
JUST AS DANTE, SO TOO MICHELANGELO.
THE SCULPTOR'S "DOGLIENZA"
IN FRANCESCO DA SANGALLO'S LETTER

Dario DONETTI

The University of Chicago

★
★ ★

THE LETTER THAT FRANCESCO DA SANGALLO wrote for the appendix to the *Lezzione sulla maggioranza delle arti* is by far the longest among those produced in 1547 by the various artists that Benedetto Varchi contacted to respond to his lecture, and eventually published three years later. The verbosity of Francesco's reply is particularly striking when compared to the texts composed by other sculptors such as Tribolo and Benvenuto Cellini, or even an artist like Battista del Tasso who had a remarkably similar career trajectory, as an architect with origins in a workshop of *legnaiuoli*. It is even more dramatic to contrast Sangallo's verbosity to the concise, lapidary reply of his declared mentor, Michelangelo Buonarroti, despite the palpable influence that the latter had on his understanding of the principles of sculpture. In fact, the length and generosity of arguments in Francesco's letter are proof of the increasing intellectual ambition that he showed from the 1540s onwards, and of a friendship with Varchi himself that, after initial rivalry, he cultivated with devotion. The first paragraph, and even more impressively the long conclusion to the letter dwell in affected declarations of humility, continuous praise of his interlocutor's poetic and personal virtues, and apologies for the presumed rhetorical deficiencies: they show, on one side, the real preoccupation of Francesco to appear sufficiently legitimated in intellectual terms, and his active attempt to fashion himself as an erudite artist versed in writing; on the other hand, they also testify to the authentic admiration that he felt at the time for "M. Benedetto [...] vero possessore d'ogni virtù e verità"¹.

Dantism

The first document of the long-lasting, albeit mutable relationship between Sangallo and Varchi is a derisive sonnet written by the Florentine poet Alfonso de' Pazzi, called Etrusco:

Rocchio a imparato a mente un'orazione
 Per recitarla a certi suoi soldati,
 Ed a Livorno gli ha tutti imbarcati
 Senza biscotto, ed egli è lor timone.

Chi crede, ch'egli andranno in perdizione,
 Chi ch'è saran per mare avventurati.
 Margollo dice, che fien svaligiati,
 E tolto lor sarà cappa e saione.

Il Varchi, che si tiene e bravo e dotto,
Vuol combatter con Rocchio, e gli ha mandato
In lingua Bergamasca un gran cartello.

Stiamo a veder di grazia chi va sotto:
L'un mena ben le man, l'altro è adatto;
S'arrende il Varchi, mi par già vedello².

The sonnet is among the rare sixteenth-century attestations of Sangallo's nickname as Margolla: a possible reference to an evil goat cited in Tuscan folk fables, and therefore perhaps to the artist's characteristic goat-like beard; or maybe, to a type of barley to be sown in the very first days of March, where Francesco's birthday was the first of the month³. Whatever the case, the use of such a nickname immediately evokes associations with the linguistic repertoire employed by the members of the Accademia Fiorentina in its early years, as well as with their preference for antiphrastic mechanisms and vernacular images⁴.

Indeed, it is in the context of the rivalries within Florence's literary Accademia that Pazzi must have written his sonnet, interpretable as the product of the confrontation between its founders and the philo-ducual newcomers that took place in the 1540s. These satirical stanzas represent an open attack on Varchi's ambitions as a leader, and "Margollo" is cited among those who appeared skeptical regarding his success, despite their future friendship. As aptly reconstructed by Diletta Gamberini, Francesco da Sangallo was among the supporters of Pazzi when he proposed himself for the position of censor, after August of 1546, in a moment of turmoil for the Accademia that ultimately brought about, in 1547, the famous expulsion of its founder Anton Francesco Grazzini, as well as of many artists and amateur poets that had joined it, including Francesco himself⁵. The last heir of the Sangallo family had become a member of the Accademia only two years earlier, in January 1545, at the height of his career as a sculptor, but also as a military engineer and an architect in the entourage of Cosimo I de' Medici⁶. Not by chance, the brief and ultimately unsuccessful alliance between this courtly artist and a poet like Alfonso de' Pazzi is prominently testified to in a longer composition — a *sonnetta* — that the latter wrote to celebrate his qualities as a designer and, simultaneously, a cognoscente of Florence's most celebrated poet and tutelary spirit of the Accademia, Dante Alighieri:

Se voi farete, San Ghallo, di Dante
 il magnio Inferno che già il Manetto
 ispeculò; e scrisse, et io l'ò letto,
 il Giamburlari ancor tanto prestante,

Vo' mostrerrete che da voi innante
 non s'è veduto se non imperfetto,
 et così, col disegno e spirto eletto
 vostro, haren noi un sì bel lume innante;

[...]

Dunque con vostro acume
 mostrateci le bolgie, il cierchio, e 'l cietro,
 e come et chi son quei che vi son dentro⁷.

