

private individual as opposed to a prince led to an encouragement to the princes themselves to build.

APPENDIX

There is an interesting letter in the Biblioteca Laurenziana from the prior of the church of S. Bartolomeo at Monteoliveto outside the Porta S. Frediano at Florence, thanking Cosimo de' Medici for restoring the buildings. The library of the church is mentioned by Gutkind in his list of Cosimo's buildings (*Cosimo de' Medici*, 1938, pp. 304-7), but otherwise the church seems to have been forgotten. The letter is not dated. Its vocabulary and content are very close to Maffei's dialogue. Cosimo is praised as the author (*te auctore et duce*) of restorations of old churches and the construction of new ones. He has, however, recognized the danger of this and is determined to aim at 'gloria', not 'voluptas'. Bandini gives excerpts in his *Catalogus codicum Latinorum bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae*, iii, 1776, col. 523:

Quum aliquando ipse in agro Florentino superioribus annis praefuerim, licet indigne, Abbatiae S. Miniatis, demum S. Barptolemaei, quod Montis Oliveti vulgo appellatur, cernens oculis non sine ingenti animi maerore eiusdem Monasterii aedificia vetustate paene collapsa, et prope diruta, omnemque fabricam brevi minari ruinam, vehementer etiam atque etiam indolui, quod in tanta, et tam praeclara Etruriae, immo totius Italiae urbe, quae Dei numine, florentibus opibus, multitudine, potentia, ac principatu terrae, marisque floret, ubi te auctore, et duce magnificentissime tot celeberrima templa, tot aedes sacrae refectae, tot Monasteria cum omni ornatu infinitis prope sumptibus Deo immortalis dedicata, tot denique aedificia regie splendideque constructa, quae singula mihi saepenumero contemplant, praeclara, et admirabilia videri solent; hoc solum S. Barptolemaei Coenobium, proh dolor! inertia atque ignavia quadam destitutum, desertum et quodammodo ab omnibus derelictum esse videatur; praesertim quum is locus, quemadmodum conspicari licet, sit, et natura, et situ haud dubie omnium praestantissimus.

. . . Tu enim is es, qui non voluptatem, malorum omnium matrem, sed gloriam ex his sumptibus quaerere soles. Quid dicam de Bibliothecis, ubi tanto studio, et diligentia coegisti libros plurimos Graecos, Hebraeos pariter et Latinos, quo studiosi et letterati homines, tamquam in amoenissimum quoddam Musarum diversorium se conferre possint? (Gadd. Plut. LXXXX Sup. Cod. XXXVI, xxxii, pag. 55, 58.)

By Helmu

For a considerable time now historians have been aware of the popularity which Hieronymus Bosch had under the Habsburgs. For this knowledge of Justi, whose findings of about eighty subsequent studies. Thanks to the work of this painter, additional evidence has been which provides us with a clearer picture of Bosch's painting had on the Spanish Peninsula reflected in at least some of the recent studies. The Peninsula tends to be taken into account only at long intervals. Two of these studies, de Salas surveys the testimonies to Bosch in Spanish texts¹ have gone largely un-

According to de Salas there are, in the development of the image of Bosch in the *Comentarios de la pintura* (written by Juan de Guevara, who judges him on his conformity to Renaissance laws of decorum) two stages Bosch's manner of presenting Catholic doctrine. This 'transcendence' was put forward by two opposite currents: Sigüenza in his *Tercera parte de la historia* stresses the moral usefulness of those

¹ X. de Salas, *El Bosco en la literatura española*, 1943. This lecture, on admission to the Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona, is mainly based upon the invaluable collection of Spanish art traces published by F. J. Sánchez Cantón, *Fuentes literarias para la historia del arte español*, i, 1923-41, and upon the complementary source material compiled by M. Herrero García, *Contribución de la literatura a la historia del arte*, 1943. In a supplementary paper 'Mas sobre el Bosco en España', *Homenaje a J. A. van Praag*, 1956, pp. 108-13, de Salas has particularly made use of the following articles: Juan de Contreras Marqués de Lozoya, 'Algo más sobre la fortuna del Bosco en España', *Boletín de la Real Academia de Historia*, cxxiii, 1948, pp. 285-94; R. de Arco, 'Estimación española del Bosco en los siglos XVI y XVII', *Revista de Ideas Estéticas*, x, 1952, pp. 417-31; A. M. Salazar, 'El Bosco y Ambrosio de Morales', *Archivo Español de Arte*, xxviii, 1955, pp. 117-38. Obviously the list of known references to Bosch in Spain is hardly complete; a few more examples are

