹⁶⁷ By 1586, the Arsenal authorities valued bronze in the form of bell-metal at 100 ducats per *mier*.¹⁶⁸

Although this information is instructive, the sample range and time period covered are regrettably inconsistent across all three materials, with far less evidence available for tin than for copper and bronze. Furthermore, many of the factors that affect an accurate assessment of marble and stone prices, as discussed earlier, are equally applicable here, such as unavoidable lacunae in the archival record, inconsistencies in how prices were recorded, and differences in the origin and quality of the materials bought.¹⁶⁹ While charting the rise in the cost of copper and tin might be useful, neither the origin nor the form in which they were supplied is always known (Tables 3 and 4). Therefore, even if we know that the copper came from Schwaz, the document may not indicate whether it was supplied refined or unrefined, or as rosette or sheet copper. There were also the associated import costs, such as customs and excise duties, freight costs, and insurance, and it is not always explicit whether one or all of these expenses were factored into the sums recorded.¹⁷⁰ An additional problem that compromises an in-depth assessment of the price of bronze (as opposed to tin and copper) is the above-noted tendency of patrons to commission sculptors/founders to supply both materials and labour rather than source the materials themselves. In such cases, a breakdown of individual expenses can rarely be determined. The only recorded example to my knowledge in this period is the copper purchased from the Mint for the Grimani monument reliefs in San Giuseppe.¹⁷¹

Another issue affecting an analysis of bronze prices is the *calo*.¹⁷² This is the unrecuperable metal lost through the casting process, which seems to have been calculated at c.6%.¹⁷³ A patron providing the bronze upfront would have had to factor in sufficient extra metal to compensate for the *calo*, to guarantee enough metal for a successful cast. Likewise

¹⁶⁷ As I have been unable to track down figures for tin between 1497 and 1543 (when the prices were comparable: 120 and 124 ducats respectively), this remains a hypothesis.

¹⁶⁸ The higher levels of tin in bell-metal could partly account for the elevated cost here.

¹⁶⁹ See p.96 above.

¹⁷⁰ On occasion (normally to encourage trade) the customs duties ('*datio*') were waived. Table 3, entries dated July 1548 and 1550.

¹⁷¹ Cat.8, doc.8.26, [446] and doc.8.44, [4].

¹⁷² Avery 2011, pp.72-3.

¹⁷³ Avery stated that the loss could be anywhere between 5 and 15% depending on the alloy (without qualification) but the documentary evidence for sculpture, artillery and bells in Venice suggests 6%—at least, this is the percentage normally given. See the Cappella Zen example of c.1521 discussed below; the view of the State gun-founders that the *calo* in artillery manufacture was 6% (Avery 2011, p.430, docs 235-6, discussed p.20); and the 1626 contract for a bell for San Giorgio Maggiore for which the anticipated *calo* was also 6% (*ibid.*, p.464, doc.300; discussed p.73).

a sculptor or founder negotiating his fee for a job would have had to budget for the metal that would be lost. Although the *calo* appears more frequently in sources concerned with bell-making, when it is documented for sculpture it is usually simply referred to as ‘excluding the *calo*’, as seen in the Sacristy Door records analysed above.¹⁷⁴ A rare instance of the *calo* being assigned a specific percentage figure in a document concerning sculpture can be found in the detailed summary of work drawn up by Pietro di Zuanne Campanato in c.1521 for the Cappella Zen bronzes, and in which he accounted for the bronze used in casting them.¹⁷⁵ After listing all the elements cast, together with the weight of metal used, he stated that the *calo* was 6%.¹⁷⁶

STUCCO

Stucco was a new sculptural material for the sixteenth-century patron and should not be confused with plaster or gesso.¹⁷⁷ A versatile, soft, fine white plaster that can be both modelled and cast, stucco offered a relatively cheap, lightweight alternative to marble and stone for figurative sculpture and interior architectural ornament.¹⁷⁸ Extensively used in the ancient world, stucco was famously rediscovered in c.1500 in Rome when excavations at sites such as the Domus Aurea revealed elaborate relief decorations on vaults and walls, the style of which became known as ‘grottesche’ (fig.3.37).¹⁷⁹ Giovanni da Udine (1487–1561), a member of Raphael’s workshop, is credited as being the first to reproduce the material successfully, using a combination of lime and white marble powder.¹⁸⁰ It swiftly became a popular choice for interior decoration in Rome and its environs, as seen, for example, in da Udine’s work in the Loggia di Raffaello, Vatican (1517–19; fig.3.38) and at Villa Madama

¹⁷⁴ ‘netto di calo’. Cat.2, docs 2.1, [8], [9] and [11]; 2.4; and 2.5.

¹⁷⁵ Cecchetti and Ongania 1886, p.19, doc.125. For further analysis of this document without discussion of the *calo*, see Avery 2011, pp.123–4.

¹⁷⁶ Campanato’s profession as a bell-maker may well account for the *calo*’s inclusion in his sums.

¹⁷⁷ Plaster or ‘gesso’ is different from stucco: a fast-setting gypsum-based compound, perfect for taking casts of statuary, such as those of antique sculptures first made during the Renaissance, most famously by Primaticcio for the French king, François I. Gesso was extensively used in the bronze-casting process for moulds made by skilled *formatori*, and for coating terracotta and wooden sculptures before the application of polychromy.

¹⁷⁸ For an overview of stucco and plaster, see Beard 1983, Penny 1993, pp.191–9; Bilbey and Cribb 2007; and Proudfoot et al 2014. For detailed analysis of stucco production methods and techniques in Venice and the Veneto, see Fogliata and Sartor 2004. For discussion of stucco techniques in Renaissance treatises, with particular reference to the Veneto, see Molli 1989.

¹⁷⁹ For the Domus Aurea and the Renaissance rediscovery of the art of stucco, see Dacos 1969. The term ‘grotesques’ was derived from the term ‘grottoes’ which was given to the excavated rooms.

¹⁸⁰ Vasari 1568, vol.3, p.578.

(1520–25; fig.3.39).¹⁸¹ It was not long before the material was being employed to great effect in Northern Italy, notably in the Camera degli Stucchi (c.1529–31) at Palazzo Te, Mantua, designed by Raphael's erstwhile collaborator, Giulio Romano (c.1499–1546) and executed by the great stuccoist Francesco Primaticcio (1504–70; fig.3.40).¹⁸² The first documented use of stucco decoration in the Veneto was at the Odeo Cornaro, Padua (begun 1530; executed by Giovanni Maria Falconetto and Tiziano Minio), and in the vaulting of the Cappella dell'Arca in the Santo (1533–4, by Falconetto and his two sons, as well as Minio, Cosini and Cattaneo; fig.3.41a-b).¹⁸³

Giovanni da Udine created some of the earliest stuccowork in Venice itself in the Palazzo Grimani at Santa Maria Formosa: first in the Camerino di Callisto in 1537, and then in the Camerino di Apollo in 1540 (figs 3.42-3.43).¹⁸⁴ Stucco was widely used in the city from the mid-sixteenth century onwards for decorative relief cycles on ceilings and vaults, such as the magnificent gilded staircases of the Palazzo Ducale (1554–61; stuccowork: c.1558–9; figs 1.30, 1.89) and the Biblioteca Marciana (stuccowork: c.1559–60; figs 1.104, 3.44-3.45); and for fireplaces, such as those created by Vittoria and his workshop for numerous patrons in Venice and their villas on the mainland.¹⁸⁵ It was also a sensible choice for statues where weight was a concern, such as the *Annunciation* group and pair of sibyls by Campagna in San Sebastiano (1582; figs 2.4-2.7).¹⁸⁶ Placed up high on the church's narrow *barco*, the figures would have resembled pristine white Carrara marble, but without the concomitant weight or expense.¹⁸⁷

Slow-setting and very hard when dry, stucco recipes varied, but Vasari, for example, advised that white stucco was achieved by mixing 'two thirds lime to one third pounded marble'.¹⁸⁸ As recommended by Vitruvius and Alberti, the lime had to be well slaked and

¹⁸¹ On Giovanni da Udine, see Dacos and Furlan 1987.

¹⁸² For Palazzo Te, see Bazzotti 2013. Primaticcio left Italy for France in 1531, where he would create some of the finest Renaissance stucco decoration at Fontainebleau for François I. See Paris 2004.

¹⁸³ For the Odeo Cornaro, see Wolters 1963a, 1963b and 1980. For the stuccowork of the Cappella dell'Arca, see McHam 1994, pp.81-3.

¹⁸⁴ Completed in September 1539. For this, see Bristot 2008b, pp.62-72; and 79-87 respectively.

¹⁸⁵ For the staircases' relevant bibliography, see Chapter 1, notes 98 and 103. For sculptural ceiling and vault decoration in sixteenth-century Venice, see Wolters 1968a; 1968b; and 2007, pp.251-82. For fireplaces, see Chapter 1, note 12.

¹⁸⁶ Timofiewitsch 1972, pp.244-4 (cat.5).

¹⁸⁷ The statues were, until recently, very dirty and difficult to read. Thanks to recent conservation work funded by Save Venice, Inc., the quality and beauty of the figures have been revealed. I am most grateful to Lesley Contarini of Save Venice for kindly allowing access to scaffolds during the conservation work.

¹⁸⁸ Vasari 1568, vol.1, p.27 (Vasari-Maclehose 1960, p.86). The Venetian patrician, Marc'Antonio Barbaro was enamoured with stucco ornament and even wrote a treatise on its manufacture, with

aged before it could be used.¹⁸⁹ Stucco's great malleability necessitates the use of a support to which it can adhere. For example, low relief stucco decorations were pressed from moulds, and while still soft, applied to a roughened surface which would act as a key.¹⁹⁰ If the stucco elements were to be modelled directly onto a ceiling/vault/wall then nails or rods would be driven into the surface and the stucco built up around these supports.¹⁹¹ For sculpture in the round, an internal armature was required, such as iron rods.¹⁹²

Regrettably, there is currently insufficient archival evidence to determine the most usual route followed by patrons for the sourcing and supply of stucco. However, documents indicate that the options were similar to those for marble and stone: patrons could either pay the sculptor to supply both the stucco and labour; source the materials themselves; or pursue a combination of the two. In February 1560, for example, the Procuratori di San Marco de Supra commissioned Vittoria to decorate the staircase of the Biblioteca Marciana using 'marble stucco' for a fee of 6 ducats, 9 *lire grossi* per foot, the inference being that the material costs were included.¹⁹³ For the Cappella del SS. Sacramento in San Giuliano, however, some of the stucco work included materials and labour, while the rest appears to have been on a labour-only basis.¹⁹⁴

The terms recorded for the components used in producing stucco sculpture (some or all of which might be enumerated by a patron in his records) include 'ferramenta' (iron work), 'terrazzo' (presumably a crushed marble mixture like that used for flooring), 'calcina' (slaked lime) and then, to cover every eventuality, 'stucco' or 'gesso'.¹⁹⁵ As far as sourcing the principal raw materials for stucco, waste marble for pulverising was a natural by-product of sculptors' and stonemasons' workshops, while lime was a cheap, widely available material,

recipes for different uses of stucco: Howard 2011, p.32.

¹⁸⁹ Vitruvius-Rowland and Howe 1999, Book VII, Ch.II, pp.88-9; Alberti-Rykwert et al 1988, p.55.

¹⁹⁰ Penny 1993, p.191.

¹⁹¹ As at Fontainebleau, see Penny 1993, pp.192-3.

¹⁹² For a discussion of stucco techniques for figures of this kind, see Dickerson III 2015, pp.146-7.

¹⁹³ Avery 1999a, p.211, doc.40(ii).

¹⁹⁴ On 28 June 1583, for example, Vittoria was paid by the *scuola* 'per far le figure neli angoli, et sopra la cornise con spesa in terazo, stuco, et calzina per le dite figure come nela dita appar, ducati vinti tre grossi 16½'; whereas Ottaviano Ridolfi was paid 'per la fatura de stuco soto il soffito' with no mention of materials, the purchase of which appears in a separate entry on the same day: 'per calzina, terazo, et stuco per far l'opera soto il soffito'. Avery 1999a, p.297, doc.114(x).

¹⁹⁵ See, for example, the documents cited in notes 193 and 194 above, and the contract of 9 July 1593 between Luca Marzopini and Francesco Tiepolo for three stucco *Angels* for the Cappella di San Sabba. Herein, the ever-fastidious Tiepolo stated that Marzopini had promised to make the angels 'a tutte sue spese di ferramenta, terrazzo et calcina et gesso, et tutta la sua materia'. Tiepolo 'Spese', fol.39r. Published Avery 2010, p.175, doc.76.

generally produced by brick and tile makers (*fornisieri*) in Venice, sold in a volume measure called the 'mastello da calcina', and transported by *calcinieri*.¹⁹⁶

CLAY

Clay was a cheap, plentiful, lowly material that could be modelled or cast in moulds like stucco, and was employed by all sculptors, utilising stocks prepared and kept in the workshop.¹⁹⁷ Depending on the intended function, works in clay were either left to dry out by themselves ('terra secca') or high-temperature fired in a kiln ('terracotta'). Clay's primary use in sixteenth-century Venice was for creating sculptors' models (fired or unfired depending on the degree of durability required): in the form of sketch-models (*bozzetti*) as part of the design process, full-scale models to aid the execution process, or contract models supplied as part of the agreement between patron and sculptor.¹⁹⁸ Clay could also be used in bronze-casting, for example, as the core ('anima') of a model in the production process. In addition, kiln-fired clay (terracotta) could be employed for finished statuary, although evidence suggests that it was not a particularly common choice in Venice in this period.¹⁹⁹ The exception appears to have been the numerous, highly-finished, terracotta portrait busts produced by Vittoria (fig.1.34).²⁰⁰

¹⁹⁶ Caniato and Dal Borgo 1990, pp.76-7 (*fornasieri*), 86 and 89 (*mastelli da calcina*), 86-9 (*calcinieri*). Only Venetians or those living on the *terraferma* were permitted to operate as *calcinieri*. They sold not only lime, but also bricks and tiles. For the use of low-grade Istrian stone from Cittanova and Porto di Quieto for lime, see Connell 1988, pp.92-3. Howard observes that Marc'Antonio Barbaro considered the best lime for making stucco to come from Monte di Medea, near Udine: Howard 2011, p.32.

¹⁹⁷ For clay and terracotta generally, see Penny 1993, pp.165-89 (moulded), 201-14 (modelled); and Fisher 2007. For a discussion of terracotta sculpture in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Italy, see Boucher 2001.

¹⁹⁸ For contract models, see Chapter 2, pp.72-6.

¹⁹⁹ Archival evidence, contemporary descriptions and surviving objects support this assertion, but many works in terracotta may have been lost and/or replaced, or not deemed worthy of mention. Terracotta had certainly been popular in nearby Padua in the late fifteenth-early sixteenth centuries, with Andrea Riccio producing numerous large-scale works in this medium, such as the extant *Virgin and Child* in the Scuola del Santo.

²⁰⁰ Although some of the surviving terracotta busts were clearly models, such as that for the marble bust of Francesco Duodo, Martin has convincingly argued that many of the surviving Vittoria terracotta busts are so well executed and finished that they were likely intended and valued as independent works of sculpture. Martin T. 1998, pp.86-7. For the Duodo busts, see *ibid.*, pp.102-3 (cat.4, marble), and 104-5 (cat.5, terracotta). The masterful terracotta bust of Doge Nicolò da Ponte (fig.1.34), which formed part of his funerary monument in Santa Maria della Carità (cat.6), was certainly conceived as a finished object, and not a model or interim version for translation into bronze or marble.

When employed for finished sculpture, terracotta tended to have some surface finish in this period, such as polychromy, gilding, or ‘bronzing’.²⁰¹ Good examples of ‘bronzed’ terracotta are Agostino Rubini’s *Mourning Virgin* and *St John the Evangelist*, which flank Campagna’s marble relief of *The Dead Christ* in the Cappella del SS. Sacramento, San Giuliano (fig.2.16).²⁰² Interestingly, tin-glazed terracotta sculpture did not flourish in Venice, as it did in Florence with the Della Robbia workshop, despite the Venetians’ famous love of colour and the fact that there were maiolica producers with the requisite glazing and firing skills operating in the city.²⁰³ The chapel of the Martini, Lucchese silk merchants, with its Della Robbia ceiling decoration (1471–6) in San Giobbe remained an exception not replicated elsewhere (fig.3.46).²⁰⁴ Terracotta was, however, used on occasion for small-scale mass-produced sculptural pieces in the home, often of a devotional nature (fig.3.47).

The ‘Why’ of Material Choices

So why would a patron choose one material over another? There are numerous pragmatic factors that he/she may have considered, many of which are interrelated. Suitability was essential: the material had to be appropriate physically for the type of sculpture being made as well as to its design, function, and intended location. Durability was also an important consideration. Istrian stone, as discussed earlier, was widely preferred to marble for external sculpture, for example, as it weathered much better in the salty, damp Venetian environment. Visibility too was a concern. If a sculpture were intended for a dim church interior or to be viewed from a distance, for example, how well could it be seen? From an unpublished document, we know that the Procuratori di San Marco de Ultra found visibility to be a problem with the dark-hued Priuli monument in San Salvador in November 1624, some 21 years after the monument’s completion (fig.1.44), and had to pay for a new window opening to improve lighting conditions.²⁰⁵ Were there load-bearing concerns? Weight distribution in architectural projects was an issue in the lagoon city, as Sansovino discovered to his cost in the well-documented débacle of the Biblioteca Marciana vault collapse in December 1545 (fig.1.19).²⁰⁶ Thus, for sculpture and sculptural decoration, where weight would equally have been a concern, stucco was often favoured, as seen in the lavish vault decorations of the

²⁰¹ Boucher 2001, pp.22-3. A primer, such as gesso, would have been applied before the surface finish. For technical analysis of primers and surface finishes, see Hubbard and Motture 2001, pp.94-5.

²⁰² For these statuettes, see Davis 1985.

²⁰³ For the Venetian love of colour, see Hills 1999. For maiolica production in Venice, see Wilson 1987.

²⁰⁴ There are a few examples of maiolica floor tiles being used, however, such as in the Lando Chapel, San Sebastiano.

²⁰⁵ PSM de Ultra, b.350, ‘Notatorio F, 1621 sino 1631’, fol.55v.

²⁰⁶ Morresi 2000, pp.191-213 (cat.31) with full bibliography.

Cappella del SS. Sacramento in San Giuliano (1578–83), as well as Campagna's *Annunciation* and pair of sibyls placed atop the narrow *barco* of San Sebastiano (1582; figs 2.4-2.7). The availability of a material and the time it would have taken to supply and transform into a work of sculpture were yet more pragmatic considerations. As discussed above, marble was not always as readily available as other types of stone, and took much longer to carve.

A central and unavoidable factor that all patrons would have had to bear in mind was affordability. Could the patron afford the materials he desired? As examined above, there were considerable differences between materials in terms of cost. Indeed, a shrewd patron could cut costs by employing cheaper materials to imitate more expensive ones. In February 1594, for example, Francesco Tiepolo chose Rovigno stone 'that imitates marble' for statues of *St Louis* and *St Francis* and 'bronzed' terracotta for four *putti* commissioned for the Cappella di San Sabba in Sant'Antonin, no doubt in an effort to manage the costs of this lavish project (fig.2.36).²⁰⁷ Some patrons, however, questioned whether a material was costly enough. As discussed in Chapter 1, lavish expenditure on suitable commissions projected the highly desired Renaissance ideals of magnificence, virtue and magnanimity onto the patron.²⁰⁸ This is undoubtedly why the egocentric Rangone was so keen to have his portraits made in bronze (figs 1.41, 1.108, 2.56-2.57).

Closely connected to the expense of the material was its aesthetic appeal and the message that its employment could convey. Marble and bronze were at the pinnacle of the materials hierarchy of the time. They were redolent of magnificence, splendour, antiquity, and nobility; and esteemed for being long-lasting and enduring (as exemplified by surviving antique statuary).²⁰⁹ In his translation of Vitruvius' *Ten books on Architecture*, published in Venice in 1567, for example, the Venetian nobleman and humanist Daniele Barbaro (1514–70) observed that different stones possessed different qualities, highlighting particularly the nobility and beauty of marbles and other precious stones:

Stones have diverse qualities, because some are vibrant, strong, luscious, like 'selice', and marble, the innate qualities of which are the resonance and hardness: others are weak and friable, like 'Toso' and sandy stones. Marbles come very close to the honour of gems for their beauty and their grace, and especially those noble marbles, which by their variety of colours, or by their

²⁰⁷ 'cioe uno Santo Alvise et uno Santo Francesco et che sia di piera viva da Rovignio de mar bianca, che imiti il marmo' and 'quattro angioletti di creacotta, et finti di bronzo'. Tiepolo 'Spese', fol. 42r-v. First published Avery 2010, p.176, doc.103.

²⁰⁸ Chapter 1, p.38.

²⁰⁹ This appreciation of marbles and other precious stones is exemplified in Francesco Colonna's famous description of the Porta Magna in his *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* (Venice, 1499), Colonna-Godwin 1999, pp.54-6. For further discussion, see Howard 2013, p.97.

great whiteness or fineness, and splendour, or translucency cause astonishment like Parian [marble], Porphyry, Serpentine, Alabaster, and other similar variegated marbles, or granites.²¹⁰

This high regard for marble and its meaning is vividly recorded in the surviving testimonies of Gianfrancesco Priuli, in his role as co-executor of the estate of Lodovico Priuli (d.1571), and his involvement in the construction of the Priuli dogal monument (c.1573–c.1603) in San Salvador, work on which began only a few years after the publication of Barbaro's volume (fig.1.44).²¹¹ The project was beset with problems over the design and materials to be employed, with heated disagreements between the Priuli family (represented by Gianfrancesco) and the Procuratori di San Marco de Ultra (who had taken over responsibility for the project in 1574) over whose design was to be used: that of Giovanni Antonio Rusconi (c.1520–87) or Vittoria.²¹² On the one hand, Rusconi's much more costly design was deemed by the family to be the most worthy way in which to memorialise the deceased doges, favouring as it did marble over other materials.²¹³ On the other hand, Vittoria's design was the procurators' choice. They regarded it as 'very honourable and appropriate' but as it relied much more on Istrian stone for the main construction, it would consequently cost much less to produce.²¹⁴ Gianfrancesco Priuli protested at great length against Vittoria's design: calling

²¹⁰ 'Hanno le pietre qualità diversa; perche alcune sono vivaci forti, succose, come la selice, & il marmo, nelle quali è innato il suono, & la sodezza: altre esauste, & leggieri, come è il Toso, & le pietre arenose. I marmi sono prossimi all'honor delle gemme per la bellezza, & gratia loro, & specialmente que marmi nobili, che per la varietà di colori, o per la gran bianchezza o finezza, & splendore, o trasparenza danno meraviglia, come il Pario, il Porfido, il Serpentino, l'Alabastro, & altri simiglianti marmi meschi, o graniti.' Barbaro 1567, p.84. Part-cited Barry 2006, p.521. For Barbaro and his 'Commentaries' on Vitruvius, see D'Evelyn 2012.

²¹¹ As discussed in Chapter 1, Lodovico was the son of Doge Girolamo, and had obtained the rights to erect the funerary monument to his late father and uncle in 1569, leaving money in his will to pay for its construction. See Chapter 1, pp.23-4, 42-3. Gianfrancesco was Lodovico's cousin and principal beneficiary.

²¹² For further discussion, see Chapter 4, p.153, and Avery 2016 forthcoming.

²¹³ From an estimate of material and labour costs of February 1576, Rusconi's design was calculated to require 700 *miera* of marble totalling 8,400 ducats (at 12 ducats per *mier*). Avery 1999a, pp.269-70, doc.92(xxiii).

²¹⁴ 'molto honorado et al proposito'. Ludwig 1911, p.27. An estimate for Vittoria's design (pre-dating that for Rusconi's design) calculated that the various marbles, *paragone* and Istrian stone would cost only 2,440 ducats. Avery 1999a, p.259, doc.92(ix).

Istrian stone 'lowly and base', declaring that the work would never succeed if it were not made from 'noble stones', and urged the procurators to return to Rusconi's design.²¹⁵

There was also a longstanding love for an even more costly material in Venice: bronze. Ancient bronzes, such as the *Lion of St Mark* (fig.3.48), and the *Four Horses* on the façade of San Marco (fig.3.49), had been appropriated from conquered Constantinople and triumphantly erected in Piazza San Marco, and the adjacent Piazzetta.²¹⁶ These rapidly became symbols of Venice's identity, closely woven into the Serenissima's mythic foundation and history, and were a proclamation of the Venetians' military prowess and indomitability.²¹⁷ The choice of bronze for many of the city's modern civic sculptures, such as the *Equestrian Monument to Bartolomeo Colleoni* (1479–96; figs 1.31a-b, 3.50a-b), and Sansovino's Loggetta figures (c.1541–6; figs 1.97, 3.51-3.54), demonstrated not only the Venetians' technological prowess, but also their self-confidence—a public declaration that the city did not fear invasion and the resulting melting-down or removal of these costly embellishments.²¹⁸

In a devotional context, although bronze had been frequently used during the Middle Ages for functional liturgical objects, such as candlesticks, holy water stoups, and bells, it was not commonly chosen for the three-dimensional representation of Christian figures before the Renaissance period, due its idolatrous connotations resulting from its use in the ancient world for votive statuettes of pagan gods.²¹⁹ Leon Battista Alberti (1404–72), however, in his architectural treatise, *De re aedificatoria*, first published in 1485, reinstated the use of bronze statues in Christian contexts, praising its 'durability', and affirmed that such objects should 'convey the grace and majesty of a god [...] and appear receptive to the prayers of the supplicants'.²²⁰ By the post-Tridentine period of the late sixteenth century, bronze had been fully accepted by the church for religious statuary, and several monumental bronze altarpieces had been produced for highly significant Venetian sites: the aforementioned *Altar of the Crucifix* (c.1582) in the Scuola di San Fantin (fig.1.75), and the high altars of Il Redentore (c.1589–90; fig.2.20) and San Giorgio Maggiore (c.1592–3;

²¹⁵ 'di pietra Istriana così abietta, et bassa'. PSM de Ultra, b.223, fasc.19, fols 15r-23r, at fol.19r; and 'perche l'opera non potria mai reusire se non si farà di pietre nobile.' Ibid., fol.20r. Partially transcribed Simane 1993, pp.54-6. Published in full Avery 1999a, pp.259-62, doc. 92(xi).

²¹⁶ For the *Lion*, see Scarfi 1990; for the *Horses*, see Perry 1977, pp.27-39; and Jacoff 1993. For the significance of bronze in the ancient world and the importance of these appropriated bronzes to Venice, see Avery 2011, pp.1-8.

²¹⁷ For the foundation of Venice's myths, and the role played by the 'stolen' bronzes, see Brown 1996a, pp.11-29.

²¹⁸ For the *Colleoni*, see Chapter 1, note 13; for the Loggetta bronzes, Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.73-88; vol.2, pp.334-5 (cat.27).

²¹⁹ For further discussion, see Avery 2011, pp.3-4.

²²⁰ Alberti-Rykwert et al 1988, Book VII, 17, p.243.

fig.1.4).²²¹ Furthermore, the sheer expense of bronze would have been regarded as a manifest demonstration of liberality and magnificence.

This does not mean that patrons were not pragmatic about their material choices. In many of the surviving multi-media commissions of the second half of the sixteenth century, for example, patrons—no doubt in close discussion with the designer, sculptor and/or *proto*—employed a variety of sculptural materials, with the most expensive and aesthetically important generally used for the main sculptural elements, and the cheaper, less prestigious for less significant parts. This hierarchical use of materials can be seen to great effect in the Cappella del SS. Sacramento in San Giuliano discussed earlier (fig.2.16, 2.48), which includes white Carrara marble (relief of *The Dead Christ supported by Two Angels*); coloured marbles (parts of the altar frame); gilt-bronze (tabernacle door relief); Istrian stone (relief of *God the Father* and parts of the altar frame); stucco (vaulting and now-lost angels crowning the altar pediment); and even 'bronzed' terracotta (statuettes of the *Mourning Virgin* and *St John the Evangelist*).²²² To my knowledge, it has thus far gone unremarked that this differs from the *scuola*'s original plan, as outlined in their contract of 1 July 1578 with Franco, which was to have the relief of *The Dead Christ* carved from Istrian stone and the flanking figures of the *Mourning Virgin* and *St John* modelled in stucco.²²³ There is no written record as to why these changes took place or by whom they were instituted, but the decision to change the material of the central relief had clearly been made by 22 December 1578, when the confraternity recorded paying the Procurator Dolfin 31 ducats, 16 *soldi* for a piece of marble specifically for *The Dead Christ*.²²⁴

In addition to pragmatic and aesthetic factors, there were issues of tradition, fashion, and competition, as well as familial/societal expectations that a patron might have taken into

²²¹ For the Redentore's high altar, see Timofiewitsch 1972, pp.46-73, 253-5 (cat.12). For San Giorgio's, see Chapter 1, note 67. For the impact of the Council of Trent on religious art, see Blunt 1978.

²²² For the lost stucco angels, see Mason Rinaldi 1975–6, pp.446-7. Other examples of the employment of material hierarchies include the Zane Altar, Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari (c.1563–c.1577–9; Istrian stone, marble, stucco); the Cappella di San Sabba, Sant'Antonin (1591–4; Carrara marble, black and white Friulian stone, Rovigno stone, *paragone*, stucco, terracotta); and the Cappella del Rosario, SS. Giovanni e Paolo (1582–1618 with later additions; Carrara marble, gilded bronze, marble, stucco).

²²³ '...et tute le dette cose, parte hanno da esser fatte della miglior pietra, et della piu bona sorte che venghi da Rovigno [...] la prospetiva insieme col corpo del nostro signore insieme con li angeli che li sono acanto, con il Dio Padre in cielo con li spiritelli che li sono intorno [...] Le altre cose veramente che non doverano esser di pietra viva, ma esser fate di stucho, et fatte di mano di buon maestro, saranno la nostra Donna, S. Giovanni [...].' BMCV, CI.IV, 164, fols 32-33.

²²⁴ '[1578] 22 detto [December] per uno pezo de marmaro fino per uno Cristo paso per l'altar tolto da Clarissimo Dolfino procurator — ducati 31 L. — S. 16.' Avery 1999a, p.296, doc.114(x).

account. When the Dalmatian-born Giovanni Vrana commissioned his votive *Altar of the Nativity* in San Giuseppe (figs 1.109-1.111), with its high relief centrepiece, apart from the obvious reasons for choosing Istrian stone (its relative cheapness and greater availability compared to marble; its inherent whiteness and lack of veining), it would also have been a subtle acknowledgement of his country of birth.²²⁵

The material chosen for a work of sculpture may also have needed to accord with that of a prototype, such as the bronze figures of the new altar for the Santo's Cappella dell'Arca di Sant'Antonio (1593–4) with the fifteenth-century bronzes of its *cappella maggiore* (figs 3.55a-b and 3.56a-b).²²⁶ Was the material appropriate to the patron's position in Venetian society and how it could be interpreted? Did it follow or break with traditions or expectations of family, location, or wider Venetian society? The long-held value of *mediocritas*, for example, remained an important consideration for the patriciate in this period, although this did not prevent many patricians from lavish displays of *magnificenza* through architecture and art patronage.²²⁷ For others, such as wealthy members of the *cittadino* class like Rangone, such social constraints were hardly a concern.²²⁸

The material choices of the Goldsmiths' Guild for its new altar in San Giacomo encompass many of the factors outlined above (figs 0.1-0.2). As discussed in Chapter 1, the guild obtained permission to erect an altar dedicated to its patron saint, St Anthony Abbot, in the newly-rebuilt ducal church in April 1601.²²⁹ The altar frame was constructed from costly marbles and decorated with numerous bronze sculptures, principally the over life-size central figure of *St Anthony Abbot*. But why did the guild choose bronze? And what would this choice have signified to its peers and wider society? It is highly likely that the guild's choice was informed, at least in part, by an acute awareness of the bronze precedents mentioned above, such as San Giorgio's new high altar also produced by Campagna. Instead of a painted canvas, or a sculpture in another material, the guild chose the costliest option: a three-dimensional altarpiece, with several almost life-size figures in bronze. The goldsmiths were probably further influenced by factors that had motivated their move to San Giacomo: a desire to bestow honour and prestige upon both their patron saint and their guild and to maximise their public display of piety and devotion.