This time, Alfonso was encouraging his ally to propose a new visual interpretation (a “disegno”) of Dante’s *Inferno*, probably in a moment when the critical reading of Alighieri had become a battlefield between him and his rival Benedetto⁸. Still, it is precisely through Dante that Varchi and Sangallo would later seal their intellectual friendship, made public through an exchange of sonnets that was published, among other examples of poetic correspondence, in 1557, within a collection of “*sonetti di M. Benedetto Varchi colle risposte, e proposte di diversi*”⁹.

Recent studies have revealed Francesco da Sangallo as a self-acclaimed *dantista*, especially in the 1540s when his literary ambitions grew beyond an amateur status, at the time he wrote most of his poetry¹⁰. Among the first documents that exhibit his familiarity with Alighieri’s writings is a page of the Barberini Codex: a monumental book of presentation drawings, mostly after the antique, compiled over several decades by Francesco’s father, and founder of the Sangallo artistic dynasty, Giuliano¹¹. His son completed the project, which was left partially incomplete at Giuliano’s death, and carefully preserved it for his entire life as a family relic and a trove of antiquarian knowledge¹². In particular, folio 18 shows an elevation of the Trajan’s Column in Rome, at the side of which Francesco compiled a long astronomic account, dated June 11 1540¹³. Transcribed in a refined *cancelleresca* hand, the annotation is all contained within a compact, quasi-typographical paragraph, which completes — from a visual point of view as well — one of the most beautiful examples of archeological reconstructions offered by the Barberini Codex. In this annotation, Francesco describes a celestial event observed from his own “orto”, i.e. from the garden

of his family home in Borgo Pinti, in Florence, while the date associated with it — possibly intentionally — is “la sera che si facevano li fuochi dello rinovala della criatione dello Ill.mo S.re Duca”: the eve of Cosimo I’s birthday. The addition sounds, in the end, like an erudite demonstration of courtly devotion and an elegant piece of fiction celebrating the glory of the Tuscan state. The nationalist implications are reinforced precisely by the explicit reference to Dante Alighieri, when Francesco writes:

viddi la luna, ch’era in quarterone pasare socto il segno di marte, e rimanere Marte celato, e non i vidde epso Marte se non quando fu pasata della luna quella parte che risprendeua, e di poi imediante si vidde Marte aparire che il corpo della Luna nollo ochupava: tanto che qui non pocha confusione i[n] me rimase.

In other words, the luminous star of Mars would have appeared to his eyes through the moon’s dark side, despite its opacity. The inexplicable event hardly took place in reality and is, in fact, an erroneous citation from Dante’s *Convivio*. But while the annotation misinterprets what Dante Alighieri described as Mars’s eclipse, caused by lunar movements, the source is declared with exactness, and Francesco’s words even betray a certain satisfaction for the Aristotelian origins of this image, which had already been used in the *De Caelo*: “sarebbe quello che Dante dice che Aristotile fa mentione che alli suo tempi achadde”¹⁴.

It is no surprise, therefore, that the 1557 poetic exchange with Benedetto Varchi also revolved around Dante. This sonnet by Francesco da Sangallo is a mannered request of intercession for the ducal commission of a monument to the *Tre spirti del ciel pregiati, e chiari, che’l mondo illuminar con prose, e carmi*”: Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio, according to a national literary canon defended by Varchi himself¹⁵. Once more, Sangallo’s acclaimed success as a figurative artist aimed to serve Dante’s cult, by envisioning a monument to the Trecento fathers of Tuscan literature. It is hard to establish whether this sonnet documents a real intention of the Medicean court, or rather must remain confined to the fictional domain of literary exercises¹⁶. However, one cannot but notice that — according to a testamentary inventory recently discovered by Alexander Röstel — portraits of such men of letters appeared in the collection of *uomini illustri* in the Sangallo house in Francesco’s time: specifically, a relief reproducing Francesco Petrarca and his beloved Laura, and no less than three effigies of Alighieri, two of which were accompanied by Beatrice Portinari’s portrait¹⁷. Even if

this must remain hypothetical, one cannot exclude that a sculptor so well-versed in portraiture — something highly unusual in mid-Cinquecento Florence — was also the author of those heads, revealing a personal as well highly charged political devotion to the city's poetic tradition¹⁸.

After Michelangelo

The composition of Sangallo's sonnet *Tre spirti del ciel pregiati*, as well as of Varchi's answer *Francesco, se così pregiate e chiari*, has been understandably dated to a moment not far from the Dantesque querelle that involved Alfonso de' Pazzi as a third actor: more precisely, it has been associated with Benedetto's lectures on the *Commedia*, and possibly to the one delivered in March 1546 on the frequently politicized topic of *Envy*¹⁹. Still, the exchange of sonnets shows a change in their respective positioning. Francesco acts here as a friendly supporter of Benedetto, seeming to organically fit with that circle of intellectually ambitious artists that surrounded the writer and were indeed invited to participate in the collective writing of the appendices of the *Lezzione sulla maggioranza delle arti*: an invitation that was likely meant to counterbalance their recent expulsion from the Accademia²⁰. As it is well-known, although this publication dates the beginning of 1550 — so to 1549, according to the *stile fiorentino* where the new year started on March 25 —, the response of Francesco likely dates to the early months of 1547, right after the *Lezzioni* were publicly delivered by Varchi and about the same time that the two poems discussed above must have been written²¹. Indeed, Francesco's letter shares with them many characteristics, including frequent insertions, sometimes in the form of embedded citations, of literary fragments from Dante's work or Greek and Roman authors²².

