

## The Politics of War: Paolo Uccello's *Equestrian Monument for Sir John Hawkwood in the Cathedral of Florence*

While Uccello's *Equestrian Monument* in Florence's Cathedral has long been admired as a spectacular example of Florentine early Renaissance mural painting, distinguished by its serene, ordered geometry, only in recent decades has the turbulent political climate in which it was created been linked to its iconography. The lists of the Cathedral's treasurers and members of its board of works who oversaw the commission, housed in the Archivio di Stato di Firenze, represent a neglected source of information illuminating the political allegiances of those who helped determine the work's iconography amidst the dramatic fallout from Florence's recent unsuccessful war with Lucca.

Strictly speaking, Uccello's two mural paintings and two stained glass windows in the Cathedral of Florence, Santa Maria del Fiore, are his only surviving works identified in contemporary documents, and so they are important for understanding the nature of the patronage he received. However, the patron-artist relationship is complicated by the corporate nature of the Cathedral's administration, and so the art-historical notion of a patron's individual intention or taste must be modified to incorporate the notion of a number of patrons' shared interests. This study of the *Equestrian Monument*<sup>1</sup> follows a methodology similar to Diane F. Zervas' study of the patronage of the Parte Guelfa (Guelf Party), a semi-official institution representing above all the interests of Florence's conservative, oligarchic families, which commissioned works by Brunelleschi and Donatello in the early part of the fifteenth century.<sup>2</sup> Like Zervas' book, this article examines the patrons' political positions within the commune to interpret iconographic choices in the commissioning of an artwork made for public display.

---

I am grateful to Margaret Haines for suggesting an investigation of the Wool Merchants' Guild's lists of officeholders might benefit the study of Uccello's commissions in Florence Cathedral. Funding for research in Italy was provided by a University of Melbourne Faculty of Arts TRIPS grant. Transcriptions and translations in this article are the author's unless stated otherwise.

<sup>1</sup> Detached mural painting, 820 x 515 cm (including the fictive frame), *fresco* and probably some *a secco* technique, transferred to canvas, later mounted on a masonite and aluminium support, Cathedral, Florence.

<sup>2</sup> Diane F. Zervas, *The Parte Guelfa, Brunelleschi and Donatello* (Locust Valley: J.J. Augustin, 1987). Corporate patronage in the Renaissance is a substantial topic, addressed in such recent studies as Jill Burke's *Changing Patrons: Social Identity and the Visual Arts in Renaissance Florence* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004). The present article is a case study of corporate patronage principally as it pertains to the *Equestrian Monument* commission.

Construction of the Cathedral began in the late thirteenth century, with supervision of the building work and its decoration given in 1331 to the wealthy and powerful Arte della Lana (Wool Merchants' Guild), whose members also frequently held prominent offices in the Florentine government. This was a consequence of the political system of republican Florence, which reserved government offices for members of the city's professional guilds. The government then delegated the maintenance of many of the city's key secular and religious institutions to the guilds. Thus, involvement with the commissioning of buildings and artworks was a fact of life for Florence's politicians, and was indeed a way to advance their political interests. The documents of the Wool Merchants' Guild in the Archivio di Stato di Firenze (Florentine State Archive) include a volume recording in Latin the terms of its members who served as *camarlinghi* (treasurers; *camerariis* in Latin) and *operai* (building supervisors; *operariis* in Latin): the so-called *Codice membranaceo contenente un registro per le diverse magistrature dell'Arte* (*Membranous Codex Containing a Register of the Various Offices of the Guild*). By the mid-1430s their staggered individual terms were limited to six and four months, respectively, with one *camarlingho* and eight *operai* usually in office at any one time.<sup>3</sup>

When Uccello first appears in the Cathedral's records, the letter written in 1432 by the Opera to enquire about his work at San Marco in Venice, none of the *camarlinghi* or *operai* is known to have a connection with him. Thus, Uccello's employment at the Cathedral seems to have come about by means other than prior association with them. However, his former master, Lorenzo Ghiberti, had been involved in work at the Cathedral since Uccello was a boy, was made a *capomaestro* (chief supervisor) of the cupola in 1420, and remained a *provveditore* (responsible for the day-to-day running of an institution) at the Cathedral until 1436.<sup>4</sup> Thus, he would have been in a good position to help his former assistant secure work there. Be that as it may, Uccello's important commissions at Santa Maria Novella and the Cathedral of Prato demonstrate that he was one of the leading mural painters in Tuscany in the early 1430s, making him an obvious candidate for commissions in the Cathedral, and his experience working in Venice was a

---

<sup>3</sup> The term '*membranaceo*' (membranous) describes a manuscript produced on leaves of unspecified animal skin. For an account of the administrative structure of the Opera del Duomo, see: Zervas, pp. 383–340, where it is noted that the number of *operai* who served at one time after 1410 was six. By the time of the *Equestrian Monument* commission, however, it was usually eight, sometimes briefly falling to six or rising to ten.

<sup>4</sup> Howard Saalman, *Filippo Brunelleschi: The Cupola of Santa Maria del Fiore*, eds A. Blunt and J. Harris (London: A. Zwemmer Ltd, 1980), pp. 56–57, 69, 133.

distinction that would have elevated him above the level of many of his local competitors in the eyes of the *operai*.

Uccello's first documented commission at the Cathedral was to commemorate a celebrated figure of fourteenth-century Italian warfare, Sir John Hawkwood (c. 1323-1394), the English military commander who came to the Italian peninsula with a company of English mercenaries during a lull in the Hundred Years War between England and France. After harassing the papacy at Avignon, the English companies took the most lucrative offers from among the constantly warring Italian states, taking payment both to conduct military campaigns for employers and to leave others in peace. Because of this, the *condottieri* (from the Italian word for their contract of employment: *condotta*) often had a fraught relationship with their Italian hosts. Their services became essential, to do without them exposed a state to its rivals' mercenaries or to the mercenaries' own terrorising, yet the mercenaries were inclined to renege their contracts without compunction, accepting more favourable offers from their employers' enemies. Their massacres of civilians added to their infamy, notorious among them the slaughter at Cesena led by Hawkwood in papal service in 1377. Internal conditions added to Florentine dependence on *condottieri* despite their uncongenial behaviour. The power of the city's knights, drawn from the ranks of the nobility, had had to be limited to curb their arrogant disregard for the rights of fellow citizens, while the merchant class became reluctant to leave their businesses to take up arms in defence of the city, or to allow their workers to do so.<sup>5</sup>

Hawkwood was for much of his career employed by the despotic Visconti regime of Milan and its sometime allies Pisa, Lucca, and Siena, when he came into conflict with Florence, the principal obstruction to the extension of Visconti political ambitions southward over the peninsula. Hawkwood became particularly close to his Milanese employer through his marriage to Bernabò Visconti's illegitimate daughter, Donnina, in 1377. Previously, in 1363 and 1364, while working for Pisa, Hawkwood had initiated a campaign of harassment of Florence, famously attacking the Brunelleschi family's Villa Petraia in Castello, taking the fortified village of Figline, defeating the Florentine commander Ranuccio Farnese at Incisa, setting fire to the Florentine *contado* (surrounding subject territories), and taunting the Florentines from outside their city walls. However, towards the end of Hawkwood's career he was won over to the Florentine side by the spectacular salaries and privileges it could afford. He subsequently enjoyed no decisive military victory over the Visconti, indeed his most significant triumph is recognized as a difficult

---

<sup>5</sup> C.C. Bayley, *War and Society in Renaissance Florence: The De Militia of Leonardo Bruni* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961), pp. 3–58.

retreat over the river Oglio. Nevertheless, Hawkwood maintained Florence's position while the Visconti regime declined through internal conflict and attrition.