That the goldsmiths were anxious to erect a conspicuous and appropriate altar is reflected in the chapter meeting minutes of December 1602, and their decision to opt for bronze may have stemmed from these anxieties.²³⁰ The minutes show an awareness of the

²²⁵ Cat.5.

²²⁶ McHam 1994, p.90.

²²⁷ For further discussion of *mediocritas*, see Brown 2004, pp.34-41.

²²⁸ Sherman 2013, p.16.

²²⁹ Chapter 1, pp.34-5; and cat.9, doc.9.4.

²³⁰ Cat.9, doc.9.6, esp. fols 2r-4v.

commissions that had been undertaken by other *scuole*, and imply that competition drove them to 'out-do' their fellow trade guilds, especially as there were two recently-erected guild altars in the same church: the painted altarpiece of the Grain sifters and packers opposite (fig.3.57), and the partially-gilded marble high altar of the Cheesemongers (fig.1.83).²³¹ Furthermore, choosing bronze had the obvious, additional benefit of reflecting the goldsmiths' own trade, that of working with costly metals. While the contract with Campagna for the *St Anthony* specified twice that the figure was to be made from bronze, it also unusually stipulated the use of brass ingots ('laton de verga') in the alloy (fig.0.5).²³² This may have been ordered for practical reasons, as brass has a lower melting point than bronze, making it easier to cast. However, the addition of brass would have enhanced the figure's aesthetic qualities, giving it a more golden appearance—a clearly desirable effect for the Goldsmiths' Guild. Evidently, by choosing bronze for their new altarpiece, the goldsmiths sought to outshine their peers, both literally and metaphorically (fig.3.58).²³³

The sculptural materials of Venice were many and varied, while locating and providing them was usually costly, often complex, and sometimes beset with difficulties. As we have seen, the sculptor was rarely entrusted with supplying the materials, but once he had them, the onus was then on him to fulfil his contractual obligations. While some sculptural commissions, such as stucco work, were executed mainly on site, most of the sculpture examined here was produced in the sculptor's workshop before transportation to its final destination. The sculptor's workshop, as we will see in the next chapter, was, therefore, the place where the crucial, final steps of the commissioning process took place, a place of inspiration, delegation, and collaboration, and where networks were crucial.

²³¹ Cat.9, doc.9.6, fol.2r-v: '[...] tutte le altre scolle, et arti [...] hanno fabricato altari, et schole di gran maraviglia e spesa'.

²³² Cat.9, doc.9.9.

²³³ Humfrey and Mackenney 1986, p.324, note 3, also make this point.

IV. WORKSHOPS, AUTHORSHIP, NETWORKS, PROBLEM-SOLVING

Several days have already passed since Your Excellency's Ambassador requested that I should make a statue of Hercules for a Ferrarese gentleman. I agreed, with the intention of having it made by one of my assistants, guiding him and correcting him, without touching it myself, as I am used to doing here with many other sculptures, since the buildings of which I am in charge prevent me from having the time to sculpt with my own hand.

Jacopo Sansovino, 11 September 1550¹

In this letter to Ercole II d'Este, Duke of Ferrara (1508–59), Sansovino revealed his standard practice for producing sculpture in his Venetian workshop. Namely that he delegated the sculpting of his designs to workshop assistants, all the while ensuring the faithful translation of his ideas through hands-off guidance and supervision. Admittedly, Sansovino enjoyed a rather atypical workshop situation compared to other Venetian sculptors in this period, given that he had to juggle his sculptural output with his highly demanding job as *proto* to the Procuratori di San Marco de Supra and his numerous independent architectural commissions.² Nevertheless, his comment offers invaluable insights into the collaborative nature of sculptural practice in a busy Venetian workshop, where a work of sculpture was rarely the result of one man's input alone.

The chapter begins with an examination of the nature and organisation of sculptors' workshops in Venice, looking at the evidence for their geographical location and internal use of space, the manpower employed and the training and tasks these employees and/or sub-

¹ 'Già parecchi giorni sono passati, che havendomi il Signor Ambasciator di Vostra Eccellentia richiesto ch'io dovessi far una statua d'Hercole per un gentilhuomo ferrarese, mi accordai seco, con animo di farla fare a qualche mio giovane, giudandolo, e correggendolo'io senza provi le mani, com'io soglio far qua di molte altre sculture, non havendo tempo per esser impedito ne le fabriche de le quali ho carico, di scolpir di mia mano.' Letter concerning d'Este's commission of a colossal statue of Hercules, which his Venice-based agent had initially told Sansovino was for a Ferrarese noble. First published Campori 1872; taken from Boucher 1991, vol.1, p.220, doc.204. For this commission, see *ibid.*, vol.1, pp.130-4 (letter discussed p.131), and vol.2, p.341 (cat.34). Also discussed Wolters 1990, pp.133-4. For a succinct discussion of the sculptor's workshop in Venice from the fifteenth to mid-sixteenth centuries, see Wolters 1990, pp.129-34; and in the specific context of Sansovino, Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.142-58.

² As is well-known, Sansovino provided invaluable training, work experience and/or independent job opportunities to the principal sculptors of the generation after him, including Cattaneo, Vittoria, Segala, and Domenico da Salò. For further discussion, see principally Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.142-58 (his workshop), 159-75 (his followers and legacy).

contractors undertook. Beyond the physical bounds of the workshop, I consider the vital role played by related trades, such as stonemasons, builders and carpenters, particularly in the execution of larger-scale commissions. Leading on from this, the chapter evaluates the knotty issue of authorship, and the nature and meaning of signatures in a period of changing social status for sculptors. Related to managing a successful workshop was the importance for a sculptor to develop and maintain a reliable and diverse network of contacts. I focus on Girolamo Campagna—revealing fascinating, new documentary evidence about his family, friendships and business partnerships—and suggest how the people in his life affected his career development through the choices he made because of them and/or the opportunities they afforded him. The chapter concludes with an analysis of the various problems that sculptors and their patrons might experience during the production process, and how they went about solving them.

The Workshop

Location

Like their stonemason counterparts, sculptors lived and worked across the city, as the annotated map demonstrates (fig.4.1).³ This was quite different from those trades traditionally centred around a particular area (as surviving street names recall). Parish records of the 1593 *status animarum*, or census of souls, for example, confirm that metal-workers (i.e. coppersmiths, blacksmiths, and bronze-casters) were indeed the predominant trade along Calle dei Fabbri, while goldsmiths and jewellers had been obligated to operate out of Rialto since 1315, with the eponymous Ruga degli Orefici their focal point (fig.1.124).⁴

While Sansovino's San Marco accommodation and workshop were perks of his position as *proto*, the scant evidence for other sculptors' living and working arrangements suggests that they tended to operate as many other artisans did, that is renting or owning property which combined both home and workshop.⁵ Generally, the only evidence we have for the whereabouts of sculptors' living quarters and workshops is the name of the parish in which they lived. Danese Cattaneo, for example, was based principally in San Pantalon,

³ As the map's legend points out, some of the workshop locations are approximate as only the parish is known.

⁴ ASPV, sezione antica, *status animarum*, 1591–4. Not all parish censuses have survived. For the San Geminiano stretch of Calle di Fabbri, see *ibid.*, b.3, 'Libro dello stato delle anime, San Geminiano'. Published Avery 2013, pp.451-2, doc.280. On 3 July 1315, the Maggior Consiglio ruled that goldsmiths were bound to work solely in the Rialto. Monticolo 1896–1914, vol.1, p.125, note 3.

⁵ For Sansovino's accommodation, see Schulz J. 1982, pp.89-92. For Campagna, see below. As discussed in Chapter 2, Aspetti is an anomaly having spent a good part of his career living and working in the Palazzo Grimani at Santa Maria Formosa, rather than independently: Chapter 2, pp.56-7.

Dorsoduro, until shortly before his death in Padua in autumn 1572. Various documents confirm this, including a letter of 7 January 1572, from the *massari* of the Santo concerning the marble relief of the *Miracle of the Resuscitated Youth* (fig.2.13), which was addressed to him at San Pantalon,⁶ and his will of 28 September 1572, in which he confirmed that he had lived and worked there.⁷

A notable exception was Alessandro Vittoria, whose meticulous records have left a wealth of information about both his home and workshop.⁸ Having rented various properties (apartment and studio spaces) in the 1550s and 1560s, Vittoria purchased at auction a substantial (c.200m²), centrally-located, two-storied detached residence plus former wine shop and walled orchard at the north end of Calle della Pietà in spring 1569, for 1,010 ducats. While this location was close to Piazza San Marco and the Bacino, it had the bonus of being adjacent to the home of his second wife's mother. In addition to being a particularly luminous property (a pre-requisite for an artist's studio), it benefited from a large paved courtyard (useful for storing stone) with well, and easy access to three navigable canals (useful for bringing in raw materials and transporting finished statues). From 1569 until Vittoria's death in 1608, this building doubled as his living quarters (for him, his second wife, his pupils and nephew-apprentices and a couple of servants) on the upper floor and, on the ground floor, his suite of workshops (c.57.5m²), a laundry and a wine store.

From Vittoria's account-books, we know that he spent a great deal of time and money renovating the complex, converting the west-facing wine-shop into a sculptor's studio, comprising three rooms with stone flags and brightly painted ceiling beams, all interconnected to aid the flow of both personnel and materials, but also no doubt so that Vittoria could keep a beady eye on what his assistants were up to. The heart of operations appears to have been a small (c.10.5m²) self-contained study, and was presumably where Vittoria made his preliminary drawings, fashioned his small-scale models in wax and clay, and kept his large reference collection of drawings, prints and statues. This was flanked by two larger (c.24m²) rooms, one on either side. These spaces must have been used by his assistants to create full-scale gesso models and undertake carving. Payments reveal that Vittoria put in several new doors with sturdy locks (presumably as a security measure and as rudimentary sound-proofing to dampen at least some of the workshop noise from travelling

⁶ 'Al Magnifico mess. Danese Cathaneo nostro amico oss.mo Venetia a S. Panthaleone.' McHam 1994, p.227, doc.78.

⁷ '[...] tre figure le quali si ritrovanno a Venetia in una stantia dove le ho lavorate, idest a san Pantalone, dove io habitava avanti venisse a Padoa.' For the whole will (drawn up in Padua), see Rigoni 1970, pp.232-3, doc.IV. The figures referred to are three of the four which Cattaneo carved for Doge Leonardo Loredan's monument in Santi Giovanni e Paolo.

⁸ The following is indebted to Avery 1999c and Avery 2001b.

upstairs) and inserted eight new windows secured by grilles and larch shutters (undoubtedly to increase the amount of light inside the workshop, and the visibility of his team).⁹

In addition to maintaining workshops in Venice in which work was frequently produced for export to patrons on the *terraferma*, Venice-based sculptors were not averse to travelling outside the city for work when required, and some even appear to have maintained twin-centre workshops.¹⁰ One such was Francesco Segala, who is known to have divided his time between his home city of Padua and Venice.¹¹ My recent discovery of a will of 13 May 1580 confirms Andrea Bacchi's hypothesis that Segala spent more time in Venice than traditionally thought, as the sculptor mentions not only his house in Padua but also confirms that he was living with his wife, Erminia di Martini, in his mother-in-law's home in Venice, in the *sestiere* of Santa Croce (fig.0.11).¹² Segala recorded the presence of numerous works of sculpture in his Venice abode, including his marble bust of jurist Tiberio Deciani (1509–82) and its terracotta model, both of which he stated should be given to the sitter with no payment outstanding (figs 4.2–4.3).¹³

⁹ San Zaccaria, b.18, Commissaria Vittoria I, fols 62–9; and San Zaccaria, b.19, Commissaria Vittoria, filza 'Ricevute'. For further discussion, see Avery 2001b, *passim*.

¹⁰ Cattaneo, for example, was living and working in Padua when he died, as he mentions the fourth statue for the Loredan monument as being in his Paduan house, while still maintaining his home/workshop in Venice. 'Un'altra di queste figure è in Padoa in casa mia non anchora finita ma vicina ad esser finita et è compagna delle sopraditte le quale per me sono sta fatte et si fano per la sepoltura del q.m Serenissimo Doce il sig. Lunardo Loredano.' Rigoni 1970, pp.232–3, doc.IV.

¹¹ For relevant bibliography, see Chapter 2, note 31.

¹² Trent 1999, p.388. For the will, see NT, b.736, no.34. Until now, it was thought that Segala had been married twice: first to Lucia Mega in Padua in 1559 (died 1575), and secondly to Regina Contarini in Venice in 1584 (dead by the time Segala drew up his final will in Padua in 1592). Pietrogrande 1942–54, pp.111–2, note 1. This new will shows that he was married a third time, to Erminia, between his marriages to Lucia and Regina.

¹³ Segala bequeathed various pieces of sculpture to his wife Erminia in lieu of cash for her 'contradote' or groomgift, which 'mi attrovo qui in casa di Madonna Virginia mia suocera dove stiamo tutti insieme'. The mention of the Deciani bust is important because it provides a *terminus ante quem* for it: 'Lasso il ritratto di marmoro dell'Excellentissimo Deciano Thiberio, et quello di pietre cotta al ditto Excellentissimo Signor Thiberio dal qual mi chiamo comesso, et satisfatto di essi ritratti, che non debbo haver cosa alcuna da lui.' The bust was hitherto believed to have been completed by 1 September 1579, the date of Deciani's will in which it is mentioned. However, its inclusion in Segala's will of May 1580 suggests that the bust had only recently been completed—otherwise why would Segala still have had both it and the model in his possession? For Deciani's monument in the Carmini, Padua, on which the marble bust was later placed, see Pietrogrande 1961, pp.29–32 and Trent 1999, p.389. The terracotta model is now in the Museo Civico, Udine.

Workshop organisation

The usual business model for sixteenth-century Venetian artisans was that of the family partnership, either between fathers and sons or between brothers, as it had been for their fifteenth-century counterparts.¹⁴ This was not only an economical means of operating (with all expenses and income shared within one household), but also a highly effective association bound by the strong emotional ties of familial loyalty. Sons who worked within a father-son partnership were not usually emancipated, and were thus limited in what they could do independently in a legal context, such as signing contracts, owning property or setting up in business, without their father's permission. Perhaps the most famous father-son partnership to produce sculpture in Cinquecento Venice was that of the Lombardo family, headed by Pietro and aided by his sons, Tullio and Antonio.¹⁵ Based at San Samuele, the workshop was technically overseen by Pietro until his death in 1515, when it was taken over and successfully managed by Tullio until his own death in 1532. As no documents have yet emerged, we do not know when either son sought emancipation. However, as Pietro had promised to leave his workshop responsibilities to one side when he took over as *proto* at the Palazzo Ducale in 1499,¹⁶ it is possible that Tullio and Antonio were emancipated at this point. It seems likely that Antonio, at least, was legally independent by January 1504, when he formed a 'compagnia' with the bronze-caster Alessandro Leopardi for their joint work on the Cappella Zen, and certainly no later than June 1506, when he was living and working in Ferrara (where he died in 1516).¹⁷

It is interesting to note that the most successful sculptors' workshops to follow that of the Lombardo family were not father-son partnerships. Both Sansovino and Vittoria operated as independent masters, employing journeymen and apprentices as necessary. Indeed, Sansovino sought an aspirationally different career for his son, Francesco, sending him to

¹⁴ Connell 1988, p.36. For the legal framework of these business associations, see *ibid.*, pp.36-53. For a partnership between brothers (*fraterna compagnia*), see the case of Girolamo and Giuseppe Campagna below.

¹⁵ The scholarship concerning the Lombardo family is extensive. For a summary of their respective careers with relevant bibliography, see Ceriana 2005a and 2005b; and Sarchi 2005. For Tullio more recently, see Ceriana 2007; Pizzati and Ceriana 2008; Washington 2009 and Schulz 2014b.

¹⁶ 'Et maxime havendo lassata la botega et post posto ogni altra cossa per servire et dismostrare ad ognuno la sua virtu et sufficientia.' Council of Ten's record of 21 March 1499 concerning Lombardo's appointment. Lorenzi 1868, vol.1, p.122, doc.251. See also Schulz 2014b, p.22. Schulz suggests that Tullio was effectively the head of the workshop by May 1501, when Antonio was documented as having received materials at a location in Santa Fosca, rather than at the family workshop. *Ibid.*, p.22.

¹⁷ For Antonio's partnership with Leopardi, see Chapter 2, p.69, note 80. For his time in Ferrara, see Ferrara 2004.

university to study Law.¹⁸ Likewise, Cattaneo's son, Perseo, appears not to have followed in his father's footsteps, and rather than training another family member to take over the business, Cattaneo took under his wing the young Girolamo Campagna, who quickly became a favoured pupil.¹⁹ Vittoria, on the other hand, had no children at all, although he did employ nephews and other relatives.²⁰ One sculptor who did follow the traditional father-son model in the second half of the sixteenth century was Pietro da Salò. At least two of his sons, Domenico and Pompeo, trained as sculptors and remained in their father's San Martino workshop until after Pietro's death in the early 1560s.²¹ While Domenico stayed on to run the family workshop, Pompeo left Venice in 1567 to seek his fortune in Linz.²²

A sculptor's progress: from apprentice to master

Regrettably, surviving records for training and employment in sculptors' workshops are rare for Cinquecento Venice. However, sculptors appear to have followed a similar pattern to their close counterparts, the stonemasons. Both were obliged to join the Arte dei Tagliapietra (Stonemasons' Guild) in order to work legally in Venice, by first paying an entrance fee and then submitting regular dues in accordance with their category of membership.²³

There were three basic categories of artisan within the Stonemasons' Guild: the apprentice (*garzone*), the master without workshop (*lavorante*) and the master with workshop

¹⁸ Born in Rome in 1521, Francesco fled to Venice with his father in 1527 after the Sack of Rome. As a teenager, he unwillingly studied Law, first in Padua (1536–40), then Florence (1541) and finally Bologna (1542). Subsequently, however, and much to his father's supposed disappointment, Francesco pursued his ambition to be a writer, and, after a brief stint at the papal court of Julius III in 1550, he devoted his life to writing and publishing in Venice. For further discussion, see Grendler 1969, especially p.141. Francesco's rebellion against his father's ambitions for him is highlighted in a chastising letter of 16 September 1540 sent to him in Padua by Pietro Aretino, his father's close friend. Aretino-Procaccioli 1997, vol.2, pp.221-2, no.199.

¹⁹ For further discussion, see below.

²⁰ Victoria Avery's recent archival research into Vittoria's family life has confirmed that he had no children (unless either of his wives suffered undocumented miscarriages). I am most grateful to her for kindly sharing these unpublished findings with me (May 2016). For his employment of apprentices and assistants (including his nephews Agostino and Vigilio Rubini) and his working methods, see Avery 1999c. For his approach to stone and marble carving, see Avery 2015.

²¹ Pietro's death date is unknown, but he must have died at some point between 1561 (date of his will) and 1563 (when his wife is documented as a widow). Finocchi Gherzi 2002a.

²² For Pompeo's relocation, see Chapter 2, pp.60-61.

²³ The guild's membership records for this period are lost. That sculptors paid dues like their stonemason counterparts is confirmed, for example, by an entry in Vittoria's records for 14 August 1594, when his friend the artist Giuseppe Scolari went to pay 10 ducats as the 'noncolo dila scola'. Avery 1999a, p.337, doc.137.

(*maestro di bottega*).²⁴ A *garzone* usually served for approximately five to nine years learning his trade, and in return received board, lodging and often clothing, as well as a small salary, collected at regular intervals from the sculptor by his parents or a close relative.²⁵ Under Venetian law, all apprenticeships had to be registered with and approved by the *Giustizia Vecchia*, the trade guilds' ruling magistracy.²⁶ Unfortunately, the *Giustizia*'s apprenticeship records prior to 1575 are lost, and those that remain for the rest of the period are patchy.²⁷ An examination of the surviving ledgers, however, shows that registrations all followed a similar model. Each ledger was prefaced by an index of names: the name of each apprentice followed by the name of the artisan to whom he was being apprenticed, together with the folio number on which his apprenticeship was formally recorded (fig.4.4). There followed an entry for each apprentice in date order. Hence, an unpublished entry for Vittoria's eighth *garzone*, Bernardo Rosso, dated 10 March 1576, consists of his name, his father's name, his approximate age (10) and confirmation that he was signing himself up to train as a sculptor with Vittoria for six years, in return for a total salary of 21 ducats, payable in annual increments (1 ducat in the first year, 2 in the second and so on; fig.4.5).²⁸ The financial responsibility taken on by the sculptor was guaranteed, usually by the new *garzone*'s father or guardian, and duly recorded in the registration document.²⁹ Thanks to the survival of Vittoria's own workshop records, there is evidence for some ten of his apprentices, including Bernardo, which offers further confirmation that sculptors' apprenticeships all followed a broadly similar model, with only the length of the apprenticeship and remuneration varying slightly (fig.4.6).³⁰

²⁴ For the guild's principal statutes, see their surviving *mariegole*: BMCV, CI.IV, 150 and 151. For a detailed discussion of masters and apprentices in the context of stonemasonry, see Connell 1988, pp.54-71. See also Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.143-4, with reference to the guild's statutes, in the context of Sansovino's workshop. For the comparable situation for bronze-casters, see Avery 2011, pp.13-16, 55-67.

²⁵ See, for example, Vittoria's records for his ninth apprentice, Bernardo Piveta, whose wages were collected by various family members, including his parents and his uncle. Avery 1999a, pp.309-10, docs 120(iii)-(ix).

²⁶ BMCV, CI.IV, 150, fol.27r-v, statute XLI.

²⁷ GV, buste 112-8 contain registers from 1575 to 1627. Within this date range, only the following years have survived: 1575-6, 1582-3, 1583-4, 1591-2, 1592-3, 1594-5, 1596-7, 1597-8, 1598-9, 1606-7, 1609-10, 1620-1, 1621-2, 1625-7.

²⁸ GV, b.112, reg.151, under 10 March 1576. For Vittoria's own, albeit incomplete, record of this apprenticeship agreement, see Avery 1999a, p.279, doc.95.

²⁹ This guarantee was called a 'piezo'.

³⁰ Avery collated the entries that Vittoria made in his personal record books by apprentice. Avery 1999a, p.194, docs 22(i)-(iii): Girolamo; *ibid.*, pp.200-2, docs 28(i)-(xxiv): Battista; *ibid.*, pp.207-8, docs 36(i)-(xvii): Marco; *ibid.*, p.220, docs 46(i)-(ix): Zanetto; *ibid.*, pp.227-8, docs 54(i)-(viii): Pietro; *ibid.*,

It seems that an apprentice could even be shared by two sculptors, if so desired, as long as the requisite legal paperwork was drawn up. Entries in Vittoria's ledger record that he took on his first apprentice, Girolamo de Zanchi, in May 1555 for a period of five years, in tandem with Sansovino.³¹ Unfortunately, Girolamo did not quite make it to two years, as recorded by a newly-discovered notarised agreement of April 1557 between Sansovino, Vittoria, and Girolamo's brother Cristoforo dissolving the apprenticeship.³² How common it was to share a *garzone* is not known. Certainly, its rarity is implied by the fact that, to my knowledge, de Zanchi is the only documented example of a *garzone* being shared by two masters. Perhaps it was simply a way for Sansovino to give his gifted former student some extra help with little financial outlay for either party.

The guild regulations stipulated that before a stonemason could work independently, he had to complete his apprenticeship and provide confirmation from his master that he had made the requisite progress in his training. As Connell observed, it was only in 1548 that the guild introduced an obligatory mastership test (*prova*) for those masters who wished to take on an apprentice themselves, or for any foreign stonemason wishing to work to Venice.³³ Whether sculptors also had to undertake such a test, however, and if they did, how diligently this was enforced, is unknown. I am inclined to think that sculptors were probably not required to demonstrate their skills through a *prova* as long as they did not carry out any work that was considered the exclusive remit of stonemasons. This is implied by the fact that, on 21 June 1551, the guild passed a motion in favour of allowing decorative stone carvers (*intagliatori di pietra*) to join the guild and to take an apprentice without having to undertake the stonemasons' 'prova de quadro'.³⁴ Whatever the case for sculptors, once the apprenticeship was successfully completed, the sculptor, like the stonemason, would either be classed as a master without workshop (*lavorante*), or a master with workshop (*maestro di bottega*).³⁵ *Lavoranti* were employed by *maestri di bottega* to assist in the workshop and

pp.228-9, docs 55(i)-(viii): Giambattista; *ibid.*, p.237, docs 67(i)-(ix): Tiberio; *ibid.*, p.279, doc.95: Bernardo (Rosso); *ibid.*, pp.309-10, docs 120(i)-(x): Bernardo (Piveta); *ibid.*, pp.330-1, docs 131(i)-(v): Antonio.

³¹ Avery 1999a, p.194, doc.22(i)-(ii).

³² NA, b.5590, fols 149v-150r. Unpublished. Vittoria's own, undated, record of Girolamo's departure states that he left for Spain, without explaining why. Avery 1999a, p.194, doc.22(iii).

³³ Connell 1988, pp.65-6. For the ruling of 29 July 1548, see BMCV, Cl.IV, 150, fols 46v-47v.

³⁴ Passed 80-33. If found in contravention of this statute, the *intagliatore* could be fined 10 ducats. BMCV, Cl.IV, 150, fols 53v-54r.

³⁵ See, for example, BMCV, Cl.IV, 150, fol.49r-v, for the guild's clarification of 16 September 1548 of what constituted a master with workshop.

were paid either by the day or by the job.³⁶ Guild statutes also determined the number of apprentices a master could have: those without a workshop could have a single apprentice, while those with could employ no more than three (excluding brothers and sons).³⁷ As Connell observed for stonemasons, it was in a sculptor's best interests to have sons and other close male relatives to train under him, as there were no limits under guild law as to the number of family members he could train at any one time, nor were sons obliged to pay the guild entrance fee.³⁸

There are no records in Venice for what a *garzone* did: extant documents simply record the payment of an apprentice's annual dues without noting what he had achieved and the progress he had made. We can assume, however, that while an apprentice would have begun by undertaking menial tasks, over time he would have learned a wide range of skills, especially if he were particularly gifted and motivated. These should have encompassed all aspects of sculptural production, including the preparation of materials (wax, clay, gesso, stone, marble, etc), the rudiments of drawing, the production and employment of models and plaster casts, the use of the various tools at a sculptor's disposal and their maintenance, and the different stages of carving stone and marble, from scaling up and blocking out, to rendering the finer details, cleaning, and polishing. Vittoria's papers show that not all *garzoni* completed their training: of the ten recorded, only three stayed until the end of their contract.³⁹ Whether this poor success rate was due to a lack of innate talent in the *garzoni* or Vittoria being a difficult task master (or a combination of the two) is unknown. Whatever the case, Vittoria's sense of relief in getting rid of his fifth apprentice, Pietro, three years before his apprenticeship was due to end, is palpable, and the feeling was clearly mutual.⁴⁰

Collaboration, delegation, and specialisation

It should be noted that for much of the previous century, there was not the same distinction made between stonemasons and sculptors as later became the norm. As Connell observed, Quattrocento stonemasons' workshops produced all aspects of work in stone, including decorative carving and sculpture, although, of course, with varying degrees of expertise and

³⁶ Vittoria's account-book, for example, records numerous such employees. San Zaccaria, b.18, Commissaria Vittoria, vol.1, fols 79r-107r (later pagination). Published Predelli 1908 and Avery 1999a, passim. See Avery 1999c for an examination of Vittoria's employment of apprentices and assistants.

³⁷ BMCV, CI.IV, 150, fol.32r-v, statute XLVIII, 13 June 1507; and fol.49r-v.

³⁸ Connell 1988, p.55.

³⁹ Battista (2nd apprentice); Marco (3rd apprentice); and Bernardo Piveta (9th apprentice): as collated by Avery 1999a, for which see note 30 above.

⁴⁰ 'adi .5. octobrio .1569. Piero fu dipenato ala Iusticia Vechia dacordo e di contenteza di tute le parte chome nel dito hoficio apare saldi e contentissimi e cossi ringratio il Signor che mia liberatto.' Avery 1999a, p.228, doc.54(viii).

innate ability.⁴¹ The exceptional talent and business acumen of key stonemason/sculptors' workshops in the late fifteenth century, such as those of the Lombardo family and Antonio Rizzo, began the physical, intellectual and aspirational separation of these hitherto intertwined trades. Indeed, this division of stonemason/artisan and sculptor/artist appears to have been pretty well entrenched by the later 1530s by when Sansovino was firmly established in Venice. This categorical separation of roles and higher degree of specialisation is already evident in such commissions as the *Altar of the Magdalen* (1523–4), for which the stonemason-cum-*proto*, Guglielmo de' Grigi, was expressly forbidden in his contract for the architectural work from producing the marble statue of the eponymous saint (fig.2.34).⁴² This essential element was separately commissioned from the sculptor, Bartolomeo Bergamasco (figs 1.47, 2.35, 2.41).⁴³

Despite the lack of archival evidence for the duties carried out by apprentices, there are a number of invaluable documents recording the tasks which sculptors delegated to workshop assistants, *lavoranti*, and external specialists, such as sawyers (*segadori*), bronze-casters (*bronzisti*), and gilders (*indoradori*). Accounts, payment receipts, and posthumous attestations of work undertaken for some of Sansovino's projects,⁴⁴ and Vittoria's book of *pagamenti*,⁴⁵ offer ample proof of how masters with busy workshops handled their numerous commissions. On the patron's side, surviving contracts and account-books dedicated to a single commission offer invaluable insights into just how many artisans (other than the sculptor and his workshop) were needed to ensure the successful completion and installation of a sculptural project, especially larger-scale commissions, such as altars and funerary monuments.⁴⁶

The well-known summary of expenses that Sansovino drew up in February 1570 for his bronze Sacristy Door is of particular importance in the context of collaboration and delegation, as it demonstrates the extent to which this busy sculptor/architect/*proto* had to farm out various tasks, as well as the degree of specialisation that such a project required (figs 1.101, 3.33).⁴⁷ Indeed, Sansovino recorded the involvement of no fewer than 16

⁴¹ Connell 1988, preface.

⁴² 'ezeto che la figura de la Madalena che die essere fatta per qualcun'o altro maestro in un altro marchado'. Cat.1, doc.1.2. See also Chapter 2, p.70.

⁴³ Cat.1, doc.1.3, [143].

⁴⁴ See, for example, the affidavits obtained in 1572 from some of Sansovino's former employees about their work on the *Giganti*, for Francesco Sansovino's failed case against the Provveditori sopra la fabrica del Palazzo in which he sought posthumous recompense for his father's work. Lorenzi 1868, pp.482-3, docs 939e-g. Also Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.225-6, docs 231-5.

⁴⁵ As at note 36 above.

⁴⁶ For example, the transcribed account-books for cats 1, 8 and 9.

⁴⁷ Cat.2, doc.2.1. First published in 1886 by Cecchetti and Ongania, this fascinating document has, naturally, been discussed at length elsewhere in various contexts. See, for example, Boucher 1991,

different sculptors and artisans in the door's manufacture.⁴⁸ After having a wooden door made as the underlying support for the bronze reliefs, Sansovino had his trusted right-hand man, sculptor Tommaso Lombardo (active 1536–46), work on master wax models of the different elements.⁴⁹ A 'maestro' Gasparo then took plaster piece-moulds from these models, using gesso supplied by an unnamed *gessaro* at Sant'Aponal.⁵⁰ Andrea *gessaro* used these plaster moulds to produce wax casting models, which were subsequently cleaned up and refined by Sansovino, with the assistance of the young Vittoria and an unknown sculptor called Antonio.⁵¹ Payments to the bronze-casters, Pietro Campanato, Bartolomeo dei Cavedoni and Agostino Zoppo follow.⁵² They supplied most of the various alloys used and undertook the physical casting of the door's constituent parts and, as discussed in Chapter 3, the most important figurative elements were entrusted to Zoppo, the most talented and experienced founder of the three.⁵³ The marble frame within which the door was later hung was carved by Menico *intagliatore* and Battista *scultore*, while the bronze components were adjusted and affixed to the door's wooden support by a blacksmith, Benetto *fabbro*.⁵⁴ Stefano *tagliapietra* was then brought in to clean up the door-frame, and a further three metal-workers took care of the finishing touches: Battista *calderaro*, a coppersmith from San Salvador, and two blacksmiths, Marco and Ambrogio (fig.4.7).⁵⁵

vol.1, pp.146-7; Sturman and Smith 2008; Avery 2011, pp.101-2; and Sturman and Smith 2013, pp.169-70.