For instance, a *sentenza* form the sixth canto of *Inferno* is employed to strengthen his demonstration of the primacy of sculpture, more precisely where the letter cites Ciaccio's words "che vuol, quanto la cosa è più perfetta, più senta il bene, e così la doglienza"²³. The reuse of similar citations under the guise of aphorisms was a common phenomenon of reading and writing practices of sixteenth-century Italy, and Francesco is no exception in his attempt to legitimize himself as a *letterato*. As for the meaning underlying this quotation, the thesis is a topical one, that of the sculptor's *difficoltà*, or fatigue:

bisogna raccontare tutte fatiche, tutte difficoltà, tutte rigidità, tutte scabrosità, tutti dispiaceri, tutti sospetti, tutte gelosie e malinconie, che quella [the sculpture, ndr] porge quasi per infino alla fine, talché dal suo principio e mezzo e quasi insino al fine poco dolce o contento o diletto ci truovo, salvo che nella sua fine apparisce un certo contento e lungo riposo di tante estreme fatiche²⁴.

While advocating for the superiority of sculpture over painting, Francesco employs pleonastic arguments: they are all listed before the *sentenza*, then recapitulated a second time right after, in a text that shows a vivid taste for abundance. They include the necessity to include multiple views of a subject within the same work, requiring “più disegno”, or more refined representational skills²⁵; the higher costs of materials, for which the intervention of powerful patrons, either private or public, is inevitable, since sculpture is identified *tout court* with monumental statuary in marble; consequently, the costs due to collaborators and expensive tools, the longtime of execution, and the intense physical labor; most importantly, “una continua gelosia che la materia non manchi”, i.e., the constant anxiety regarding the availability of material, due to the limitations intrinsic to marble carving and the difficulty of reworking or repairing a mistake²⁶. Towards the end of the text, Francesco even includes a troublingly gendered statement on the lack of women versed in sculpture, as opposed to the many renowned female painters, to demonstrate the superior physical strength required in the carving of marble. In the end, compared to the ease of painting — whose reasons are explained briefly in the initial part of the letter — all the arguments siding with the sculptors are negative ones, and thus point to the abnegation and perseverance of those artists who choose to practice such genre, and ultimately, to their moral superiority. It is through such implications that Francesco justifies the insertion of two long and digressive invectives against the envious voices of the partisan critics that sculptors always need to face. The only positive reward for the difficult art of sculpture is the promise of eternity. Statues from a distant past testify to the capacity of this art to win the battle against time, thus fulfilling the promise of Ciacco’s words, that the “doglienza” that comes from aiming for the most perfect result is in the end paired with an equal satisfaction.

The defense of the primacy of sculpture, as well as of its moral superiority deriving from the larger physical efforts and higher tenacity it requires, places Francesco under the direct influence of Michelangelo, despite the lack of visible references to Buonarroti in

his own letter²⁷. Traditionally, the stylistic choices of Francesco da Sangallo as a marble sculptor have been interpreted as oscillating between intentional archaisms, with references to the tradition of the previous century, and a tendency towards monumentality and muscular expressionism absorbed from Michelangelo. Sangallo's self-fashioning as a Michelangelesque artist is particularly evident in his self-portrait of around 1540, that he continued to repeat frequently in his production of medals and drawings, in which he shows attributes of the sculptor such as the long beard and the turban, not differently from the famous depiction of Buonarroti by Giuliano Bugiardini and a similar sixteenth-century drawing at the Louvre of uncertain attribution (**fig. 5–6**)²⁸. Moreover, the latter played a fundamental role in the biography of the young Sangallo, partially because of his friendship with Francesco's father, Giuliano, who acted as a true mentor in his estimation, during the first Roman years; but also because it was under Michelangelo, in the mid-1520s, that Francesco was trained as a marble carver, when he was hired among those who helped to execute the project for the Medicean tombs of the New Sacristy²⁹. Documentary and visual testimonies of this long-lasting relationship are numerous, and so are the occasions when Francesco invoked Michelangelo as a source of authority: lastly in his famous letter to Vincenzo Borghini on the discovery of the *Laocoön*, which again associates the memory of Giuliano with that of Buonarroti, within a context of intellectual kinship and quotidian familiarity with the world of Roman antiquities³⁰.