By A. D. Fraser Jenkins

Between 1436 and 1450 Cosimo de' Medici was alone in Italy in spending very large sums of money on a series of building projects. This was opposed to the most generally expressed opinion of the time that ostentation and the use of wealth to produce some personal monument should be avoided, and was also in contrast to the usual method of financing new buildings from state or guild funds. During this period however these attitudes began to change, and by the middle of the century the idea was current that it was the natural behaviour of a nobleman to patronize architecture, and in fact a duty of his superior position. The example of Cosimo (who was not, of course, a nobleman) was instrumental in this change of fashion as it produced the need for a defence of architectural patronage, which was found in the discussion of the virtue of Magnificence. After the middle of the century there were several patrons of architecture on Cosimo's scale, although the size of private fortunes was continually decreasing.

In the Trecento, up to the time of Salutati's *De seculo et religione* of 1381, when the humanists discussed riches they came to the conclusion that poverty should be praised, and this conclusion has been analysed by Hans Baron in terms of Franciscan ideals.¹ Later, riches came to be regarded as neither good nor bad in themselves, and even very useful for the exercise of virtue, as in Bruni's 1419 commentary on the pseudo-Aristotelian *Economics*. It was often argued in these discussions that riches have only a relative value, as in Poggio Bracciolini's *De nobilitate*² (1440) or in the central theme of Francesco Filelfo's *De paupertate*³ (about 1445), where Leonardo Bruni argues at length that riches are 'indifferentia' and compares their use amongst various rich men. Those who are virtuous do not try too hard to become rich, but if this is inevitable they spend their money quickly, according to the advice of Matteo Palmieri in his *Della vita civile*⁴ of 1439. To hoard up money and then spend it on a tomb, for example, is ridiculous, as Leonardo Bruni writes,⁵ since it is better to be known by works. The worst way to use money is to bring it into any sort of association with usury, which was generally stated to be an evil. The embarrassing suspicion that the life of the merchant depends upon usury (explicitly attacked by preachers—most notably in the early Quattrocento by San Bernardino) lies behind these discussions.

Contemporary sources frequently give the impression that money given to charities was an atonement for usury, and the practice of making restitution serve to gain merit was attacked by St. Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence,

This article is based on material from a thesis written for an M.Phil. at the Warburg Institute. I am much indebted to my supervisor Mr. M. D. K. Baxandall for help and criticism.

¹ H. Baron, 'Franciscan poverty and civic wealth', *Speculum*, xiii, 1938, pp. 1ff.

² Poggio Bracciolini, *De nobilitate*, 1657, p. 45.

pp. 27ff.

³ Francesco Filelfo, *De paupertate*, in E. Garin, *Prosatori latini del quattrocento*, 1952, pp. 494ff.

⁴ Matteo Palmieri, *Della vita civile*, ed. F. Battaglia, 1944, p. 60.

⁵ L. Bruni, *Epistolae*, ed. L. Mehus, ii, 1741,

and San Bernardino. Giovanni Dominici (died 1420), Antoninus's Dominican teacher, had earlier given rules on the morality of donating to charity in his *Regola del governo di cura familiare*. Rebuilding churches is one of the expenditures he recommends, but only if it is done so that nobody knows whose money was used—it is better therefore to repair old churches than to found new ones:

Arai ancora in questo stato stando a dispensare i ben del tuo signore a'forestieri, i quali sono tutti altri poveri non inchiusi ne'membri due detti di sopra. Così si possono spendere i beni in fabbricare chiesa, monasteri, spedali; maritar fanciulle, liberar prigioni, vestir mal vestiti, dare a ciascuno che chiede per l'amor di Dio, dove tu non sai essere stremità o ultimo bisogno. E queste limosine sono tutte buone fatte per Dio; pure che sieno di quello soverchia a'poveri se'obbligata, come di sopra à detto. Ma dispiace a Dio tu facci a lui chiesa di pietra morte, e lasci stare quello della viva pietra, cioè l'uomo. Guarti dalla comune vanagloria, la quale ha moltiplicate molte spelonche di ladroni. Se vuogli spendere quantità di danari, più ti consiglio rifacci una chiesa guasta e abbandonata, o spedal rifiutata per povertà, dotando di quel che puoi, che fabbricar di nuovo; però sarà maggiore onore di Dio avere una casa sofficiente, che due mendiche; e tu n'arai più premio, perchè arai minor fama nel mondo. Però che presuppongo, così faccendo tu fabbricherai in sull'altrui, e l'arme d'altri aranno fama; e così il nome del patronaggio rimarrà pure ne'primi. E così non sapa la man manca quello far la diritta, perchè la limosina tua sarà in ascondito; e il Padre Eterno, che vede in ascondito, la ti renderà in cielo.⁶

By the fifteenth century the merchants and bankers were most unlikely to be actually prosecuted for usury; it might be thought they became free to use charity as an excuse for flamboyance, but this is not the case. B. N. Nelson remarks⁷ that Cosimo's conscious policy of getting the best return in 'service and goodwill' from money given during his lifetime was unusual compared with the more prevalent random scattering of petty amounts.

One of the first hints that Dominici's attitude was being relaxed is in Alberti's *Della famiglia*, written in the 1430's. One of the interlocutors asks what rules should govern spending money, as the Alberti had, on building additions to churches, and in 'molti luoghi dentro e fuori della terra . . . pubblici e privati edifici'.⁸ The reply is that these sorts of expenses, as well as 'dipignere la loggia, comperare gli arienti, volersi magnificare con pompa, con vestire e con liberalità' are unnecessary but both harmless and pleasurable, and therefore may be indulged in at will. Elsewhere in the book he writes of riches:

Puossi colle ricchezze conseguire fama e autorità adoperandole in cose amplissime e nobilissime con molta larghezza e magnificenza.⁹

⁶ G. Dominici, *Regola del governo di cura familiare*, 1860, p. 122.

⁷ B. N. Nelson, 'Usurer and merchant prince', *Journal of Economic History*, Supple-

ment vii, 1947, pp. 104ff.

⁸ L. B. Alberti, *Della famiglia*, ed. C. Grayson, 1960, p. 210.

⁹ *Ed. cit.*, p. 141.

This recommends their use in a way which seems comparable to architectural patronage in intention and in scale.

The dates of some of the buildings commissioned by Cosimo are in dispute, but his first large work in Florence was certainly the convent of San Marco, begun in 1436. His total oeuvre was an innovation both in its scale and its wide geographical distribution. He was prepared to take part in joint works—for example, at the SS. Annunziata and at S. Croce—but also in huge buildings for which he alone was responsible—S. Marco, S. Lorenzo (after 1440) and the Badia at Fiesole, in addition to his palace and villas. More usually architecture and large sculptural commissions in Florence had been administered by small committees appointed by the guilds and financed from public funds. Individual patronage was important in the case of the rich man who supported the churches and monasteries in the quarter of the city in which he lived, as, for example, Palla Strozzi and Niccolò da Uzzano had.¹⁰ As far as architecture was concerned, in the first half of the century the patronage of such men consisted of adding to existing churches and to the family palace.

An essential part of Cosimo's place in the changing of this practice was the spread of his reputation for generosity. This emerges from two letters from Venice appealing to him for money for building. In 1437 the Confraternity of the Florentines in Venice wrote to the brothers Cosimo and Lorenzo de' Medici asking for money to build a chapel in the Frari.¹¹ The Confraternity say that they have heard of 'le magne hopere si vegliono fatte per voj nelle chiese e luoghj di dio' after the example of their father; furthermore, the brothers are famous, wherever they have been, for spending a lot of money 'in nonore dj dio'. They therefore expect a donation measurable 'a rispetto della vostra magnificienza'. The chapel was built and finished in 1443, but whether or not with Medici money is not known. Francesco Barbaro wrote to Cosimo from Venice in 1443, explaining that he had the responsibility of looking after the Carthusian monastery of S. Andrea, and felt obliged to enlarge or decorate it in some way.¹² He reminds Cosimo that he once stayed there in a difficult time—presumably in 1433 during his flight from Florence—and that he should now repay them by building a chapel or decorating the church, as he had promised. He adds also that it will be a contribution to Cosimo's immortality to be known in Venice as well as in Florence for his munificence.¹³ There is a slight lack of respect in both of these letters which suggests that the money was being demanded in the light of past obligations rather than being

¹⁰ M. Wackernagel, *Der Lebensraum des Künstlers in der Florentinischen Renaissance*, 1938, pp. 226ff.