⁴⁸ It is worth remembering that the actual number of artisans involved would have been even higher, as each documented master would almost certainly have had employees of his own to assist him with his delegated task(s).

⁴⁹ Cat.2, doc.2.1, [1], [2].

⁵⁰ Cat.2, doc.2.1, [5] and [4] respectively.

⁵¹ Cat.2, doc.2.1, [6] and [7] respectively.

⁵² Cat.2, doc.2.1, [8]-[11].

⁵³ Chapter 3, pp.112-14. That Sansovino thought so is supported by the fact that he calls Zoppo *scultore*, an appellation he does not accord the other two casters. In fact, Zoppo was later entrusted with transporting Sansovino's marble relief of the *Miracle of the Maiden Carilla* from Venice to Padua and then installing it in the Cappella dell'Arca in the Santo in about the same period (November-December 1563), a temporal connection I believe has not been made previously. Although Zoppo was paid by the *massari*, Sansovino may well have recommended the Paduan-based *bronzista* for the job. For the Santo's payments to Zoppo, see McHam 1994, pp.169, note 63; 223-4, doc.69. For Zoppo, a rare bronzefounder-cum-sculptor who trained in Padua under Tiziano Minio's father (Minio being another of Sansovino's cohort of one-time assistants), see Trent 1999, pp.230-5 (by Leithe-Jasper).

⁵⁴ Cat.2, doc.2.1, [12], [13].

⁵⁵ Cat.2, doc.2.1, [13]-[19].

Funerary Monument to Doge Marino Grimani and Dogaresa Morosina Morosini

So how many artists and artisans *did* it take to make a sculptural complex? Depending on the commission's relative scale and complexity, as well as the diversity of materials employed, this could range from a few to a small army. One of the best-documented, large-scale complexes of the period is the Grimani-Morosini monument in San Giuseppe di Castello (fig.1.39), and an examination of its production account-book is richly rewarding in this regard (fig.4.8).⁵⁶ The Cancelliere grande, Galeazzo Secco, ensured that all monetary transactions were dutifully recorded on a day-to-day basis in the front of the ledger.⁵⁷ Corresponding statements of account for all the significant suppliers of materials and services were noted in the back, with each statement summarising the details of a particular contract followed by a list of all incremental payments in date order.⁵⁸

An analysis of this account-book, together with the surviving contracts, shows what an enormous undertaking such funerary monuments were. They required huge amounts of planning, money and manpower. While the principal sculptural elements of the Grimani monument were contracted from Campagna (stone and marble sculpture; figs 2.50a-b and 4.9, 4.10a-b-4.18) and Cesare Gropo with his nephew, Zuanbattista (bronzes; figs 4.19a-b, 4.20a-b, also figs 3.31-3.32), the architectural structure required the services of the following specialists.⁵⁹ *Proto*, Francesco de Bernardin Smeraldi, oversaw the whole project: he drew up estimates of material costs, provided drawings and *sagome*, managed the contractors, assessed the quality of materials and work supplied, and ran the construction site at San Giuseppe (fig.4.21a-b).⁶⁰ The workshop of stonemasons Bortolo and Zamaria de Tadio, meanwhile, executed all of the architectural stonework for the monument (fig.4.22a-b), with Zamaria additionally responsible for laying the *paragone*, white, and red Verona stone pavement at the end of the project.⁶¹ Builder Francesco Piston undertook the crucial underpinning for the monument, building the foundations (using some 350 wooden 'palli'

⁵⁶ The account-book was bound by a bookbinder, Mattia Teran, part-way through the project, in July 1602. Cat.8, doc.8.26, [354], in which binding it remains to this day.

⁵⁷ Cat.8, doc.8.26. Entitled 'Cassa': essentially meaning 'cash-book' or 'day-book' in modern book-keeping parlance.

⁵⁸ Cat.8, docs 8.27-8.77. Entitled 'Marcadi': meaning contracts.

⁵⁹ For Campagna, see cat.8, docs 8.10 and 8.23 (contracts); 8.42, 8.43, 8.72, 8.74 (statements of account). For Gropo, see cat.8, docs 8.12 (contract); 8.44, 8.45 (statement of account).

⁶⁰ Cat.8, docs 8.11 (contract); 8.34, 8.35 (statement of account). See also docs 8.7 (Smeraldi's estimate of the Istrian stone required for the monument) and 8.21 (his calculations for Alvise Gaetano's mosaics, for which see below).

⁶¹ Cat.8, docs 8.8, 8.13 (contracts); 8.20 (statement of account provided by them and checked and approved by Smeraldi); 8.32, 8.33, 8.50-8.53, 8.64 (statements of account). For the pavement, docs 8.24 (contract); 8.76 (statement of account). The stone for it was supplied by one Nicolò Picin, a stonemason in Verona: docs 8.73 and 8.75.

supplied by the Officio delle Acque in the process.⁶² Piston was re-employed to assemble all the component parts of the monument as far as possible in April 1602, including the installation of Campagna's sculpture made to date (essentially everything bar the reclining figures of the doge and dogaressa, which were commissioned later, in 1604).⁶³ Sadly, Piston died on the job and his cousin, Pietro Bertazzuol, and his associate Vincenzo Saroto took over from him in spring 1603.⁶⁴ Two decorative stone-carvers, Girolamo and Domenico, were contracted separately to carve the non-figurative embellishments: the former, the various capitals for the columns and pilasters; the latter, the other elements, such as the festoons, roses for the cornice, and the coats-of-arms (fig.4.22a-c).⁶⁵ Meanwhile, an unknown sculptor called Battista carved minor figurative elements, such as the marble lions' paws supporting the sarcophagi and the pair of female heads carved in high-relief set between the low-relief festoons hanging above the sarcophagi (figs 4.22a, 4.23a-b).⁶⁶ Finally, a pair of mosaics (against which the reclining dogal portrait-statues atop their sarcophagi were to be placed) were entrusted to mosaicist Alvise Gaetano, following a 'desegno colorido' by the painter, Santo Peranda (1566–1638; figs 4.10a-b).⁶⁷ Secondary—but no less crucial—service-providers included carpenters, a professional marble sawyer and polisher, blacksmiths, portage companies for deliveries to the building site, and boatmen for the removal and disposal of rubble and the relocation of excavated consecrated earth.⁶⁸ Meanwhile, all the requisite raw materials and fixings, supplied by various tradesmen, were accounted for right down to the last nail.⁶⁹

Authorship

When considering a work of sixteenth-century sculpture, the notion of authorship is complex. This is highlighted by Sansovino's letter to the Duke of Ferrara about his sculptural *modus*

⁶² Cat.8, docs 8.9 (contract); 8.38, 8.40 (statement of account). For the purchase of the wooden piles, see doc.8.26, [103].

⁶³ Cat.8, docs 8.15 (contract), 8.39, 8.41 (statement of account).

⁶⁴ Cat.8, docs 8.18 (contract); 8.68, 8.70 (statement of account).

⁶⁵ For Girolamo, cat.8, docs 8.14 (contract); 8.54 (statement of account). For Domenico, cat.8, docs 8.17 (contract); 8.56, 8.57, 8.61, 8.63, 8.66, 8.67 (statements of account).

⁶⁶ Cat.8, doc.8.26, [348], [350], [360], [388], [405], [414], [420], [428], [432], [445], [528], [532].

⁶⁷ Cat.8, docs 8.22 (contract); 8.69, 8.71 (statement of account).

⁶⁸ For example, cat.8, doc.8.26, [14], [51], [54] (carpenter); [130], [136], [173] (sawyer-cum-polisher); [309], [313], [320] (polisher); [328], [409] (blacksmith); [56], [82] ('fachini'); [106], [107], [109], [115], [127] (removal of consecrated earth). For the separate statement of account with Oratio di Napoli, marble sawyer-cum-polisher, see cat.8, docs 8.46-8.49.

⁶⁹ Cat.8, doc.8.26, passim. For the supply of the monument's marble and Istrian stone, see Chapter 3, pp.97, 98-99, 100-01. Nails and other iron fixings were supplied by blacksmiths. See, for example, doc.8.26, [11] (hinges) and [15] (nails).

operandi discussed at the beginning of this chapter. Sculpture was, by necessity, a team-effort, especially for those sculptors who ran busy and successful workshops, such as Sansovino, Vittoria, and Campagna.⁷⁰ The practice of signing sculpture in sixteenth-century Venice, which increased as the century progressed, belies the high levels of delegation and collaboration behind the finished product. In most cases, the translation of a model designed by the master to the marble or Istrian stone block was undertaken by several hands, from its blocking out by assistants to extracting the essential form of the sculpture, although all stages were presumably performed under the watchful eye of the master and with his verbal input, as Sansovino described. It was usually only when a sculpture was much further forward that the finer details of the most important elements, such as face and hands, prompted actual physical ‘hands-on’ intervention by the master himself. Once the carving was completed, assistants (and not the master) would have carried out the final tasks of cleaning and polishing—again with the non-tactile guidance of the master.

Moreover, as is also well known, the extent to which a sculptor personally worked on a piece of sculpture of his own design was likely much higher at the start of his career (when he was trying to make a name for himself, had fewer commissions and fewer assistants) than later on. Thus, Vittoria’s exquisitely carved marble statuette of *St John the Baptist* (fig.1.53), commissioned in 1550 in his youth, when he was still in Sansovino’s workshop and without assistants of his own, is widely considered as wholly autograph.⁷¹ Once established, a sculptor might, of course, favour certain commissions with more personal attention than others. The degree of the master’s input would surely have depended on such factors as how much the project interested him from an aesthetic and/or technical stand-point, the importance of the patron, the prestige and visibility of its final destination, and how many commissions he was juggling at the time. The statues of *Hope* and *Charity* for the Venier monument, for example, are both ‘signed’ by Sansovino and yet they differ considerably in quality (figs 2.45-2.46; 4.24-4.25). *Hope* is by far the more beautiful and compelling of the two, which suggests that Sansovino personally intervened more in her production than in that of her pendant.⁷² Indeed, he appears to have delegated the execution of *Charity* almost entirely to an assistant, possibly Tommaso Lombardo.⁷³

So what should we make of sculptors’ signatures? As observed by Wolters, it was only after Sansovino’s arrival in Venice in 1527 that the wholesale signing of sculpture really

⁷⁰ For a useful discussion of the production methods and techniques of Renaissance and Early Modern Italian sculpture, see Wittkower 1999, pp.79-165; and Helms 1998.

⁷¹ See, for example, Avery 1999c, p.146; and Trent 1999, p.16 (Leithe-Jasper).

⁷² The signatures on both are: ‘IACOBVS SANSOVINVS SCVLPTOR / ET ARCHITECTVS FLORENTINVS F.’ For a summary of the qualitative assessment of these figures by previous scholars, see Boucher 1991, vol.2, pp.32-3, cat.32.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p.33.

took off.⁷⁴ This phenomenon was undoubtedly tied up with the changing status of sculptors generally, which moved gradually from manual artisan to intellectual artist over the course of the Cinquecento, influenced in part by the related *paragone* debate discussed in Chapter 1.⁷⁵ In terms of authorship and the collaborative nature of sculpture, the physical signing emphasised the important concepts of invention, intellect and *ingegno* behind a work's design.⁷⁶ Sansovino's double signature and self-portrait on his Sacristy Door, for example, is surely his way of acknowledging the primacy of his role in the commission, despite the large team of assistants and other specialists behind its execution, as discussed above (figs 4.26-4.28).⁷⁷ Certainly, the door would not have existed without his design in the first place, nor his expert management of its manufacture.⁷⁸ Likewise, his signatures on the Venier *Hope* and *Charity*, advertising the fact that he was both a sculptor and architect, extend the stamp of authorship to the rest of the monument, the execution of which he had sub-contracted out.⁷⁹

⁷⁴ Wolters 1990, p.133. As he points out, few sculptures produced in Venice prior to Sansovino's arrival in 1527 were signed (Wolters gives the pertinent exceptions of Donatello's *Baptist* [Frari], Rizzo's *Eve* [Arco Foscari], Tullio's *Coronation of the Virgin* [Cappella Bernabò, San Giovanni Crisostomo], and a handful of works by Pyrgoteles and Simone Bianco), plus the reliefs in the Cappella dell'Arca, in the Santo. This is quite distinct from the practice of painters in Venice, who commonly, and often prominently, signed their work long before Sansovino's arrival. For Venetian painters' signatures, see Matthew 1998 and Gilbert 2000. For signatures on Venetian bronzes, including Sansovino's Sacristy Door, see Avery 2011, pp.90-2. For a broader look at artists' signatures in Renaissance Italy, see Goffen 2001 and Rubin 2006. For sculptors' signatures and identity in Renaissance Italy, see Boffa 2013.

⁷⁵ For the changing status of the artist in Renaissance Italy generally, see Barker et al 1999 and Ames-Lewis 2000. For an examination of Venice-based sculptors and how they sought to present themselves through portraiture, see Fiorentini 2007. For the *paragone* debate, see Chapter 1, pp.41-2.

⁷⁶ For further discussion of these concepts in the broader context of Renaissance Italy, see Kemp 1997, pp.226-55.

⁷⁷ The upper *Resurrection* relief and the lower *Entombment* relief are both signed 'OPVS JACOBI / SANSOVINI F' along the lower edges of the tomb.

⁷⁸ As is widely acknowledged, bronze was the perfect sculptural medium for Sansovino, as it allowed him full artistic exploration and expression of his ideas through relatively quick modelling, as opposed to much more time-consuming carving. See, for example, Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.145, 157.

⁷⁹ The architectural framework would undoubtedly have been sub-contracted to a trusted stonemason, such as his friend and collaborator, Salvador q. Vettor, while the remaining sculpted elements of the relief of the *Pietà* and the *gisant* figure of the doge were passed to Vittoria. That Salvador may have been the stonemason responsible is suggested by Boucher 1991, vol.1, p.120, whose workshop executed the architecture of Livio Podocataro's tomb (also designed by Sansovino) in San Sebastiano. For Vittoria's record of payments for his work on the Venier monument, see cat.4, docs 4.4-4.7.

Signatures were equally a means of advertising, not only for the sculptor, but also for the patron, as the signature would have made it clear to all viewers whose sculpture was on display, thereby (hopefully) extolling the patron's aesthetic judgement and sensibilities, as well as his magnificence through the implied depth of his purse.⁸⁰ In terms of their position, signatures tended to be placed on the socle or pedestal of sculptures in the round, or on an appropriate section of a relief, such as da Salò's signature on the *Altar of the Nativity* along the mound of earth beneath the *Baptist* and *Virgin* (fig.4.29).⁸¹ In the case of portrait busts, signatures were usually placed along the rim of one of the truncated shoulders or arms (figs 4.30-4.31). On all of his signed portrait busts, for example, Vittoria cleverly carved his name along whichever edge was to be most visible when the bust was installed in its final destination.⁸²

The format of sculptors' signatures usually comprised his name, nationality (both in Latin), often prefaced with 'opus' (in full or abbreviated) or terminated with 'fecit' (again in full or abbreviated) or occasionally 'faciebat', in classicising Roman capitals (as opposed to the Gothic-style of epigraphy used for carved inscriptions in the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries). A degree of rivalry appears to have occurred, particularly in the last decades of the period, with signatures often becoming larger, longer and more detailed. This is especially evident in San Salvador, where we see Sansovino's proud identical signatures on the Venier *Hope* and *Charity* flaunting not only his nationality, but also his twin expertise as a sculptor and architect (figs 4.24-4.25). Vittoria followed suit, prominently signing his *Sts Sebastian* and *Roch* on the Pork-butchers' altar, the placement of which, as Avery pointed out, cunningly takes up the two most visible sides of both sculptures' socles (figs 4.32-4.33).⁸³ By the end of the period, Giulio del Moro, clearly not wishing to be outdone, boldly signed his *Sts Lawrence* and *Jerome* on the Priuli monument 'IVLII MAVRI OPVS' (figs 4.34-4.35), and his statue of the *Risen Christ* on the monument to Andrea Dolfi and his wife

⁸⁰ For further discussion of patronal signposting, see Nelson and Zeckhauser 2008a. For a discussion of artists' signatures as a sign of ambition, see Rubin 2006.

⁸¹ In earlier statuary, socles were usually reserved for the name of the sculpted figure placed upon them, as seen on Bartolomeo Bon's *Virtues* on the Porta della Carta.

⁸² See the catalogue of Vittoria's autograph and workshop busts in Martin T. 1998, pp.97-154, which records the form and placement of all signatures. The exception to this is the early bust of Giambattista Ferretti (1557, formerly on his tomb in Santo Stefano, now Louvre, Paris), which is boldly signed in the cartouche of the socle. As Avery pointed out, this had the danger of confusing the identity of the sculptor with that of the sitter and was an experiment never to be repeated. Avery 2007b, p.27.

⁸³ The *St Roch* on the left is signed 'ALEXANDER' on the socle's outside edge visible from the left-hand side of the altar, and 'VICTORIA F.' on the front. The *St Sebastian* on the right, meanwhile, is signed 'ALEXANDER' on the front, with 'VICTORIA' carved along on the visible right-hand edge of the socle. For this and a broader analysis of Vittoria's use of socles and signatures, see Avery 2007b.

opposite 'IVLIVS MAVRVS VERONENSIS / SCVLPTOR PICTOR ET / ARCHITECTVS F.' (figs 4.36a-b), proclaiming for all to see that he was not only its Veronese author, but also a sculptor, architect, *and* painter.⁸⁴ For reasons unknown, Campagna did not sign his *tour de force* group of the *Madonna and Child* on the nearby Dolfin family altar (fig.4.37), but perhaps its omission was a contractual stipulation for devotional reasons.⁸⁵

We do not know who was responsible for the actual act of signing: whether the master wrote out the desired signature for an assistant to execute (perhaps using a pattern-book) or a skilled epigrapher to trace and carve onto the piece, or whether he did it himself.⁸⁶ Certainly, some signatures are better carved than others: Tullio Lombardo's few signatures are a masterclass in *all'antica* epigraphy (figs 4.38-4.40), while Vittoria's are always elegant (figs 4.41a-c and 4.42a-b). Some of Campagna's, on the other hand, appear positively incompetent, with poor letter placement and untidy carving (figs 4.43-4.44). This is most evident on his otherwise well-executed *Virtue*, formerly on the da Ponte monument, where his signature is carved along the forward-facing bottom edges of the three stacked books under the allegory's right foot (fig.4.45).⁸⁷ Whoever was responsible clearly misjudged the available space and ran out of room: on the middle book, the 'P' of 'CAMP' is smaller than the first three letters, while the final 'A' of his surname on the bottom book is far too small, being half the size of the preceding 'AGN'.

Networks

Any sculptor (or artist or artisan) wishing to have a successful independent career needed considerable natural talent and ambition, enhanced by thorough training and solid workshop experience. More than this, he also needed to cultivate a useful network of contacts and supporters, from fellow artists and artisans to patrons and other third parties with social and economic clout. And, as ever in life, he needed a certain degree of luck to be in the right place at the right time. An analysis of the life and work of Girolamo Campagna supports these assertions.

⁸⁴ For del Moro, see Comastri 1988 and Bacchi 2000d.

⁸⁵ For this commission (for which there is little documentation), see principally Timofiewitsch 1972, pp.110-23, 130-2, 249-51 (cat.9).

⁸⁶ For the use of Roman lettering pattern-books in Quattrocento Italy, see Sperling 2009. In terms of other text inscribed on sculpted altars and monuments, the task of executing lengthy epitaphs and other inscriptions was frequently delegated to specialists. For example, the epitaph on Girolamo Grimani's monument in San Giuseppe was produced by three different people: 'Ser Zuane de Spagoa' wrote out the 738 letters, which were carved by Zuane *tagliapietra*, and gilded by Zuane Indorador: Grimani-Barbarigo, b.33, fol.281v.

⁸⁷ 'HYER.' on the first, 'CAMP' on the second, and 'AGNA' on the bottom book. 'FECIT' is carved on the forward-facing edge of the single book under the statue's left foot.

Born in Verona in 1549 to Matteo (a tanner) and Maddalena, Campagna came from a modest artisanal background, one of eight documented children (four of whom survived to adulthood).⁸⁸ Trained by Danese Cattaneo (most likely in Verona initially),⁸⁹ Campagna was clearly highly valued by his master. Not only did Cattaneo make a heart-felt plea on his death-bed that his former pupil should finish his prestigious commission of the *Miracle of the Resuscitated Youth* relief for the Santo, Padua, in autumn 1572 (fig.2.13), but he also bequeathed to him all his plaster casts and drawings.⁹⁰ This bequest would have been of considerable practical, aesthetic and psychological importance to the young sculptor, given that Cattaneo's workshop effects included not only his own models but also various models and casts bequeathed to him by Jacopo Sansovino.⁹¹ Campagna must have been living in Venice, and working in Cattaneo's *bottega* by 3 December 1571, when he was called upon to evaluate Sansovino's Sacristy Door on behalf of Francesco Sansovino.⁹²

Apart from a brief stay in Augsburg to repair sculpture for Hans Fugger in spring 1574, Campagna appears to have spent his entire career living and working in Venice, punctuated by only occasional visits to the *terraferma* in connection with commissions and/or land and property investments.⁹³ It has long been known through archival and other primary sources that Campagna counted amongst his network of friends and supporters, fellow artists from Verona, as well as other Venice-based painters, architects, *proti*, and patricians. These included the painters Giuseppe Salviati, Francesco Montemezzano, Dario Varotari, Francesco Bassano, and Aliense, the *proto* Cesare Franco, architect Vincenzo Scamozzi, and the celebrated academic and collector, Marco Mantova Benavides.⁹⁴

But what of Campagna's personal life and how can this elucidate his career? The biographies of Temanza and Timofiewitsch have long provided considerable information

⁸⁸ Timofiewitsch 1972, pp.14-5.

⁸⁹ Trent 1999, p.399. Cattaneo was working in Verona between 1562–5 on the Fregoso monument in Sant'Anastasia. Rossi 1995, pp.104-31.

⁹⁰ For the Santo relief, see Chapter 2, pp.57-60. In his will, Cattaneo stated: 'lasso per ragion di legato a m. Gerolymo Campagna Veronese mio discepolo tutti li mei giessi et disegni che io mi ritrovo havere et questo in segno de amorevolezza.' Rigoni 1970, pp.232-3, doc.IV, at p.232.

⁹¹ For Sansovino's 1568 will, see Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.233-4, doc.256.

⁹² Campagna's appointment as *perito* for the Sacristy Door confirms that he was 'habitante in Venetia' by this date: Boucher 1991, vol.1, p.238, doc.282. That Campagna was working in Cattaneo's workshop in San Pantalon is confirmed by the latter's death-bed explanation that Campagna had carried out most of the work to date on the unfinished Santo relief. Chapter 2, p.57. Furthermore, in an affidavit dated 10 June 1571 (in relation to the Sacristy Door litigation) the owner of Cattaneo's house in San Pantalon stated that Campagna had worked there for Cattaneo, first as his apprentice and then as a *lavorante*. Boucher 1991, pp.239-40, doc.292.

⁹³ For Campagna's time in Augsburg, see Timofiewitsch 1972, pp.17-8.

⁹⁴ Chapter 2, pp.57, 67-8.

about his personal life, in addition to his professional one.⁹⁵ Their information can now be greatly augmented by my recent archival discoveries for him and his family which offer intriguing insights into his personal life, his career and the network of contacts that he assiduously developed over his lifetime.⁹⁶ Until now, Campagna was believed to have had two wives: Lucia (d. April 1580) and Laura (d. 1622).⁹⁷ It was previously known that he must have been married and had at least one living child with his first wife by July 1579, when the contract for the Santo's new high altar recorded him as an independent master and *paterfamilias* living in San Vidal.⁹⁸ It can now be revealed that Campagna took a third wife between Lucia and Laura. My discovery of an unpublished marriage contract, drawn up on 15 March 1581 and notarised on 15 July 1581, reveals that Girolamo married a certain Lucietta Cescon in the parish of San Samuele—less than a year after the death of Lucia.⁹⁹ What is particularly significant in the present context, is that the go-between for both parties was none other than Paolo Veronese, the hugely successful painter and Campagna's compatriot.¹⁰⁰ We also learn that Lucietta was the daughter of Catarina and the late Girolamo Cescon, a physician, and that she was bringing to the marriage a sizeable (and no doubt welcome) dowry of some 700 ducats.¹⁰¹ This discovery that Campagna and Veronese were on such friendly terms may well provide the explanation as to why the still relatively unknown Girolamo was awarded the commission for the stucco *Annunciation* group and pair of *Sibyls* for Veronese's beloved church of San Sebastiano, completed in May 1582, as well as their shared links with the painter's former pupils and assistants.¹⁰²

⁹⁵ Temanza 1778, pp.519-28; Timofiewitsch 1972, pp.13-34; and Timofiewitsch 1974. More recently, Trent 1999, pp.398-405 (by Bacchi); Bacchi 2000c; and Avery 2004. Crucial to our knowledge of his professional life, of course, was Campagna's autobiographical letter of 1604 addressed to the Duke of Urbino, for which see cat.8, doc.8.25, discussed Chapter 2, pp.52-3.

⁹⁶ Unless otherwise stated, all the documents cited below are unpublished, and will form part of a planned broader monograph on the life and work of Campagna.

⁹⁷ For Lucia, who according to Temanza, died after giving birth to a child who also died, see Temanza 1778, p.521. For Laura's death recorded in the San Silvestro *Libro dei Morti*, see APS, Libro dei Morti, 1576 fino 1632, under 15 February 1621 [m.v.].

⁹⁸ 'habitante in Venetia nel confin de s. Vidale, facendo et governandosi come padre di fameglia et pubblico scultore'. Sartori-Fillarini 1976, p.41.

⁹⁹ NA, b.11891, fols 171r-172v. I am most grateful to Dott.ssa Alessandra Schiavon, Vice-Direttore of the ASV for kindly allowing me to consult this *busta*, which is normally not available for consultation.

¹⁰⁰ 'Contratto di nozze trattato et concluso per l'eccellentissimo Signor Paolo Caliari Pittor'. Ibid., fol.171r.

¹⁰¹ Girolamo was certainly marrying above his station: physicians were the highest ranking medical profession in Venice. Palmer 1979.

¹⁰² Chapter 2, p.56.

Other documents reveal that, tragically, Lucietta died on 23 April 1583 from complications following the still-birth of their (first?) daughter, Catarina, 8 days before (figs 4.46–4.47).¹⁰³ Although men and women living in the sixteenth century were more inured to death than we are today and high child mortality was a daily reality, Campagna (who was juggling at least two major commissions at the time), must surely have felt the loss of his wife and child keenly.¹⁰⁴ These new documents also provide the earliest documentary proof that Campagna was living and working in the parish of San Samuele by this date, thereby supporting Temanza's account for the first time.¹⁰⁵

Further documents disclose that Campagna did not wait long to re-marry for a third time: his first child with Laura Ruggieri (wife number 3), was baptised in San Samuele on 26 August 1584, taking the name Campagna Bernardo (fig.4.48).¹⁰⁶ If we assume that Campagna junior was conceived in wedlock, then Girolamo's marriage to Laura had probably taken place by November 1583, only seven months after the death of Lucietta. Until now, Girolamo was believed to have had only one child, Angela, or at least the only child to outlive him.¹⁰⁷ My discoveries significantly revise this assumption, and reveal that Campagna had at least ten children (in addition to the still-born Catarina mentioned above).¹⁰⁸ This revelation

¹⁰³ ASPV, San Samuele, Libro dei Morti II, reg.IV, (1578–89): Catarina under 'C', dated 15 April 1583; Lucietta under 'L', dated 23 April 1583.

¹⁰⁴ He was in the middle of carving the figures for the da Ponte monument (commissioned in August 1582, with a two-year deadline) and was still at work on the Santo's new high altar. For the former, see cat.6, doc.6.3. For the latter, see Chapter 2, pp.55, 61–2, 68, 73.

¹⁰⁵ Temanza was previously the only source for this information. Temanza 1778, p.521.

¹⁰⁶ ASPV, San Samuele, Battesimi, Libro IV, under 'C'. Pace Timofiewitsch who believed Temanza was mistaken in calling Laura 'Ruggieri' instead of 'Buggieri' (Timofiewitsch 1972, p.31). Numerous unpublished documents confirm that she was indeed Ruggieri, daughter of Francesco and Santa. For example, NA b.2703, fol.28r–v, at fol.28r.

¹⁰⁷ Timofiewitsch 1972, p.31.

¹⁰⁸ For his offspring's baptismal records, all listed under the first letter of their first name, by date, see ASPV, San Samuele, Battesimi, Libro IV: Campagna Bernardo (26.8.1584); Maddalena Faustina (20.10.1587); Matteo and Santa (twins, 30.10.1588); Anzola Domenica (12.11.1590); Matteo Anzolo (22.2.1592); Francesco Rocco (25.8.1594). ASPV, San Samuele, Battesimi, Libro VII: Anzola Catarina (15.5.1596); Zuanbattista Partenio (13.7.1599); and APS, 'No. 1 Batizzati dal 1573 sino 1608 San Silvestro', under letter of first name: Anzola Catarina (14.5.1604). Some of the children's names were familial, such as Matteo and Maddalena after Girolamo's parents and Francesco and Santa after Laura's. For Laura's parents, see note 106 above. Not all his children survived to adulthood. In San Samuele's records, I have thus far traced the deaths of the twin Matteo (10.11.1588), and the second Matteo (3.3.1592), both of whom had been ill since birth. ASPV, San Samuele, Libro Morti II, reg. IV and reg. V, under 'M' respectively. Francesco died on 30 September 1623, aged 30, and Girolamo's namesake and eldest son, Campagna, on 28 December 1626, aged 42. APS, Libro dei Morti (1576–1632), under date. Thanks to Victoria Avery's research in the State death records held by the ASV, we

has a significant bearing on our understanding of Girolamo's sculptural output, helping to explain both its quantity and varied quality. Having such a large family to support would surely have pressurised him into obtaining as many commissions as possible in order to guarantee a steady income and financial security. This stands in marked contrast to his older rival, Vittoria, who as revealed above had no children at all, despite two marriages. Although he housed stray relatives at various points in his career, Vittoria certainly did not have to contend with the same financial pressures. This may partially explain why the majority of Vittoria's works are of a superior quality, despite Campagna's evident abilities as an original designer and talented executioner.

The newly-discovered baptismal records for Campagna's multiple offspring also furnish invaluable new insights into his close circle of friends and supporters through the choice of godfathers. Of the children I have traced so far, the following godparents were chosen: Giacomo Contarini q. Pietro (for Campagna junior), Girolamo Contarini q. Girolamo and Andrea Batochi (for Maddalena), merchant Giacomo Ragazzoni (for Matteo I), *proto* Simon Sorella (for Santa), Pietro Mocenigo q. Marc'Antonio and Dionisio Nodaro (for Anzola Domenica), painter Marco q. Rocco (for Matteo II), Gianpaolo Barbò (for Francesco), 'sollicitador da cause' Alessandro Volpe and Gian Battista Contarini q. Pietro (for Anzola Catarina), and Francesco Trevisan and Bertuccio Contarini q. Girolamo (for Zuanbattista).¹⁰⁹

Of particular interest in the present context is the appointment of Giacomo Contarini as godfather to Campagna Bernardo on 26 August 1584. Contarini (1536–95) also lived in the parish of San Samuele, in his palace on the Grand Canal (known today as the Palazzo Contarini 'dalle Figure'; fig.4.49).¹¹⁰ Contarini enjoyed a brilliant political career, was involved in numerous architectural projects for the State, and was instrumental in overseeing the redecoration of the Palazzo Ducale following the devastating fires of 1574 and 1577.¹¹¹ A highly learned man, he amassed an important library of manuscripts and books, as well as a

know that Girolamo Campagna himself died on 27 October 1621. Avery 2004, p.240. For Girolamo's death record in the parish ledgers, see APS, Libro dei Morti (1576–1632), under date. Although Francesco and Campagna died not long after their father, both outlived their parents. In addition to Angela, one of his other daughters, probably Santa, also survived to adulthood, becoming 'Suor Girolama' at the convent of San Lorenzo at an unknown date. See, for example, an investment document dated 2 January 1624: NA b.614, fols 80r-81v.