Indeed, the almost-antique authority of Michelangelo was commonly paralleled — at least in the circle of writers and *intendenti* of mid-Cinquecento Florence — with that of Dante: not least by Benedetto Varchi himself, who, in his lecture on the sonnet *Non ha l'ottimo artista alcun concetto*, defined Buonarroti as “pieno di quella antica purezza e Dantesca gravità”³¹. And to mention one more example, another Tuscan *letterato* such as Pierfrancesco Giambullari — in a dedicatory letter that, significantly, introduced the 1556 treatise *In difesa della lingua Fiorentina* by Carlo Lenzoni — compared Michelangelo's architecture with the inventive, vernacular-based vocabulary of Dante Alighieri³². Specifically, Giambullari insisted on the composite character of Dante's Florentine, by declaring it as effective as the ornamental inventions employed by Buonarroti in his vestibule of the Laurentian Library, which was used, not by chance, as the fictitious setting for Lenzoni's dialogue on the origins of the Tuscan language³³.

Ancient Virtue

Despite the commonplace interpretation of Michelangelo's legacy as the radical innovator who "broke the ties and chains" of conventional classicism, its overlapping with antiquity was crucial for Francesco da Sangallo, and possibly also brought about, in the very last years of his life, his marginalization within the Florentine academic world, then dominated by Vasari³⁴. Such conflation was, in Francesco's understanding of his mentor, as important as the one with Dante Alighieri. To cite just one example, we know how in a 1563 dispute around the design for the big niches that would have hosted the statues of the *Apostles* in the Florentine cathedral he claimed an original project left by Michelangelo himself, which just replicated the Pantheon's edicules, in a demonstration of antiquarian monumentality³⁵. A similar triangulation also characterized the letter addressed to Benedetto Varchi: besides the described references to Dante and Michelangelo, the other examples of Francesco's textual reuse employ ancient sources. Ciaccio's *sentenza* is interestingly placed at the center of the argumentation, serving as its conceptual focus and climax. In symmetrical positions, shortly after the beginning and towards the end of the long letter, two more citations appear: while their origin is not declared, they are clearly inspired by antiquity, being both *exempla virtutis* taken from Greek and Roman history; and once more, they allow Francesco to employ an aphoristic formulary to develop his argument.

The first anecdote supports Sangallo's attack against those modern, i.e., contemporary sculptors that are "inumani, superbi, avari, invidiosi, maldicenti"; the opposition is to the example offered by "quello statuario, anzi proprio filosofo, [che] ad Alessandro rispose, quando lo dimandò che cosa era la scultura, ed egli a lui che altro non era che una seconda natura"³⁶. Between the lines, a learned reader could recognize the exemplary response by Eupompos of Sikyon as recorded by Pliny: "since he was asked whom, among the ancients, he imitated, he pointed to a crowd of men and said that one should follow nature, and not the maker"³⁷. The second paraphrased citation, added to the letter by Francesco da Sangallo, makes even more explicit the identification with the prototype of the literate artist who devotes himself to theoretical discussions. Sangallo defines himself as "amatore di virtù e verità" and parallels his own ethical tension with that of the Stoic philosopher Arius Didymus: the one who, according to Plutarch's *Life of Demetrius*

and Anthony, convinced Octavianus Augustus to spare the city of Alexandria, out of respect for his own moral superiority³⁸. “A’ virtuosi piace chi è di virtù amatore” is the philosopher’s inference³⁹.

Francesco da Sangallo’s letter is the most articulate example from his literary production, which otherwise counts only a handful of sonnets. The treatise on the “modi del fare il marmo” mentioned in the letter shows the degree of his intellectual ambition, but does not survive, nor left other traces, and one wonders if such project was ever completed⁴⁰. The main legacy of Francesco activity as an amateur poet, which seems confined mostly to the 1540s, is in fact his ramified acquaintances with Florence’s men of letters⁴¹. Undoubtedly, the one with Benedetto Varchi was the most durable and influential⁴². Still, we can assume a contribution to the compilation of the *Vita di Giuliano e Antonio da San Gallo, architetti fiorentini* published in the 1550 edition of Vasari’s *Vite*: not just as a reliable source — which Vasari declares in several passages — but with a more proactive role⁴³. This first version of the biography of the Sangallo brothers opens with a true celebration of the moral, even more than artistic, rank of the family. The Sangallos’ fortune is associated, again, with the central concept of virtue, described as the true legacy that was handed down from the founder Francesco di Bartolo to his sons, Giuliano and Antonio, and implicitly to his homonymous grandson:

Onde nasce che, oltre l’opere, nome suo in infinito cresce, e lascia di sé ne’ posterì suoi l’eternità del nome, e dassi animo a quegli che sono timidi che si mettono inanzi alle fatiche e all’operare. Così adunque s’abbellisce il mondo, e si dà animo ai p̄ncipi che di continuo faccino dell’opere, e si mostra le doti avute dal Cielo nelle virtù ai discendenti⁴⁴.