¹¹ I am indebted to Miss Susan Connell for pointing out and sending a transcription of this letter to me. It is in the Archivio di Stato di Firenze, Filza xiii, no. 65, M.A.P.

¹² F. Barbaro, *130 Letters*, ed. R. Sabatini, 1884, p. 114.

¹³ Quare cum nuper ab ipsis monachis certior sim factus te aliquando, cum apud eos devertisses, aut cellam unam aedificandam aut ecclesiam exornandam tibi desumpsisse,

tenere me non potui quin a te meo iure postularem, ut divo Andreae ac sanctissimo ordini Carthusiensium cum tua gloria sicut semper soles satisfacias. Quamquam enim istic multa monumenta posteris sis relicturus munificentiae tuae, in quibus ut ita dicam nomen tuum immortalitati consecrasti, non parvam tamen laudem consequeris, si etiam apud nostros homines velut ex quadam specula gentis tuae alio quodam modo peregrinabitur in omni fere nationes' (*loc. cit.*).

begged for, but the point here is not Cosimo's motives—whether personal or political—for patronizing architecture, or the opportunities that were available to him as a private citizen with power over the state, but the effect of creating a situation in which patronage was expected.

Pius II and Machiavelli wrote about the buildings that Cosimo patronized, and they both mention the popular feeling against them. In 1463 Pius in his *Commentaries* gave a brief account of Cosimo's control of Florence and his expenditure on building, and adds that although he thinks these were excellent works there were people who hurled insults at him for appearing too powerful.¹⁴ Machiavelli, in the *Istorie Fiorentine* of 1525, gives a detailed list of Cosimo's buildings,¹⁵ and then describes how although his actions were always those of a king he was careful to avoid appearing grander than an ordinary citizen in his way of life, since he was so aware of the danger of attracting envy. He was apparently successful in this as Machiavelli writes that Cosimo was so prudent that 'mai la civile modestia non trapassò', but the description of such precise calculations implies that expenditure on architecture in such a political context was thought of as something that would naturally arouse envy.

Anyone hoping to benefit from Cosimo's willingness to spend money on architecture had to have an answer for such criticism. This situation arose with the church and monastery of the Badia at Fiesole that had been given to an order of Augustinian Canons in 1439 and was rebuilt at Cosimo's expense from 1456. A defence of Cosimo, *In magnificentiae Cosmi Medicei Florentini detractores*, was written in Florence by a member of the order, Timoteo Maffei¹⁶. It was most probably written between 1454 and 1456, as Maffei seems to refer to his office of rector general of the order, which he held from 1454–57,¹⁷ and it must be before work was started on the Badia since it is clearly an appeal for this: the Badia is not mentioned. Maffei's work is in the form of a dialogue, and the material is mostly borrowed from St. Thomas Aquinas's discussion of Magnificence in the *Summa Theologica*.¹⁸ Thomas's pattern of arguments for and against Magnificence being a virtue is easily turned into an argument between a defender, Maffei, and a detractor of Cosimo's 'Magnificence', and is easily related to architecture since Thomas's discussion is carried on in such abstract terms. Once the relation is established the defence is ready-made, as Thomas concludes that Magnificence is a virtue. At the beginning of the dialogue Maffei describes the architecture 'wonderfully embellished at the expense of Cosimo de' Medici, that most famous and magnificent man',¹⁹ and then goes on '... nor can I help admiring the virtue of this man ... especially as there is no one ... who could be compared with Cosimo for achieving Magnificence'. After this we get Thomas's arguments as to whether or not

¹⁴ Pius II, *Commentarii*, 1614, p. 49.

¹⁵ N. Machiavelli, *Istoria Fiorentina*, ed. M. Bonfantini, 1954, p. 880.

¹⁶ The dialogue exists in two manuscripts both in the Biblioteca Laurentiana: (a) Plut. xlvii, Cod. xvii, fols. 78–102, and (b) Plut. lxxx, Sup. Cod. xlvi, fols. 125^v–131^v. It is

published inaccurately in G. Lami, *Deliciae Eruditorum*, xii, 1742, pp. 150–68. It has

recently been discussed by E. H. Gombrich in 'The early Medici as Patrons of Art', originally published in 1960 and reissued in *Norm and Form*, 1966, p. 35.