¹⁰⁹ See note 108 for relevant archival references. Unfortunately, the name of Anzola Catarina's godfather, Girolamo and Laura's youngest child, is illegible. As this was the third child to be called Angela, we can assume that the earlier two daughters with this name were dead by the time of her birth in 1604. For Giacomo Ragazzoni, a wealthy and highly successful merchant, see De Maria 2010, *passim*.

¹¹⁰ For Contarini, see Maria Francesca Tiepolo's introduction to Contarini's family archive in the ASV, inv.311/4; Hochmann 1987; and Hochmann 1992, pp.252-63.

¹¹¹ For the Palazzo Ducale's redecoration programme, see Wolters 1966.

large collection of antiquities, drawings, paintings, sculpture, fossils, minerals, and mathematical and scientific instruments, for which he was renowned in his own lifetime.¹¹² Significantly, Contarini was also a great patron of Veronese and his sons, Francesco Bassano, Giuseppe Salviati, and Tintoretto, a supporter of Palladio and Scamozzi, friends with Daniele and Marc'Antonio Barbaro, and his home was regarded as an academy of learning and culture.¹¹³ The fact that he was on sufficiently close personal terms with Campagna by mid-1584 as to be willing to stand as godfather to his son, surely explains at least some of the significant opportunities that came Girolamo's way in the early years of his career. It is possible, for example, that it was through Contarini that Campagna came to the attention of Marc'Antonio Barbaro and met Scamozzi, both of whom were responsible for overseeing the construction of the da Ponte monument, for which Campagna was contracted to carve no fewer than eight figures in August 1582 (figs 1.35, 2.3).¹¹⁴ Likewise, it would seem logical to suppose that it was Contarini who lay behind Campagna's involvement in the sculptural decoration of the Sala delle Quattro Porte in the Palazzo Ducale, for which he was commissioned to carve one of four sets of overdoor statues in 1584 (fig.4.50).¹¹⁵

In terms of where Campagna lived and worked, he was definitely living and working in San Samuele by April 1583 (and likely from the time of his marriage to his second wife Lucietta in 1581), as discussed above. More specifically, the baptismal record for Campagna junior states that the family lived in Calle di Ca' da Lezze (fig.4.51).¹¹⁶ Girolamo and his family were still living here in 1591, when he gave his friend, the painter, Dario Varotari, power of attorney to represent his interests in Padua.¹¹⁷ At some point after this date but certainly before September 1601, Campagna had moved across the Grand Canal to Sant'Aponal, close to the Rialto (fig.4.1).¹¹⁸ His contract of 8 May 1604 for the Duke of Urbino's Montefeltro portrait-statue, however, records him as living in San Silvestro.¹¹⁹ Based on this evidence, Timofiewitsch suggested that these dwellings were probably in one and the

¹¹² Francesco Sansovino, for example, extolled Contarini's library and collection in his 1581 guidebook. Sansovino 1581, p.138r.

¹¹³ Hochmann 1987, pp.453, 455-7.

¹¹⁴ As discussed in Chapter 2, p.64, Campagna would continue to work with Scamozzi throughout his career. For the da Ponte contract, see cat.6, doc.6.3.

¹¹⁵ For this project, see Chapter 1, pp.19-20. I wonder whether Contarini also recommended Campagna to execute the marble *Hercules* and *Mercury* on the fireplace of the Sala del Collegio, and the *Telemons* on the fireplace in the Sala dell'Antecollegio, both in the Palazzo Ducale, which Timofiewitsch dated to the same period. Timofiewitsch 1972, pp.21-2.

¹¹⁶ 'Campagna et Bernardo nato de Madonna Laura, et de Misser Gierolamo Campagna giugali habitano in cale da ca da Leze'. ASPV, San Samuele, Battesimi, Libro IV, under 'C'.

¹¹⁷ NA 509, fol.21r-v, dated 16 February 1591.

¹¹⁸ See cat.8, doc.8.10, in which he is recorded as 'habitante al presente in contrà de Santo Aponal'.

¹¹⁹ Calzini 1899, pp.21-2, note 2, doc.I.

same place, given the close proximity of the two churches.¹²⁰ This hypothesis can now be confirmed by the fact that the baptism on 14 May 1604 of Campagna's youngest daughter, Anzola Catarina, took place in San Silvestro, while a financial document of 20 May 1605 concerning his wife, Laura, states that it was drawn up by the notary at his home in Sant'Aponal.¹²¹

In addition to these family records, I have also located a number of archival sources that shed light on Campagna's sculptural operations and his financial and business dealings beyond his primary trade. Although Girolamo was known to have worked with his younger brother, Giuseppe, the latter has always been considered as more of an assistant than as an equal business partner. While there is no denying Girolamo's dominance, a document of October 1592 offers the earliest confirmation that the brothers were actually set up as a legally-binding fraternal partnership (*una fraterna compagnia*).¹²² This meant that even if Giuseppe's name was not included in a contract, both brothers were equally responsible in the eyes of Venetian law for all the terms and conditions therein.

Moreover, although Campagna was known to have collaborated with the bronze-caster, Francesco Mazzoleni, who ran the foundry at the sign of the crown, at Ponte delle Ancore in San Salvador, the extent of their partnership was hitherto unknown.¹²³ New documents suggest that their friendship went beyond their documented collaboration on the Priuli monument in San Salvador and the high altars of Il Redentore and San Giorgio Maggiore (figs 1.44, 2.20, 1.4 respectively).¹²⁴ In August 1589, for example, when Francesco found himself embroiled in a legal case, Campagna represented his interests as his arbiter.¹²⁵ Furthermore, after Francesco's death, Campagna helped out his widow, the formidable Catarina, by buying land belonging to his old friend in order that her daughter,

¹²⁰ Timofiewitsch 1972, p.31.

¹²¹ APS, 'No.1 Batizzati dal 1573 sino 1608 San Silvestro', under 'A'; and NA b.2703, fol.28r-v respectively.

¹²² NA, b.510, fols 246v-247r, at fol.246v. I have not yet been able to establish when the *fraterna* was instituted, but it was probably after the death of their father, Matteo, as was standard practice. As would be expected from a *fraterna*, the brothers also shared the proceeds from land and property investments on the *terrafirma*. See, for example, their joint Paduan tax return of 1615 (published Avery 2011, p.459, doc.293), and an unpublished land purchase of 10 February 1621, NA, b.608, n.p., under date. For further discussion of fraternal partnerships, see Connell 1988, pp.42-8.

¹²³ For the Ponte delle Ancore foundry, see Avery 2011, pp.40-2.

¹²⁴ For their newly-discovered collaboration on the bronze capitals and column bases for the Priuli monument in 1588, see Avery 2016 forthcoming. On Mazzoleni's role in the Redentore and San Giorgio high altars, see Avery 2011, pp.40, 91.

¹²⁵ NA, b.5641, n.p., under date (30.8.1589).

Marietta, might have a suitable dowry for her marriage to one Valentino Teritella in 1610.¹²⁶ This documentary proof of a friendship that went beyond the purely professional supports my long-held suspicion that it was very likely Mazzoleni who cast Campagna's other bronzes, particularly his *St Anthony Abbot* for the goldsmiths' altar in San Giacomo (1604; figs 0.2, 3.58).¹²⁷ After all, why would Girolamo entrust his work to another caster when he had a good friend who was such a proficient foundryman, as proven by the exemplary quality of the Redentore and San Giorgio bronzes?

In addition to the income that Campagna derived from his busy sculptural practice and his land and property investments, he sought a further income stream through the construction and operation of a horse-powered, fresh water extraction mill at Lizza Fusina, at the mouth of the Brenta, to supply drinking water to Venice, particularly explicable now that we know he had so many children to feed and clothe.¹²⁸ From the contract of December 1587, we learn that Campagna obtained the right to the water source from another member of the Contarini family, Girolamo q. Paolo, and took on the enterprise with fellow sculptor, Francesco Terilli (active 1596–1633).¹²⁹ Campagna stumped up the modest capital to erect the mill machinery (80 ducats) which was to be overseen by Terilli and they agreed to apportion the business's day-to-day running costs equally. The mill was to be ordinarily operated by a single horse, with Francesco responsible for organising a second horse to be available whenever two were needed. This collaboration, albeit one beyond their shared sculptural trade, is interesting as art historians have previously observed the stylistic influence of Campagna in the younger Terilli's work.¹³⁰ Indeed, is it possible that Terilli received the commission for the pair of bronze holy water stoup statuettes in Il Redentore on Campagna's recommendation (figs 4.52-4.53)?¹³¹

Problem-solving

Thanks to the inherent cost of materials, the time-consuming production processes, and the number of individuals usually involved in a commission, works of sculpture were arguably

¹²⁶ NA, b.2708, fols 16r-17r. The land was sold for 100 ducats. For Catarina, who took over the running of the bronze foundry after Francesco's death, see Kryza-Gersch 2008 and Avery 2011, pp.40-2.

¹²⁷ Jones 2011, p.22.

¹²⁸ NA, b.5638, fols 206r-207v. For Lizza Fusina as a source of potable water for Venice, see Tafuri 1989, p.150.

¹²⁹ For Terilli, who would have been technically classed as an *intagliatore di legno*, working principally in wood and ivory, see most recently Ericani 1997, pp.30-54; Trent 1999, pp.433-9 (by Zanuso and Leithe-Jasper) and Zanuso 2000.

¹³⁰ Trent 1999, pp.433 and 434 (Zanuso).

¹³¹ Trent 1999, pp.438-9 (cat.99; entry by Zanuso).

more prone to problems arising in the course of manufacture than painting. Regrettably, there is little documentary evidence for the guild's role in regulating sculptors' output, and the extent of its influence over them and their workshops. This situation is complicated still further due to missing guild records and lacunae in the surviving registers of the *Giustizia Vecchia*, the guild's ruling magistracy. There are, however, numerous documented instances of problems occurring and of how these difficulties were resolved, including the preferred Venetian method of arbitration and the various avenues available for legal redress, such as the *Giustizia* in its role as a small claims court.

What sort of problems arose?

As discussed in Chapter 3, problems of material supply and availability could hamper a commission, as the Duke of Ferrara discovered when he charged Sansovino with carving the colossal *Hercules* in 1550 (fig.3.23).¹³² Lack of progress and delays were common factors in sculptural production, with the principal cause being a slow work-rate or late delivery. Indeed, the entire manufacture of the *Hercules* was hindered by tardy progress and delays, vividly recorded in the letters exchanged by the Duke, his agent, and Sansovino.¹³³

Similarly, patrician Girolamo Zane was left waiting impatiently for his statue of *St Jerome*, commissioned from Vittoria in 1563 as part of his new altar in the Frari (figs 4.54-4.55). In his will of 10 February 1570, Zane lamented that despite having supplied the marble three or four years earlier, he was still waiting for the statue of his name-saint to be started.¹³⁴ Avery's recent re-assessment of the altar's history indicates that Vittoria did not finish the statue until the later 1570s, by which time poor Zane had been dead for several years.¹³⁵ Given that Vittoria had a number of other important commissions on his books during this period, such as the Montefeltro Altar in San Francesco della Vigna (fig.1.50), the delay was no doubt caused in great part by having too much work on the go.¹³⁶ Indeed, a heavy workload was likely the main reason for Sansovino's tardiness in finishing the aforementioned *Hercules*, as Boucher has observed was the case with some of his other sculptural commissions.¹³⁷ Certainly, the endless excuses offered by the sculptor-architect suggest that the commission was never really a priority, perhaps because the patron was not Venice-based.

¹³² Chapter 3, pp.99-100.

¹³³ Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.220-4, docs 201-24.

¹³⁴ 'vedendo il poco lavor che lui [Vittoria] ha fato se ben sono ani 3 in 4 che ha esa piera in le mano'. NT, b.1259, no.521, fol.2r. Part-published Avery 1999a, p.230, doc.59(ii).

¹³⁵ Avery 2014. Zane's death and his sons' apparent lack of interest in the project may have been additional factors.

¹³⁶ Discussed Chapters 1, pp.25-6, 39; and 2, pp.79, 82.

¹³⁷ Boucher 1991, vol.1, p.155.

Lack of progress and delays were not always caused by the sculptor: patrons could be equally to blame. The Priuli monument in San Salvador is one such example (fig.1.44).¹³⁸ Rich documentation reveals the conflict that ensued when the surviving Priuli family members and the Procuratori di San Marco de Ultra vehemently disagreed over the monument's design, materials and budget.¹³⁹ The family, led by Gianfrancesco Priuli, campaigned to honour the defunct doges with an extremely expensive cenotaph composed of great quantities of marble and numerous free-standing columns designed by architect Giovanni Antonio Rusconi, estimated to cost some 13,650 ducats.¹⁴⁰ However, the procurators felt that a less expensive design by Vittoria, largely favouring Istrian stone over marble, and figure sculpture over columns, would be an equally appropriate monument, but far cheaper and quicker to produce.¹⁴¹ The family eventually got its way, but not before considerable progress had been made on Vittoria's design, which forced a number of stonemasons to petition the procurators for out-of-pocket expenses.¹⁴²

Other difficulties recorded in archival documents include poor workmanship,¹⁴³ divergence from agreed designs,¹⁴⁴ patrons' inability to pay,¹⁴⁵ problems experienced by third parties,¹⁴⁶ death,¹⁴⁷ and posthumous litigation, most famously that instigated by Jacopo Sansovino's son, Francesco, with all manner of patrons, both State and private.¹⁴⁸

¹³⁸ Discussed Chapters 1, pp.21, 23-4, 25, 42-3; 2, 46-7; and 3, pp.88, 97, 121, 123-4.

¹³⁹ Simane 1993, pp.49-64 and Avery 2016 forthcoming.

¹⁴⁰ Avery 1999a, pp.269-70, doc.92(xxiii). See also Simane 1993, p.57. For an unpublished copy of Priuli's petition in favour of Rusconi's design, see PSM de Ultra, b.225, fasc.10, fols 7r-9v. For a further copy: PSM de Ultra, b.223, fasc.19, fols 15r-23r. Part-cited Simane 1993, pp.54-6; published in full Avery 1999a, pp.259-62, doc.92(xi).

¹⁴¹ An initial estimate, excluding the proposed ten statues, brick, lime and gilding, came to 4,090 ducats. Avery 1999a, p.91, doc.92(ix).

¹⁴² See, for example, Bortolomeo Calciner's petition for payment for having executed the model of Vittoria's design. Avery 1999a, pp.270-1, doc.92(xxv).

¹⁴³ For example, some of the sculpted elements produced for the Cappella dell'Arca in the Santo were considered as not up to scratch, such as Minello's relief of *The Investiture of St Anthony* (completed 1519) which was described as 'goffo et sta molto male'. McHam 1994, p.205, doc.15; discussed pp.43-4.

¹⁴⁴ The *massari* of the Santo, for example, ordered Aspetti to recast the head of his bronze *St Anthony* of Padua, intended for the altar of the eponymous chapel, as they claimed it did not resemble the saint. McHam 1994, p.247, doc.123; discussed p.89.

¹⁴⁵ See the examples of Bresciano and the monks of Santo Spirito in Isola (Paschal Candlestick, 1565), and Campagna and the Goldsmiths' Guild (*St Anthony Abbot*, 1605) discussed Chapter 2, p.81 and note 145.

¹⁴⁶ Delay often impacted on third parties, especially for private or confraternal commissions being constructed in ecclesiastical settings. On 18 July 1582, the Canons of San Salvador were forced to issue a formal notarised complaint against Gianfrancesco Priuli and stonemason-cum-*proto* Cesare

The Giustizia Vecchia

As is well documented, the Venetian legal system was supported by a number of courts and magistracies. That which particularly affected sculptors and craftsmen was the Rialto-based Giustizia Vecchia, a lower ranking magistracy founded in 1173.¹⁴⁹ It had a range of responsibilities, including operating as a court, regulating most of the trade guilds and their activities, controlling prices and, as discussed above, overseeing apprenticeship contracts. Thanks to James Shaw's extensive research, we know a great deal about the role of the Giustizia Vecchia as a court. It administered what Shaw termed 'market justice', and also dealt with civil justice, such as small claims cases. It is worth remembering Venice's approach to the law, which differed significantly from other Italian states. To quote Shaw:

Venetian law was a system based upon written statutes, a body of case law cobbled together out of previous decisions, and customs, rather than a rational and ordered system of Roman law, drawn up by skilled jurists.¹⁵⁰

Judges were generally amateurs: patricians elected by their peers, with little or no legal knowledge or training. They were expected to use 'arbitrium' or discretion, and to look to their consciences when hearing cases and passing judgements. As Shaw has observed, emotionally-charged language rather than legal reasoning tended to be used in complaints brought before the Giustizia Vecchia, to appeal to the judges' conscience and pull at their heart-strings.¹⁵¹ Small claims cases (which from 1537 had been assigned a maximum value of 50 ducats) could entail an exchange of numerous complaints between plaintiff and defendant. While some cases resulted in a final hearing before the court's judges, others were often resolved out of court to save money.

There were, of course, other magistracies and appeal courts that litigants, especially those with larger claims, could turn to for legal redress, although access to some depended on whom the plaintiffs were or with whom they were dealing.¹⁵² These included the

Franco about a column that had been left in their cloister many months previously, during the erection of the Priuli monument. Despite having asked both of them repeatedly to have it removed, the column was still there. They demanded it be moved as soon as possible, as they needed to erect a new well in its place. NA 3301, n.p., under 18 July 1582.

¹⁴⁷ For example, the deaths of Tullio Lombardo in 1532 and Cattaneo in 1572, which left the *massari* of the Santo with unfinished reliefs for the Cappella dell'Arca.

¹⁴⁸ For example, Francesco's unsuccessful demand for additional monies for the Venier *Hope* and *Charity*. Cat.4, docs 4.8-4.11.

¹⁴⁹ For an overview, see Shaw 2006, pp.22-44.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p.13.

¹⁵¹ Shaw 2006, p.14.

¹⁵² The Collegio dei XII (established 1548) heard cases from 100 to 400 ducats in value, and its rulings in cases up to 200 ducats in value could not be contested. Da Mosto 1937, vol.1, p.88. The Collegio dei XX Savi del Corpo dei XL (in 1527 it had 30 members, 25 in 1559, and then 20 in 1572): it initially

Conservatori ed Esecutori delle Legge;¹⁵³ the Sopragastaldo;¹⁵⁴ the Giudici del Procurator;¹⁵⁵ the Collegio dei XX Savi del Corpo del Senato;¹⁵⁶ and the Council of Ten.¹⁵⁷

Before proceeding to court, there were, however, tried and trusted ways of resolving problems. Direct negotiation appears to have been particularly favoured by patrons outside of Venice, such as the Duke of Ferrara in the case of the *Hercules* commission (fig.3.23).¹⁵⁸ Despite lengthy delays and Sansovino's repeated excuses and promises, the correspondence does not indicate that the Duke or his agent ever considered legal action. In the end, it appears that the Duke simply expected his beleaguered agent to persuade Sansovino to finish the statue and have it shipped to Ferrara as soon as possible. A similar

dealt with cases from 100 to 300 ducats in value and then from 400 to 800 ducats. Da Mosto 1937, vol.1, p.87. These courts were created to relieve the Quarantia Civil Vecchia (the principal supreme civil court which heard appeals originating from within Venice) of some of its less important cases, as it was overloaded with work. Da Mosto 1937, vol.1, pp.63-4.

¹⁵³ Created in 1553 by the Maggior Consiglio, it was composed of three elected patricians (at the rank of senator) and oversaw the lawyers of the courts of San Marco and Rialto, as well as the application of the law regarding 'compromessi' and wills. Da Mosto 1937, vol.1, p.79.

¹⁵⁴ This implemented civil sentences. Da Mosto 1937, vol.1, p.102.

¹⁵⁵ This magistracy oversaw the work of the Procuratori di San Marco. For example, the Giudici adjudicated in the disagreement between the PSM de Ultra and Gianfrancesco Priuli over how much could be spent from the late Lodovico Priuli's estate on the Priuli monument in San Salvador. See, for example, the statement submitted by the PSM to the Giudici on 15 April 1580: PSM de Ultra, b.225, fasc.38, fols 36r-40r. Part-published Simane 1993, pp.58-9, note 68.

¹⁵⁶ In case of Francesco Sansovino versus the PSM de Supra over posthumous remuneration for his father's Sacristy Door, the Giudici del Procurator first considered the matter. However, when they were unable to resolve it, the case went before the Collegio dei X Savi (ed aggiunti) del Corpo del Senato, ultimately finding in favour of Sansovino to the tune of 1,350 ducats. For transcriptions of all the litigation, see Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.235-40, docs 262-94, discussed p.71. The Collegio dei X Savi (ed aggiunti) was an appeal court for civil litigation. The Collegio was originally entitled just 'dei X Savi' but in 1569, a further ten 'aggiunti' were appointed to assist in serious cases. This was formalised in 1619 and the court became known as the Collegio dei XX Savi. Da Mosto 1937, vol.1, p.105.

¹⁵⁷ As discussed in Chapter 1, the *scuole grandi* were ultimately answerable to the Council of Ten. In 1625, artisans who were owed money for their work on the Scuola Grande di San Rocco's new high altar in its upper *albergo* presented their grievances to the Heads of the Council of Ten. In turn, the *scuola* instituted legal action against the estate of the late Campagna (from whom 14 figures in marble had been commissioned for the new altar in February 1607) in order to retrieve any completed but as yet undelivered statues, any unused marble and the money it had disbursed for work that remained unexecuted on Campagna's death in 1621. For this long-running debacle, see Timofiewitsch 1996.

¹⁵⁸ For the correspondence, see Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.220-24 (docs 201-25).

path was taken by the Duke of Urbino and his Venetian agent, Giulio Brunetti, with Campagna over the Montefeltro portrait-statue commissioned in April 1604 (fig.1.106).¹⁵⁹

However, if direct channels of communication broke down, a sculptor or patron could issue the offending party with a notarised ‘protestatio’ or complaint, to which the accused could respond with a ‘refutatio’. This exchange of ‘protestations’ and ‘refutations’ could continue for some time. In the case of Vittoria versus San Geremia, discussed below, three such documents have so far come to light: two from the sculptor and one from the church.¹⁶⁰ Having reached this point, opting for the celebrated Venetian way of appointing arbiters to resolve a disagreement was a common choice. Arbitration could be sought out of court or via the appropriate magistracy. Thanks to Connell’s research, we know a great deal about arbitration and its employment in the sphere of fifteenth-century sculptors and stonemasons.¹⁶¹ My own research indicates that the process continued with only minor changes.

Essentially, arbitration involved the appointment of arbiters or arbitrators by each conflicting party. Their role was to investigate a case and to settle it once and for all. They might, for example, be called upon to assess whether a finished piece of sculpture was good enough, determine what work remained to be done so that a commission could be completed satisfactorily, or assess the final value of a finished work. The notarial act nominating the arbiters was called a ‘compromissum’ or ‘compromesso’ and this recorded their appointment, whom they were representing, and outlined the case under investigation.¹⁶²

It should be noted that there was a legal difference between an arbiter and an arbitrator. Essentially, an arbiter’s final decision was binding and could not be overturned, whereas the arbitrator’s was considered more like the advice of a friend, and could therefore be appealed against, or a further ‘compromissum’ sought. The decision of two arbiters was called a ‘sententia arbitramentalis’.¹⁶³ This form of arbitration was the famous ‘de more veneto’ process, of which Venetians were very proud.¹⁶⁴ The decision of two arbitrators, on the other hand, was called a ‘laudum’.¹⁶⁵ It should be noted that arbiters could be nominated

¹⁵⁹ Discussed Chapters 1, p.38; 2, pp.52-3, 61, 79; and 3, pp.92, 98.

¹⁶⁰ Cat.3, docs 3.2-3.4.

¹⁶¹ Connell 1988, pp.208-21.

¹⁶² On occasion, the ‘compromissum’ might also include the arbiters’ final decision.

¹⁶³ Often simply noted as ‘sententia’ in the margins of surviving notarial ledgers.

¹⁶⁴ The law of 22 July 1578 (‘In Materia de Compromissi, & Sententie Arbitrarie’) passed by the Maggior Consiglio, boasted of the world-wide fame and honour of this Venetian method of problem-solving. *Novissimum* 1729, p.267v. Cited Connell 1988, p.209, with a different page number. This sort of decision was usually referred to in documents as a decision ‘de iure et de facto’ or ‘de more veneto’. *Ibid.*, p.209. See, for example, cat.4, doc.4.9, fol.271r: ‘de iure et de facto more veneto’.

¹⁶⁵ Connell 1988, p.209.

as both 'arbitri' and 'arbitradores' in a case, presumably to ensure that all bases were covered.

Arbiters and arbitrators would be given a set amount of time to evaluate the matter in question. If they needed more time, they could inform the notary who had drawn up the 'compromissum', and an extension would be agreed and duly recorded.¹⁶⁶ If they could not decide on a mutually acceptable outcome, then the arbiters or arbitrators could elect a third person to adjudicate. When the arbiters' or arbitrators' remit was to assess the final price of a piece of sculpture, this valuation was called a 'stima'. In the cases involving arbiters I have come across, those investigating and evaluating sculptural commissions were either sculptors, architects, stonemasons, or *proiti*. The essential requirement for any litigant was that the arbiter be a good man, of sound judgement, and with the relevant expertise to pronounce on the matter in hand.¹⁶⁷

A case in point is the arbitration entered into by Giovanni Vrana and Domenico da Salò in March 1573 over the completion of the *Altar of the Nativity* in San Giuseppe di Castello (figs 1.109-1.111).¹⁶⁸ For this, architect Andrea Palladio and stonemason-cum-*proto* Francesco de Bernardin Smeraldi were appointed as both arbiters and arbitrators: Palladio by Vrana and Smeraldi by da Salò.¹⁶⁹ Unfortunately, after being granted three extensions to deliver their verdict, Smeraldi and Palladio were still unable to agree, and so on 3 June, a third arbiter was appointed by mutual consent to settle the dispute: Simon Sorella, *proto* of the Procuratori di San Marco de Supra.¹⁷⁰ The outcome agreed by the three arbiters was as follows: Vrana had to pay da Salò 34 ducats for all the work he had undertaken in accordance with the contract.¹⁷¹ Da Salò, however, was required to complete the work outlined in the contract, have the altar gilded, and undertake remedial work to the altar frame to improve its overall structure.¹⁷²

Problems occurred not only between sculptors and patrons, but also between sculptors and their employees and collaborators.¹⁷³ Vittoria's long-term workshop assistant,

¹⁶⁶ Usually in the margins alongside the original 'compromissum'.

¹⁶⁷ Connell 1988, p.210.

¹⁶⁸ Cat.5. See also Chapters 1, p.39; and 2, pp.62-3.

¹⁶⁹ Cat.5, doc.5.1.

¹⁷⁰ Cat.5, docs 5.2, 5.3, 5.4 for the deadline extensions, doc.5.5 for Sorella's appointment. This case was overseen by the Conservatori ed Esecutori delle Legge. Unfortunately, neither their 'termination' of 4 March 1573, nor the original contract between Vrana and da Salò referenced in the 'compromissum' (doc.5.1) have survived.

¹⁷¹ Cat.5, doc.5.6.

¹⁷² Cat.5, doc.5.6.

¹⁷³ Sansovino and Vittoria famously fell out, resulting in the latter going off to Vicenza to work for a time (and also sneakily trying to take over the commission for the Duke of Ferrara's colossal *Hercules*). Leithe-Jasper 1963, pp.14-18; Boucher 1991, vol.1, p.132; Avery 1996, vol.1, pp.65-8, 76-

Andrea dell'Aquila (c.1565–after 1619), for example, issued a bitter complaint to the Giustizia Vecchia on 15 May 1609, a year after the death of his erstwhile employer, claiming that he had been under-valued and under-paid for some 31 years.¹⁷⁴ The unpublished settlement agreement of 13 July 1609, drawn up by the notary Giulio Figolin on behalf of Vittoria's executors, the nuns of San Zaccaria and their lay procurator, Pietromaria Gradenigo, stated that the magistracy had ruled in dell'Aquila's favour and that he should receive 100 ducats from the sculptor's estate as recompense.

San Geremia versus Alessandro Vittoria

A case that did result in an appearance before the Giustizia Vecchia is that of San Geremia versus Vittoria. On 3 April 1565, Vittoria responded to a complaint levelled against him by the parish priest of San Geremia and one of its lay procurators, Girolamo da Pozzo.¹⁷⁵ In his newly discovered autograph statement, Vittoria outlined the details of the commission (fig.4.56): namely that he had been contracted in 1550 to carve a marble statuette of *St John the Baptist* for the baptismal font of San Geremia by lay procurator Angelo Maria Priuli (fig.1.52). He acknowledged that Priuli had supplied the marble and paid him an advance of 2 ducats against an agreed final total of 10. He confirmed that he had carved the *Baptist* in accordance with the contract, but that after Priuli's death, the statuette had remained in his possession without his ever having been paid the final 8 ducats. He then issued the church with an ultimatum:

And because it's not right for me to hang on to the said figure permanently so that no-one gets to look at it: I am therefore making it known to you, Magnificent Mr Girolamo da Pozzo, Procurator of the aforesaid church and also to you, Reverend Parish Priest, that should you want the aforesaid figure, you should come and collect it, paying me the sum that such a work of art deserves within 10 days. Otherwise, should the said deadline expire, I declare that I intend to keep the above-mentioned money for myself as is right and proper, and that I will dispose of the said figure as I see fit as my own property, in the event that, by the said deadline, you have not made any resolution.¹⁷⁶

9; and Avery 1999a, pp.17-19, docs 9-12. Cattaneo also fell out of favour with Sansovino for a while, with the latter excluding him from his penultimate will. Boucher 1991, vol.1, pp.155, 233, doc.255.

¹⁷⁴ NA, b.5914, fols 313v-314v. I am grateful to Victoria Avery for kindly sharing this document with me, which will be discussed further in her forthcoming Vittoria monograph. For dell'Aquila, see Bacchi 2000b.

¹⁷⁵ Cat.3, doc.3.2.

¹⁷⁶ Cat.3, doc.3.2.

The parish priest and his clerical colleagues responded quickly to Vittoria's complaint. On 10 April, one Paulo Fontana, an officer of the Sopragastaldo delivered their written response. The notary recorded how Fontana went to Vittoria's house, and having found the sculptor absent, spoke first to an unnamed apprentice, and then to the sculptor's wife, who read the church's reply and kept it in order to pass it on to Vittoria on his return.¹⁷⁷ In this document, the priests of San Geremia responded vehemently, calling Vittoria's complaint 'false and deceitful' and declaring that he had no right to give the marble *Baptist* to anyone, considering that it had been commissioned by the late Priuli, when he had been a procurator of San Geremia, and that Priuli had in fact paid Vittoria the 10 ducats, citing as proof an entry in the nobleman's account-books. They proceeded to inform Vittoria that this evidence would be presented to the Giustizia Vecchia, and should Vittoria continue to claim that he had only ever received 2 ducats, he was doing so in vain, and that he was absolutely forbidden from giving the statuette to anyone else, given that it legally belonged to their church.