The impression offered by these initial paragraphs is that of a bookish addition to the biography, which otherwise sounds fluent and casual. Given the acknowledged multi-authored character of Vasari’s *Vita*, they might well be another example of Francesco’s occasional output as a writer, as possibly demonstrated by their removal from the second edition, which seems to confirm their adjunct nature⁴⁵. In light of such a hypothesis, one could say that the emphatic conclusion of the Vasarian biography of the Sangallo brothers stems almost naturally from the description of their virtuous legacy. Indeed, these lines comprise a Latin epitaph, seemingly inspired by Benedetto Varchi. The first two verses read “*Cedite Romani structores, cedite Graii / Artis Vitruvi tu quoque cede parens*” and are another paraphrase of the opening of a famous poem by

Propertius, written in honor of the *Aeneid*: “*Cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Graii*”⁴⁶. Confirming the capillary circulation of such textual fragments, as well as the subterranean inspiration that authors such as Giorgio Vasari and Francesco da Sangallo drew from this author, the same elegy would appear again in Benedetto Varchi’s *Ercolano*: a dialogue on the true character of the Florentine *volgare*, that same language dignified by Dante and championed by a generation of mid-Cinquecento intellectuals.

Notes

1. Cf. B. VARCHI, *Deux leçons sur l’art*, ed. and trans. by F. Dubard de Gaillarbois, Paris, Classiques Garnier, 2020, p. 488.
2. *Il terzo libro delle opere burlesche di M. Francesco Berni, M. Gio: Della Casa, dell’Aretino, de’ Bronzini, de’ Franzesi, di Lorenzo de’ Medici, del Galileo, del Ruspoli, del Bertini, del Firenzuola, del Lasca, del Pazzi, e di altri autori*, in Firenze, MDCCXXIII, 221. For the original manuscript version, see BNCF, Magliabechiano 272, VII. This manuscript reads, in the title: “Questi sonetti contro Benedetto Varchi sono d’Alfonso de’ Pazzi d[ett]o l’Etrusco, suo fiero antagonista”; cf. A. CASTELLANI, *Nuovi canti carnascialeschi di Firenze: le “canzone” e mascherate di Alfonso De’ Pazzi*, Firenze, Leo S. Olschki, 2006, pp. 109–112.
3. Cf. S. BATTAGLIA, *Grande dizionario della lingua italiana*, 21 vol., Torino, Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1961–2004, IX, p. 802. See also the *Vocabolario degli accademici della Crusca of 1612 ad vocem “marzuolo”*, p. 513: “L’orzo marzuolo, che a Bologna si chiama margolla, si semina per tutto il mese di Marzo”.
4. Cf. the repertoire included in J. TOSCAN, *Le carnaval du langage : le lexique érotique des poètes de l’équivoque de Burchiello à Marino (XV^e–XVII^e siècles)*, diss., Université de Lille III, 1981, on the zoological, alimentary, and agricultural vocabulary of the *Canti carnascialeschi*.
5. D. GAMBERINI, *The Artist as a Dantista: Francesco da Sangallo’s Dantism in Mid-Cinquecento Florence*, “Dante Studies”, n° 135, 2017, pp. 169–191: 178–185.
6. Cf. F. QUIVIGER, *The Presence of Artists in Literary Academies*, in *Italian Academies of the Sixteenth Century*, ed. by ID., D. Chambers, London, Warburg Institute, 1995, pp. 105–112; M. FIRPO, *Gli affreschi di Pontormo a San Lorenzo. Eresia, politica e cultura nella Firenze di Cosimo I*, Torino, Einaudi, 1997, pp. 205–206. For the first document registering the participation of Sangallo in the Accademia’s activities, cf. BM, ms. B, III, 52, c. 37v, transcribed by F. VITTUCCI, *Materiali su Francesco da Sangallo*, diss., Università degli Studi di Milano, 2002, p. 129.
7. D. GAMBERINI, *op. cit.*, p. 181.
8. *Ivi*, 171–174, 185 associates the project with the cross-section of Dante’s *Inferno* appearing in the drawn illustrations added to a copy of Landino’s *Comento sopra la Comedia di Danthe Alighieri* in the Biblioteca Vallicelliana (BV, Z.79.A), which were once attributed to members of the Sangallo family; cf. B. DEGENHART, *Dante, Leonardo und Sangallo (Dante-Illustrationen Giuliano da Sangallos in ihrem Verhältnis zu Leonardo da Vinci und zu den Figurenzeichnungen der Sangallo)*, “Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte”, n° 15, 1957, pp. 101–287: 171–193. However, in addition to stylistic discrepancies, the annotation “Franc.o qui” (c. 106r) that Degenhart interpreted as Francesco’s signature does not coincide with his handwriting.