¹⁷ N. Widlocher, *La congregazione dei Canonici Regolari Lateranense*, 1929, Appendix.

¹⁸ *Summa Theologica*, IIa, IIae, q. 134, a. 1–4.

¹⁹ Manuscript (a) of note 16, fol. 82^v.

Magnificence is a mean, whether it is an action or the virtue in control of the action, whether it is a subsection of Fortitude, whether it can be practised by the poor and whether the Magnificent man is 'in the sanctification of God', as a quotation from the Psalms claims.²⁰ All this is interspersed with references to Cosimo's buildings, and made a little more humanist in character through the use of classical exempla and the form of the dialogue. The revival of Thomas's treatment of Magnificence shifts the central point of the discussion away from the value of usury and riches, with its equivocal conclusion, to the abstract status of Magnificence as a virtue. The buildings have their taint removed as they become some sort of concrete exempla encouraging the virtue, since everyone can see from the *impresa* on them whose they are; Cosimo's are therefore described at length. They are not to be condemned for their excessive size, but praised for the excess of virtue in the patron's mind, shown by his having spent more than he need; Maffei therefore also praises the expense of the decoration and furnishings. He explains why in the middle of a list of buildings:

But all these things deserve extraordinary praise and should be recommended to posterity with the utmost enthusiasm, since from Cosimo's Magnificence in building monasteries and temples it will have had divine excellence before its eyes, and it will consider with how much piety and with how much thankfulness we are indebted to God, and not to religious people and clerics. And in his house he has not thought about what Cosimo wanted but what was consistent with such a great city as Florence, in that he thought that if he was not going to look ungrateful it was necessary that he should appear more fully equipped and more distinguished than the other people in the town in the same proportion as he received benefits from it greater than theirs.²¹

There is very little, however, in the Maffei text that is a positive recommendation to great men in general to be Magnificent. This is much more explicit in the passage of the *Nicomachean Ethics* that was Thomas's source. Here the emphasis is on the practical activity of the rich. Aristotle discusses at length what class of people can be Magnificent, and excludes the poor, unlike Thomas and Maffei:

But great expenditure is becoming to those who have suitable means to start with, acquired by their own efforts or from ancestors or connexions, and to people of high birth and reputation, and so on; for all these things bring with them greatness and prestige.²²

This Aristotelian sense of Magnificence was current in Cosimo's time, and was exploited by Francesco Filelfo in the *Convivia Mediolanensia*, written in Milan in 1443 and dedicated to Filippo Maria Visconti.²³ Part of this dialogue is a discussion of the nature of *Magnidecentia*, a direct translation of Aristotle's *megaloprepeia*. *Magnidecentia* is exclusively a virtue of the rich. Filelfo's main concern is to differentiate between it and liberality by referring *megaloprepeia*

²⁰ Psalms xcv, 6.

²¹ Manuscript (a) of note 16, fol. 86r.

²² Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. W. D.

Ross, 1915, 1122b, ll. 30ff.

²³ F. Filelfo, *Convivia Mediolanensia*, 1537.

pp. 78ff.

to the standard of behaviour thought suitable to the situation and the agent. The situations are Aristotle's—weddings and hospitality to famous guests, for example—and the agent is in effect anyone who wishes to appear civilized and dignified. Filelfo did not connect this with architecture, but the theory of *Magnidecentia* refers to all large expenditure. Once architectural patronage had been connected with Magnificence, the implication that it was a natural practice of every great man followed from the Aristotelian sense of the word.