Four days later, on 14 April, Vittoria responded in an equally indignant and forthright fashion (fig.4.57):

Your discourteous reply—which is just what I expected from you, Reverend Parish Priest and priests of San Geremia of Venice—to me, Alessandro Vittoria, Sculptor, in response to my very honest protest, does not merit a further response: only this shall I tell you: that if you intend to take any action concerning the statue of St John which I made, without having satisfied my deserving protest already put to you, then you must inform the Giustizia Vecchia of this within 15 days after the holidays, so that you cannot use the impediment of divine offices as an excuse. Otherwise, as outright owner of the said statue, I will dispose of it as my own property. I also tell you that I have only ever had 2 ducats from the late Magnificent Priuli and the marble to make this statue. Should you not want this statue for the amount it will be valued by mutual friends, or be willing to go to the Giustizia Vecchia as above, I, out of sheer courtesy on my part and not out of any obligation, am happy to give back the 2 ducats to the church and also pay you for the marble if you can demonstrate how much it cost.¹⁷⁸

The documented saga continued on 14 May 1565, when a further notarial act records the final resolution of the discord between the two parties, in an out of court settlement.¹⁷⁹ As a whole month had passed since Vittoria's reply with his threat that San Geremia act within 15 days or the statuette remain his and his alone, it seems likely that further, as yet undiscovered, discussions between the two parties must have taken place. Recorded by a

¹⁷⁷ Cat.3, doc.3.3.

¹⁷⁸ Cat.3, doc.3.4.

¹⁷⁹ Cat.3, doc.3.6.

notary, the settlement begins with a summary of both parties' original grievances and concludes with a summary of the resolution:

both parties having gone before the Giustizia Vecchia in dispute, now to avoid litigation and expense, have come together in the present agreement. That is, that the Reverend Mr Priest Marcuola Zamoro, Deacon of the said church [...] has had and received from the said Mr Alessandro here present 12½ ducats in cash [...] as settlement for all that the said Church Chapter was claiming from Mr Alessandro in order for him to have the said figure. Therefore, this figure should now remain with this Mr Alessandro as his outright property, and he can do with it and dispose of it howsoever he sees fit, thus bringing the above [dispute] for both parties to a mutual end and permanent settlement.¹⁸⁰

This small and inexpensive sculptural commission should have been straightforward: Priuli had ordered the figure from Vittoria in April 1550, provided the marble and a downpayment of 2 ducats against a final payment of 10. Vittoria clearly proceeded to carve the figure and Priuli paid the remaining balance. Yet, after Priuli's death on 4 February 1551, and for reasons unknown, Vittoria did not deliver the statuette and nor did the chapter of San Geremia pursue the matter. Only 15 years later, in April 1565, did the church issue Vittoria with a demand for restitution. Although this action prompted a heated exchange of notarised declarations rife with insults and indignant protestations from both parties, and led to an appearance before the Giustizia Vecchia, a civil if not quite amicable end to the matter was reached, allowing San Geremia to recoup its costs and Vittoria to maintain his honour and to keep what would become one of his most treasured possessions (figs 4.58a-d).¹⁸¹

As we have seen, for the business of sculpture to truly thrive, sculptors had to operate on a basis of good time-management, delegation, and teamwork within the workshop, and a high degree of collaboration without. Furthermore, networks—artistic, artisanal and patronal—were crucial to a sculptor's success. And, at the end of the day, no matter how well-prepared the sculptor and patron may have been when embarking on a new commission, problems could still arise. However, both parties had the security of knowing that well-established avenues of negotiation and legal redress existed in Venice, so that, no matter what the difficulty, both sides could be sure of a fair outcome.

¹⁸⁰ Cat.3, doc.3.6.

¹⁸¹ For evidence of how important the statuette became to Vittoria, see the excerpts from his various wills, in which he made special provision for it: cat.3, docs 3.7-3.13.

CONCLUSION

Since we are all made of a soul and a body, if there is some hope of immortality, and if we do not wish to survive only in one part and die in the other, what, I ask is better suited than this art [of sculpture] to preserve the memory of the one and the other?

Pomponius Gauricus, *De Sculptura* (1504)¹

As we have seen, there were many reasons as to why patrons commissioned sculpture—devotion, piety, celebration, ‘signing’, practicality—but underlying every project examined here was the notion of memory: the desire to create something long-lasting, permanent and even eternal. Like their motivations, the patrons of sculpture in Renaissance and Early Modern Venice varied, but they all required one thing: money. While archival evidence shows that many individual patrons, such as Doge Marino Grimani, had the necessary financial means to commission sculpture, this was clearly not true of everyone who aspired to do so. Membership of confraternities and guilds afforded the less well-off in Venetian society the opportunity to participate in ambitious sculptural projects: the sixteenth-century equivalent of crowd-funding. Commissions such as the Goldsmiths’ altar in San Giacomo (figs 0.1, 0.2, 3.58) show the lengths to which certain patrons were willing to go, in this case funding the project through short-term loans and compulsory member contributions. The predilection for large-scale, multi-media, multi-figure projects increased steadily across the century, particularly complex altar projects and funerary monuments to the wealthy, paving the way for the lavish theatricality of seventeenth-century Baroque.

Contracts remained central to the commissioning process and were important for both parties. Agreements continued to encompass standard terms and conditions, with an emphasis on incentives, penalties and guarantees for both sides, and with sculptors’ fees rising steadily across the period. My examination of what patrons could afford, and how they paid for it, demonstrates the complex nature of these business dealings. Indeed, while it is tempting to believe that patrons held all the power through their hold on the purse-strings, sculptors often possessed an emotional power over their designs and creations and, as a result, were able to exercise a considerable degree of independence in the execution of commissions.

The sourcing and supply of materials, especially marble and stone, was inherently complex and time-consuming in the lagoon city, where all the requisite raw materials had to

¹ ‘Nam quum ex animo et corpore constemus omnes, siqua modo spes est immortalitatis, ac non partim vivere, partim et emori optamus. Quid rogo ad ustriusque memoriam conservandam hac arte convenientius?’ Gauricus 1504 p.5r. (Translation: Luchs 1995, p.11, quoting from Gauricus-Chastel and Klein 1969, in the context of the value of portrait sculpture).

be imported. Perhaps the most surprising discovery is that almost all patrons supplied marble and stone to sculptors, choosing to entrust the task to a *proto*, stonemason or agent. Clearly, this was an aspect over which patrons could exercise a further degree of control, while choosing an appropriate alloy for a work of sculpture in bronze required a greater measure of trust. As with sculptors' fees, unsurprisingly, material costs rose across the century.

Hierarchies of materials, meanwhile, are evident throughout the period, with marble and bronze being the most revered (as well as the most expensive). It is interesting to note an appreciation of the multi-sensory nature of materials, from the auditory qualities of *bronzos da Verona* and marbles, to the visual lustre and shine of highly polished surfaces, and the tactility of carved, modelled and cast forms.

In terms of sculptural production, it is all too easy to revert to nineteenth-century romantic notions of sculpture being created by the lone master, slaving away in his garret, but we have long known that this was not the case. The evidence presented here proves that sculpture in Venice was a business like any other, with the workshop a hub not only of artistic inspiration and invention, but also of teamwork, delegation, and hard graft, in which most masters were usually juggling several commissions at once and frequently running behind schedule. Furthermore, sculpture could not be completed without collaborating with other trades. Hence builders were required to install statuary into the framework produced by stonemasons, using iron fixings made by blacksmiths, as the documents examined here demonstrate.

The inherently collaborative nature of sculpture should, therefore, not be forgotten when considering the concept of authorship and the knotty issue of attribution. Indeed, patrons were thoroughly aware that a work of sculpture would realistically never be the sole product of the sculptor's hand. The sculptor was surely aiming to run a workshop where well-trained assistants could translate and emulate their master's ideas and stylistic conventions as fluently and seamlessly as possible to ensure works of a consistent quality and aesthetic/visual uniformity. We should, therefore, be wary of the desire of some art historians to assign individual elements (this eyebrow, that foot) to the master's hand, while maintaining an awareness of qualitative differences within the elements of a single commission, as well as between contemporary works produced by a single workshop.²

The findings presented here also counsel against imposing our modern-day perception and appreciation of quality on that of the period. We might wonder why some Venice-based sculptors—now regarded as rather second rate—received prestigious commissions, such as da Salò and the monument to Vincenzo Cappello at Santa Maria Formosa (fig.1.32), or del Moro and the sculpture for the Priuli and Dolfin monuments in San Salvador (figs 1.44, 3.7-3.8; and 1.119, 4.36a-b respectively). Yet the fact that they were awarded these commissions speaks of the high regard in which they were held by sixteenth-

² See also Wolters 1990, pp.132-3, who subscribes to this view.

century patrons. Indeed, by considering the work of the most talented alongside the more pedestrian sculptors, a much more balanced picture of sculptural production in Venice emerges—something that cannot be achieved through the traditional monographic study.

Commissioning sculpture in this period was a costly, time-consuming and potentially tricky undertaking. Both patron and sculptor would, of course, have always striven for a satisfactory completion—it was, after all, to their mutual benefit. But when problems arose, well-established mechanisms existed in Venice to resolve them. And so demand for sculpture remained steady throughout the century, and resulted in a city as richly decorated in sculpture as in paintings and mosaics.

To conclude, this thesis offers a much-needed holistic study of the patronage, practices, processes and place of sculpture in Cinquecento and early Seicento Venice, and has sought to avoid a single art historical/theoretical approach (such as positivism or materialist art history), and the constraints that such methodologies can impose. Through close analysis and careful interpretation of myriad archival documents (both my own numerous discoveries and published sources) and primary texts, I have been able to recreate the social, economic, technical and cultural contexts in which sculpture was commissioned and produced, and assess the creative agency enjoyed by both patrons and sculptors. Close visual analysis of the objects themselves and the spaces for which they were made has elucidated further how patrons' desires and ambitions were curtailed or given free rein, and likewise, how sculptors responded to the constraints or liberties they were afforded. Moreover, by combining archival research, connoisseurship, newly-available scientific and technical evidence, as well as a practical and aesthetic understanding of materials and production processes, I have endeavoured to surpass Connell's ground-breaking research on the employment of fifteenth-century sculptors. I hope that this thesis presents a measured and critical evaluation of the 'how' and 'why' of sculpture—a thriving, yet previously underappreciated industry in Renaissance and Early Modern Venice—and has thereby helped to transform the field of Venetian sculpture studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

MANUSCRIPT SOURCES CITED

All archives and libraries are in Venice

Archivio Parrocchiale di Santa Maria dei Frari:

Parrocchia di San Polo, Commissarie

Parrocchia di San Polo, Registro di documenti dal 1584 al 1797 relativi alla Chiesa di San Polo

Archivio Parrocchiale di San Silvestro:

Libro dei Morti, 1576–1632

'No. 1 Batizzati dal 1573 sino 1608 San Silvestro'

Archivio di Stato:

Archivio Grimani-Barbarigo, b. 20

Archivio Grimani-Barbarigo, b. 21

Archivio Grimani-Barbarigo, b. 29

Archivio Grimani-Barbarigo, b. 33

Archivio Tiepolo, Consegna II, b. 108 (no. 236)

Archivio Tiepolo, Consegna II, b. 133 (no. 262)

Arti, b. 420

Arti, b. 710

Cancelleria inferiore, 'Atti del Doge Marino Grimani, 1595–1606', reg. 78

Cancelleria inferiore, 'Chiese e Luoghi su di Juspatronato Ducale, 1556–1629', reg. 259

Decima del Clero, b. 33

Decima del Clero, b. 34

Direzione Dipartimentale del Demanio e Diritti uniti, Atti, b. 418

Giudici del Piovego, b. 21

Giustizia Vecchia, b. 112

Giustizia Vecchia, b. 113

Giustizia Vecchia, b. 114

Giustizia Vecchia, b. 115

Giustizia Vecchia, b. 116

Giustizia Vecchia, b. 117

Giustizia Vecchia, b. 118

Notarile-Atti, Rocco de Benedetti, b. 432

Notarile-Atti, Rocco de Benedetti, b. 447

Notarile-Atti, Rocco de Benedetti, b. 448

Notarile-Atti, Fabrizio Beacian, b. 504

Notarile-Atti, Fabrizio Beacian, b. 509

Notarile-Atti, Fabrizio Beacian, b. 510

Notarile-Atti, Fabrizio Beacian, b. 558

Notarile-Atti, Fabrizio Beacian, b. 608

Notarile-Atti, Fabrizio Beacian, b. 614

Notarile-Atti, Pietro Contarini, b. 2571

Notarile-Atti, Pietro Contarini, b. 2579

Notarile-Atti, Giovanni Francesco Crivelli, b. 2703

Notarile-Atti, Giovanni Francesco Crivelli, b. 2708

Notarile-Atti, Marc'Antonio Cavanis, b. 3269

Notarile-Atti, Marc'Antonio Cavanis, b. 3279

Notarile-Atti, Marc'Antonio Cavanis, b. 3295

Notarile-Atti, Marc'Antonio Cavanis, b. 3298

Notarile-Atti, Marc'Antonio Cavanis, b. 3301

Notarile-Atti, Marc'Antonio Cavanis, b. 3311

Notarile-Atti, Marc'Antonio Cavanis, b. 3315

Notarile-Atti, Giovan'Andrea Catti, b. 3378
Notarile-Atti, Giovanni Figolin, b. 5590
Notarile-Atti, Giovanni Figolin, b. 5602
Notarile-Atti, Giovanni Figolin, b. 5614
Notarile-Atti, Giovanni Figolin, b. 5617
Notarile-Atti, Giovanni and Federico Figolin, b. 5638
Notarile-Atti, Giovanni and Federico Figolin, b. 5641
Notarile-Atti, Giovanni and Federico Figolin, b. 5642
Notarile-Atti, Giovanni and Federico Figolin, b. 5647
Notarile-Atti, Giulio Figolin, b. 5914
Notarile-Atti, Galeazzo Secco, b. 6621
Notarile-Atti, Girolamo Lionello, b. 7977
Notarile-Atti, Girolamo Lionello, b. 7985
Notarile-Atti, Girolamo Lionello, b. 7986
Notarile-Atti, Vettor Maffei, b. 8098
Notarile-Atti, Vettor Maffei, b. 8105
Notarile-Atti, Vettor Maffei, b. 8109
Notarile-Atti, Vettor Maffei, b. 8160
Notarile-Atti, Vettor Maffei, b. 8165
Notarile-Atti, Vettor Maffei, b. 8168
Notarile-Atti, Vettor Maffei, b. 8170
Notarile-Atti, Vettor Maffei, b. 8171
Notarile-Atti, Vettor Maffei, b. 8184
Notarile-Atti, Vettor Maffei, b. 8202
Notarile-Atti, Girolamo Savina b. 11891
Notarile-Atti, Cesare Ziliol, b. 14046
Notarile-Testamenti, Marco Aleandro, b. 13
Notarile-Testamenti, Fabrizio Beacian, b. 56
Notarile-Testamenti, Fabrizio Beacian, b. 57
Notarile-Testamenti, Fabrizio Beacian, b. 58
Notarile-Testamenti, Angelo de Canal, b. 210
Notarile-Testamenti, Gianpaolo Dario, b. 323
Notarile-Testamenti, Giulio Figolin, b. 402
Notarile-Testamenti, Paolo Lioncino, b. 602
Notarile-Testamenti, Vettor Maffei, b. 657
Notarile-Testamenti, Vettor Maffei, b. 658
Notarile-Testamenti, Bernardin Moravio, b. 736
Notarile-Testamenti, Antonio Marsilio, b. 1207
Notarile-Testamenti, Antonio Marsilio, b. 1209
Notarile-Testamenti, Antonio Marsilio, b. 1217
Notarile-Testamenti, Giulio Ziliol, b. 1249
Notarile-Testamenti, Cesare Ziliol, b. 1259
Notarile-Testamenti, Cesare Ziliol, b. 1260
Notarile-Testamenti, Cesare Ziliol, b. 1263
Procuratoria di San Marco, Misti, b. 12
Procuratoria di San Marco, Misti, b. 12A
Procuratoria di San Marco, Misti, b. 98A
Procuratoria di San Marco de Citra, b. 242
Procuratoria di San Marco de Citra, b. 249A
Procuratoria di San Marco de Supra, Chiesa, Atti, b. 68
Procuratoria di San Marco de Supra, Chiesa, Atti, b. 74
Procuratoria di San Marco de Supra, Chiesa, Atti, b. 77
Procuratoria di San Marco de Ultra, b. 223
Procuratoria di San Marco de Ultra, b. 225
Procuratoria di San Marco de Ultra, b. 350
Procuratoria di San Marco de Ultra, b. 362
San Francesco della Vigna, b. 4

San Giorgio Maggiore, b. 21
San Lorenzo, b. 3
San Salvador, b. 32
San Salvador, b. 41
San Zaccaria, b. 18, Commissaria Vittoria I
San Zaccaria, b. 19, Commissaria Vittoria
Scuole piccole e suffragi, b. 55
Scuola del Rosario, b. 251
Scuola del Rosario, b. 303
Scuola del Rosario, b. 330
Scuola di San Rocco, Atti, b. 414
Soprintendente alle Decime del Clero, b. 32
Soprintendente alle Decime del Clero, b. 33

Archivio Storico del Patriarcato di Venezia:

Archivio 'segreto', Clero. Benefici, Beneficiorum collatimum
Archivio 'segreto', Visite Apostoliche, Visita Apostolica 1581, filze
Archivio 'segreto', Visite Apostoliche, Visita Apostolica 1581, protocollo
Archivio 'segreto', Visite Pastorali, Priuli
Sezione antica, status animarum, 1591–4
San Geminiano, Libro dei Morti, 1550–87
San Giuliano, Scuola del SS. Sacramento in San Giuliano, Registri di Cassa 1, b. 48
San Samuele, Battesimi, Libro IV
San Samuele, Battesimi, Libro VII
San Samuele, Libro dei Morti II, 1556–1602

Biblioteca del Museo Correr:

Cl. IV, 139, Mariegola degli Orefici e Gioiellieri
Cl. IV, 140, Sovegno degli Orefici e Gioiellieri
Cl. IV, 150, Mariegola dell'arte dei Tagliapietra
Cl. IV, 151, Mariegola dell'arte dei Tagliapietra
Cl. IV, 164, Mariegola della scuola del SS. Sacramento a San Giuliano
Cl. IV, 205, Mariegola della Scuola degli Oresi e Zogielieri
Cod. Cic. 2007–2020, Emmanuele Cicogna, 'Iscrizioni veneziane inedite'
Cod. Cic. 2021–2023, Emmanuele Cicogna, 'Aggiunte alle iscrizioni veneziane'
Cod. Cic. 3784, no. 413, Girolamo Priuli, 'Arbore della nobilissima Famiglia Priuli'
Cod. Cic. 585, no. 105, Iconographic programme for the 1577 redecoration of the Palazzo Ducale

Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana:

Ms. It. Cl. VII 1639=7540, Ceremoniale del Doge (1594)

Istituzioni di Ricovero e di Educazione:

Sacco no. 2, Q. Maria Massa

PRIMARY PUBLISHED SOURCES

Agricola-Hoover and Hoover 1950

Agricola, Georg, *De Re Metallica*, trans. Herbert Clark Hoover and Lou Henry Hoover (New York: Dover, 1950)

Alberti-Rykwert et al 1988

Alberti, Leon Battista, *On the Art of Building in Ten Books*, trans. Joseph Rykwert, Neil Leacher, and Robert Tavernor (Cambridge, MA, and London: MIT Press, 1988)

Aretino 1538

Aretino, Pietro, *Le Lettere di M. Pietro Aretino di nuovo impresse et corrette* (Venice: Giovane Padovano, 1538)

Aretino-Camesasca et al 1957

Aretino, Pietro, *Lettere sull'arte di Pietro Aretino*, ed. Ettore Camesasca, Fidenzio Pertile and Carlo Cordié, 3 vols (Milan: Edizioni del Milione, 1957)

Aretino-Procaccioli 1997

Aretino, Pietro, *Lettere*, ed. Paolo Procaccioli, 5 vols (Rome: Salerno Editrice, 1997)

Aristotle-Rowe and Broadie 2002

Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. Christopher Rowe, commentary Sarah Broadie (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)

Barbaro 1567

Barbaro, Daniele, *I dieci libri dell'architettura di M. Vitruvio...* (Venice: Francesco de' Franceschi Senese & Giovanni Chrieger Alemanno Compagni, 1567)

Barocchi 1960–62

Barocchi, Paola (ed.), *Trattati d'arte del Cinquecento*, 3 vols (Bari: G. Laterza, 1960)

Biringuccio 1540

Biringuccio, Vannoccio, *De la pirotechnia: libri X dove ampiamente si tratta non solo di ogni sorte & diversita di miniere ...* (Venice: per Venturino Roffinello. Ad instantia di Curtio Navo & Fratelli, 1540)

Biringuccio-Smith and Gnudi 1942

Biringuccio, Vannoccio, *The Pirotechnia of Vannoccio Biringuccio. The Classic Sixteenth-Century Treatise on Metals and Metallurgy*, trans. Cyril Stanley Smith and Martha Teach Gnudi (New York: The American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, 1942)

Borromeo 1577

Borromeo, Carlo, *Instructionem fabricae, et supellectilis, libri II* (Mediolani: apud Pacificum Pontium typographum, 1577)

Cellini 1568

Cellini, Benvenuto, *Due trattati: uno intorno alle otto principali arti dell'oreficeria. L'altro in materia dell'arte della scultura...* (Florence: Valente Panizzi & Marco Peri, 1568)

Colonna-Godwin 1999

Colonna, Francesco, *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*, trans. Joscelyn Godwin (London: Thames & Hudson, 1999)

Contarini 1541

Contarini, Pietro, *Argo voluptas* (Venice: Bernardinus de Vienis, 1541)

Contarini 1542

Contarini, Pietro, *Argo vulgar* (Venice: per Alouise de Tortis, 1542)

De Benedetti 1571

De Benedetti, Rocco, *Ragguaglio delle allegrezze, solennità e feste fatte in Venetia per la felice vittoria* (Venice: Gratoso Perchaccino, 1571)

Doglioni 1603

Doglioni, Giovanni Nicolò, *Le cose maravigliose et notabili della città di Venetia. Riformate, accomodate, grandemente ampliate et con ogni verita si contengono et si descrivono usanze antiche, habiti et vestiti fabriche et palazzi* (Venice: Ghirardo & Iseppo Imberti, 1603. Ed. consulted: 1624)

Fioravanti 1567

Fioravanti, Leonardo, *Dello specchio di scientia universale* (Venice: Andrea Ravenoldo, 1567)

Frimmel 1896

Frimmel, Theodor von, *Der Anonimo Morelliano (Marcanton Michiel's Notizia d'opere de disegno): Text und Übersetzung*. Quellenschriften für Kunstgeschichte und Kunsttechnik. N.F. 1 (Vienna: Graeser, 1896)

Garzoni 1589

Garzoni, Tomaso, *La piazza universale di tutte le professioni del mondo, nuovamente ristampata, et posta in luce de Thomaso Garzoni* (Venice: Appresso Gio. Battista Somasco, 1589) [first published 1585]

Gaurico-Cutolo 1999

Gaurico, Pomponio, *De Sculptura*, ed. and trans. Paolo Cutolo (Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1999)

Gauricus 1504

Gauricus, Pomponius, *De Sculptura* (Florence, 1504)

Groto 1572

Groto, Luigi, *Trofeo della Vittoria sacra ottenuta dalla Christianissima Lega contro Turchi nel anno MDLXXI ...* (Venice: Sigismondo Bordogna & Franc. Patriani, 1572)

Lotto-Chiodi 1968

Lotto, Lorenzo, *Le Lettere inedite di Lorenzo Lotto*, ed. Luigi Chiodi (Bergamo, Tip. Vescovile G. Secomandi, 1968)

Novissimum 1729

Novissimum statutorum ac Venetarum legum volumen (Venice: Ex typographia Ducali Pinelliana, 1729)

Pacifico 1697

Pacifico, Antonio, *Cronica Veneta* (Venice: Lovisa, 1697)

Piccolomini 1542

Piccolomini, Alessandro, *De la institutione di tutta la vita de l'homo nato nobile e in città libera* (Venice: Hier. Scotum, 1542)

Pino 1548

Pino, Paolo, *Dialogo di Pittura* (Venice, Paolo Gherardo, 1548)

Pliny-Jex-Blake 1896

Pliny the Elder, *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art*, trans. K. Jex-Blake (London and New York: Macmillan, 1896)

Ridolfi 1648

Ridolfi, Carlo, *Le meraviglie dell'arte, ovvero Le vite degli illustri pittori veneti e dello stato*, 2 vols (Venice: Gio. Battista Soava, 1648)

Rota 1597

Rota, Giovanni, *Lettera nella quale si descrive l'ingresso nel palazzo ducale della serenissima Morosina Morosini Grimani di Vinetia* (Venice: Giovanni Antonio Rampazetto, 1597)

<http://special-1.bl.uk/treasures/festivalbooks/pageview.aspx?strFest=0227&strPage=1>

Sansovino 1561

Sansovino, Francesco, *Delle cose notabili che sono in Venetia* (Venice: Comin da Trino di Monserrato, 1561)

Sansovino 1581

Sansovino, Francesco, *Venetia città nobilissima et singolare* (Venice: Domenico Farri, 1581)

Sansovino-Martinoni 1663

Sansovino, Francesco and Giustiniano Martinioni, *Venetia città nobilissima et singolare descritta dal Sansovino con nove e copiose aggiunte di D. Giustinian Martinioni* (Venice: Appresso Steffano Curti, 1663)

Sansovino-Stringa 1604

Sansovino, Francesco and Giovanni Stringa, *Venetia città nobilissima, et singolare; Descritta già in XIII Libri da M. Francesco Sansovino: et hora con molta diligenza corretta, emendata, e più d'un terzo di cose nuove ampliata dal M. R. D. Giovanni Stringa, Canonico della Chiesa Ducale di S. Marco* (Venice: Altobello Salicato, 1604)

Sanudo-Barozzi et al 1879–1903

Sanudo, Marin, *I Diarii di Marino Sanuto*, ed. Nicolò Barozzi et al, 58 vols (Venice, 1879–1903)

Sanudo-Caracciolo Aricò 1980

Sanudo, Marin, *De origine, situ et magistratibus urbis Venetae, ovvero La città di Venezia (1493–1530)*, ed. Angela Caracciolo Aricò (Milan: Istituto editoriale cisalpino-goliardica, 1980)

Scamozzi 1615

Scamozzi, Vincenzo, *L'idea della architettura universale*, 2 vols (Venice, 1615)

Serlio 1619

Serlio, Sebastiano, *Tutte l'opere d'architettura et prospetiva di Sebastiano Serlio Bolognese [...] raccolto da M. Gio. Domenico Scamozzi Vicentino* (Venice: Giacomo de'Franceschi, 1619)

Varchi 1550

Varchi, Benedetto, *Due Lezioni di M. Benedetto Varchi ...* (Florence: Ap. L. Torrentino, 1549 [stile fiorentino])

Vasari 1550

Vasari, Giorgio, *Le vite de' piu eccellenti pittori, scultori, e architettori*, 2 vols (Florence: Appresso Lorenzo Torrentino, 1550)

Vasari 1568

Vasari, Giorgio, *Le vite de' piu eccellenti pittori, scultori, e architettori*, 3 vols (Florence: Appresso i Giunti, 1568)

Vasari 1789

Vasari, Giorgio, *Vita de M. Jacopo Sansovino, scultore e architetto della Repubblica di Venezia ... ampliata riformata e corretta. Seconda edizione* (Venice: Antonio Zatta e figli, 1789)

Vasari-De Vere 1996

Vasari, Giorgio, *Lives of the Painters, Sculptors and Architects*, trans. Gaston de Vere (London: David Campbell, 1996)

Vasari-Maclehose 1960

Vasari, Giorgio, *Vasari on Technique*, trans. Louisa S. Maclehose (New York: Dover, 1960)

Vitruvius-Rowland and Howe 1999

Vitruvius, *The Ten Books on Architecture*, trans. Ingrid D. Rowland, commentary Thomas Noble Howe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

SECONDARY PUBLISHED SOURCES

Acidini Luchinat 1998–9

Acidini Luchinat, Cristina, *Taddeo e Federico Zuccari: fratelli pittori del Cinquecento*, 2 vols (Milan: Jandi Sapi, 1998–9)

Aikema et al 2016

Aikema, Bernard, Massimo Mancini, and Paola Modesti (eds), *“In centro et oculis urbis nostre”: la chiesa e il monastero di San Zaccaria* (Venice: Marcianum Press, 2016)

Allerston 2007

Allerston, Patricia, ‘Consuming Problems: Worldly Goods in Renaissance Venice’, in O’Malley and Welch 2007, pp. 11–46

Ames-Lewis 1995

Ames-Lewis, Francis (ed.), *The Early Medici and Their Artists* (London: Birkbeck College, 1995)

Ames-Lewis 2000

Ames-Lewis, Francis, *The Intellectual Life of the Early Renaissance Artist* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000)

Ames-Lewis and Joannides 2003

Ames-Lewis, Francis, and Paul Joannides, *Reactions to the Master: Michelangelos’ Effect on Art and Artists in the Sixteenth Century* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2003)

Anderson 2002

Anderson, Christy (ed.), *The Built Surface*, vol. 1, *Architecture and the Pictorial Arts from Antiquity to the Enlightenment* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002)

Angelini 1961

Angelini, Luigi, *Bartolomeo Bon, Guglielmo d’Alzano, architetti bergamaschi in Venezia* (Bergamo, 1961)

Arbel 2004

Arbel, Benjamin, ‘The Last Decades of Venice’s Trade with the Mamluks: Importations into Egypt and Syria’, *Mamluk Studies Review*, 8/2 (2004), pp. 37–86

Arcangeli 1996

Arcangeli, Catarina Schmidt, ‘Un tempio aperto: i Bellini e il ruolo nel progetto della facciata della Scuola Grande di San Marco’, *Studi di storia dell’arte*, 7 (1996), pp. 65–98

Attardi 2002

Attardi, Luisa, *Il camino veneto del Cinquecento: struttura architettonica e decorazione scultorea* (Vicenza: A. Colla, 2002)

Avcioglu and Jones 2013

Avcioglu, Nebahat, and Emma Jones (eds), *Art, Architecture and Identity in Venice and its Territories, 1450–1750* (Farnham and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2013)

Avery C. 1981

Avery, Charles, ‘The Fingerprints of the Sculptor’, in Washington 1981, pp. 16–25

Avery C. 1984

Avery, Charles, ‘La cera sempre aspetta: Wax Sketch Models for Sculpture’, *Apollo*, 119 (1984), pp. 166–76

Avery C. 2003

Avery, Charles, 'Not quite Sansovino and not quite Vittoria: Andrea di Alessandri, called Il Bresciano', *The Sculpture Journal*, 9 (2003), pp. 46-61

Avery C. 2007

Avery, Charles, 'Modello: Il. Sculpted', *Grove Art Online. Oxford Art Online* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007–16).