9. *De sonetti di M. benedetto Varchi colle risposte, e proposte di diversi. Parte seconda*, in Firenze, appresso Lorenzo Torrentino, MDLVII, II, p. 135. B. VARCHI, *Deux leçons sur l'art*, cit., pp. 113, 119–120, 133.
10. D. GAMBERINI, *op. cit.*; D. DONETTI, *Francesco da Sangallo e l'identità dell'architettura toscana*, Roma, Officina Libraria, 2020, pp. 85–90; A. RÖSTEL, *The House and Collection of Giuliano, Antonio and Francesco da Sangallo*, "The Burlington Magazine", forthcoming.
11. The extensive literature on the Barberini Codex includes: A. NESSELRATH, *I libri di disegni di antichità: tentativo di una tipologia*, in *Memoria dell'antico nell'arte italiana*, ed. by S. Settis, Torino, Einaudi, 1986, pp. 87–147, and particularly pp. 129–130; S. BORSI, *Giuliano da Sangallo: i disegni d'architettura e dell'antico*, Roma, Officina, 1985; S. FROMMEL, *I disegni di Giuliano da Sangallo: relazioni tra studio dell'antico e progettazione*, "Opus Incertum", a. III, n° 5, 2008, pp. 12–27; C. BROTHERS, *Giuliano da Sangallo and the Ruins of Rome*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, forthcoming.
12. Cf. D. DONETTI, "E io così in groppa a mio padre": *Giuliano e Francesco da Sangallo*, in *Giuliano da Sangallo*, conference proceedings (Firenze, Vicenza, 2011–2012), ed. by A. Belluzzi, C. Elam, F. P. Fiore, Milano, Officina Libraria, 2017, pp. 276–288.
13. BAV, Cod. Barb. Lat. 4424, f. 18 recto. Cf. CH. HUELSEN, *Il libro di Giuliano da Sangallo, Codice Vaticano Barberiniano Latino 4424. Testo*, Leipzig, Harrassowitz, 1910, pp. 28–29.
14. Citations are, respectively, from Dante, *Conv.*, II, iii, 6, and Aristotle, *Cael.*, II (B), 12, 291b-292a. On the sixteenth-century fortune of Alighieri's *Convivio* cf. S. GILSON, *Reading the Convivio from Trecento Florence to Dante's Cinquecento commentators*, "Italian Studies", vol. 64, n° 2, 2009, pp. 266–295: pp. 277–293.
15. Among others, cf. M. FIRPO, *op. cit.*, pp. 168–171.
16. Cf. S. IACOPOZZI, *Il ciclo scultoreo degli Uffizi: genesi e sviluppo di un progetto non solo celebrativo*, in *Gli uomini illustri della Loggia degli Uffizi. Storia e restauro*, ed. by M. Scudieri, Firenze, Edifir, 2001, pp. 15–33; D. GAMBERINI, *I colloqui poetici degli artisti della corte medicea con Benedetto Varchi*, "La Rivista. Études culturelles italiennes Sorbonne Universités", n° 5, 2017, special issue *Varchi e dintorni*, pp. 61–69: 65–68.
17. A. RÖSTEL, *op. cit.*, nn. 35, 245, 250, 294.
18. On Francesco's anomaly as a sculptor who specialized in portraits, see U. MIDDELDORF, *Portraits by Francesco da Sangallo*, "The Art Quarterly", n° 1, 1938, pp. 109–138; F. ORTENZI, *Formazione e ascesa di Francesco da Sangallo*, "Proporzioni", vol. 7/8, 2006–2007 (2009), pp. 49–66: 58–59.
19. Cf. P. CHERCHI, *Due lezioni di B. Varchi ispirate da J. L. Vives*, "Lettere Italiane", a. XL, n° 3, 1988, pp. 387–399, with bibliography.
20. For a recent account on Varchi and the artists, see A. GEREMICCA, "Damone" per "Crisero" e gli altri: *Benedetto Varchi e gli artisti (prima e dopo l'Accademia Fiorentina)*, in *Intrecci virtuosi. Letterati, artisti e accademie tra Cinque e Seicento*, ed. by C. Chiummo, A. Geremicca, P. Tosini, Roma, De Luca Editori d'Arte, 2017, pp. 11–26, particularly p. 23 for Francesco da Sangallo.
21. Cf. B. VARCHI, V. BORGHINI, *Pittura e scultura nel Cinquecento*, ed. by P. Barocchi, Livorno, Sillabe, 1998, pp. 7–84; D. GAMBERINI, *op. cit.*, p. 178; B. VARCHI, *Deux leçons sur l'art*, cit., p. 70.
22. On this phenomenon in Benedetto Varchi's œuvre see A. ANDREONI, *La via della dottrina. Le lezioni accademiche di Benedetto Varchi*, Pisa, ETS, 2012, pp. 65–238; on the use of *sentenze* by Dante in Vasari's *Vite*, see L. BOLZONI, *Citazioni letterarie nella Giuntina: per una mappa delle loro funzioni*, in *I mondi di Vasari. Accademia, lingua, religione, storia, teatro*, conference proceedings (Firenze, 2011) ed. by A. Nova, L. Zangheri, Venezia, Marsilio, 2013, pp. 141–159: 146–150.