The political significance of the *condottieri* in Renaissance Italy is indicated by the enormous financial rewards and honours they were given. In 1375 Florence granted Hawkwood and his company 130,000 florins, and gave Hawkwood a five-year salary of 600 florins, and a lifetime annual pension of 1200 florins, simply to desist attacking the city and its interests. In 1391 he was promised 2000 florins annually to enter Florence's employ, as well as 2000 florins for the dowry of each of his three daughters, an annual pension of 1000 florins for his wife should she outlive him, and Florentine citizenship for himself and his male descendents.<sup>6</sup>

Two of the honours bestowed on *condottieri* were portraits installed in public places and state funerals. In 1328 Simone Martini painted a portrait of Guidoriccio da Fogliano in the Palazzo Pubblico in Siena, showing the *condottiere* on horseback in a landscape with the castles he had captured for his employers. Around 1363 a papier-maché equestrian monument for Pietro Farnese was placed on a Roman sarcophagus in the Cathedral in Florence.<sup>7</sup> In the early years of the fifteenth century a polychrome wood statue of Paolo Savelli on horseback atop a marble sarcophagus was installed in the Basilica dei Frari in Venice.<sup>8</sup> Not surprisingly given the subject matter, there was an element of rivalry between Italian cities in the commissioning of such monuments. In Florence a portrait of the enemy *condottiere* Niccolò Piccinino, probably hanging upside-down in chains, was painted on the walls of the Palazzo della Signoria in 1428. Two years later a more flattering painting of Piccinino was made on a wall in Lucca, in gratitude for having

---

<sup>6</sup> John Temple-Leader's and Giuseppe Marcotti's classic biography *Sir John Hawkwood: Story of a Condottiere*, trans. Leader Scott (Florence: G. Barbèra, 1889) has been largely superseded by William Caferro's *John Hawkwood: An English Mercenary in Fourteenth-Century Italy* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006): pp. 43–61 (on Hawkwood's entry into Italy); 62–94 (on the role of *condottiere* in Italy in the fourteenth century); 97–208 (on his service for Pisa and Milan); 193–95 (on his marriage to Donnina); 22, 97–115 (on his 1363–64 campaign against Florence); 188–90 (on Cesena); 164, 175 (on Florence's 1375 settlement); 299 (on Florence's 1391 terms); 16, 20 (on the reasons for his popularity in Florence).

<sup>7</sup> Eve Borsook, 'The Power of Illusion: Fictive Tombs in Santa Maria del Fiore', in *Santa Maria del Fiore: The Cathedral and its Sculpture*, Acts of the International Symposium for the VII Centenary of the Cathedral of Florence, Villa i Tatti, 5–6 Jun. 1997, ed. M. Haines, (Fiesole: Edizioni Cadmo, 2001), 59–78, (pp. 62–63).

<sup>8</sup> Adriana Augusti, *Il Monumento a Paolo Savelli nella Basilica di S. Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, Venezia*, (Venice: Canal and Stamperia Editrice, [1994]).

saved it from the Florentines with whom they had been at war since 1429.<sup>9</sup> In 1433 Florence upped the ante by renewing plans for a depiction of Hawkwood in the Cathedral, symbolically its most important site.

The scholarly investigation of the *Equestrian Monument* began as early as 1686, with the first volume of Filippo Baldinucci's *Notizie dei Professori del Disegno*, in which documents from the Opera del Duomo (the cathedral's board of works) relating to the commission were first published.<sup>10</sup> Transcriptions were eventually made by Giovanni Poggi in 1909.<sup>11</sup> Eve Borsook then explored the technical, historical, and cultural context of the *Equestrian Monument* in four extensively researched publications between 1960 and 2001, and, importantly, began the investigation of the political context of the commission, a task that was taken up by Franco and Stefano Borsi, and Wendy Wegener in separate publications in 1992 and 1995, respectively.<sup>12</sup> In 1998 and 1999 Lorenza Melli published the results of an illuminating investigation of the *Study for the Equestrian Monument* housed in the Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe degli Uffizi, Florence.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Michael Mallett, *Mercenaries and their Masters: Warfare in Renaissance Italy* (London: The Bodley Head, 1974), pp. 94–95.

<sup>10</sup> Filippo Baldinucci, *Notizie dei professori del disegno* [...], 7 vols, reprint of Florence, 1845 ed., (Florence: Reproduzione Anastatica, Eurografica S.p.A., 1974–75; orig. ed. Turin, 1686–1728), I, p. 450.

<sup>11</sup> Giovanni Poggi, *Il Duomo di Firenze: Documenti sulla decorazione della chiesa e del campanile tratti dall'Archivio dell'Opera*, 2 vols, ed. M. Haines (Florence: Edizione Medicea, 1988; orig. ed. Berlin, 1909).

<sup>12</sup> Eve Borsook: *The Mural Painters of Tuscany: From Cimabue to Andrea del Sarto* (London, Phaidon Press, 1960), pp. 149–150; Second Edition, revised and enlarged (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), pp. 74–79; 'L'"Hawkwood" d'Uccello et la *Vie de Fabius Maximus* de Plutarque: Évolution d'un Projet de Cénotaphe', *Revue de l'Art*, 55 (1982), 44–51; 'The Power of Illusion', 59–78; Franco and Stefano Borsi, *Paolo Uccello*, trans. E. Powell (London: Thames and Hudson, 1994; orig. French ed., Paris, 1992), pp. 302–05; Wendy J. Wegener, 'That the Practice of Arms is Most Excellent Declare the Statutes of Valiant Men': The Luccan War and Florentine Political Ideology in Paintings by Uccello and Castagno', *Renaissance Studies*, 7, no. 2 (1995), 129–67.

<sup>13</sup> Lorenza Melli, 'Nuove indagini sui disegni di Paolo Uccello agli Uffizi: Disegno sottostante, tecnica, funzione', *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz*, XLII, no. 1, 1998, pp. 1–15, 33–35; 'A New Investigation of the Preparatory Drawing for the *Equestrian Monument to John Hawkwood* by Paolo Uccello: Its Genesis and Relationship with the Fresco', in *Le dessin sous-jacent et la technologie dans la peinture*, eds H. Verougstraete and R. van Schoute, with the collaboration of A. Dubois, Colloque XII, La peinture dans les Pays-Bas au 16e siècle, Pratiques d'atelier infrarouges et autres méthodes d'investigation, Bruges, 11–13 Sep. 1997, (Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1999), 261–72. Other important studies include Millard Meiss' 'The Original Position of Uccello's John Hawkwood', *Art Bulletin*, LII, no. 2 (1979), p. 23,

Nevertheless, one source of information has been neglected to date: the records made by the Wool Merchants' Guild of the *camarlinghi* and *operai* in office at the time of the commission. These can be used to begin to reconstruct the political allegiances of those responsible for determining the work's iconography, helping to interpret the *Equestrian Monument* further in the context of the factional disputes that divided Florence following the failed war with Lucca. Furthermore, the duration of the office holders' tenures may also help account for the evolving form the work took over the duration of the commission.