<http://www.oxfordartonline.com/subscriber/article/grove/art/T058760>. (accessed 29 August 2016)

Avery 1996

Avery, Victoria, 'The Early Works of Alessandro Vittoria', PhD thesis, 3 vols, University of Cambridge, 1996

Avery 1999a

Avery, Victoria, 'Documenti sulla vita e le opere di Alessandro Vittoria (c. 1525–1608)', *Studi Trentini di Scienze Storiche*, Sezione Prima, LXXVIII/1 (1999), Supplemento

Avery 1999b

Avery, Victoria, 'Alessandro Vittoria Collezionista', in Trent 1999, pp. 140-51

Avery 1999c

Avery, Victoria, 'La bottega di Alessandro Vittoria', in Trent 1999, pp. 126-39

Avery 2001a

Avery, Victoria, 'Nuove fonti archivistiche per il rinnovo cinquecentesco della Cappella del Rosario ai Santi Giovanni e Paolo', in Finocchi Ghersi 2001, pp. 175-97

Avery 2001b

Avery, Victoria, 'The House of Alessandro Vittoria Reconstructed', *The Sculpture Journal*, 5 (2001), pp. 7-32

Avery 2003

Avery, Victoria, 'Alessandro Vittoria: the Michelangelo of Venice?', in Ames-Lewis and Joannides 2003, pp. 157-79

Avery 2004

Avery, Victoria, 'Girolamo Campagna 1549–1621', in Boström 2004, vol.1, pp. 238-41

Avery 2007a

Avery, Victoria, 'The Production, Display and Reception of Bronze Heads and Busts in Renaissance Venice and Padua: Surrogate Antiques', in Kohl and Müller 2007, pp. 75-112

Avery 2007b

Avery, Victoria, 'Alessandro Vittoria's Socles: Shaping and Naming', in Gerstein 2007, pp. 16-32

Avery 2010

Avery, Victoria, "'Ridotta à perfettione": The Rebuilding of the Cappella di San Sabba in Sant'Antonin and Artistic Practice in late Cinquecento Venice', in Favaro 2010, pp. 153-79

Avery 2011

Avery, Victoria, *Vulcan's Forge in Venus' City: The Story of Bronze in Venice, 1350–1650* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)

Avery 2012

Avery, Victoria, 'I Bronzi Zen', *Quaderni della Procuratoria di San Marco* (Venice: Marsilio, 2012), pp. 72-83

Avery 2013

Avery, Victoria, '*Campane, Cavedoni, Candelieri and Caramali*: Giacomo Calderari (c.1562–1622)', pp. 236-51

Avery 2014

Avery, Victoria, "'...belo et onorato per onor ancho suo": Alessandro Vittoria's Zane Altar Reconsidered', in Corsato and Howard 2014, pp. 233-49

Avery 2015

Avery, Victoria, 'Alessandro Vittoria and the Art of Carving', in Helmstutler Di Dio 2015, pp. 87-110

Avery 2016 forthcoming

Avery, Victoria, 'Material matters: bronze and its (non-)employment in the monuments to Venice's doges (1475–1625)', in Paul 2016 forthcoming

Bacchi 2000a

Bacchi, Andrea (ed.), *La scultura a Venezia da Sansovino a Canova* (Milan: Longanesi, 2000)

Bacchi 2000b

Bacchi, Andrea, 'Andrea dall'Aquila', in Bacchi 2000a, pp. 688-9

Bacchi 2000c

Bacchi, Andrea, 'Girolamo Campagna', in Bacchi 2000a, pp. 715-19

Bacchi 2000d

Bacchi, Andrea, 'Giulio del Moro', in Bacchi 2000a, pp. 730-1

Bacchi 2000e

Bacchi, Andrea, 'Domenico da Salò', in Bacchi 2000a, p. 731

Bacchi 2000f

Bacchi, Andrea, 'Jacopo Sansovino (Jacopo Tatti detto)', in Bacchi 2000a, pp. 781-4

Bacchi 2000g

Bacchi, Andrea, 'Alessandro Vittoria', in Bacchi 2000a, pp. 800-05

Barker et al 1999

Barker, Emma, Nick Webb and Kim Woods (eds), *The Changing Status of the Artist* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999)

Barry 2006

Barry, Fabio, 'Painting in Stone: The Symbolism of Colored Marbles in the Visual Arts and Literature from Antiquity until the Enlightenment', PhD thesis, Columbia University, 2006

Bashir Hecht 1977

Bashir Hecht, Herma, *Die Fassade des Dogenpalastes in Venedig* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1977)

Bassett and Fogelman 1997

Bassett, Jane, and Peggy Fogelman, *Looking at European Sculpture: A Guide to Technical Terms* (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 1997)

Bassi 1997

Bassi, Elena, *Tracce di chiese veneziane distrutte: ricostruzioni dai disegni di Antonio Visentini* (Venice: Istituto veneto di scienze, lettere, ed arti, 1997)

Bazzotti 2013

Bazzotti, Ugo, *Palazzo Te: Giulio Romano's Masterwork in Mantua* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2013)

Beard 1983

Beard, Geoffrey, *Stucco and Decorative Plasterwork in Europe* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1983)

Benacchio Flores d'Arcais 1930

Benacchio Flores d'Arcais, Malvina, 'Vita e opere di Tiziano Aspetti I', *Bolletino del Museo Civico di Padova*, N.S. Annata VI (1930), pp. 189-206

Benacchio Flores d'Arcais 1931

Benacchio Flores d'Arcais, Malvina, 'Vita e opere di Tiziano Aspetti II & III', *Bolletino del Museo Civico di Padova*, N. S. Annata VII (1931), pp. 101-52

Benacchio Flores d'Arcais 1932

Benacchio Flores d'Arcais, Malvina, 'Vita e opere di Tiziano Aspetti IV & V', *Bolletino del Museo Civico di Padova*, N. S. Annata VIII (1932), pp. 67-103

Benacchio Flores d'Arcais 1934–9

Benacchio Flores d'Arcais, Malvina, 'Vita e opere di Tiziano Aspetti VI', *Bollettino del Museo Civico di Padova*, N. S. Annate X-XI (1934–9), pp. 91-138

Bertelli and Rubinstein 1980

Bertelli, Sergio and Nicolai Rubinstein (eds), *Florence and Venice: Comparisons and Relations*, 2 vols (Florence, 1980)

Bertoli and Romanelli 1997

Bertoli, Bruno and Giandomenico Romanelli, *Chiesa di San Salvador: arte e devozione* (Venice: Marsilio, 1997)

Bettiolo 1913

Bettiolo, G., 'Un Altare votivo per la vittoria di Lepanto nella Chiesa di S. Giuseppe di Castello', *Arte Cristiana*, Anno 1, no. 10 (1913), pp. 310-14

Bewer 2012

Bewer, Francesca, 'Bronze Casting: The Art of Translation', in London 2012, pp. 24-31

Bilbey and Cribb 2007

Bilbey, Diane, and Ruth Cribb, 'Plaster Models, Plaster Casts, Electrotypes and Fictile Ivories', in *Trusted* 2007, pp. 153-71

Bisson 2012

Bisson, Massimo, *Meravigliose macchine di giubilo: l'architettura e l'arte degli organi a Venezia nel Rinascimento* (Verona: Scripta, 2012)

Bistort 1912

Bistort, Giulio, *Il magistrato alle pompe nella Repubblica di Venezia: studio storico* (Venice: R. Deputazione Veneto-Tridentina di Storia Patria, 1912)

Black 1989

Black, Christopher F., *Italian Confraternities in the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)

Blunt 1978

Blunt, Anthony, *Artistic Theory in Italy 1450–1600* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962, 4th impression 1978). Chapter VIII, 'The Council of Trent and Religious Art', pp. 103-36

Boffa 2013

Boffa, David, 'Sculptors' Signatures and the Construction of Identity', in Coonin 2013, pp. 35-56

Bohde 2001

Bohde, Daniela, 'Titian's three-altar project in the Venetian church of San Salvador: strategies of self-representation by members of the Scuola Grande di San Rocco', *Renaissance Studies*, 15/4 (2001), pp. 450-72

Bonfait 2001

Bonfait, Olivier (ed.), *Geografia del Collezionismo: Italia e Francia tra il XVI e il XVIII secolo* (Rome: École Française de Rome, 2001)

Boström 1995

Boström, Antonia, 'Daniele da Volterra and the Equestrian Monument to Henry II of France', *The Burlington Magazine*, 137/1113 (Dec. 1995), pp. 809-20

Boström 2004

Boström, Antonia (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Sculpture*, 3 vols (New York and London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2004)

Boucher 1976

Boucher, Bruce, 'Jacopo Sansovino and the Choir of St. Mark's', *The Burlington Magazine*, 118/881 (Aug. 1976), pp. 552-65

Boucher 1977

Boucher, Bruce, 'Opere ignote Sansovinesche alla Biblioteca Marciana', *Arte Veneta*, 31 (1977), pp. 190-92

Boucher 1979

Boucher, Bruce, 'Jacopo Sansovino and the Choir of St. Mark's: the Evangelists, the Sacristy Door and the Altar of the Sacrament', *The Burlington Magazine*, 121/912 (March 1979), pp. 155-68

Boucher 1991

Boucher, Bruce, *The Sculpture of Jacopo Sansovino*, 2 vols (New Haven and London: Yale University Press)

Boucher 1994

Boucher, Bruce, 'La scultura nell'età del Sansovino', in Palucchini 1994, pp. 925-80

Boucher 1996

Boucher, Bruce, *Jacopo (d'Antonio) Sansovino (Tatti)*, in Turner 1996, vol. 29, pp. 769-74

Boucher 2001

Boucher, Bruce, 'Italian Renaissance Terracotta: Artistic Revival or Technological Innovation', in Houston 2001, pp. 1-31

Boucher and Radcliffe 1983

Boucher, Bruce, and Anthony Radcliffe, 'Sculpture', in London 1983, pp. 355-7

Braunstein 1965

Braunstein, Philippe, 'Les entreprises minières en Vénétie au Xve siècle', *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, 77/2 (1965), pp. 529-607

Braunstein 1977

Braunstein, Philippe, 'Le marché du cuivre à Venise à la fin du Moyen Age', in Kellenbenz 1977, pp. 78-94

Breiner 1994

Breiner, David, 'Vincenzo Scamozzi, 1548–1616: a catalogue raisonné', PhD thesis, Cornell University 1994

Bresc-Bautier 2007

Bresc-Bautier, Geneviève, 'I marmi', in Franceschi et al 2007, pp. 283-308

Bristot 2008a

Bristot, Annalisa (ed.), *Palazzo Grimani a Santa Maria Formosa: Storia, arte, restauri* (Verona: Scripta, 2008)

Bristot 2008b

Bristot, Annalisa, 'Saloni, portici e stanze splendidamente ornati', in Bristot 2008a, pp. 61-125

Brown 1989–90

Brown, C. Malcolm, 'Tullio Lombardo and Mantua: an inlaid marble pavement for Isabella d'Este's *grotta* and a marble portal for the *studiolo*', *Arte Veneta*, 43 (1989–90), pp. 121-30

Brown 1987

Brown, Patricia Fortini, 'Honor and necessity: the dynamics of patronage in the confraternities of Venice', *Studi Veneziani*, n.s., 14 (1987), pp. 179-212

Brown 1996a

Brown, Patricia Fortini, *Venice & Antiquity: The Venetian Sense of the Past* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1996)

Brown 1996b

Brown, Patricia Fortini, 'Le Scuole', in Tenenti and Tucci 1996, pp. 307-54

Brown 2004

Brown, Patricia Fortini, *Private Lives in Renaissance Venice: Art, Architecture and the Family* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2004)

Brown 1974

Brown, William Archer, 'Nicolò Da Ponte: The Political Career of a Sixteenth-Century Venetian Patrician', PhD thesis, New York University, 1974

Brunello 1981

Brunello, Franco, *Arti e mestieri a Venezia nel Medioevo e nel Rinascimento* (Vicenza: Neri Pozza, 1981)

Buonanno 2014

Buonanno, Lorenzo, 'Stone Mediators: Sculpted Altarpieces in Early Renaissance Venice', PhD thesis, Columbia University, 2014

Burckhardt 1908

Burckhardt, Jakob, *The Cicerone: an art guide to painting in Italy for the use of travellers and students*, trans. A. H. Clough (London: T. Werner Laurie, 1908)

Burckhardt 1929–34

Burckhardt, Jacob, *Gesamtausgabe*, ed. F. Stahelin and H. Wöfflin, 14 vols (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1929–34)

Burns et al 1995

Burns, Howard, Christoph Luitpold Frommel and Lionello Puppi (eds), *Michele Sanmicheli: Architettura, linguaggio e cultura artistica nel Cinquecento* (Milan: Electa, 1995)

Burzer 2010

Burzer, Katja (ed.), *Le vite del Vasari: genesi, topoi, ricezione / Die Vite Vasaris : Entstehung, Topoi, Rezeption*. Collana del Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florenz, Max-Planck-Institut, 1 (Venice: Marsilio, 2010)

Butterfield 1997

Butterfield, Andrew, *The Sculptures of Andrea Verrocchio* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997)

Butters 1996

Butters, Suzanne B., *The Triumph of Vulcan: Sculptor's Tools, Porphyry and the Prince in Ducal Florence*, 2 vols (Florence: Olschki, 1996)

Caffi 1884

Caffi, Michele, 'Guglielmo Bergamasco ossia Vielmo Vielmi di Alzano', *Archivio Veneto*, n.s., 28/1 (1884), pp. 30-42

Calzini 1899

Calzini, Egidio, *Urbino e i suoi monumenti* (First published 1897, ed. consulted: Florence: Bernardo Seeber, 1899)

Campori 1872

Campori, Giuseppe, 'Una Statua di Jacopo Sansovino', *Atti e memorie delle Reale Deputazioni di storia patria per le provincie modenesi*, VI (1872), pp. 501-12

Caniato and Dal Borgo 1990

Caniato, Giovanni, and Michela dal Borgo, *Le arti edili a Venezia* (Rome: EdilStampa, 1990)

Capponi 2006

Capponi, Niccolò, *Victory of the West: The Story of the Battle of Lepanto* (London: Macmillan, 2006)

Caputo 1988

Caputo, Fulvio, *Progetto S. Salvador. Un restauro per l'innovazione a Venezia* (Venice: Albrizzi, 1988)

Casarin 2000

Casarin, S., 'Alcuni aspetti del dibattito sulla tutela artistica a Venezia tra Otto e Novecento', *Venezia Arti*, 14 (2000), pp. 129-35

Cecchetti 1872

Cecchetti, Bartolomeo, 'Le industrie in Venezia nel secolo XIII', *Archivio Veneto*, 4 (1872), pp. 211-57

Cecchetti and Ongania 1886

Cecchetti, Bartolomeo, and Ferdinando Ongania (eds), *Documenti per la storia dell'augusta ducale basilica di San Marco in Venezia dal nono secolo sino alla fine del decimo ottavo dall'Archivio di Stato e dalla Biblioteca Marciana a Venezia* (Venice: F. Ongania, 1886)

Ceresole 1880

Ceresole, V., 'La Porte de Bronze, sacristie de Saint-Marc à Venise', *L'Art*, VI/1 (1880), pp. 249-56, 273-6

Ceriana 2002

Ceriana, Matteo, 'Grigi, Guglielmo (de')', in *DBI*:

[http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/grigi-guglielmo-detto-il-bergamasco_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/grigi-guglielmo-detto-il-bergamasco_(Dizionario-Biografico)/) (accessed April 2016)

Ceriana 2005a

Ceriana, Matteo, 'Lombardo, Pietro', in *DBI*:

[http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/pietro-lombardo_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/pietro-lombardo_(Dizionario-Biografico)/) (accessed April 2016)

Ceriana 2005b

Ceriana, Matteo, 'Lombardo, Tullio', in *DBI*:

[http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/tullio-lombardo_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/tullio-lombardo_(Dizionario-Biografico)/) (accessed April 2016)

Ceriana 2007

Ceriana, Matteo (ed.), *Tullio Lombardo, scultore e architetto nella Venezia del Rinascimento* (Verona: Cierre, 2007)

Ceriana and Avery 2008

Ceriana, Matteo and Victoria Avery (eds), *L'Industria artistica del bronzo del Rinascimento a Venezia e nell'Italia settentrionale* (Verona: Scripta, 2008)

Ceschi et al 2007

Ceschi, Chiara, Pierluigi Fantelli, and Francesca Flores d'Arcais (eds), *Arte nelle Venezia: scritti di amici per Sandro Sponza* (Saonara: il Prato, 2007)

Cessi 1934

Cessi, Roberto, 'L'Altare degli Orefici in San Giacomo di Rialto', *Rivista della città di Venezia*, 13 (1934), pp. 251-4

Cessi 1962

Cessi, Francesco, *Alessandro Vittoria, Scultore*, Parte II (Trent: Maroni, 1962)

Chambers 1997

Chambers, David S., 'Merit and Money: The Procurators of St Mark and Their *Commissioni*, 1443–1605, *The Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 60 (1997), pp. 23-88

Chambers and Pullan 2001

Chambers, David S., and Brian Pullan (eds), *Venice: A Documentary History, 1450–c1630* (Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 2001)

Christ 2016/7 forthcoming

Christ, Georg (ed.), *Venetian Rule in the Eastern Mediterranean 1400–1700: Empires, Connectivities and Environments* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2016/7 forthcoming)

Christian and Drogin 2010

Christian, Kathleen W. and David J. Drogin (eds), *Patronage and Italian Renaissance Sculpture* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2010)

Cicogna 1824–53

Cicogna, Emmanuele Antonio, *Delle iscrizioni veneziane*, 6 vols (Venice: Giuseppe Picotti, 1824–53)

Cicogna-Pazzi and Bergamasco 2001

Cicogna, Emmanuele Antonio, *Corpus delle iscrizioni di Venezia e delle isole della laguna veneta di Emmanuele Antonio Cicogna ovvero riepilogo sia delle Iscrizioni Edite pubblicate tra gli anni 1824 e 1853 che di quelle Inedite conservate in originale manoscritto presso la Biblioteca Correr di Venezia e dal 1867, anno della morte dell'insigne erudito, rimaste in attesa di pubblicazione*, ed. Pietro Pazzi and Sara Bergamasco, 3 vols (Venice: Edizioni Biblioteca Orafa di Sant'Antonio abate, 2001)

Cicognara 1824

Cicognara, Leopoldo, *Storia della scultura dal suo risorgimento in Italia fino al secolo di Canova: per servire di continuazione all'opere di Winckelmann e di D'Agincourt*, 8 vols (First published Venice: Picotti, 1813–16; ed. consulted, Prato: Giachetti, 1824)

Cole 1995

Cole, Alison, *Virtue and Magnificence: Art of the Italian Renaissance Courts* (New York: H. N. Abrams, 1995)

Collareta 2007

Collareta, Marco, 'Aspetti del 'paragone' al tempo di Tullio Lombardo', in Ceriana 2007, pp. 183-5

Comastri 1988

Comastri, Enrico, 'Profilo di Giulio del Moro', *Arte Veneta*, 42 (1988), pp. 87-97

Concina 1988

Concina, Ennio, 'Una fabbrica "in mezzo della città": la chiesa e il convento di San Salvador', in Caputo 1988, pp.73-153

Concina 1995

Concina, Ennio, *Le Chiese di Venezia – L'Arte e la Storia* (Udine: Magnus, 1995)

Concina 2009

Concina, Ennio, 'San Salvador: la fabbrica, l'architettura', in Guidarelli 2009, pp. 9-27

Conn and Rosand 2011

Conn, Melissa, and David Rosand (eds), *Save Venice Inc. Four Decades of Restoration in Venice* (Venice: Grafiche Veneziane / Save Venice Inc., 2011)

Connell 1976

Connell, Susan, 'The Employment of Sculptors and Stonemasons in Venice in the Fifteenth Century', PhD thesis, The Warburg Institute, University of London, 1976

Connell 1988

Connell, Susan, *The Employment of Sculptors and Stonemasons in Venice in the Fifteenth Century* (New York and London: Garland, 1988)

Coonin 2013

Coonin, Arnold Victor, *A Scarlet Renaissance: Essays in Honor of Sarah Blake McHam* (New York: Italica, 2013)

Cooper 1990

Cooper, Tracy E., 'The History and Decoration of the Church of San Giorgio Maggiore in Venice', PhD thesis, Princeton University, 1990

Cooper 2005

Cooper, Tracy E., *Palladio's Venice* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005)

Cope 1979

Cope, Maurice, *The Venetian Chapel of the Sacrament in the Sixteenth Century* (New York and London: Garland, 1979)

Čoralič and Pavičić 2005

Čoralič, Lovorka and Ivana Prijatelj Pavičić, 'Ivan iz Vrane – mletački admiral u Lepantskom boju', *Povijesni prilozi*, 29, year 24 (2005), pp. 127-50

Cornaro 1749

Cornaro, Flaminio, *Ecclesiae Venetae antiquis monumentis nunc primum editis illustratae ac in decades distributae*, 15 vols in 9 (Venice: Jo: Baptistae Pasquali, 1749)

Coronelli 1744

Coronelli, Vincenzo, *Guida de' Forestieri, o sia Epitome Diaria perpetua Sagra-Profana per la Città di Venezia* (Venice, 1744)

Corsato and Howard 2014

Corsato, Carlo and Deborah Howard (eds), *Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari: Immagini di Devozione, Spazi della Fede / Devotional Spaces, Images of Piety* (Padua: Centro Studi Antoniani, 2014)

Covi 1983

Covi, Dario, 'Verrocchio and Venice, 1496', *Art Bulletin*, 66 (1983), pp. 253-73

Cristellon and Menchi 2014

Cristellon, Cecilia, and Silvana Seidel Menchi, 'Religious Life', in Dursteler 2014, pp. 379-419

Crouzet-Pavan 2002

Crouzet-Pavan, Elisabeth, *Venice Triumphant: The Origins of a Myth*, trans. Lydia G. Cochrane (Baltimore, MD, and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002)

Dacos 1969

Dacos, Nicole, *La découverte de la Domus Aurea et la formation des grotesques à la Renaissance*. Studies of the Warburg Institute (Leiden, 1969)

Dacos and Furlan 1987

Dacos, Nicole, and Caterina Furlan, *Giovanni da Udine 1487–1561* (Udine: Casamassima, 1987)

Dal Borgo 1991

Dal Borgo, Michela, 'Le arti dei metalli preziosi', in Venice 1991, pp. 45-9

Dal Borgo 2002

Dal Borgo, Michela, 'Grimani, Girolamo', in *DBI*: [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/girolamo-grimani_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/girolamo-grimani_(Dizionario-Biografico)/) (accessed May 2016)

Dalla Costa and Feiffer 1981

Dalla Costa, Mario and Cesare Feiffer, *Le pietre dell'Architettura Veneta e di Venezia* (Venice: Stamperia di Venezia, 1981)

Dal Pozzo 1718

Dal Pozzo, Bartolomeo, *Le vite dei pittori, degli scultori ed architetti veronesi* (Verona: Giovanni Berno, 1718)

Da Mosto 1937

Da Mosto, Andrea, *L'Archivio di Stato di Venezia: Indice generale, storico, descrittivo ed analitico*, 2 vols (Rome: Biblioteca d'Arte Editrice, 1937)

Da Mosto 2007

Da Mosto, Andrea, *I dogi di Venezia* (First published as *I dogi di Venezia con particolare riguardo alle loro tombe*, Venice: F. Ongania, 1939. This edition: Florence: Giunti, first published 2003, ed. consulted, 2007)

D'Andrea 2014

D'Andrea, David, 'Charity and Confraternities', in Dursteler 2014, pp. 421-47

Davies 1994

Davies, Paul, 'A Project Drawing by Jacopo Sansovino for the Loggetta in Venice', *The Burlington Magazine*, 136/1097 (Aug. 1994), pp. 487-97

Davies 2013

Davies, Paul, 'The Early History of Jacopo Sansovino's Scheme for Piazza San Marco', in Avcioglu and Jones 2013, pp. 51-69

Davies and Hemsoll 2004

Davies, Paul, and David Hemsoll, *Michele Sanmicheli* (Milan: Electa, 2004)

Davis 1985

Davis, Charles, 'Shapes of Mourning: Sculpture by Alessandro Vittoria, Agostino Rubini, and others', in Morrogh 1985, vol. 2, pp. 163-75

Davis 1995

Davis, Charles, 'Il monumento di Alessandro Contarini al Santo di Padova', in Burns et al 1995, pp. 180-95, 306-13

Davis 1996

Davis, Charles, 'Camini del Sansovino', *Annali di architettura*, 8 (1996), pp. 93-114

Davis 2003a

Davis, Charles, 'Vincenzo Scamozzi progettista di monumenti commemorativi?', in Vicenza 2003, pp. 89-109

Davis 2003b

Davis, Charles, 'Monumento al doge Niccolò da Ponte in Santa Maria della Carità a Venezia (1582–1584)', in Vicenza 2003, p. 242 (cat. 17)

Davis 2003c

Davis, Charles, 'Dionigi Valesio, da un disegno dell'architetto Aloisio Grandi, *Mausoleo del doge Niccolò da Ponte*', in Vicenza 2003, pp. 242-3 (cat. 17a)

Davis 2003d

Davis, Charles, 'Alessandro Vittoria, *Busto in terracotta del doge Niccolò da Ponte*', in Vicenza 2003, pp. 243-4 (cat. 17b)

Davis 2003e

Davis, Charles, 'Lapicida veneto, *Iscrizione sepolcrale del doge Niccolò da Ponte*', in Vicenza 2003, pp. 244-5 (cat. 17c)

Davis 2007a

Davis, Charles, 'La cappella Bernabò in San Giovanni Crisostomo: storia e immagine', in Ceriana 2007, pp. 217-78

Davis 2007b

Davis, Charles, *Chiesa di San Giovanni Crisostomo, Venice: the account books of the Fabbrica, 1499–1507*, Fontes 2 (Heidelberg: University of Heidelberg, 2007)

Davis 2010

Davis, Charles, 'Zur Auswirkung der Kunstliteratur: der Künstler und die Viten – der Fall Jacopo Sansovino, Selbstverständnis und Ansehen', in Burzer 2010, pp. 191-216

D'Evelyn 2012

D'Evelyn, Margaret, *Venice & Vitruvius: Reading Venice with Daniele Barbaro and Andrea Palladio* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2012)

De Marchi and Goodwin 1999

De Marchi, Neil, and Craufurd Goodwin (eds), *Economic Engagements with Art* (Durham, North Carolina and London: Duke University Press, 1999)

De Maria 2010

De Maria, Blake, *Becoming Venetian: immigrants and the arts in early modern Venice* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2010)

De Maria and Frank 2013

De Maria, Blake, and Mary E. Frank, *Reflections on Renaissance Venice: A Celebration of Patrician Fortini Brown* (Milan: 5 Continents, 2013)

Dickerson III 2015

Dickerson III, C.D., 'Camillo Mariana and the Nobility of Stucco', in Helmstutler Di Dio 2015, pp. 137-66

Dursteler 2014

Dursteler, Eric (ed.), *A Companion to Venetian History, 1400–1797* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, first published 2013, ed. consulted: 2014)

Eisler 2007

Eisler, Colin, "'Wrongly Together: Rightly Apart": Two Venetian High Renaissance Drawings at the Yale University Art Gallery', *Artibus et Historiae*, 28/56, Part 2 (2007), pp. 9-13

Ericani 1997

Ericani, Giuliana, 'La scultura lignea del Seicento nel Veneto', in Spiazzi 1997, pp. 9-105

Fantoni et al 2003

Fantoni, Marcello, Louisa C. Matthew, and Sara F. Matthews-Grieco (eds), *The Art Market in Italy (15th–17th Centuries) / Il mercato dell'arte in Italia (secc. XV–XVII)* (Modena: Panini, 2003)

Farago 1992

Farago, Claire, *Leonardo da Vinci's "Paragone": a critical interpretation, with a critical edition of the text in the Codex Urbanitas* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 1992)

Favaretto 2008

Favaretto, Irene, "'La memoria delle cose antiche...': il gusto per l'antico e il collezionismo di antichità a Venezia dal XIV al XVI secolo', in Hochmann et al 2008, pp. 82-95

Favaretto et al 2004

Favaretto, Irene, Marcella De Paoli, and Maria Cristina Dossi, *Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Venezia* (Milan: Electa, 2004)

Favaro 2010

Favaro, Tiziana (ed.), *Chiesa di Sant' Antonin: storia e restauro* (Venice: Soprintendenza per i beni architettonici e paesaggistici di Venezia e Laguna, 2010)

Fenlon 2007

Fenlon, Iain, *The Ceremonial City: History, Memory and Myth in Renaissance Venice* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007)

Ferber 1776

Ferber, John James, *Travels through Italy in the Years 1771 and 1772, described in a series of letters to Baron Born on the Natural History particularly the Mountains and Volcanos of that Country by John James Ferber, Professor of Natural History at Miedaw in Curland and Member of Several Literary Societies*, trans. R. E. Raspe (London: L. Davies for the Royal Society, 1776)

Finocchi Gherzi 1998

Finocchi Gherzi, Lorenzo, *Alessandro Vittoria: Architettura, scultura e decorazione nella Venezia del tardo Rinascimento* (Udine: Forum, 1998)

Finocchi Gherzi 1999

Finocchi Gherzi, Lorenzo, 'Gli stucchi veneziani', in Trent 1999, pp. 85-93

Finocchi Gherzi 2001

Finocchi Gherzi, Lorenzo (ed.), *Alessandro Vittoria e l'arte veneta della maniera* (Udine: Forum, 2001)

Finocchi Gherzi 2002a

Finocchi Gherzi, Lorenzo, 'Pietro Grazioli da Salò', in *DBI*: [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/pietro-grazioli_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/pietro-grazioli_(Dizionario-Biografico)/) (accessed June 2014)

Finocchi Gherzi 2002b

Finocchi Gherzi, Lorenzo, 'Domenico Grazioli da Salò', see under 'Pietro Grazioli da Salò' in *DBI*: [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/pietro-grazioli_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/pietro-grazioli_(Dizionario-Biografico)/) (accessed June 2014)

Fiorentini 2007

Fiorentini, Erna, 'Identità artistica nella retorica del mezzo espressivo. Vittoria, Campagna e altri scultori ritratti da pittori e il ruolo del bozzetto nel Veneto', in Galli et al 2007, pp.217-41

Fisher 2007

Fisher, Wendy, 'Terracotta', in Trusted 2007, pp. 35-47

Fogelman 2002a

Fogelman, Peggy, 'Girolamo Campagna, *Madonna and Child with Angels and the Infant Saint John the Baptist*', in Fogelman et al 2002, pp.116-19 (cat.15)

Fogelman 2002b

Fogelman, Peggy, 'Girolamo Campagna, *Infant*', in Fogelman et al 2002, pp.122-7 (cat.16)

Fogelman and Fusco 1988

Fogelman, Peggy, and Peter Fusco, 'A Newly Acquired Bronze by Girolamo Campagna', *The J. Paul Getty Museum Journal*, 16 (1988), pp. 105-10

Fogelman et al 2002

Fogelman, Peggy, Peter Fusco, and Marietta Cambareri (eds), *Italian and Spanish sculpture: catalogue of the J. Paul Getty Museum collection* (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2002)

Fogliata and Sartor 2004

Fogliata, Mario, and Maria Lucia Sartor, *L'arte dello stucco: storia, tecnica, metodologie della tradizione veneziana* (Treviso: Antilia, 2004)

Fogolari 1924

Fogolari, Gino, 'La Chiesa di Santa Maria della Carità: ora sedie delle Regie Gallerie dell'Accademia: documenti inediti di Bartolomeo Bon, di Antonio Vivarini, di Ercole del Fiore e di altri artisti', *Archivio Veneto-Tridentino*, 4th series, 5 (1924), pp. 57-119

Foscari 1995

Foscari, Antonio, 'Tommaso Lombardo da Lugano nella bottega di Jacopo Sansovino', *Venezia Arti*, 9 (1995), pp. 141-5

Foscari and Tafuri 1983

Foscari, Antonio, and Manfredo Tafuri, *L'armonia e i conflitti: la chiesa di San Francesco della Vigna nella Venezia del '500* (Turin: Einaudi, 1983)

Franceschi et al 2007

Franceschi, Franco, Richard A. Goldthwaite, and Reinhold C. Mueller (eds), *Commercio e cultura mercantile. Volume 4. Il Rinascimento italiano e l'Europa* (Treviso: Angelo Colla, 2007)

Franzoi and Di Stefano 1975

Franzoi, Umberto, and Dina di Stefano, *Le chiese di Venezia* (Venice: Alfieri, 1975)

Franzoi et al 1990

Franzoi, Umberto, Terisio Pignatti, and Wolfgang Wolters, *Il Palazzo ducale di Venezia* (Treviso: Canova, 1990)

Frizzoni 1906

Frizzoni, G., 'Nuove rivelazioni intorno a Jacopo Palma, il Vecchio', *Rassegna d'arte*, VI (1906), pp. 113-21

Gaier 2002a

Gaier, Martin, *Facciate Sacre a Scopo Profano: Venezia e la Politica dei Monumenti dal Quattrocento al Settecento* (Venice: Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, 2002)