23. Dante, *Inf.*, VI, 107–108.
24. B. VARCHI, *Deux leçons sur l'art*, cit., p. 490. Cf. also L. MENDELSON, *Paragoni. Benedetto Varchi's "Due Lezioni" and Cinquecento Art Theory*, Ann Arbor (Mich.), UMI Research Press, 1982, p. 156; R. E. GREGG, *Tangible Identity in Francesco da Sangallo's Medals*, "The medal", n° 72, 2018, pp. 28–41: 34–35, which however does not touch on the reuse of fourteenth-century materials.
25. B. VARCHI, *Deux leçons sur l'art*, cit., p. 476.
26. *Ivi*, p. 480.
27. O. BÄTSCHMANN, *The Paragone of Sculpture and Painting in Florence Around 1550*, in *Le vite del Vasari. Genesis, topoi, ricezione*, conference proceedings (Firenze, 2008), ed. by K. Burzer, C. David, S. Fester, A. Nova, Venezia, Marsilio, 2010, pp. 86–87; R. PREIMESBERGER, *Rilievo und Michelangelo: "... benché ignorantemente"*, in *Visuelle topoi. Erfindung und tradiertes Wissen in den Künsten der italienischen Renaissance*, ed. by U. Pfisterer, M. Seidel, München, Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2003, pp. 303–316; B. VARCHI, *Deux leçons sur l'art*, cit., pp. 120–121.
28. Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des dessins, inv. n° 2715, *recto*. For Michelangelo's portrait, part of Casa Buonarroti's collection, see E. STEINMANN, *Die PorträtDarstellungen des Michelangelo*, Leipzig, Klinkhardt & Biermann, 1913, pp. 17–19. The reference to Michelangelo implied by this attribute is noticed also by R. GREGG, *op. cit.*, pp. 31–33.
29. M. CAMPIGLI, *Silvio Cosini e Michelangelo*, "Nuovi studi", n° 12, 2006 (2007), pp. 85–116; D. DONETTI, *Modelli, produzione, variazioni. L'organizzazione del lavoro nel cantiere della Sacrestia Nuova*, in *Michelangelo. Arte, materia, lavoro*, ed. by A. Nova, V. Zanchettin, Venezia, Marsilio, 2019, pp. 217–231.
30. Cf. E. CARRARA, "La notizia che io ho delle statue antiche di Fiorenza". *La lettera autografa di Francesco da Sangallo e altre giunte all'epistolario di don Vincenzo Borghini*, in *Mosaico: temi e metodi di arte e critica per Gianni Carlo Sciolla*, vol. I, ed. by R. Cioffi, O. Scognamiglio, Napoli, Luciano, 2012, pp. 101–110; E. FERRETTI, *Acquedotti e fontane del Rinascimento in Toscana: acqua, architettura e città al tempo di Cosimo I dei Medici*, Firenze, Leo S. Olschki Editore, 2016, pp. 150–152.
31. Cf. R. CARLSON, "Eccellentissimo poeta et amatore divinissimo": *Benedetto Varchi and Michelangelo's Poetry at the Accademia Fiorentina*, "Italian Studies", vol. LXIX, n° 2, 2014, pp. 169–188: 172–174, with bibliography.
32. M. DALY DAVIS, *Carlo Lenzone's "In difesa della lingua fiorentina, e di Dante" and the Literary and Artistic World of Cosimo Bartoli and the Accademia Fiorentina*, in *Cosimo Bartoli (1503–1572)*, conference proceedings (Mantova, Florence 2009), ed. by F. P. Fiore, D. Lamberini, Firenze, Leo S. Olschki Editore, 2011, pp. 261–282.
33. On the *questione della lingua*, Michelangelo, and the architectural implications of such debate cf. CH. DAVIS, *Cosimo Bartoli and the Portal of Sant'Apollonia by Michelangelo*, "Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz", n° 19, 1975, pp. 261–273; A. PAYNE, *Architects and Academies: Architectural Theories of Imitatio and the Literary Debates on Language and Style*, in *Architecture and Language*, ed. by G. Clarke, P. Crossley, Cambridge/New York, Cambridge University Press, 2000, pp. 118–137; C. ELAM, "Tuscan Dispositions": *Michelangelo's Florentine Architectural Vocabulary and its Reception*, "Renaissance studies", n° 19, 2005, pp. 46–82, particularly pp. 60–65.
34. D. DONETTI, *Francesco da Sangallo...*, cit., pp. 113–121.
35. C. CINELLI, F. VOSSILLA, *Bartolomeo Ammannati e le statue degli Apostoli in Santa Maria del Fiore. Ipotesi e acquisizioni documentarie*, "Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz", vol. XLIII, 1999 (2000), pp. 208–224; F. VOSSILLA, *Le grandi edicole di Santa Maria del Fiore*, in *Vasari e Ammannati per la città dei Medici*, ed. by C. Acidini, G. Pirazzoli, Firenze, Polistampa, 2011, pp. 200–201.