Borsook demonstrated how the cult of exemplary individuals was promoted in Florence through such activities as the translation of Plutarch's *Parallel Lives*, the collection of biographies of famous Greek and Roman men, under the influence of the humanist Chancellor Coluccio Salutati (1375-1406) and his disciple and successor Leonardo Bruni (1370-1444).<sup>14</sup> A project to honour eight Florentine worthies with marble monuments was initiated at the end of the fourteenth century when the Signoria discussed the idea during Salutati's chancellorship. In the end, the project was realized, under Bruni, in the Cathedral in a greatly modified form. Uccello's *Equestrian Monument* belongs to a series of four fictive tombs painted in pairs on the north and south aisle walls of the Cathedral for two *condottieri*, Sir John Hawkwood and Niccolò da Tolentino (the latter painted by Andrea del Castagno in 1455-1456), and two ecclesiastics, Cardinal Corsini (painted in 1422 by an unrecorded artist, perhaps Giovanni dal Ponte) and Fra Luigi de' Marsili (painted in 1439 by Bicci di Lorenzo). Interestingly, Salutati had written to the humanist Cardinal Pietro Corsini at Avignon for Latin translations of Plutarch's works, and Corsini may even have supplied Salutati rubrics for a translation of the *Parallel Lives* by 1394, while Fra Luigi de' Marsili was among Florence's leading humanists.<sup>15</sup> Thus, the four fictive monuments may be loosely tied together by the common thread of humanist culture: the warriors on the north wall glorified in the light of the humanist culture created by the scholars on the south wall.<sup>16</sup> The reason for the Opera's unprecedented decision to commission painted rather than

---

which argued that the work was originally painted some distance above the stone dado on which it currently rests. Dale Kent (*Cosimo de' Medici and the Florentine Renaissance: The Patron's Oeuvre* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), pp. 272-74) has examined the *Equestrian Monument* in the context of Cosimo de' Medici's patronage.

<sup>14</sup> Borsook, 'L' "Hawkwood"', pp. 44-51.

<sup>15</sup> R.G. Witt, *Hercules at the Crossroads: The Life, Work and Thought of Coluccio Salutati* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1983), pp. 302-03.

<sup>16</sup> On the monuments in the Cathedral, see Cecilia Frosinini, 'Testimonianze pittoriche e di arredo tra duecento e quattrocento', in *La Cattedrale di Santa Maria del Fiore a Firenze*, 2 vols, ed. C. Acidini

sculpted monuments is unclear, but may be attributed to thrift or haste. In the period of great activity prior to the consecration of the Cathedral in 1436 some of its furnishings were improvised in inexpensive materials with a view to replacing them with permanent fixtures in due course.<sup>17</sup> A belief in the power of painting to create a vivid impression in the Cathedral's bare, lofty interior may also lie behind the decision.<sup>18</sup>

A monument in marble to the English *condottiere* had been proposed by the Signoria while he was still alive, to be 'adorned with such stone and marble figures and armorial ensigns as shall seem convenient, either to the magnificence of the Commune of Florence, or to the honour and lasting fame of the said Sir John', and this was agreed to by the Opera in 1393.<sup>19</sup> Hawkwood died in March of the following year and a lavish funeral was held in Florence. The procession began at the Piazza della Signoria, moving to the Baptistery where his bier, draped in rich crimson velvet and gold brocade, was placed over the baptismal font. His remains were then interred in the choir of the Cathedral.<sup>20</sup> Meanwhile, a depiction of Hawkwood was painted, as Giovanni di Paolo Morelli noted in his *Ricordi*: 'He was very loyal and faithful to our Commune and, when he died, he was painted for posterity in the Camera del Comune'.<sup>21</sup> However, King Richard II interrupted the plans for Hawkwood's tomb by successfully petitioning Florence for

---

Luchinat, (Florence: Giunti/Cassa di Risparmio di Firenze, 1995), II, pp. 194–201, in which the Corsini monument is attributed to Giovanni di Marco, called Giovanni dal Ponte; and Borsook, 'The Power of Illusion', pp. 59–78. Others to be commemorated in the Cathedral in the fifteenth century included the poet Dante, the artist Giotto, and the architect-engineer Brunelleschi.

<sup>17</sup> Michaël J. Amy ('The Revised Attributions and Dates of Two 15th Century Mural Cycles for the Cathedral of Florence', *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz*, XLII, no. 1 (1998), 176–89) discussed this practice in relation to other mural paintings commissioned for Florence Cathedral in the 1430s. A cycle of *Apostles* (identified by Amy as painted in 1436 by Bicci di Lorenzo, Lippo di Andrea, Rossello di Jacopo Franchi, and Giovanni di Marcho, but since destroyed) was to be replaced or augmented by a commission in 1503 to Michelangelo for sculptures of the Apostles. Between 1435 and 1439 a wooden choir and altars for the radiating chapels were ordered and built, to be replaced by marble versions, beginning as early as 1439.

<sup>18</sup> Borsook, 'The Power of Illusion', p. 75.

<sup>19</sup> Temple-Leader and Marcotti, *Hawkwood*, pp. 276–77, the translation is by Leader Scott; Poggi., *Il Duomo*, II, pp. 123–24, doc. 2052.

<sup>20</sup> Caferro, *Hawkwood*, pp. 314–17.

<sup>21</sup> Giovanni Morelli, *Ricordi*, ed. V. Branca, Second Edition (Florence: Felice Le Monnier, 1969), p. 316: 'Fu uomo molto leale e fedele al nostro Comune e, come fu morto, fu dipinto per fama nella Camera del Comune'.

Hawkwood's remains in 1395, and rather than a marble monument in the Cathedral, a painted one was made by Agnolo Gaddi and Giuliano d'Arrigio (Pesello) in the same year.<sup>22</sup> It is unclear whether this was intended as a model for how the final version would look in stone, or whether enthusiasm for an expensive marble monument had waned following the loss to Britain of Hawkwood's remains, at which time the authorities became reconciled to the view that a painted monument would suffice.

Whatever the case, less than forty years later the painting had outlived its usefulness. On 13 July 1433 the Opera agreed to place notices at the Cathedral, the Baptistery, and Orsanmichele, announcing a competition for a model or design for a new monument to Hawkwood.<sup>23</sup> Borsook posed some cogent questions about the re-initiation of the project. Why re-commemorate Hawkwood instead of honouring any of the other men of diverse achievements originally considered for commemoration, but yet to be honoured? Borsook proposed a number of possible pragmatic motivations for the decision: Hawkwood's existing painting may have needed replacing, possibly due to water damage from a broken window recorded nearby at the time, or it may have succumbed to the program of renovation for the church interior being implemented in the fifteenth century. It might, though, be countered that damaged paintings can be more cheaply restored than re-commissioned, and that old-fashioned ones can be updated. Gaddi and Pesello were artists of repute, whose work would not likely have been lightly dismissed.

However, Borsook began to connect the project with its political context, noting that the wisdom of hiring *condottieri* had been a matter of public debate in Florence for some time. Bruni's tractate *De militia*, dedicated to Rinaldo degli Albizzi in 1420, had argued for the maintenance of a Florentine militia of knights. At the end of the war with Lucca the subject was again very relevant. The most recent military commander for the city, Niccolò da Tolentino, had not been very successful, was considered impetuous and grasping, and was a controversial figure due to his close ties with the Medici. This may explain why the Opera, then under the influence of the rival Albizzi faction, looked to an earlier *condottiere* to commemorate, one who might be viewed as successful, prudent, and more loyal to the commune.<sup>24</sup> Wendy Wegener expanded on

---

<sup>22</sup> Giovanni Poggi, 'Paolo Uccello e l'Orologio di S. Maria del Fiore', in *Miscellanea di storia dell'arte in onore di Igino Benvenuto Supino*, ed. Rivista d'Arte (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1933), 323–36 (pp. 322–23).

<sup>23</sup> Poggi, 'Il Duomo', II, p. 124, doc. 2054.