Gaier 2002b

Gaier, Martin, 'Königin in einer Republik. Projekte für ein Grabmonument der Caterina Corner in Venedig', *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz*, 46/1 (2002), pp. 197-234

Galli et al 2007

Galli, Aldo, Chiara Piccinini, and Massimiliano Rossi, *Il ritratto nell'Europa del Cinquecento* (Florence: Olschki, 2007)

Gallicciolli 1795

Gallicciolli, Giambattista, *Delle memorie venete antiche profane ed ecclesiastiche*, 8 vols (Venice: Domenico Fracasso, 1795)

Gallo 1957

Gallo, Rodolfo, 'Contributi su Jacopo Sansovino', *Saggi e memorie di storia dell'arte*, 1 (1957), pp. 83-105

Gallo and Mason 1995

Gallo, Andrea and Stefania Mason, *Chiesa di San Nicolò dei Mendicoli: arte e devozione* (Venice: Marsilio, 1995)

Gardani 1966

Gardani, Dante Luigi, *La chiesa di San Giacomo di Rialto, storia e arte* (Venice: La Tipografica, 1966)

Garfagnini 1993

Garfagnini, Gian Carlo (ed.), *Lorenzo il Magnifico e il suo mondo* (Florence: Olschki, 1993)

Gerola 1924–5

Gerola, Giuseppe, 'Nuovi documenti veneziani su Alessandro Vittoria', *Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*, LXXXIV, Parte seconda (1924–5), pp. 339-59

Gerstein 2007

Gerstein, Alexandra (ed.), *Display and displacement: sculpture and the pedestal from Renaissance to post-Modern* (London: Courtauld Institute of Art Research Forum and Paul Holberton Publishing, 2007)

Gianighian and Pavanini 1984

Gianighian, Giorgio and Paola Pavanini (eds), *Dietro i palazzi: tre secoli di architettura minore a Venezia, 1492–1803* (Venice: Arsenale, 1984)

Gilbert 1974

Gilbert, Felix, 'Venice in the crisis of the League of Cambrai', in Hale 1974, pp. 274-92

Gilbert 1998

Gilbert, Creighton, 'What Did the Renaissance Patron Buy?', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 51/2 (1998), pp. 392-450

Gilbert 2000

Gilbert, Creighton, 'A preface to signatures (with some cases in Venice)', in Rogers 2000, pp. 79-89

Giovanelli and Gar 1858

Giovanelli, Benedetto dei and Tommaso Gar, *Vita di Alessandro Vittoria scultore trentino* (Trent: Monauni, 1858)

Glasser 1968

Glasser, Hannelore, *Artists' Contracts of the Early Renaissance* (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1968)

Gnoli 1988

Gnoli, Raniero, *Marmora Romana*, 2nd ed. (Rome: Edizioni dell'Elefante, 1988)

Goethe 1887–1919

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von, *Werke*, 50 vols (Weimar: H. Böhlau, 1887–1919)

Goffen 2001

Goffen, Rona, 'Signatures: inscribing identity in Italian Renaissance art', *Viator*, 32 (2001), pp. 303-70

Goldthwaite 1987

Goldthwaite, Richard, 'The Empire of Things: Consumer Demand in Renaissance Italy' in *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy*, in Kent and Simons 1987, pp. 153-75

Goldthwaite 1993

Goldthwaite, Richard, *Wealth and the Demand for Art in Italy, 1300–1600* (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1993)

Goy 2006

Goy, Richard, *Building Renaissance Venice: Patrons, Architects and Builders c. 1430–1500* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2006)

Gramigna and Perissa 1981

Gramigna, Silvia, and Annalisa Perissa, *Scuole di arti, mestieri e devozione a Venezia* (Venice: Arsenale Cooperativa, 1981)

Gramigna and Perissa 2008

Gramigna, Silvia, and Annalisa Perissa, *Scuole grandi e piccole a Venezia tra arte e storia* (Venice: Grafiche 2am, 2008)

Grendler 1969

Grendler, Paul, 'Francesco Sansovino and Italian Popular History, 1560–1600', *Studies in the Renaissance*, 16 (1969), pp. 139-80

Grendler 1999

Grendler, Paul (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Renaissance*, 5 vols (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1999)

Gronau 1930

Gronau, Georg, 'Die Statue des Federigo di Montefeltro im herzoglichen Palast von Urbino', *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz*, 3/5 (1930), pp. 254-67

Gronau 1936

Gronau, Georg, *Documenti artistici urbinati* (Florence: Sansoni, 1936)

Grubb 1986

Grubb, James, 'When Myths Lose Power: Four Decade of Venetian Historiography', *The Journal of Modern History*, 58/1 (Mar. 1986), pp. 43-94

Guerra et al 2006

Guerra, Andrea, Manuela Morresi and Richard Schofield (eds), *I Lombardo : architettura e scultura a Venezia tra '400 e '500* (Venice: IUAV / Marsilio, 2006)

Guerzoni 1999

Guerzoni, Guido, 'Liberalitas, Magnificentia, Splendor: The Classic Origins of Italian Renaissance Lifestyles', in De Marchi and Goodwin 1999, pp. 332-78

Guidaldi 1931–2a

Guidaldi, Luigi, 'Contribuiti alla storia dell'arte antoniana. 5. Tiziano Aspetti e Girolamo Paliari', *Il Santo*, 4 (1931–2), pp. 193-5, 202-3

Guidaldi 1931–2b

Guidaldi, Luigi, 'Ricerche sull'altare di Donatello', *Il Santo*, 4 (1931–2), pp. 239-289

Guidarelli 2003

Guidarelli, Gianmario, “Una giogia ligata in piombo”. La fabbrica della Scuola Grande di San Rocco 1517–1560’, *Quaderni di San Rocco*, 8 (Venice: Helvetia, 2003)

Guidarelli 2004

Guidarelli, Gianmario, ‘Sante Lombardo e la costruzione della facciata meridionale della Scuola Grande di San Rocco a Venezia, 1524–1527’, *Venezia Cinquecento*, XIV/28 (2004), pp. 5-221

Guidarelli 2009

Guidarelli, Gianmario (ed.), *La chiesa di San Salvador a Venezia. Storia, Arte, Teologia* (Padua: Il Prato, 2009)

Gullino 1986

Gullino, Giuseppe, ‘Da Ponte, Nicolo’, in *DBI*:

[http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/nicolo-da-ponte_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/nicolo-da-ponte_(Dizionario-Biografico)/) (accessed May 2013)

Gullino 2002

Gullino, Giuseppe, ‘Grimani, Marino’, in *DBI*:

[http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/marino-grimani_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/marino-grimani_(Dizionario-Biografico)/) (accessed April 2012)

Häberlein 2012

Häberlein, Mark, *The Fuggers of Augsburg: pursuing wealth and honor in Renaissance Germany* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2012)

Hale 1974

Hale, J. R. (ed.), *Renaissance Venice* (First published 1973, ed. consulted: London: Faber and Faber, 1974)

Helms 1998

Helms, G. M., ‘The Materials and Techniques of Italian Renaissance Sculpture’, in McHam 1998, pp. 18-39

Helmstutler Di Dio 2015

Helmstutler Di Dio (ed.), *Making and Moving Sculpture in Early Modern Italy* (Farnham and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2015)

Hiesinger 1971

Hiesinger, Katherine, ‘Venetian Wall Tombs in the second-half of the Cinquecento’, PhD thesis, Harvard University, 1971

Hills 1983

Hills, Paul, ‘Piety and Patronage in Cinquecento Venice: Tintoretto and the Scuole del Sacramento’, *Art History*, 6/1 (1983), pp. 31-43

Hills 1999

Hills, Paul, *Venetian Colour: Marble, Mosaic, Painting and Glass 1250–1550* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999)

Hochmann 1987

Hochmann, Michel, ‘La collection de Giacomo Contarini’, *Mélanges de l’Ecole française de Rome. Moyen-âge, Temps modernes*, 99/1 (1987), pp. 447-89

Hochmann 1992

Hochmann, Michel, 'Le mécénat de Marino Grimani. Tintoret, Palma le Jeune, Jacopo Bassano, Giulio del Moro et le décor du palais Grimani; Véronèse et Vittoria à San Giuseppe', *Revue de l'Art*, 1 (1992), pp. 41-51

Hochmann 2001

Hochmann, Michel, 'Les collections des familles "papalistes" à Venise et à Rome du XVIe au XVIIIe siècle', in Bonfait 2001, pp. 203-21

Hochmann et al 2008

Hochmann, Michel, Rosella Lauber, and Stefania Mason (eds), *Il collezionismo d'arte a Venezia. Dalle origine al Cinquecento* (Venice: Marsilio, 2008)

Hofstede et al 2007

Hofstede, Ulrike Mueller, Hannah Baader, Kristine Patz, and Nicola Suthor (eds), *Im Agon der Künste. Paragonales Denken, ästhetische Praxis und ide Diversität der Sinne* (Berlin: Fink Verlag, 2007)

Hope 1981

Hope, Charles, 'Artists, Patrons, and Advisers in the Italian Renaissance', in Lytle and Orgel 1981, pp. 293-343

Howard 1987

Howard, Deborah, *Jacopo Sansovino: Architecture and Patronage in Renaissance Venice* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, first published 1975, ed. consulted: 1987)

Howard 1994

Howard, Deborah, 'Renovation and innovation in Venetian architecture', *Scroope: Cambridge Architecture Journal*, 6 (1994), pp. 66-74

Howard 2002

Howard, Deborah, *The Architectural History of Venice* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, first published 1980, ed. consulted, 2002)

Howard 2011

Howard, Deborah, *Venice Disputed: Marc'Antonio Barbaro and Venetian Architecture* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2011)

Howard 2013

Howard, Deborah, 'Space, Light and Ornament in Venetian Architecture: Pietro Lombardo Reconsidered', in De Maria and Frank 2013, pp. 95-103

Howard 2016/7 forthcoming

Howard, Deborah, 'The Old, the Antique and the Venerable in Venetian Architecture', in Christ 2016/7 forthcoming

Hubbard and Motture 2001

Hubbard, Charlotte, and Peta Motture, 'The Making of Terracotta Sculpture: Techniques and Observation', in Houston 2001, pp. 83-95

Humfrey 1988

Humfrey, Peter, 'Competitive Devotions: The Venetian Scuole Piccole as Donors of Altarpieces in the Years around 1500', *The Art Bulletin*, 70/3 (1988), pp. 401-23

Humfrey 1993

Humfrey, Peter, *The Altarpiece in Renaissance Venice* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993)

Humfrey 2007

Humfrey, Peter (ed.), *Venice and the Veneto* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007)

Humfrey and Mackenney 1986

Humfrey, Peter, and Richard Mackenney, 'The Venetian Trade Guilds as Patrons of Art in the Renaissance', *The Burlington Magazine*, 128/998 (May 1986), pp. 317-30

Huse and Wolters 1990

Huse, Norbert and Wolfgang Wolters, *The Art of Renaissance Venice: Architecture, Sculpture and Painting 1460–1590*, trans. Edward Jephcott (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990)

Ivanoff 1964

Ivanoff, Nicola, 'Il coronamento statuario della Marciana', *Ateneo Veneto*, N.S., 2/1 (1964), pp. 101-12

Ivanoff 1968

Ivanoff, Nicola, 'La Libreria Marciana: arte e iconologia', *Saggi e memorie di storia dell'arte*, 6 (1968), pp. 33-78

Jacoff 1993

Jacoff, Michael, *The Horses of San Marco and the Quadriga of the Lord* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993)

Jenkins 1970

Jenkins, A. D. Fraser, 'Cosimo de Medici's Patronage of Architecture and the Theory of Magnificence', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 33 (1970), pp. 162-70

Jestaz 1986

Jestaz, Bertrand, *La Chapelle Zen à Saint-Marc de Venise. D'Antonio à Tullio Lombardo* (Wiesbaden and Stuttgart: Steiner, 1986)

Jestaz 2005

Jestaz, Bertrand, 'Desiderio da Firenze: bronzier à Padoue au XVI^e siècle, ou le faussaire de Riccio', *Monuments et mémoires de la Fondation Eugène Poit*, 84 (2005), pp. 99-171

Jones 2009

Jones, Emma, "'... un opera si importante e degna à gloria de Dio e de Missier Santo Antonio': The Goldsmiths' Altar in San Giacomo di Rialto, Venice: A Documentary Case-study of Trade Guild Patronage', MA diss., University of Warwick, 2009

Jones 2011

Jones, Emma, 'The Goldsmiths' Altar in San Giacomo di Rialto: A Documentary Case-study of Venetian Trade Guild Patronage', *The Sculpture Journal*, 20/1 (2011), pp. 7-42

Jones 2013a

Jones, Emma, 'A Carved Stone Female Allegorical Figure by Girolamo Campagna', Lot 30, *The Exceptional Sale*, Christie's, London, 4 July 2013, pp.138-43.

Jones 2013b

Jones, Emma, 'Priestly patronage in late Renaissance Venice: Antonio Gatto's *cappella maggiore* in San Polo', in Motture et al 2013, pp. 218-35

Jones 2015

Jones, Emma, 'The Sculptural Stones of Venice: The Selection, Supply, and Cost of Marble and Stone in the Sixteenth Century', in Helmstutler Di Dio 2015, pp.111-36

Kellenbenz 1977

Kellenbenz, Hermann (ed.), *Schwerpunkte der Kupferproduktion und des Kupferhandels in Europa 1500-1650* (Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau, 1977)

Kemp 1997

Kemp, Martin, *Behind the Picture: Art and Evidence in the Italian Renaissance* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997)

Kempers 1992

Kempers, Bram, *Painting, Power and Patronage: the rise of the professional artist in the Italian Renaissance*, trans. Beverley Jackson (London: Allen Lane, 1992)

Kent and Simons 1987

Kent, F. W., and Patricia Simons, with J. C. Eade (eds), *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987)

Klapisch-Zuber 1969

Klapisch-Zuber, Christiane, *Les maîtres du marbre: Carrare 1300–1600* (Paris: S.E.V.P.E.N., 1969)

Kryza-Gersch 1996

Kryza-Gersch, Claudia, 'Studien zu Tiziano Aspetti', PhD thesis, University of Vienna, 1996

Kryza-Gersch 1998

Kryza-Gersch, Claudia, 'New Light on Nicolò Roccatagliata and his son Sebastian Nicolini', *Nuovi Studi*, 5 (1998), pp. 111-26

Kryza-Gersch 2008

Kryza-Gersch, Claudia, 'Due altari seicenteschi a San Marco: Nicolò Roccatagliata e Sebastiano Nicolini, e la produzione di ornamenti in bronzo per le chiese veneziane', in Ceriana and Avery 2008, pp. 253-72

Labalme and Sanguineti White 2008

Labalme, Patricia, and Laura Sanguineti White (eds), *Città Excelentissima: Selections from the Renaissance Diaries of Marin Sanudo*, trans. Linda L. Carroll (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2008)

Laemmer 1861

Laemmer, Hugo, *Monumenta Vaticana. Historiam ecclesiasticam saeculi XVI illustrantia* (Freiburg: Sumtibus Herder, 1861)

Lane 1973

Lane, Frederic, *Venice: a Maritime Republic* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973)

Lane 1992

Lane, Frederic, *Venetian Ships and Shipbuilders of the Renaissance* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992)

Lane and Mueller 1985

Lane, Frederic, and Reinhold C. Mueller, *Money and Banking in Medieval and Renaissance Venice* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1985)

Lanzoni 2005

Lanzoni, Kristin Huffman, 'Alessandro Vittoria's sculpture, his art collection, and social and cultural myths of cinquecento Venice', PhD thesis, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2005

Lanzoni 2008

Lanzoni, Kristin Huffman, 'Devozione e prestigio: l'altare dell'Arte dei Marzeri a San Zulian', *Arte Veneta*, 65 (2008), pp. 125-32

Lauber 1999

Lauber, Rosella, "'Ornamento lodevole" e "ornatissima di pietre": Marcantonio Michiel nella chiesa veneziana di Santa Maria della Carità', *Arte Veneta*, 53 (1999), pp. 144-50

Lauber 2000

Lauber, Rosella, 'Giambattista Bregno: *Angelo*', in Venice 2000, pp. 85-9 (cat. 24)

Lavin 1967

Lavin, Irving, 'Bozzetti and modelli. Notes on sculptural procedure ...', *Stil und Überlieferung in der Kunst des Abendlandes. Akten des 21. Internationaler Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte, Bonn 1964*, 3 (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1967), pp. 93-104

Lazzarini 1981

Lazzarini, Lorenzo, *La pulitura dei materiali lapidei da costruzione e scultura: metodi industriali e di restauro* (Padua: CEDAM, 1981)

Lazzarini 1986

Lazzarini, Lorenzo, 'I materiali lapidei dell'edilizia storica veneziana', *Restauro e Città*, 3/4 (1986), pp. 84-100

Lazzarini 2003

Lazzarini, Lorenzo, 'I marmi e le pietre', in Piana and Wolters 2003, pp. 231-9

Leithe-Jasper 1963

Leithe-Jasper, Manfred, 'Alessandro Vittoria: Beiträge zu einer Analyse des Stils seiner figürlichen Plastiken unter Berücksichtigung der Beziehungen zur Gleichzeitigen Malerei in Venedig', PhD thesis, University of Vienna, 1963

Leithe-Jasper 2008

Leithe-Jasper, Manfred, 'Desiderio da Firenze: riflessioni sugli studi recenti', in Trent 2008, pp. 159-63

Lewis 1982

Lewis, Douglas, 'Jacopo Sansovino: Sculptor of Venice', in Rosand 1982, pp. 133-90

Lorenzetti 1913

Lorenzetti, Giulio (ed.), *Vita di Jacopo Tatti detto il Sansovino di Giorgio Vasari* (Florence, 1913)

Lorenzetti 1926

Lorenzetti, Giulio, *Venezia e il suo estuario* (Milan: Bestetti & Tumminelli, 1926)

Lorenzetti 1929

Lorenzetti, Giulio, *Itinerario sansoviniano a Venezia* (Venice, 1929)

Lorenzi 1868

Lorenzi, Giovanni Battista, *Monumenti per servire alla storia del palazzo ducale di Venezia, ovvero serie di atti pubblici dal 1253 al 1797*, 2 vols (Venice: M. Visentini, 1868)

Luchs 1995

Luchs, Alison, *Tullio Lombardo and Ideal Portrait Sculpture in Renaissance Venice, 1490-1530* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)

Luchs 2009

Luchs, Alison, 'A Sculpture of Longing: Tullio Lombardo, Nostalgia for Antiquity, and Modern Venetian Sculpture', in Washington 2009, pp. 4-17

Ludwig 1911

Ludwig, Gustav, *Archivalische Beiträge zur Geschichte der venezianischen Kunst*, ed. Wilhelm von Bode, Georg Gronau and Detlev von Hadeln. *Italianische Forschungen*, vol. 4 (Berlin: B. Cassirer, 1911)

Luzzi 1984–5

Luzzi, Anna, 'La Chiesa di San Polo in Venezia', 2 vols, unpublished Tesi di Laurea, Università degli Studi di Venezia, Ca' Foscari, 1984–5

Lytle and Orgel 1981

Lytle, Guy, and Stephen Orgel (eds), *Patronage in the Renaissance* (Princeton and Guildford: Princeton University Press, 1981)

Mackenney 1981

Mackenney, Richard, 'Trade Guilds and devotional confraternities in the state and society of Venice to 1620', PhD thesis, Cambridge University, 1981

Mackenney 1986

Mackenney, Richard, 'Devotional Confraternities in Renaissance Venice', in Sheils and Wood 1986, pp. 85-96

Mackenney 1987

Mackenney, Richard, *Tradesmen and Traders: The World of the Guilds in Venice and Europe, c. 1250–1650* (London: Croom Helms, 1987)

Mackenney 1994

Mackenney, Richard, 'Continuity and change in the scuole piccole in Venice, c. 1250–c. 1600', *Renaissance Studies*, 8/4 (1994), pp. 388-403

Mackenney 2000

Mackenney, Richard, 'The *scuole piccole* of Venice: Formations and Transformations', in Terpstra 2000, pp. 172-89

Manno 1995

Manno, Antonio, *I mestieri di Venezia: storia, arte e devozione delle corporazioni dal XIII al XVIII secolo* (Cittadella: Biblos, 1995)

Manno 1999

Manno, Antonio, *Il poema del tempo: i capitelli del Palazzo Ducale di Venezia: storia e iconografia* (Venice: Canal & stamperia editrice, 1999)

Mariacher 1962a

Mariacher, Giovanni, *Bronzetti Veneti del Rinascimento* (Vicenza: Neri Pozza, 1962)

Mariacher 1962b

Mariacher, Giovanni, *Il Sansovino* (Milan, 1962)

Mariacher 1987

Mariacher, Giovanni, *La scultura del Cinquecento* (Torino: UTET, 1987)

Martin L. 2001

Martin, Lillian Ray, *The art and archaeology of Venetian ships and boats* (London: Chatham, 2001)

Martin S. 1998

Martin, Susanne, *Venezianische Bildhaueraltäre und ihre Auftraggeber 1530–1620* (Marburg: Tectum Verlag, 1998)

Martin T. 1991

Martin, Thomas, 'Grimani Patronage in San Giuseppe di Castello: Veronese, Vittoria and Smeraldi', *The Burlington Magazine*, 133/1065 (Dec. 1991), pp. 825-33

Martin T. 1998

Martin, Thomas, *Alessandro Vittoria and the Portrait Bust in Renaissance Venice* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998)

Martin T. 1999

Martin, Thomas, 'Nicolò da Ponte', in Trent 1999, pp. 296-7

Mason 1986

Mason, Stefania, 'Le virtù della Repubblica e le gesta dei capitani. Dipinti votivi, ritratti, pietà', in Venice 1986, pp. 13-18

Mason 2010

Mason, Stefania, 'La cappella di San Sabba a Sant' Antonin: committenza e devozione nella Venezia di fine Cinquecento', in Franco 2010, pp. 135-51

Mason Rinaldi 1975

Mason Rinaldi, Stefania, 'Tre momenti documentati dell'attività di Palma il Giovane', *Arte Veneta*, 29 (1975), pp. 197-204

Mason Rinaldi 1975–6

Mason Rinaldi, Stefania, 'La Cappella del SS. Sacramento in San Zulian', *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*, 134 (1975–6), pp. 439-60

Mason Rinaldi 1976–7

Mason Rinaldi, Stefania, 'Il libro dei conti della famiglia Tiepolo per la cappella di S. Sabba in S. Antonin', *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*, 135 (1976–7), pp. 193-212

Mason Rinaldi 1984

Mason Rinaldi, Stefania, *Palma il Giovane, l'opera completa* (Milan: Electa, 1984)

Matthew 1998

Matthew, Louisa C., 'The Painter's Presence: Signatures in Venetian Renaissance Pictures', *The Art Bulletin*, 80/4 (1998), pp. 616-48

Matthew 2007

Matthew, Louisa, 'Clergy and Confraternities', in Humfrey 2007, pp. 33-91

McAndrew 1969

McAndrew, John, 'Sant'Andrea della Certosa', *The Art Bulletin*, 51 (1969), pp. 15-28

McHam 1994

McHam, Sarah Blake, *The Chapel of St. Anthony at the Santo and the Development of Venetian Renaissance Sculpture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

McHam 1998

McHam, Sarah Blake (ed.), *Looking at Italian Renaissance Sculpture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)

McHam 2003

McHam, Sarah Blake, 'La scultura esterna', in Piana and Wolters 2003, pp. 123-40

McHam 2013

McHam, Sarah Blake, *Pliny and the Artistic Culture of the Italian Renaissance: The Legacy of the Natural History* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2013)

McTavish 1980

McTavish, David, 'A Drawing by Girolamo Campagna for the High Altar of San Giorgio Maggiore', *Arte Veneta*, 34 (1980), pp. 165-8

McTavish 1981

McTavish, David, *Giuseppe Porta called Giuseppe Salviati* (New York: Garland, 1981)

Meli 1965

Meli, Angelo, 'Cappella Colleoni – I tre Santi dell'ancona', *Bergomum*, 39/1 (1965), pp. 3-46

Mendelsohn 1982

Mendelsohn, Leatrice, *Paragoni: Benedetto Varchi's Due Lezioni and Cinquecento Art Theory* (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press, 1982)

Mendelsohn 2007

Mendelsohn, Leatrice, 'Simultaneität und der *paragone*: Die Rechtfertigung der Kunst im Auge des Betrachters', in Hofstede et al 2007, pp. 294-335

Merkel 1999a

Merkel, Ettore (ed.), *La Cena in Emmaus di San Salvador* (Milan: Electa, 1999)

Merkel 1999b

Merkel, Ettore, 'La Cena in Emmaus del diarista Girolamo Priuli donata ad Antonio Contarini, priore di San Salvador e patriarca di Venezia', in Merkel 1999a, pp. 9-20

Modesti 2005

Modesti, Paola, *Il convento della Carità e Andrea Palladio* (Verona: Cierre, 2005)

Molli 1989

Molli, Giovanni Baldissin, "'Una pella come un marmo': la riscoperta della tecnica dello stucco nella trattistica rinascimentale, con particolare riguardo all'area veneta', *Bollettino del Museo Civico di Padova*, Annata 78 (1989), pp. 93-101

Molmenti 1899

Molmenti, Pompeo, *Sebastiano Veniero e la battaglia di Lepanto* (Florence, 1899)

Molmenti 1925

Molmenti, Pompeo, *La storia di Venezia nella vita privata* (6th ed., Bergamo: Istituto Italiano d'Arti Grafiche, 1925)

Monticolo 1896–1914

Monticolo, Giovanni (ed.), *I capitolari delle arti veneziane: sottoposte alla giustizia e poi alla giustizia vecchia dalle origini al MCCCXXX*, 3 vols (Rome: Forzani, 1896–1914)

Moretti 2007

Moretti, Lino, 'Alessandro Vittoria, Bartolomeo Modolo, Pietro Bearzi e storici dell'arte a San Zaccaria', in Ceschi et al 2007, pp. 99-105, 292-3

Morigi and Morigi 2008

Morigi, Giovanni, and Lorenzo Morigi, 'Note tecniche sul restauro del monumento a Bartolomeo Colleoni di Andrea del Verrocchio', in Ceriana and Avery 2008, pp. 459-79

Morin 1985

Morin, Marco, 'La battaglia di Lepanto', in Tenenti 1985, pp. 210-31

Morresi 2000

Morresi, Manuela, *Jacopo Sansovino* (Milan: Electa, 2000)

Morresi and Hay 1996

Morresi, Manuela, and Dorothy Hay, 'Cooperation and Collaboration in Vicenza before Palladio: Jacopo Sansovino and the Pedemuro Masters at the High Altar of the Cathedral of Vicenza', *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 55/2 (June 1996), pp. 158-77

Morrogh 1985

Morrogh, Andrew (ed.), *Renaissance Studies in Honour of Craig Hugh Smyth: Art and Architecture*, 2 vols (Florence: Giunti-Barbèra, 1985)

Morrogh 2010

Morrogh, Andrew, 'The Gritti Monuments in San Francesco della Vigna, Venice: The Case for Palladio's Authorship', *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 69/2 (2010), pp. 206-33

Moschini 1815

Moschini, Giannantonio, *Guida per la Città di Venezia all'amico delle belle arti opera di Giannantonio Moschini*, 2 vols (Venice: Alvisopoli, 1815)

Moschini 1842

Moschini, Giannantonio, *La Chiesa e il Seminario di Santa Maria della Salute in Venezia* (Venice: G. Antonelli, 1842)

Mothes 1859–60

Mothes, Oskar, *Geschichte der Baukunst und Bildhaurei Venedigs*, 2 vols (Leipzig: F. Voigt, 1859-60)

Motture 2001

Motture, Peta, *Bells & Mortars: catalogue of Italian bronzes in the Victoria and Albert Museum* (London: V&A Publications, 2001)

Motture et al 2013

Motture, Peta, Emma Jones and Dimitrios Zikos (eds), *Carvings, Casts and Collectors: The Art of Renaissance Sculpture* (London: V&A Publications, 2013)

Mueller 1971

Mueller, Reinhold C., 'The Procurators of San Marco in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries: A Study of the Office as a Financial and Trust Institution', *Studi Veneziani*, 13 (1971), pp. 105-220

Mueller 1988

Mueller, Reinhold C., 'Veronesi e capitali veronesi a Venezia in epoca scaligera', in Varanini 1988, pp. 369-76

Mueller 1997

Mueller, Reinhold C., *Money and Banking in Medieval and Renaissance Venice: The Venetian Money Market: banks, panic and the public debt, 1200-1500* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1997)

Munman 1968

Munman, Robert, 'Venetian Renaissance Tomb Monuments', PhD thesis, Harvard University, 1968

Muraro 1982

Muraro, Michelangelo, 'La scala senza giganti. Iconographie et politique au Palais Ducal de Venise à la fin du 15. siècle', *Arts et langage*, 2 (1982), pp. 23-38

Nelson and Zeckhauser 2008a

Nelson, Jonathan K. and Richard J. Zeckhauser (eds), *The Patron's Payoff: Conspicuous Commissions in Italian Renaissance Art* (Princeton, NJ and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2008)

Nelson and Zeckhauser 2008b

Nelson, Jonathan K. and Richard J. Zeckhauser, 'Main Players', in Nelson and Zeckhauser 2008a, pp. 17-35

Niccoli 1999

Niccoli, Ottavia, 'Garzoni, Tomaso', in *DBI*:

[http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/tomaso-garzoni_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/tomaso-garzoni_(Dizionario-Biografico)/) (accessed June 2016)

O'Malley 2005

O'Malley, Michelle, *The Business of Art: Contracts and the Commissioning Process in Renaissance Italy* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005)

O'Malley 2013

O'Malley, Michelle, *Painting Under Pressure: Fame, Reputation and Demand in Renaissance Florence* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2013)

O'Malley and Welch 2007

O'Malley, Michelle, and Evelyn Welch (eds), *The Material Renaissance*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007)

Pallucchini 1994

Pallucchini, Rodolfo (ed.), *Storia di Venezia: Temi: L'Arte*, Parte I (Venice: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1994)

Palmer 1979

Palmer, Richard, 'Physicians and surgeons in sixteenth-century Venice', *Medical History*, 23/4 (1979), pp. 451-60

Paoletti 1893–7

Paoletti, Pietro, *L'architettura e la scultura del Rinascimento in Venezia*, 3 vols (Venice: F. Ongania, 1893–7)

Pardo 1984

Pardo, Mary, *Pino's Dialogo di pittura: A Translation with Commentary* (Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 1984)

Paul 2014

Paul, Benjamin (ed.), *Celebrazione e autocritica. La Serenissima e la ricerca dell'identità veneziana nel tardo Cinquecento* (Rome: Viella, 2014)

Paul 2016 forthcoming

Paul, Benjamin (ed.), *Doges' Tombs/Tombe Dogali* (Rome: Viella, 2016 forthcoming)

Pavanello 2012

Pavanello, Giuseppe (ed.), *La Basilica dei Santi Giovanni e Paolo* (Venice: Marcianum Press, 2012)

Pavičić 2007

Pavičić, Ivana Prijatelj, 'Contributo all'apprezzamento dell'altare di Giovanni Vrana nella chiesa di San Giuseppe di Castello', in Pilo et al 2007, pp. 243-8

Pavičić 2008

Pavičić, Ivana Prijatelj, 'Le idee cristologiche nel contesto della commemorazione della battaglia di Lepanto: contributo allo studio dell'altare di Giovanni Vrana nella chiesa di san Giuseppe a Venezia', *Ikon*, 1 (2008), pp. 215-26

Pellegrini 2003

Pellegrini, Roberta, 'Il monumento del doge Marino Grimani a San Giuseppe di Castello, Venezia (1598–1604)', in Vicenza 2003, pp. 384-5

Pedrocco 1983

Pedrocco, Filippo, 'Il patrimonio artistico disperso dei Servi di Maria a Venezia', in Venice 1983, pp. 103-24

Perocco 1964

Perocco, Guido, *Carpaccio nella Scuola di S. Giorgio degli Schiavoni* (Venice, 1964)

Penny 1993

Penny, Nicholas, *The Materials of Sculpture* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993)

Perry 1977

Perry, Marilyn, 'Saint Mark's Trophies: Legend, Superstition, and Archaeology in Renaissance Venice', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 40 (1977), pp. 27-49

Perry 1978

Perry, Marilyn, 'Cardinal Domenico Grimani's Legacy of Ancient Art to Venice', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 41 (1978), pp. 215-44

Pezzolo 2014

Pezzolo, Luciano, 'The Venetian Economy', in Dursteler 2014, pp. 255-89

Piana and Wolters 2003

Piana, Mario, and Wolfgang Wolters (eds), *Santa Maria dei Miracoli a Venezia. La storia, la fabbrica, i restauri* (Venice: Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, 2003)

Pichi 2009

Pichi, Silvia, 'Scuole di devozione, Arti e mestieri nella chiesa di San Salvador', in Guidarelli 2009, pp. 29-65

Pietrogrande 1942–54

Pietrogrande, Luisa, 'Francesco Segala I', *Bollettino del Museo Civico di Padova*, XXXI-XLIII (1942-54), pp. 111-36

Pietrogrande 1955

Pietrogrande, Luisa, 'Francesco Segala II', *Bollettino del Museo Civico di Padova*, XLIV (1955), pp. 99-119

Pietrogrande 1961

Pietrogrande, Luisa, 'Francesco Segala III', *Bollettino del Museo Civico di Padova*, L (1961), pp. 29-58

Pignatti 1981

Pignatti, Terisio (ed.), *Le Scuole di Venezia* (Milan: Electa, 1981)

Pilo et al 2007

Pilo, Giuseppe Maria, Laura de Rossi, and Isabella Reale (eds), *Un'identità: custodi dell'arte e della memoria* (Monfalcone: Edizioni della Laguna, 2007)

Pincus 1976

Pincus, Debra, *The Arco Foscari: the building of a triumphal gateway in fifteenth-century Venice* (New York and London: Garland, 1976)

Pincus 2001

Pincus, Debra (ed.), *Small Bronzes in the Renaissance* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001)

Pittoni 1909

Pittoni, Laura, *Jacopo Sansovino scultore* (Venice: Istituto veneto di arti grafiche, 1909)

Pizzati and Ceriana 2008

Pizzati, Anna, and Matteo Ceriana (eds), *Tullio Lombardo: Documenti e Testimonianze* (Verona: Scripta, 2008)

Planiscig 1921

Planiscig, Leo, *Venezianische Bildhauer der Renaissance* (Vienna: Schroll & Co., 1921)

Planiscig 1935

Planiscig, Leo, 'Domenico da Salò', in Thieme and Becker 1907–50, vol. 29 (1935), p. 353

Pope-Hennessy 1980

Pope-Hennessy, John, 'The Relations between Florence and Venetian Sculpture in the Sixteenth Century', in Bertelli and Rubenstein 1980, vol. 2, pp. 323-35

Pope-Hennessy 1984

Pope-Hennessy, John, 'Review: *Antonio Rizzo, Sculptor and Architect* by Anne Markham Schulz', *The Burlington Magazine*, 126/978 (Sept. 1984), pp. 573-4

Pope-Hennessy 2000

Pope-Hennessy, John, *Italian High Renaissance and Baroque Sculpture* (First published 1963, with updated editions in 1970, 1985, and 1996. Ed. consulted, London: Phaidon, 2000)

Pope-Hennessy 1996

Pope-Hennessy, John, *Italian Renaissance Sculpture* (First published 1958, with updated editions in 1971, 1985. Ed. consulted, London: Phaidon, 1996)

Pope-Hennessy and Lightbown 1964

Pope-Hennessy, John, and Ronald W. Lightbown, *Catalogue of Italian sculpture in the Victoria and Albert Museum* (London: H.M.S.O., 1964)

Predelli 1908

Predelli, Riccardo, 'Le Memorie e le Carte di Alessandro Vittoria', *Archivio Trentino*, XXIII (1908), pp. 5-74, 129-265

Proudfoot et al 2014

Proudfoot, Trevor et al, 'Stucco and plasterwork', *Grove Art Online. Oxford Art Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed May 27, 2014:

<http://www.oxfordartonline.com/subscriber/article/grove/art/T081969>.