The great men who became new patrons needed instruction. Alberti's *De re aedificatoria* takes the form of an exposition of architecture as an art, and is so introduced in the preface and the first chapter; the whole approach differs from Vitruvius's introduction of his work as a guide for his patron Augustus. Although Alberti does not claim to be writing a textbook for the patron, topics that first arose from the discussion of Magnificence appear throughout the book. His view in *Della famiglia* that extensive patronage is 'harmless' has now hardened into detailed and authoritative (because antique) instructions for patronage. A large section of the preface is devoted to praise and encouragement of the patron:

Men of publick Spirits approve and rejoice when you have raised a fine Wall or Portico, and adorned it with Portals, Columns, and a handsome Roof, knowing you have thereby not only served yourself, but them too, having by this generous Use of your Wealth, gained an addition of great Honour to yourself, your Family, your Descendants, and your City.²⁴

His approach is repeatedly that the particular piece of architecture must be related to the social status of the patron, and to its use. Although the details of this owe most to Vitruvius, the desire to find rules for patronage goes with an awareness that the great man reveals himself in architecture; this arose out of the idea of Magnificence and was made more urgent by Cosimo's precedent.

The change in the pattern of patronage can be seen in individual examples. The most striking of the patrons of architecture in the second half of the century is Lodovico Gonzaga.²⁵ He succeeded to the Marquisate of Mantua in 1444, and in 1450 called Luca Fancelli from Florence as architect of a new hospital in the town and a palace at Revere, twenty miles away, both begun in that year. He built villas for himself and in 1459, the earliest date at which Alberti's presence is documented at Mantua, commissioned two churches from him; Alberti was working on these by 1460—S. Lorenzo (which came to nothing) and S. Sebastiano. In 1470 Lodovico accepted Alberti's designs for S. Andrea, for which a project already existed by another architect. Lodovico also patronized the building of the dome of the SS. Annunziata in Florence, adding enormously to the money that his father had left for that purpose. In 1470 Alberti gave advice on this, submitting a new plan. This was a very large building programme, particularly as the latest building, S. Andrea, was

²⁴ Trans. J. Leoni, ed. J. Rykwert, 1965, p. x. 'Boni viri, quod parietem aut porticum duxeris lautissimam, quod ornamenta postium columnarum tectique imposueris, et tuam et suam vicem comprobant et congratulantur vel ea re maxime, quod intelligunt quidem

te fructu hoc divitiarum tibi familiae posteris urbiq; plurimum decoris ac dignitatis adauxisse' (ed. G. Orlandi, i, 1966, p. 13).

²⁵ E. Marani and C. Perina, *Mantova, Le arti*, ii, 1961, chs. 3 and 4.

of unprecedented size for a new church in the fifteenth century. It seems to have been closely associated with Lodovico personally, as most of the work was seriously interrupted at his death, whereas much other architectural work was done by his successor, and there is criticism of the style of S. Sebastiano from his immediate circle during his lifetime.

A large oeuvre can also be associated from the 1450's with Pope Pius II²⁶ and Federico da Montefeltre,²⁷ and to a lesser extent with Alfonso V of Naples,²⁸ but in each case the situation is confused by the peculiar status of the patron: Pius worked through other people, partly for himself, partly for the church; Federico embellished with funds earned outside Urbino the city to which he had succeeded only by election; and Alfonso concentrated on military architecture and triumphal processions. Nevertheless in each case huge and expensive buildings were being seen as aspects of their patron. Leonello d'Este, Duke of Ferrara from 1441 until his death in 1450, was probably not a great patron of architecture,²⁹ although the destruction of much of the town and its outskirts by the Venetians in 1482 makes it difficult to be certain.

The Visconti in Milan built little after the death of Gian Galeazzo in 1402.³⁰ Francesco Sforza, duke from 1450, continued the work on the cathedral which had been interrupted for fifty years, continued the Certosa of Pavia, and began various other churches. Calling Filarete to Milan he put him in charge of the Castello and the new and very large Ospedale Maggiore. Filarete's building work for Francesco Sforza is less important than his treatise on architecture, written in the early 1460's and dedicated to Francesco, of which the best extant version is a copy dedicated to Piero de' Medici and probably written before 1465. Although very much indebted to Alberti this is planned as a dialogue between architect and patron, for whom it is a textbook. The theme is again that the quality of the building must reflect the dignity of the owner, but Alberti's discussion in terms of universals is simplified and treated in terms of real examples. The reasons for building are now utility and fame,³¹ and the houses suitable for certain ranks of society are described with sketch plans. Lodovico Gonzaga is used as a shining example of the best sort of patron, who builds in a correctly learned style. Filarete had probably never read any discussion of Magnificence, but he nevertheless reflects the conclusions of the argument both in the idea of a textbook on architectural patronage and in the pervasive notion of decorum.