36. B. VARCHI, *Deux leçons sur l'art*, cit., p. 482.
37. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, XXXIV, 61. Author's translation.
38. Plutarch, *Ant.*, 80, 1–2; the episode is also in Cassius Dio, LVI, 16, 3–4. Cf. B. VARCHI, *Paragone — Rangstreit der Künste, Italienisch und Deutsch*, ed. by O. Bättschmann, T. Weddigen, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2013, p. 26; B. VARCHI, *Deux leçons sur l'art*, cit., p. 489.
39. B. VARCHI, *Deux leçons sur l'art*, cit., p. 488.
40. “Queste cose lascerò indistinte, perché in altro luogo n’ho io scritto che un dì vi farò vedere, ché proposito mi viene in ciò molto a dilatarmi”, *ivi*, p. 486. P. O. KRISTELLER, *Iter Italicum Accedunt Alia Itinera: A Finding List of Uncatalogued or Incompletely Catalogued Humanistic Manuscripts of the Renaissance in Italian and Other Libraries*, 10 vols., London, Warburg Institute, 1963–1997, I, p. 85, attributes to Francesco da Sangallo a manuscript translation of a passage from Vitruvius, now at the Biblioteca Laurenziana, Florence (Ashb. 639, cc. 109–151), which was actually written by his cousin Giovan Battista; cf. P. N. PAGLIARA, *Alcune minute autografe di G. Battista da Sangallo. Parti della traduzione di Vitruvio e la lettera a Paolo III contro il cornicione michelangiolesco di Palazzo Farnese*, “Architettura archivi. Fonti e storia”, n° 1, 1982, pp. 25–50.
41. D. HEIKAMP, *Rapporti fra accademici e artisti nella Firenze del Cinquecento*, “Il Vasari”, n° 15, 1957, pp. 139–163.
42. The very last mention of a work by Francesco da Sangallo in Varchi’s writing is the description of Charles V’s 1536 entry into Florence, within the *Storia fiorentina di Messer Benedetto Varchi. Nella quale principalmente si contengono l’ultime Rivoluzioni della Repubblica Fiorentina, e lo stabilimento del Principato nella Casa de’ Medici*, in Colonia, appresso Pietro Martello [*aeditio princeps*], MDCCXX, pp. 581–585. However, Varchi does not mention the artist’s name, possibly relying on other sources such as Lasca or Marco Guazzo that show the same omission.
43. G. VASARI, *Le vite de’ più eccellenti pittori, scultori e architettori nelle redazioni del 1550 e 1568*, 6 vol., ed. by P. Barocchi, R. Bettarini, Firenze, Sansoni, 1966, vol. IV, p. 7 and V, p. 86; cf. ID., *Das Leben der Sangallo-Familie*, trans. by V. Lorini, ed. by M. Burioni, D. Mädler, Berlin, Wagenbach, 2010, p. 15. On the shared authorship of Vasari’s collection of biographies, see A. NOVA, “Vasari” versus Vasari. *La duplice attualità delle vite*, “Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz”, vol. LV, 2013, pp. 55–71, with bibliography.
44. For a documentary reconstruction of the family tree of the Sangallos, see G. BELLÌ, *Per una biografia di Giuliano e Antonio da Sangallo*, “Archivio storico italiano”, vol. 176, n° 2 (656), 2018, pp. 347–368; ID., *Addenda alle biografie di Giuliano e Antonio da Sangallo*, in *Giuliano da Sangallo 1516–2016*, conference proceedings (Firenze, 2016), ed. by D. Donetti, S. Frommel, A. Nova, Roma, Officina Libraria, forthcoming.
45. G. VASARI, *Le vite de’ più eccellenti pittori, scultori e architettori...*, cit., IV, p. 131. On the discrepancies between the two editions of the *Vite*, see A. NOVA, *Piero di Cosimo, le “Vite” di Vasari e i limiti di un sistema teleologico*, in *Piero di Cosimo 1462–1522. Pittore fiorentino eccentrico fra Rinascimento e Maniera*, exhibition catalog (Firenze, Galleria degli Uffizi, 2015), ed. by E. Capretti, A. Forlani Tempesti, S. Padovani, D. Parenti, Firenze, Giunti, 2015, pp. 64–75: 66–71.
46. Propertius, *Eleg.*, II, xxxiv, 65–66. For the meaning of this epigraph in the context of the myth of Florence’s origins developed under Cosimo I, see D. DONETTI, *Etruscan Speech: Cinquecento Architecture in Florence and the Aramei*, “Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz”, vol. LX, 2018, pp. 93–106.





FIGURE 5. — Francesco da Sangallo, *Self-Portrait; Portrait of Elena Marsuppini* (detail), 1551. Cast bronze medal; 98 mm (diam.). London, British Museum, Department of Coins and Medals.



FIGURE 6. — Circle of Michelangelo Buonarroti, *Portrait of Michelangelo Buonarroti*, 1522. Red chalk on paper, 36,4×24,8 cm. Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des dessins.