<sup>24</sup> Borsook: 'The Mural Painters', p. 75; 'L'"Hawkwood"', p. 45; 'The Power of Illusion', pp. 64–68. For the *De militia*, see: Bayley.

the *Equestrian Monument*'s links to the war with Lucca, which city had recently challenged Florence to show its mettle in the commemoration of a successful military commander in the war between the two cities. The war was concluded on 26 April 1433, at great cost and with few gains, before Florence had responded. Just a few months after the end of the war, then, the Florentine leadership had good cause to try to reclaim something of the city's military pride, and Hawkwood may have been considered a more successful warrior than any of the current crop. Wegener developed Borsook's argument, suggesting Hawkwood may have been chosen for re-commemoration as an uncontroversial *condottiere* from the not-too-distant past, acceptable to the Albizzi and Medici regimes, whose legacy could be used to promote the practice of using mercenaries, and whose indiscretions, such as they were, would have been long forgotten.<sup>25</sup>

There is no doubt that Hawkwood was successful in defending Florence, even if his achievements were exaggerated by the Florentines.<sup>26</sup> Whether he was impartial in dealing with Florence's internal politics, how loyal he was to the city, and whether his misdeeds were forgotten by its citizens are, however, moot points. After all, Hawkwood and his troops had been used to protect the Signoria during the suppression of the revolt of the *arti minori* (lesser guilds) in January 1382, allowing the restoration of the Guelf oligarchy of the *arti maggiori* (the principal guilds, including the Wool Merchants' Guild), headed by Maso degli Albizzi. The Albizzi and their supporters then gradually entrenched themselves in the centre of Florentine politics until their exile in 1434. The fact that Hawkwood resisted becoming involved in the suppression of more riots in March may demonstrate a reluctance to become a tool of the new regime, rather than even-handedness.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Wegener, 'Practice of Arms', pp. 153–62.

<sup>26</sup> Caferro (pp. 305–06) attributed a substantial amount of Hawkwood's glory for his famous retreat over the river Oglia to the Florentine propaganda machine.

<sup>27</sup> Caferro, pp. 227–28; Bayley, pp. 69, 194–95. Anthony Molho (*The Florentine Oligarchy of the Late Trecento, 1393–1402*, Doctoral Dissertation, Western Reserve University, 1965, (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms Inc., 1987) pp. 182–239, especially p. 193) observed that Hawkwood entered Florence's employ prior to the establishment of the Albizzi regime, but was personally inclined towards the politics of the *arti maggiori* (to which the Albizzi faction belonged). Gene Brucker (*The Civic World of Early Renaissance Florence*, (Princeton; Princeton University Press, 1977), pp. 60–101) described the end of the *arti minori* government as not a spectacular gain for the Albizzi family and the Guelf Party, since extreme conservative elements were restrained under the new regime, however, he noted that the Albizzi increased their power in the later crisis of 1393. For an account of the struggle for power of the

The Florentines were also forced to entice, cajole, and bribe the recalcitrant *condottiere* to remain in their service. A grandfather of an *operaio* who revived the *Equestrian Monument* in 1433, Guido di Soletto del Pera Baldovinetti, was one of a number of ambassadors sent to southern Italy to plead for Hawkwood's return to Florence's service in 1389, unsuccessfully.<sup>28</sup> The chronicler of fourteenth-century Florentine war and politics, Donato Velluti, was the grandfather of another *operaio*, Donato di Michele Velluti, who served two terms during the *Equestrian Monument* commission. The elder Velluti recorded Hawkwood's faithful service as captain, but in the period when he served Florence's enemies.<sup>29</sup>

So when Morelli referred to Hawkwood as 'loyal and faithful to our Commune', how is he to be understood? In his *Ricordi*, a manuscript relating the history of his family and of Florence, and containing words of advice to his sons on how they could get ahead in the city, Morelli also portrayed himself as loyal to the commune, but was frank about his aristocratic, Guelf perspective, distinguishing himself and his family from parvenus, artisans, and the lower classes.<sup>30</sup> For example, he advised his sons to associate with '*buoni uomini antichi di Firenze, guelfi e leali al Comune*' ('good men, long established in Florence, Guelf and loyal to the Commune').<sup>31</sup> For Morelli, loyalty to the commune was on a par with loyalty to the Guelf Party and its aristocratic values, and so it can be construed to have a specifically conservative political significance for him. Morelli served as *operaio* at the Cathedral in the interlude between the decision to hold a competition for the *Equestrian Monument* and the awarding of the commission, from January 1435, and his perspective was most likely shared by other representatives of Florence's social élite in the Opera.

Regardless of what popular sentiment may have grown up around the figure of Hawkwood after his death, the Florentine élite had long memories, were not likely to be taken in

---

conservative, oligarchic elite in Florentine politics in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in relation to their association with the Guelf Party, see: Zervas, 1987, pp. 13–46.

<sup>28</sup> Caferro, p. 282.

<sup>29</sup> Donato Velluti, *La Cronica domestica di Messer Donato Velluti*, eds Isidoro Del Lungo and Guglielmo Volpi, (Florence: G.C. Sansoni Editore, 1914, Tavola I). In the extensive genealogy of the Velluti family included in this edition, only one 'Michele' is present: one of the sons of the author of the *Cronica*. Hawkwood is mentioned in Velluti's *Cronica* on pp. 238, 280, 284, and 285. Donato di Michele Velluti served as *operaio* from May 1434 and July 1436; see the Appendix for a transcription of these and all subsequent offices referred to in this article.

<sup>30</sup> Gene Brucker, *Civic World*, pp. 36–37.

<sup>31</sup> Morelli, *Ricordi*, p. 196.

by propaganda, whether their own or someone else's, and were undoubtedly aware that the ultimate interest of *condottieri* such as Hawkwood was self-interest, but that this was not necessarily antithetical to their own, or their view of the commune's best interests. In the case of the most ambitious members of Florentine society, their self-interest and their view of the interests of the commune would have held much in common. Perhaps, then, there was also an element of self-interest on the part of the Albizzi faction in the choice of Hawkwood as the subject of commemoration in 1433.

September of that year saw the culmination of anti-Medici sentiment, growing in some quarters of Florence since the war, with the expulsion from Florence of leading members of the Medici faction by their enemies among Florence's oligarchic families. Cosimo and Averardo de' Medici were charged, among other things, with having conspired 'to induce the people of Florence to enter into a war with the Lucchesi, which was almost the ruin not only of the Florentine Republic, but of the conditions of all Italy.'<sup>32</sup> The hyperbole betrays the blame-shifting nature of the allegation; records suggest that in reality a majority of the Florentine *reggimento* had initially been in favour of the war with Lucca, including such leading figures as Rinaldo degli Albizzi and Neri Capponi.<sup>33</sup>

This major political upheaval coincided with a disruption to the orderly appointments by the Wool Merchants' Guild of its *camarlinghi*. New *camarlinghi* had taken office without interruption on the first of January and July for many years. At the beginning of 1434, however, a reorganisation was instigated (*'postea vigore reformationis sup[er]stetit'*) resulting in a delay of one month, and whose name appears in the list in February? None other than Giovanni di Messer Rinaldo Gianfigliuzzi, one of the leading figures of the anti-Medici party, who had also been a strong advocate of the war<sup>34</sup> (*'Iohan[n]es d[omi]ni raynaldi de Albizis* [~~'Albizis'~~ *crossed out] gianifiglazis p[ro] vj m[en]sib[us] Inceptis die p<sup>i</sup>o febr[uarij] 1433.'*). The scribe made a telling mistake, initially giving the surname as Albizzi, the family that provided one of the most aggressive opponents of the Medici, Rinaldo degli Albizzi.

The lists of the *camarlinghi* and *operai* show that members of the Albizzi faction were consolidating power in the lead up to the events of September 1433. The *camarlinghi* Andrea di Vieri Rondinelli and Piero di Giovanni Panciatichi held the purse strings for a year between them,

---

<sup>32</sup> Dale Kent, *The Rise of the Medici Faction in Florence 1426–1434* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), p. 257, the translation is Kent's.

<sup>33</sup> Kent, *Rise*, p. 258; Brucker, pp. 496–97.