In the absence of texts giving reasons why people built, it is difficult to be sure these patrons were of a type that did not exist before, conscious of the need to associate themselves with an architectural oeuvre. Certainly, like Palla Strozzi, many men continued to look after the ecclesiastical buildings in the neighbourhood of the family palace, but the scale of the later patrons is

²⁶ R. Rubinstein, *Pius II as patron of art*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, London 1957.

²⁷ For a list, see Vespasiano da Bisticci, *Vite di uomini illustri*, ed. d'Ancona/Aeschlimann, 1951, pp. 224-6.

²⁸ G. L. Hersey, 'The arch of Alfonso in Naples and its Pisanesque "Design"',

Master Drawings, vii, 1969, pp. 16-23.

²⁹ B. Zevi, *Biagio Rossetti*, 1960, pp. 20, 68.

³⁰ E. Arslan, in *Storia di Milano*, vii, 1956, pp. 621ff.

³¹ Filarete's *treatise on architecture*, ed. J. R. Spencer, 1965, bk. ii, fol. 8r. Translation volume, p. 16.

vastly larger. These men were also more preoccupied with style. They have been mentioned because they were the most extensive individual patrons, but it is notable that each employs a conspicuously Magnificent style. It is the classicizing attitude to ornament typical of this style which is the most notable characteristic of Italian architecture just after Brunelleschi. The convention of considering the patron as author of a building is illustrated by the lists of buildings put in patrons' biographies. That of Filippo Maria Visconti (died 1447) by Pier Candido Decembrio includes among its seventy-one chapters two entitled 'de aedificiis per eum conditis' and 'de cura, et restitutione sacrarum aedium'.³² Vespasiano da Bisticci's biographies are particularly rich in this, and although probably written in the 1480's no doubt reflect the prevailing opinion about his subjects at the time that he knew them. In his life of Cosimo de' Medici he makes no mention of Michelozzo as his architect, although he says that Maffei designed the Badia at Fiesole, and mentions 'uno maestro intendentissimo . . . che si chiamava Lorenzo' at Careggi.³³ The twenty-fifth book of Filarete's treatise is devoted to listing Cosimo's buildings,³⁴ but although Brunelleschi, Donatello, Luca della Robbia and Gozzoli, and the *intarsiatori* Gusto and Minore are named, the impression is always that Cosimo was the author. In the case of the Badia, Cosimo and Maffei were jointly responsible, according to Filarete, even though Michelozzo is mentioned elsewhere in the book. In the chronicle of S. Marco at Florence the prior, Lapaccini, who died in 1457, refers to the rebuilding in 1437 and to ' . . . magnificus viris Cosmo et Laurentio Medicis autoribus'.³⁵

The way in which attitudes towards the patronage of architecture changed in Tuscany may be summarized. Early in the century such patronage was on a small scale and local. From the 1430's Cosimo de' Medici began much larger works on sites throughout the area, and was criticized for doing so. In the 1430's Alberti wrote in *Della famiglia* that expenditure on building for the honour of the family was harmless, and could be practised freely. Francesco Filelfo, living in Milan but having been in Florence earlier, wrote in 1443 recommending *magnificentia*, the Aristotelian Magnificence, as a natural practice of the superior classes, although this was quite outside the context of architecture. By the time he was writing *De re aedificatoria* (1452) Alberti was much more specific about the building being related to the owner's social position and being seen in terms of the family's honour. Shortly after this Maffei used St. Thomas's treatment of Magnificence in order to defend Cosimo's work from criticism. During the 1450's some princes in Italy, in particular Lodovico Gonzaga and Francesco Sforza, began to build on a scale for which Cosimo was the only precedent. These events are too close to one another in time and too varying in character to be seen as a connected sequence, but they do document a clear change in taste either side of the mid-century. In all this Cosimo's position is slightly ironical, in that the argument that naturally formed around him in defence of patronage by a

³² P. C. Decembrio, *Vita Philippi Mariae illustri*, ed. cit., 1951, p. 416.

Viccomitis, in Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum*

Scriptores, 1731, vol. xx, cap. xxxvi, xxxvii.

The buildings in fact amount to very little.

³³ *La cronica di San Marco*, ed. R. Morçay, in *Archivio Storico Italiano*, 1913, p. 11.

³⁴ Vespasiano da Bisticci, *Vite di uomini*