Pullan 1971

Pullan, Brian, *Rich and Poor in Renaissance Venice: The Social Institutions of a Catholic State to 1620* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971)

Pullan 1974

Pullan, Brian, 'The occupations and investments of the Venetian nobility in the middle and late sixteenth century', in Hale 1974, pp. 379-408

Pullan 1981

Pullan, Brian, 'Natura e carattere delle Scuole', in Pignatti 1981, pp. 9-26

Radcliffe et al 1992

Radcliffe, Anthony, Malcolm Baker, and Michael Maek-Gérard (eds), *Renaissance and Later Sculpture. The Thyssen-Bornemisza Collection* (London: Philip Wilson for Sotheby's, 1992)

Radke 2001

Radke, Gary, 'Nuns and Their Art: The Case of San Zaccaria in Renaissance Venice', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 54/2 (2001), pp. 430-59

Riccardelli et al 2014

Riccardelli, Carolyn, Jack Soutanian, Michael Morris, Lawrence Becker, George Wheeler, and Ronald Street, 'The Treatment of Tullio Lombardo's *Adam*: A New Approach to the Conservation of Monumental Marble Sculpture', *Metropolitan Museum Journal*, 29 (2014), pp. 49-116

Rigoni 1938

Rigoni, Erice, 'Testamenti di tre scultori del Cinquecento', *Archivio Veneto*, XXII (1938), pp. 86-106

Rigoni 1970

Rigoni, Erice, *L'arte rinascimentale in Padova: Studi e documenti* (Padua: Antenore, 1970)

Rizzi 2012

Rizzi, Alberto, *I leoni di San Marco: il simbolo della Repubblica veneta nella scultura e nella pittura*, 3 vols (Verona: Cierre, 2012)

Rizzo 1993

Rizzo, P., *San Giuseppe di Castello* (Venice, 1993)

Rodolico 1953

Rodolico, Francesco, *Pietre delle città d'Italia* (Florence: F. Le Monnier, 1953)

Rogers 2000

Rogers, Mary (ed.), *Fashioning identities in Renaissance art* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), pp. 79-89

Romanelli 1981

Romanelli, Giandomenico, 'Cicognara, Leopoldo', in *DBI*:

[http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/francesco-leopoldo-cicognara_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/francesco-leopoldo-cicognara_(Dizionario-Biografico)/) (accessed May 2011)

Rosand 1982

Rosand, David (ed.), *Titian: His World and His Legacy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982)

Rosand 1984

Rosand, David (ed.), *Interpretazioni Veneziane. Studi Di Storia Dell'arte in Onore Di Michelangelo Muraro* (Venice: Arsenale Editrice, 1984)

Rosand 2001

Rosand, David, *Myths of Venice: The Figuration of a State* (Chapel Hill, NC: North Carolina University Press, 2001)

Rossi 1995

Rossi, Massimiliano, *La poesia scolpita: Danese Cataneo nella Venezia del Cinquecento* (Lucca: M. Pacini Fazzi, 1995)

Rossi 1968

Rossi, Paola, *Girolamo Campagna* (Verona: Vita Veronese, 1968)

Rossi 2003

Rossi, Paola, 'Le sculture cinquecentesche e secentesche', in Piana and Wolters 2003, pp. 193-7

Rubin 1993

Rubin, Patricia, 'Vasari, Lorenzo and the myth of Magnificence', in Garfagnini 1993, pp. 427-42

Rubin 1995a

Rubin, Patricia, *Giorgio Vasari: Art and History* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995)

Rubin 1995b

Rubin, Patricia, 'Magnificence and the Medici', in Ames-Lewis 1995, pp. 37-49

Rubin 2006

Rubin, Patricia, 'Signposts of Invention: Artists' Signatures in Italian Renaissance Art', *Art History*, 29/4 (2006), pp. 563-99

Sagredo 1856

Sagredo, Agostino, *Sulle consorterie delle arti edificative in Venezia* (Venice, P. Naratovich, 1856)

Sanderson and Cheetham 2009

Sanderson, R. W., and Francis Cheetham, 'Alabaster', *Grove Art Online. Oxford Art Online*. Oxford University Press, updated 9 November 2009, accessed April 24, 2014: <http://www.oxfordartonline.com/subscriber/article/grove/art/T001400>.

Sarchi 2005

Sarchi, Alessandra, 'Lombardo, Antonio', in *DBI*: [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/antonio-lombardo_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/antonio-lombardo_(Dizionario-Biografico)) (accessed August 2016)

Sartori-Fillarini 1976

Sartori, Antonio, *Documenti per la storia dell'arte a Padova*, ed. Clemente Fillarini, Fonti e studi per la storia del Santo a Padova, fonti 4, studi 3 (Vicenza: Neri Pozza, 1976)

Scarfi 1990

Scarfi, Bianca Maria (ed.), *The Lion of Venice: Studies and Research on the Bronze Statue in the Piazzetta* (Venice: Albrizzi Editore, 1990)

Schmitter 2002

Schmitter, Monika, 'Falling Through the Cracks: The Fate of Painted Palace Façades in Sixteenth-Century Italy', in Anderson 2002, pp. 130-61

Schofield 2006

Schofield, Richard, 'La facciata della Scuola Grande di San Marco: Osservazioni preliminari', in Guerra et al 2006, pp. 160-93

Schulz 1980

Schulz, Anne Markham, 'Giambattista Bregno', *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen*, 22 (1980), pp. 173-202

Schulz 1983

Schulz, Anne Markham, *Antonio Rizzo, Sculptor and Architect* (Princeton: University of Princeton Press, 1983)

Schulz 1984

Schulz, Anne Markham, 'Bartolomeo di Francesco Bergamasco', in Rosand 1984, pp. 257-74

Schulz 1991

Schulz, Anne Markham, *Giambattista and Lorenzo Bregno, Venetian Sculpture in the High Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)

Schulz 1994

Schulz, Anne Markham, 'La scultura', in Palucchini 1994, pp. 545-605.

Schulz 1998

Schulz, Anne Markham, *Giammaria Mosca called Padovano: a Renaissance Sculptor in Italy and Poland*, 2 vols (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998)

Schulz 2000

Schulz, Anne Markham, 'Giovanni Battista da Carona, Venetian Sculptor of the High Renaissance', *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz*, 44 (2000), pp. 215-36

Schulz 2011

Schulz, Anne Markham, *Woodcarving and Woodcarvers in Venice, 1350–1550* (Florence: Centro di, 2011)

Schulz 2012a

Schulz, Anne Markham, 'Altare di Verde della Scala', in Pavanello 2012, pp. 189-91

Schulz 2012b

Schulz, Anne Markham, 'Angelo, Giambattista Bregno', in Pavanello 2012, pp. 180-81

Schulz 2012c

Schulz, Anne Markham, 'Santa Maria Maddalena', in Pavanello 2012, pp. 191-2

Schulz 2014a

Schulz, Anne Markham, 'Life and Works of Pietro Paoletti, Historian of Venetian Art', *Archivio Veneto*, 6th ser., 8 (2014), pp. 91-122

Schulz 2014b

Schulz, Anne Markham, *The Sculpture of Tullio Lombardo* (London: Harvey Miller; Turnhout: Brepols, 2014)

Schulz J. 1982

Schulz, Juergen, 'The Houses of Titian, Aretino, and Sansovino', in Rosand 1982, pp. 73-118

Selvatico 1847

Selvatico, Pietro, *Sulla architettura e sulla scultura in Venezia dal Medio Evo sino ai nostri giorni* (Venice: P. Ripamonti Carpano, 1847)

Serra 1923

Serra, Luigi, *Alessandro Vittoria* (Rome: Alfieri e Lacroix, 1923)

Sheils and Wood 1986

Sheils, W. J., and Diana Wood (eds), *Voluntary Religion* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986)

Shaw 2006

Shaw, James, *The Justice of Venice: Authorities and Liberties in the Urban Economy, 1550–1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)

Sherman 2013

Sherman, Allison, "'Soli Deo honor et gloria'? Cittadino Lay Procurator Patronage and the Art of Identity Formation in Renaissance Venice', in Avcioglu and Jones 2013, pp. 15-32

Simane 1993

Simane, Jan, *Grabmonumente der Dogen. Venezianische Sepulkralplastik im Cinquecento* (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1993)

Sohm 1981

Sohm, Philip L., *The Scuola Grande di San Marco, 1437-1550: the architecture of a Venetian lay confraternity* (Michigan: Ann Arbor Microfilms, 1981)

Soravia 1822–4

Soravia, Giambattista, *Le chiese di Venezia*, 3 vols (Venice: Per Francesco Andreola, 1822–4)

Spear and Sohm 2010

Spear, Richard E., and Philip L. Sohm, *Painting for Profit: the Economic Lives of Seventeenth-century Italian Painters* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2010)

Sperling 2009

Sperling, Christine M., 'Written in stone: sculptors' patterns for Roman letters in inscriptions from the Italian Renaissance', *The Sculpture Journal*, 18/2 (2009), pp. 156-65

Spiazzi 1997

Spiazzi, Anna Maria (ed.), *Scultura lignea barocca nel Veneto* (Verona: Cassa di Risparmio di Verona, Vicenza, Belluno e Ancona, 1997)

Sponza 1984

Sponza, Sandro, 'Per la chiesa di S. Giuseppe di Castello: scoperte, conferme, puntualizzazioni', *Provincia di Venezia*, 11/3 (1984), pp. 22-31

Stedman Sheard 1971

Stedman Sheard, Wendy, 'The Tomb of Doge Andrea Vendramin in Venice by Tullio Lombardo', PhD thesis, Yale University, 1971

Stedman Sheard 1984

Stedman Sheard, Wendy, 'The Birth of the Monumental Classicizing Relief in Venice on the Façade of the Scuola di San Marco', in Rosand 1984, pp. 149-74

Stott 1982

Stott, Deborah, 'Fatte à Sembianza di Pittura: Jacopo Sansovino's Bronze Reliefs in S. Marco', *The Art Bulletin*, 64/3 (1982), pp. 370-88

Strupp 1993a

Strupp, Joachim, 'The Sculpted Altarpiece in Renaissance Venice, ca. 1460–1530', PhD thesis, University of St Andrews, 1993

Strupp 1993b

Strupp, Joachim, 'The Colour of Money. Use, Cost and Aesthetic Appreciation of Marble in Venice ca. 1500', *Venezia Cinquecento*, 3 (1993), pp. 7-32

Sturman and Smith 2008

Sturman, Shelley, and Dylan Smith, 'La porta della Sacrestia di San Marco di Jacopo Sansovino: risultati preliminari di un'indagine', in Ceriana and Avery 2008, pp. 447-58

Sturman and Smith 2013

Sturman, Shelley, and Dylan Smith, 'Italian Renaissance bronzes: alloy analysis, artist and interpretation', in Motture et al 2013, pp. 160-75

Tafari 1969

Tafari, Manfredo, *Jacopo Sansovino e l'architettura del '500 a Venezia* (Padua: Marsilio, 1969)

Tafari 1983

Tafari, Manfredo, '*Pietas* repubblicana, neobizantinismo e umanesimo. Giorgio Spavento e Tullio Lombardo nella chiesa di San Salvador', *Ricerche di Storia dell'Arte*, 19 (1983), pp. 5-36

Tafari 1989

Tafari, Manfredo, *Venice and the Renaissance*, trans. Jessica Levine (Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press, 1989)

Tassini 1895

Tassini, Giuseppe, *Iscrizioni della Chiesa e del Convento di S. Salvatore di Venezia illustrate* (Venice: Tip. M. S. Fra Compositori Tipografi, 1895)

Temanza 1778

Temanza, Tommaso, *Vite dei più celebri architetti e scultori veneziani che fiorirono nel secolo decimosesto*, 2 vols (Venice: Stamperia di C. Palese, 1778)

Temanza 1827

Temanza, Tommaso, *Vita di Alessandro Vittoria*, ed. G. A. Moschini (Venice: Presso Giuseppe Picotti tipografo, 1827)

Tenenti 1959

Tenenti, Alberto, *Naufraiges: corsaires et assurances maritimes à Venise, 1592–1609* (Paris: S.E.V.P.E.N., 1959)

Tenenti 1967

Tenenti, Alberto, *Piracy and the Decline of Venice, 1580–1615* (London: Longmans, 1967)

Tenenti 1985

Tenenti, Alberto (ed.), *Venezia e i Turchi: scontri e confronti di due civiltà* (Milan: Electa, 1985)

Tenenti and Tucci 1996

Tenenti, Alberto, and Ugo Tucci (eds), *Storia di Venezia. V. Il Rinascimento. Società ed economia* (Rome: Istituto della enciclopedia, 1996)

Terpstra 2000

Terpstra, Nicholas (ed.), *The Politics of Ritual Kinship: Confraternities and Social Order in Early Modern Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Thieme and Becker 1907–50

Thieme, Ulrich, and Felix Becker (eds), *Allgemeines Lexicon der Bildenden Künstler*, 37 vols (Leipzig, 1907–50)

Thomas 1995

Thomas, Anabel, *The Painter's Practice in Renaissance Tuscany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)

Timofiewitsch 1963

Timofiewitsch, Wladimir, 'Quellen und Forschungen zum Prunkgrab des Dogen Marino Grimani in S. Giuseppe di Castello zu Venedig', *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz*, 11 (1963–5), pp. 33–54

Timofiewitsch 1965

Timofiewitsch, Wladimir, 'Der Altar der Scuola degli Orefici in San Giocometto di Rialto in Venedig', *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz*, 11 (1963–5), pp. 287–91

Timofiewitsch 1972

Timofiewitsch, Wladimir, *Girolamo Campagna: Studien zur venezianischen Plastik um das Jahr 1600* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1972)

Timofiewitsch 1974

Timofiewitsch, Wladimir, 'Campagna, Girolamo', in *DBI*: [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/girolamo-campagna_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/girolamo-campagna_(Dizionario-Biografico)/) (accessed April 2011)

Timofiewitsch 1996

Timofiewitsch, Wladimir, 'L'Altare al Piano Superiore della Scuola Grande di San Rocco a Venezia. Fonti e ricerche', *Saggi e memorie di storia dell'arte*, 20 (1996), pp. 199–226

Tomasi and Zendri 2007

Tomasi, Franco, and Christian Zendri, 'Mantova Benavides, Marco', in *DBI*: [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/marco-mantova-benavides_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/marco-mantova-benavides_(Dizionario-Biografico)/) (accessed June 2016)

Tondro 2002

Tondro, Maximilian, 'Memory and tradition: the ephemeral architecture for the triumphal entries of the Dogaresse of Venice in 1577 and 1597', PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 2002

Traverso 2000

Traverso, Chiara, *La Scuola di San Fantin o dei 'Picai': carità e giustizia a Venezia* (Venice: Marsilio)

Trevisan 2006

Trevisan, Camillo, 'I rilievi prospettici di Sant'Aniano nella facciata della Scuola grande di San Marco a Venezia. Studio prospettico e proporzionale', in Guerra et al 2006, pp. 217-23

Trusted 2007

Trusted, Marjorie (ed.), *The Making of Sculpture: The materials and techniques of European sculpture* (London: V&A Publications, 2007)

Tucci 1977

Tucci, Ugo, 'Il rame nell'economia veneziana del secolo XVI', in Kellenbenz 1977, pp. 95-116

Tucci 1981

Tucci, Ugo, *Mercanti, navi, monete nel Cinquecento veneziano* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1981)

Turner 1996

Turner, Jane (ed.), *The Dictionary of Art*, 34 vols (London: Macmillan, 1996)

Ure 1840

Ure, Andrew, *A Dictionary of Arts, Manufactures, and Mines: containing a clear exposition of their principles and practice* (London: Longman, Orme, Brown, Green, & Longman, 1840)

Urban 1998

Urban, Lina, *Processioni e feste dogali: "Venetia est Mundus"* (Vicenza: Neri Pozza, 1998)

Valcanover et al 1991

Valcanover, Francesco, Maria Agnese Chiari Moretto Wiel, Antonella Dalla Pozza, and Bruno Nogara, *Pittura murale esterna nel Veneto: Venezia e provincia* (Venice: Ghedini & Tassotti, 1991)

Vanin and Eleuteri 2007

Vanin, Barbara, and Paolo Eleuteri, *Le mariegole della Biblioteca del Museo Correr* (Venice: Marsilio, 2007)

Varanini 1988

Varanini, G. M. (ed.), *Gli Scaligeri 1277–1387. Saggi e schede pubblicati in occasione della mostra storico-documentaria allestita al Museo di Castelvecchio di Verona* (Verona, 1988)

Varotto 2006

Varotto, Donatella, 'Il De sculptura di Pomponio Gaurico. Una testimonianza sulla fortuna critica dell'arte donatelliana in Padova agli inizi del Cinquecento', *Storia dell'arte*, 113/114 (n.s. 13/14, 2006), pp. 77-102

Venturi 1937

Venturi, Adolfo, *Storia dell'arte italiana, X: La scultura del Cinquecento, Parte 3* (Milan: Ulrico Hoepli, 1937)

Vicentini 1922–33

Vicentini, Antonio M., *I Servi di Maria nei documenti e codici veneziani. Gli antichi archivi de Servi a Frari* (vol. 1); *I Servi i Maria nelle raccolte veneziane. Collezioni pubbliche e semi pubbliche* (vol. 2), 2 vols (Treviglio: Tipografia editrice Messaggi, 1922–33)

Vio 2004

Vio, Gastone, *Le scuole piccole nella Venezia dei Dogi* (Vicenza: Angelo Colla, 2004)

Wackernagel 2011

Wackernagel, Martin, *The World of the Florentine Renaissance Artist. Projects and Patrons, Workshop and Art Market*, trans. Alison Luchs (Translation first published: Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981. Ed. consulted: Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 2011)

Warren 2001

Warren, Jeremy, '“The Faun Who Plays on the Pipes”: A New Attribution to Desiderio da Firenze', in Pincus 2001, pp. 83-103

Warren 2014

Warren, Jeremy, *Medieval and Renaissance Sculpture in the Ashmolean Museum*, 3 vols (Oxford: Ashmolean Museum Publications, 2014)

Warren 2016

Warren, Jeremy, *The Wallace Collection: Catalogue of Italian sculpture*, 2 vols (London: Wallace Collection, 2016)

Weddigen 1974

Weddigen, Erasmus, 'Thomas Philologus Ravennae ...', *Saggi e memorie di storia dell'arte*, 9 (1974), pp. 7-76

Weihrauch 1935

Weihrauch, H. R., *Studien zum bildnerischen Werke des Jacopo Sansovino* (Strasbourg, 1935)

Weihrauch 1938

Weihrauch, H. R., 'Jacopo Tatti ... genannt Jacopo Sansovino', in Thieme and Becker 1907–50, vol. 32 (1938), pp. 465-70

Wiel 2011

Wiel, Maria Agnese Chiari Moretto, 'Il Tesoro della Scuola Grande di San Rocco: la Scuola come committente di oreficeria nel Cinquecento', *Ateneo Veneto*, 1 (2011), pp. 107-39

Wilk 1978

Wilk, Sarah, *The Sculpture of Tullio Lombardo. Studies in Sources and Meaning* (New York: Garland, 1978)

Wilson 1987

Wilson, Timothy, 'Maiolica in Renaissance Venice', *Apollo*, 123/300 (1987), pp. 184-9

Wilson 1999

Wilson, Bronwen, '“Il bel sesso, e l'austero Senato”: The Coronation of Dogaresa Morosina Morosini Grimani', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 52/1 (1999), pp. 73-139

Wilson 2004

Wilson, Carolyn C., 'The Cult of St Joseph in Early Cinquecento Venice and the Testimony of Marino Sanudo's *Diario*', *Studi Veneziani*, N. S., 47 (2004), pp. 287-312

Wilson 2005

Wilson, Bronwen, *The World in Venice: Print, The City, & Early Modern Identity* (Toronto and London: University of Toronto Press, 2005)

Wittkower 1999

Wittkower, Rudolf, *Sculpture: Processes and Principles* (First published Allen Lane, 1977; ed. consulted: Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1999)

Wolters 1963a

Wolters, Wolfgang, 'Tiziano Minio als Stukkator im "Odeo Cornaro" zu Padua', *Pantheon*, 21/1 (Jan.–Feb. 1963), pp. 20-8

Wolters 1963b

Wolters, Wolfgang, 'Tiziano Minio als Stukkator im "Odeo Cornaro" zu Padua', *Pantheon*, 21/4 (July–Aug. 1963), pp. 222-8

Wolters 1966

Wolters, Wolfgang, 'Der Programmentwurf zur Dekoration des Dogenpalastes nach dem Brand vom 20. Dezember 1577', *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz*, 12.3/4 (1966), pp. 271-318

Wolters 1968a

Wolters, Wolfgang, 'La decorazione plastica delle volte e dei soffitti a Venezia e nel Veneto nel secolo XVI', *Bollettino del centro internazionale di studi di architettura Andrea Palladio*, 10 (1968), pp. 268-78

Wolters 1968b

Wolters, Wolfgang, *Plastische Deckendekorationen des Cinquecento in Venedig und im Veneto* (Berlin: D. Gruyter, 1968)

Wolters 1980

Wolters, Wolfgang, 'La decorazione interna della Loggia e dell'Odeo Cornaro', in Padua 1980, pp. 72-9

Wolters 1990

Wolters, Wolfgang, 'Sculpture', in Huse and Wolters 1990, pp. 129-74; 345-6

Wolters 2007

Wolters, Wolfgang, *Architettura e Ornamento: La decorazione nel Rinascimento veneziano* (Verona: Cierre, 2007)

Wolters 2010

Wolters, Wolfgang, *Il Palazzo ducale di Venezia: un percorso storico-artistico* (Verona: Cierre, 2010)

Worthen 2014

Worthen, Thomas, 'Soazoni, or The Venetian Reformation of San Nicolò dei Medicoli', in Paul 2014, pp. 233-83

Zanotto 1856

Zanotto, Francesco, *Nuovissima guida di Venezia e delle isole della laguna* (Venice: Brizeghel, 1856)

Zanuso 2000

Zanuso, Susanna, 'Francesco Terilli', in Bacchi 2000a, pp. 793-4

Zava Boccazzi 1965

Zava Boccazzi, F., *La Basilica dei Santi Giovanni e Paolo* (Venice, 1965)

Zorzi 1984

Zorzi, Alvise, *Venezia scomparsa*, 2 vols (Milan: Electa, 1984)

Zupko 1999

Zupko, Ronald Edward, 'Weights and Measures', in Grendler et al 1999, vol.5, pp. 301-05

EXHIBITION CATALOGUES

Atlanta 2007

Radke, Gary (ed.), *The Gates of Paradise: Lorenzo Ghiberti's Renaissance Masterpiece*, High Museum of Art, Atlanta: 28 April–15 July 2007; Art Institute of Chicago: 28 July–13 October 2007; The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York: 30 October 2007–13 January 2008 (New Haven and London: High Museum of Art with Yale University Press, 2007)

Berlin 2003

Krahn, Volker (ed.), *Bronzetti Veneziani. Die venezianischen Kleinbronzen der Renaissance aus dem Bode-Museum Berlin*, Georg Kolbe Museum, Berlin: 26 October 2003–11 January 2004 (Berlin and Cologne: SMB DuMont, 2003)

Ferrara 2004

Ceriana, Matteo (ed.), *Il Camerino di alabastro. Antonio Lombardo e la scultura all'antica*, Castello di Ferrara, Ferrara: 14 March–13 June 2004 (Milan: Silvana, 2004)

Houston 2001

Boucher, Bruce (ed.), *Earth and Fire: Italian Terracotta Sculpture from Donatello to Canova*, Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, 18 November 2001–3 February 2002, Victoria and Albert Museum, London, 14 March–7 July 2002 (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001)

London 1983

Martineau, Jane and Charles Hope (eds), *The Genius of Venice 1500-1600*, Royal Academy of Arts, London: 25 November 1983–11 March 1984 (London: Royal Academy of Arts / Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1983)

London 2002

Avery, Victoria, with Jo Dillon, *Renaissance and Baroque Bronzes from the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge*, Daniel Katz Gallery, London: 11 June–19 July 2002 (London: Daniel Katz / Gli Ori, 2002)

London 2012

Ekserdjian, David (ed.), *Bronze*, Royal Academy of Arts, London: 15 September–9 December 2012 (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2012)

Padua 1980

Puppi, Lionello (ed.), *Alvise Cornaro ed il suo tempo*, Loggia e Odeo Cornaro and Sala del Palazzo della Ragione, Padua: 7 September–9 November 1980 (Padua: Il Comune, 1980)

Paris 2004

Cordellier, Dominique (ed.), *Primate, maître de Fontainebleau*, Musée du Louvre, Paris: 22 September 2004–3 January 2005 (Paris: Réunion des Musées Nationaux, 2004)

Trent 1999

Bacchi, Andrea, Lia Camerlengho and Manfred Leithe-Jasper (eds), *"La bellissima maniera": Alessandro Vittoria e la scultura veneta del Cinquecento*, Castello del Buonconsiglio, Trent: 25 June–26 September 1999 (Trent: Provincia Autonoma di Trento, 1999)

Trent 2008

Bacchi, Andrea, and Luciana Giacomelli, *Rinascimento e passione per l'antico: Andrea Riccio et il suo tempo*, Castello del Buonconsiglio, Trent: 5 July–2 November 2008 (Trent: Provincia Autonoma di Trento, 2008)

Venice 1979

Romano, Serena, *La porta della Carta: i restauri*, Palazzo Ducale, Venice, May–July 1979 (Venice: Armena, 1979)

Venice 1983

Fra Paolo Sarpi e i Servi di Maria a Venezia nel 750° anniversario dell'ordine, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Sala sansoviniana, Venice, 28 October–19 November 1983 (Venice: Stamperia di Venezia, 1983)

Venice 1986

Redolfi, Maddalena (ed.), *Venezia e la difesa del Lepanto. Da Lepanto a Candia 1570–1670*, Palazzo Ducale, Venice, 1986 (Venice: Arsenale, 1986),

Venice 1991

Arti e mestieri in Venezia (Venice: Stamperia Comune di Venezia, 1991)

Venice 2000

Mason Rinaldi, Stefania and R. Polacco (eds), *I tesori della fede. Oreficeria e Scultura dalle Chiese di Venezia*, Church of San Barnaba, Venice, 11 March–30 July 2000 (Venice, 2000)

Verona 1996

Aliberti Gaudioso, Filippa M. (ed.), *Pisanello. I luoghi del gotico internazionale nel Veneto*, Museo di Castelvechio, Verona, 8 September–8 December 1996 (Milan: Electa, 1996)

Vicenza 2003

Barbieri, Franco and Guido Beltramini (eds), *Vincenzo Scamozzi, 1548–1616*, Museo Palladio, Palazzo Barbaran da Porto, Vicenza, 7 September 2003–11 January 2004 (Venice: Marsilio, 2003)

Vicenza 2008

Beltramini, Guido and Howard Burns (eds), *Palladio*, Palazzo Barbaran da Porto, Vicenza, 20 September 2008–9 January 2009 and Royal Academy of Arts, London, 31 January – 13 April 2009 (Venice: Marsilio, 2008)

Washington 1981

Katz, Lois (ed.), *Fingerprints of the Artist: European Terracotta Sculpture from the Arthur M. Sackler Collection*, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Fogg Art Museum, Cambridge, MA, 1980–82 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981)

Washington 2009

Luchs, Alison (ed.), *Tullio Lombardo and Venetian High Renaissance Sculpture*, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., 4 July–31 October 2009 (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art / New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009)

Washington 2011

Luciano, Eleonora, with Denise Allen and Claudia Kryza-Gersch, *Antico: The Golden Age of Renaissance Bronzes*, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D. C.: 6 November 2011–8 April 2012; The Frick Collection, New York: 1 May–29 July 2012 (London: National Gallery of Art with Paul Holberton, 2011)