<sup>34</sup> Kent, *Rise*, pp. 258, 294, 296, 317–319, 325, 356.

from July 1432 until July 1433, two weeks before the competition for the new Hawkwood commission was agreed to. Allowing for a few weeks in which the plans for the monument might have been discussed and the budget allocated, the project may well have been a legacy from the term of the latter *camarlingho*. An Albizzi faction sympathiser in the Opera not long before the announcement of the competition was Francesco di Messer Rinaldo Gianfigliuzzi, who joined in January 1433. Another, Andrea di Vieri Rondinelli, joined in April, Matteo di Nuccio Solosmei, joined in May but departed on 12 June, and Guido di Soletto del Pera Baldovinetti, joined at the beginning of July. Thus, when the competition for the commission was agreed to on 13 July, two of the eight *operai* are identifiable as from the Albizzi faction, with a third having been replaced only the day before. Subsequently, others also served as *operai*: Filippo di Bernardo Guadagni, from September; Antonio di Lionardo Raffacani and Jacopo di Messer Rinaldo Gianfigliuzzi, from January 1434; Biagio di Jacopo Guasconi, from May; Mariotto di Niccolò Baldovinetti, from July; and Bernardo di Ser Lodovico Doffi, from September.<sup>35</sup>

By September 1434, however, the power base of the Albizzi faction was unravelling. The Medici were recalled to Florence, and their enemies were in turn expelled, including Rinaldo degli Albizzi and his son Ormanno, or they were fined or barred from holding public office, punishments affecting every one of their supporters listed above.<sup>36</sup> The ascendancy of the Albizzi faction in 1433 may explain why the project for a new Hawkwood monument in the Cathedral was initiated. Hawkwood became a hero in the period at the end of the fourteenth century when Florentine politics began to be dominated by the conservative, oligarchic élite, led by Maso degli Albizzi, Rinaldo's father. The commission to re-commemorate Hawkwood was then, perhaps, an attempt to rekindle the memory of his military competence as a much-needed boost for the current regime whose own competence had become suspect. Hawkwood's success had laid the foundation for the period of political stability that the Albizzi regime had enjoyed at the end of the fourteenth century and the beginning of the fifteenth; he had in fact stood guard during the establishment of the regime, and it had been the Albizzi regime that had originally commemorated him in such a lavish manner.

Work resumed on Hawkwood's monument under the new Medici-friendly regime in 1436. Why? Perhaps because the project had already won the approval of the Opera and to stop it would have caused further unwanted disruption. A low-key resumption of power was a characteristic strategy of returned exile families in Florence, intended to avoid providing

---

<sup>35</sup> See the Appendix for a transcription of these and the other offices referred to in this article.

<sup>36</sup> Kent, *Rise*, pp. 294–330, 355–56.

remaining pockets of resistance a pretext for consolidating their opposition.<sup>37</sup> The Medici faction may also have believed the monument could be moulded to its advantage, by thwarting Hawkwood's apotheosis as an Albizzi faction hero, converting him to a non-partisan hero around whom all Florentines could rally, as Borsook suggested.<sup>38</sup> Perhaps they even felt it could be subtly manipulated to counter the accusations of warmongering made against them, as shall be discussed below. Unlike the then recently completed mural paintings in the Brancacci Chapel, which some scholars believe were vandalized to remove portraits of members of the Brancacci family exiled in 1434 with other members of the Albizzi faction, the *Equestrian Monument* could be made acceptable to the new regime by fine-tuning details of the as yet unfinished commission.<sup>39</sup>

While no prominent member of the Medici faction had served as *camarlingho* or *operaio* in the period of the commission prior to September 1434,<sup>40</sup> subsequently, the exertion of Medici-friendly influence could have been made through Antonio di Bartolomeo Corbinelli, appointed *camarlingho* on 1 July 1436, or Giuntino di Guido Giuntini, appointed *operaio* on 1 January 1435, Giovanni di Cocco Donati, appointed *operaio* on 18 January 1436, and Giovenco di Antonio de' Medici, the cousin of Cosimo de' Medici, appointed *operaio* on 1 March 1436.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Bayley, p. 69.

<sup>38</sup> Borsook, 'L' "Hawkwood"', p. 45.

<sup>39</sup> For a recent review of Heinrich Brockhaus' proposal that portraits of the Brancacci family were defaced in the *Saint Peter Raising the Son of Theophilus and Saint Peter Enthroned as Bishop of Antioch* scene, following their expulsion from Florence in 1434 (published in 'Die Brancacci-Kapelle in Florenz', *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorisches Instituts in Florenz*, III (1930), 160–82) see John T. Spike, *Masaccio* (New York, London, Paris: Abbeville Press, 1995), pp. 124–32. For a rejection of this hypothesis, see: Paul Joannides, 'Masaccio's Brancacci Chapel: Restoration and Revelation', *Apollo*, CXXXII, (1991), 26–32 (p. 26).

<sup>40</sup> Due to intermarriage among Florence's leading families, it would have been difficult to exclude all those with a connection to the Medici from the Opera, thus, Giovanni di Foresi Salviati, who married Valenza de' Medici, served as *operaio* from October 1433. Furthermore, his distant cousin Alamanno di Jacopo Salviati, who married Caterina de' Medici, has been identified as a Medici supporter (Kent, p. 353). For the relations between the Salviati and Medici families, see: Pierre Hurtubise, *Une Famille-témoin les Salviati* (Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1985), pp. 46–52 (p. 48 for Giovanni Salviati; Annexe A for the genealogy showing the relationship between Giovanni and Alamanno).

<sup>41</sup> Kent (*Cosimo*, p. 273) noted the close relationship of Giovenco and Cosimo, and the presence of the former on the Opera at the time of the commission as a likely conduit of the interests of the latter in relation to the commission.

Thus, one of the eight *operai* in office when the project was resumed on 18 May was a Medici, and a Medici supporter had left office the day before. Another Medici supporter, Neri di Gino Capponi was appointed *operaio* on 14 June 1436.<sup>42</sup> But for that matter, pro-Medici sentiment might have been expressed by any member of the Opera sufficiently astute to tell which way the political wind was blowing, an unmistakable sign of which was Cosimo de' Medici's term as Gonfaloniere di Giustizia (effectively the mayor) in January and February of 1435.<sup>43</sup> It seems, though, that the Medici at the beginning of their regime were slightly less rigorous in their control of the Opera than the Albizzi had been at the end of theirs. Two members of the Albizzi faction would serve at the Cathedral during the remainder of the period in which the commission for the *Equestrian Monument* continued: Donato di Michele Velluti<sup>44</sup> and Bartolomeo Fortini.<sup>45</sup>

On 18 March 1436 the Opera declared its intention to continue with the project, albeit in somewhat vague terms. On 26 May further deliberations were entered into, and on 30 May Uccello was awarded the commission to paint the monument in *terra verde* (literally 'green earth').<sup>46</sup> This represents a break from the manner of the earlier Corsini monument, painted in black and white in imitation of marble. Perhaps the appearance of the Corsini monument was considered not quite dramatic enough to compete with the Cathedral's massive bare walls, accounting for the introduction of colour and the increased scale in the next in the series of monuments.<sup>47</sup> Like Uccello's *Creation Stories*, painted in *terra verde* in the Chioostro Verde of Santa Maria Novella in the late 1420s or early 1430s, the *Equestrian Monument* depends for its visual force on the contrast between the light green earth pigment used for the subject, with some features picked out in stronger colours for clarity, and the deep red of the background. The colouring of the subject does not strictly imitate bronze sculpture, which traditionally may be gilded but not otherwise coloured, or stone or wood, which if painted, were usually coloured

---

<sup>42</sup> See the Appendix for a transcription of these and the other offices referred to in this article.

<sup>43</sup> Kent, *Rise*, p. 343.

<sup>44</sup> Based largely on Kent's 'List of those exiled or otherwise punished by the Balìa of 1434', *Rise*, pp. 355–57. It is not clear why it was deemed acceptable for Velluti to take office in July 1436 under the Medici. Perhaps it was because in September 1434 he had confessed to corruption during his term as *gonfaloniere*, accepting a large fine, thus rendering him a less potent political force (Bayley, p. 139).

<sup>45</sup> Borsook, 'L'“Hawkwood”', p. 47 n. 30; Nicolai Rubinstein, *The Government of Florence Under the Medici (1434 to 1494)*, Second Edition (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968; orig. ed. Oxford, 1966) p. 18 n.5.

<sup>46</sup> Poggi, *Il Duomo*, II, p. 124, docs 2055–2058.

<sup>47</sup> As suggested by Borsook, 'The Power of Illusion', pp. 69, 75.

naturalistically.<sup>48</sup> Still, there can be little doubt that the image alludes to a sculptural monument, and who better than Uccello, a painter trained in the workshop of one of Florence's leading sculptors, to carry out such a commission?

For the design of the horse Uccello may have recalled antique examples: the celebrated gilded bronze horses of San Marco in Venice, as is often suggested. For the sarcophagus, Uccello drew inspiration from a modern model in Donatello's and Michelozzo's *Tomb of Baldassare Cossa* in the Baptistery, made in the 1420s.<sup>49</sup> Uccello created a forceful design overall, restrained in its ornament, but enlivened by the glittering play of light and shadow over its geometrically conceived forms. The design makes a compromise between the profile view of the horse and rider on the one hand, and the looming *di sotto in su* (seen from below) depiction of the sarcophagus and base on the other. This represents an exaggeration of the strategies sometimes used in raised tomb sculptures to provide the observer with a satisfactory view of the deceased: their sculpted bodies are sometimes gently tipped up on their biers to allow the observer on the ground to see more of their face.<sup>50</sup> Uccello took advantage of his medium to achieve a degree of legibility in this respect that would have been almost impossible in sculpture. He also included refinements only a painter could achieve: the thin, fluttering ribbons trailing across the top of the sarcophagus, of a type commonly depicted flat against the supporting background surface in relief sculpture, are here shown dancing delicately on their edges across the sarcophagus. Similarly, the strands of the horse's tail are much finer than would have been feasible in any traditional sculptural

---

<sup>48</sup> Borsook ('L' "Hawkwood"', p. 46) proposed that the choice of *terra verde* may have been intended as an allusion specifically to a bronze monument, inspired by Lapo da Castiglionchio the Younger's freshly completed translation of Plutarch's biography of the Roman general Fabius Maximus. Plutarch related that an equestrian monument in bronze was erected in Maximus' honour on the Roman Capitol. Wegener ('Practice of Arms', pp. 134–35) cast doubt on this hypothesis, observing that the sarcophagus and base of the monument, usually made of stone in bronze equestrian monuments, are in the same green paint as the horse and rider. Furthermore, Wegener noted that the monument was not gilded, as antique bronze sculptures frequently were, and that the horse's trappings and other details are painted in red and black, in a manner unusual for bronze sculptures. Examples of naturalistically painted wood and stone sculpture are found in the horse and rider and sarcophagus of the *Equestrian Monument to Paolo Savelli* in the Basilica dei Frari, Venice.

<sup>49</sup> Borsook, 'The Power of Illusion', p. 73.

<sup>50</sup> An example is the tomb of Gian Antonio, son of the famous condottiere Gattamelata, in the Santo at Padua.

medium. Thus, the work represents an episode in the debate over the relative merits of painting and sculpture, known as the *paragone*.<sup>51</sup>

The execution of the monument, however, did not go smoothly. On 28 June the Opera decided with its *capomaestro* that the part of the painting showing the horse and rider should be erased, and on 6 July a new horse and rider were ordered.<sup>52</sup> The significance of this intervention by the patron has been recognized by Zervas as a rare documented case of the active role that a patron could play in the development and execution of an early Renaissance work of art.<sup>53</sup> Regrettably, the record does not explain precisely why the project was revised, only that it was ‘not painted as it should be’. Franco and Stefano Borsi assumed that since Uccello was eventually paid for the first and second versions of the horse and rider, his work must not have been at fault, rather, the setback resulted from an inefficiency of the Opera.<sup>54</sup> Two other pieces of circumstantial evidence tend to support this view.

First, following a penetrating analysis of the *Study for the Equestrian Monument* in the Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe degli Uffizi, Lorenza Melli has shown that the drawing bears numerous modifications made in a second stage of its execution, which may correspond to changes made by Uccello to the initial design at the request of the Opera. Where Hawkwood was initially depicted in the drawing in armour from head to foot, in the revised version of the drawing he wears armour only on the lower half of his body, exposing his head and showing him wearing a *giornea* (here a sleeveless jacket) and mantle. In the second version he is shorter and his legs are less far forward. The position of the horse’s reins and right, rear hoof were also modified, as was the perspective of the sarcophagus, which was altered from a profile view to *di sotto in su*. The changes made the rider less imposing and militaristic, and more humanist in character, as an identifiable individual in a more relaxed posture. The changes also made the horse’s stance less firmly planted on the sarcophagus and more delicately balanced, with only two hooves carrying its weight. It is not clear whether Uccello chiselled the first painting of the horse and rider off the wall of the Cathedral and started afresh, or whether he painted the modifications

---

<sup>51</sup> For a discussion of the rivalry between sculpture and painting in the early fifteenth century, including a brief reference to the *Equestrian Monument*, see Albert Châtelet, ‘Gentile da Fabriano, Pisanello et Robert Campin, de la réalité sculpturale à la réalité de la vie’, in *Studi in onore di Angiola Maria Romanini*, 2 vols, eds A. Cadei, M.R. Tosti-Croce, A.S. Malacatt, and A. Tomei, (Rome: Edizioni Sintesi Informazione, 1999), II, 707–14.

<sup>52</sup> Poggi, *Il Duomo*, II: p. 124, doc. 2058; p. 125, doc. 2059.

<sup>53</sup> Zervas, p. 5.

<sup>54</sup> Borsi and Borsi, p. 303.

over the top of the first version, although some technical and documentary evidence has been interpreted to suggest the latter.<sup>55</sup>

If the Opera initially approved the design as it was in the first phase of the drawing, why would it have been dissatisfied with the first version as it was painted? This question is all the more pertinent in light of the fact that Uccello's study is squared up to enlarge the design accurately on the wall. Indeed, it is famously the earliest surviving Renaissance drawing to have been treated in this manner. There is, however, evidence that Uccello had previously used this technique, and so would have been eminently qualified to reproduce his design on the wall of the Cathedral accurately.<sup>56</sup> The reason for the revision to the design more likely arose not with Uccello but with the corporate nature of the Opera, with its constantly changing personnel. Five of the *operai* in office when the commission was given to Uccello, who apparently approved the design in its first incarnation, were still in office when the revision was ordered. However, one of the original members had been replaced, as occurred from time to time due to other commitments, on 13 June, just over a fortnight before the change was ordered, and two new members had joined the Opera on 14 June, one of whom was the very prominent citizen Neri di

---

<sup>55</sup> Melli ('Nuove Indagini', p. 14; 'A New Investigation', p. 270) believed Uccello probably did not scrape off the first version of the horse and rider to paint the second version on a fresh *intonaco* (the last fine layer of plaster that absorbs the pigment in fresco painting), but applied the modifications *a secco* (pigment applied in an autonomous binder over the dried *intonaco*) over the first version. Melli argued that the relatively small sum Uccello received for the commission does not suggest that a complete repainting of the horse and rider occurred, and that areas of losses in the surface of the mural painting reported during restoration in the nineteenth century correspond to changes present in the study, losses that might have resulted from degraded *a secco* applications. Indeed, the outline of the earlier version of the horse's rear right hoof appears to be visible beneath the red background surrounding the final version. Although, no similar traces of the earlier version are visible through losses elsewhere on the surface of the mural painting.

<sup>56</sup> Borsook, *Mural Painters*, pp. 81–83: In the *Presentation of the Virgin* and the *Stoning of Saint Stephen* scenes in the Marcovaldi Chapel (also known as the Assunta Chapel) of the Cathedral in Prato the walls were marked out with grids of squares, made by snapping string rubbed with chalk against the damp *arricci* (the preparatory layers of mural paintings). For the compelling argument that these paintings can be attributed to Uccello and assistants working about 1435, see: Anna Padoa Rizzo, *La Cappella dell'Assunta nel Duomo di Prato* (Prato: Claudio Martini Editore, 1997). Curiously, the alignment of the squaring on the *Study for the Equestrian Monument* is not consistent over the entire support, perhaps because Uccello applied the squaring over the first version of the drawing and then reconfigured the support to better accommodate the changes he made for the second version?

Gino Capponi. Furthermore, the terms of two of the original *operai* finished at the end of June, to be replaced by two new members at the beginning of July.<sup>57</sup>

The second piece of circumstantial evidence supporting the idea that the revision resulted from the patrons' change of mind is that the end of June represented the first occasion since the commission was awarded that new members outnumbered incumbent members in the Opera. Even if the order to revise the commission was made a little prematurely, two days before the precise moment of transition, the two departing members would probably have had less power to stop the change in their last days in office, if indeed they had wanted to. It is tempting to deduce that Capponi, described by F.W. Kent as the second most powerful man in Florence from 1434 (after Cosimo de' Medici),<sup>58</sup> whose opinion would have carried more weight than most *operai*, might have exerted some particular influence on the execution of the project at this point. Capponi only served two weeks of his four-month term, just long enough to see the order made for the revision to the first version of the *Equestrian Monument*, before taking up his appointment as Gonfaloniere di Giustizia in July.<sup>59</sup> As one of the Dieci di Balìa (Florence's war committee made up of ten of its wealthiest citizens) during the conflict with Lucca, Capponi had been deeply involved in Florence's war efforts and worked closely with its *condottieri*. He had had a serious dispute with Rinaldo degli Albizzi over the prosecution of the war, and grew somewhat closer to the Medici as a result, becoming a supporter of theirs by 1434.<sup>60</sup> Might he have intervened in the commission for the *Equestrian Monument*, to take the Albizzi hero down a peg as it were, reducing him from a daunting militaristic figure to a less threatening one? Such a move could have found support in many quarters of Florence, notably among the Medici. While this seems a

---

<sup>57</sup> See the Appendix for a transcription of these and the other offices referred to in this article.

<sup>58</sup> Francis W. Kent (*Household and Lineage in Renaissance Florence: The Family Life of the Capponi, Ginori and Rucellai* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977) p. 223.

<sup>59</sup> Giuseppe M. Mecatti, *Storia cronologica della Città di Firenze*, 2 vols (Sala Bolognese: Arnaldo Forni Editore [1977]; orig. ed. Naples, 1755), II, p. 405.

<sup>60</sup> Kent, *Rise*, pp. 259–60, 264; Bayley, pp. 100–01, 114–15, 130–31. Albizzi believed Capponi overstepped his authority in attempting to recruit assistance for Florence's war effort from the pope, and had Capponi exiled from Florence in 1432, only to see the sentence revoked, allowing Capponi's return a few months later. In 1434, sensing a conspiracy between Capponi and the exiled Medici, Albizzi began compiling evidence to indict him, which came to nothing when the priors quashed his plan. F.W. Kent (pp. 222–23) described the increasingly close relationship between Neri Capponi and Cosimo de' Medici after 1434 as probably a '*mariage de convenance*'.

plausible hypothesis, on the limited evidence available about the Opera's deliberations at this point it must remain a matter for conjecture.

The miraculous survival of Uccello's *Study for the Equestrian Monument*, the only study of its kind for a fifteenth-century project for the Cathedral, and the documents for the evolution of the commission make the *Equestrian Monument* probably the best-recorded mural painting of the early Renaissance period. This may indirectly have allowed the impression to form that the types of changes it underwent were exceptional. Granted, the highly charged political environment in which the *Equestrian Monument* was executed may account for the patrons' great concern to achieve a satisfactory result. However, other kinds of evidence indicate that commissions in the Cathedral were modified in the course of their execution in circumstances that most likely involved a dialogue between artist and patron about the desired outcome. Uccello's own *Clockface with Four Male Heads (Evangelists?)* over the principal door inside the façade of the Cathedral is illustrative in this respect.

An entry in the Opera del Duomo's accounts, dated 22 February 1443, records a payment of forty *lire* to Uccello for the *Clockface*. Another entry on 2 April records a payment of ten *lire* for 125 pieces of gold leaf used to gild a star, presumably the original hand of the clock, and for painting the blue field around it.<sup>61</sup> During conservation of the *Clockface* by the Gabinetto dei Restauri della Soprintendenza alle Gallerie between 1963 and 1968 a number of layers of later overpainting were removed, revealing the *Clockface* as it now appears.<sup>62</sup> However, beneath the layer with the blue field in the centre of the clock, corresponding to the reference to blue pigment in the record of the second payment, yet another layer was found with a green centre and a fictive frame around the inner circumference of the clock, similar to the one around its outer circumference. The inner frame can be made out in some photographs through losses in the blue layer. Similarly, losses to the dark coloured background behind the heads in the corners reveal the presence of a light-blue layer, especially around the head in the bottom right corner.

The documentary evidence for the commission is somewhat ambiguous, and the two payments have been interpreted as reflecting either two phases of the commission for the

---

<sup>61</sup> Poggi, *Il Duomo*, II, p. 162, docs 2238, 2240.

<sup>62</sup> Umberto Baldini, 'L'Orologio dipinto da Paolo Uccello nel Duomo Fiorentino: Nuovi studi e precisazioni per la sua lettura', in *Gli "Oriuoli Meccanici" di Filippo di ser Brunellesco Lippi: Documenti e notizie inedite sull'arte dell'orologeria a Firenze/L'Orologio dipinto da Paolo Uccello nel Duomo fiorentino: Nuovi studi e precisazioni per la sua lettura* (Florence: Casa Editrice le Lettere, 2000), 35–70 (p. 38 n. 2). The treatment was carried out under the direction of Dino Dini, with the assistance of Guido Botticelli and Sabino Giovannoni.

*Clockface* corresponding to the changes made to its colour and design, or two kinds of reimbursement, the first for labour and the second for more expensive materials.<sup>63</sup> However, it is inconceivable that Uccello did not submit a presentation drawing for such an enormous commission (it is well over six metres high by six metres wide), and highly unlikely that he would have significantly altered its design solely on his own initiative, especially given its prominent location where his progress could be followed. Comparing the *Study for the Equestrian Monument* with the finished painting, it seems that Uccello was given a little latitude by the Opera in determining the shapes of certain contours and perhaps in adding small areas of colour, but not in subtracting any major detail; every feature in the drawing appears in the painting without significant alteration. Since the changes to the *Clockface* involve the omission of a significant feature of the original design, it seems likely that the change was ordered by the Opera for its own reasons, perhaps to improve its legibility: the gold hand of the clock would be easier to see against a plain, dark-blue background. Uccello might well have been in agreement about the desirability of this modification after seeing the partially completed work from the floor of the Cathedral for the first time.

Uccello's earlier difficulty with the Opera during the commission for the *Equestrian Monument*, and his considerable experience at the peak of his career in the 1440s, make any lack of care on his part in the execution of the *Clockface* unlikely. Furthermore, the Opera went on to award Uccello three more commissions in 1443 and 1444 for the designs of enormous stained glass windows in the drum of the cupola (of which two survive: the *Nativity* and the *Resurrection*), not something to be expected for an artist guilty of committing serial errors or wilful behaviour in the execution of commissions, but a reward to be expected for an artist capable of satisfying the Opera's fastidious requirements.<sup>64</sup>

The *Equestrian Monument* was effectively finished in time for the benediction of the Cathedral's newly completed cupola by the bishop of Fiesole on 30 August. The next day two recently-appointed *operai*, Francesco di Benedetto di Caroccio Strozzi and Simone di Nofri Bonacorsi, assessed the value of Uccello's work, for which he was paid on the same day.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> Frosinini, 'Testimonianze', p. 205; Baldini, 'L'Orologio', pp. 37–38. Where Frosinini saw the second payment as above all a reimbursement for Uccello's expenses, Baldini interpreted the second payment as relating to the revised version of the commission.

<sup>64</sup> Poggi, *Il Duomo*, I: p. 143, doc. 750; p. 144, doc. 754; and p. 145, doc. 761.

<sup>65</sup> Poggi, *Il Duomo*, II, p. 125, doc. 2060. Strozzi was appointed on 1 July, Bonacorsi at the end of June. See the Appendix for a transcription of these and the other offices referred to in this article.

However, yet more fine-tuning of the monument was required. On 17 December, a decision was made to renew the inscription under the direction of Bartolomeo di Ser Benedetto Fortini, appointed *operaio* on the 6th of that month. The nature of the first version of the inscription is unrecorded, and the document of the Opera's deliberation does not specify whether Uccello was the artist who modified it. Notwithstanding a few minor differences to the script used in the signature, the crisp, elegant, humanist letters of the second (and current) version of the inscription are, however, consistent with Uccello's style. The fact that the Opera ordered a change to the project under the direction of a new *operaio* three-and-a-half months after Uccello's work had been assessed and paid for is yet another indication that the Opera was capable of changing its mind about the form of one of its commissions and that this might be related to its changing personnel. Very much later, probably in 1524, the decorative painted frame was added with its elaborate torchères and fantastic creatures, altering the work's aspect yet again.<sup>66</sup>

The wording of the inscription on the *Equestrian Monument's* sarcophagus imitates part of a classical panegyric for Fabius Maximus, indicating that it depicts 'John Hawkwood, British knight, most prudent leader of his age and most expert in the art of war.' The panegyric was known to fifteenth-century scholars from a stone tablet, now housed in the Museo Archeologico in Florence. The inscription makes the *Equestrian Monument* an allegorical portrait, depicting Hawkwood as a modern Fabius Maximus.<sup>67</sup> The Romans made Quintus Fabius Maximus a dictator (a magistrate with extraordinary powers) in the third century BC to repel Hannibal, who had been marauding Tuscany as well as many other parts of Italy. Fabius tailed his foe, hampering his raiding parties, picking off his troops at opportune moments, and gradually wearing his opponent down without engaging in a full-blown battle. This strategy, though effective in minimising Hannibal's threat, earned Fabius Rome's dissatisfaction and the sobriquet 'the dawdler' (*cunctator*). In time, however, his caution came to be praised.<sup>68</sup> Uccello's depiction of Hawkwood's horse, with only its two left legs firmly planted on the sarcophagus, elicited

---

<sup>66</sup> Borsook, *Mural Painters* (1980), p. 77. The authorship of the frame is unrecorded, but is compatible with Credi's style and his documented restoration of the *Equestrian Monument* in 1524.

<sup>67</sup> Borsook, 'L'"Hawkwood"', p. 47; Borsook, 'The Power of Illusion', p. 73. The translation of the inscription is Caferro's (p. 318).

<sup>68</sup> The story of Fabius Maximus' role in the Hannibalic War was told by the Classical historian Appian of Alexandria (c. 95–c. 165), *Appian's Roman History*, trans. H. White, Revised Edition, eds J.D. Denniston and E. Iliff Robson, (Cambridge: W. Heinemann, 1955–64), I.

consternation from Giorgio Vasari, who thought this stance unnatural.<sup>69</sup> Specialists, however, have identified the pace as an amble (*ambio*), perhaps an allusion to Fabius the ‘dawdler’ and Hawkwood the ‘prudent’.<sup>70</sup> The poised gait was also used for the foremost horse drawing Federico da Montefeltro’s chariot on the reverse of Piero della Francesca’s double portrait of the ruler and his wife, housed in the Galleria degli Uffizi, whose Latin inscription similarly relates the male subject to the tradition of Roman military leadership.<sup>71</sup>

The humanist program of the *Equestrian Monument* certainly partakes of Leonardo Bruni’s republican rhetoric. His famous *Laudatio Florentinae Urbis* (*Panegyric to the City of Florence*) was composed in 1403-04 following the collapse of the Visconti empire. Like its classical model, Aelius Aristides’ *Panathenaicus*, Bruni’s text praises a city that resisted the despotism of a neighbouring state:<sup>72</sup>

Now this interest in republicanism is not new to the Florentine people, nor did it begin (as some people think) only a short time since. Rather, this struggle against tyranny was begun a long time ago when certain evil men undertook the worst crime of all – the destruction of the liberty, honour, and dignity of the Roman people. At that time, fired by a desire for freedom, the Florentines adopted their penchant for fighting and their zeal for the republican side, and this attitude has persisted down to the present day. If at other times these political factions were called by different names, still they were not really different. From the beginning Florence has always been united in one and the same cause against the invaders of the Roman state and it has constantly persevered in this policy to the present time. By Jove, this was caused by a just hatred of tyranny more than by the well-deserved respect due to the ancient fatherland. For who could bear that the Roman state, acquired with the kind of virtue that Camillus, Publicola, Fabricius, Curtius, Fabius, Regulus, Scipio, Marcellus, the Catos, and countless other very honourable and chaste men displayed, fell into the hands and under the domination of Caligula and other monsters and vile tyrants who were innocent of no vice and redeemed by no virtue?<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite de’più eccellenti pittori scultori e architettori italiani, nelle redazioni del 1550 e 1568*, testo, ed. G. Mardersteig (Florence: Sansoni Editore, 1966–87), III, p. 68: 1568 ed.

<sup>70</sup> Baldinucci, *Notizie*, I, pp. 442–46; Temple-Leader and Marcotti, pp. 295–96.

<sup>71</sup> Marilyn Aronberg Lavin, *Piero della Francesca* (London: Phaidon, 2002), pp. 260–264.

<sup>72</sup> Witt, *Hercules*, p. 123.

<sup>73</sup> Leonardo Bruni, *Panegyric to the City of Florence*, in *The Earthly Republic: Italian Humanists on Government and Society*, eds B.G. Kohl and R.G. Witt, with E.B. Welles, trans. B.G. Kohl (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1978), pp. 151–52; the translation is by B.G. Kohl.

By logic such as this, Hawkwood, as an instrument of Florence's military resistance to the Visconti, could be viewed as a continuation of Florence's traditional resistance to tyranny and defence of its republic, and as such a worthy heir to the Roman defenders of their republic, such as Fabius.

Despite Bruni's commentary with its description of Florence's love of fighting, the *Equestrian Monument* does not speak of military force so much as diligence: the inscription refers to prudence and expertise. In the wake of the disastrous war with Lucca and its socially divisive outcome, it is not surprising to find a somewhat cooler attitude to war being expressed in Florence in 1436. In the bronze sculptures made for them by Donatello, the Medici tempered triumphalism in the commissioning of monuments referring to the defence of the Florentine republic by masking the message in allegory and valorising the underdog, be it David in his battle with Goliath, or Judith and her struggle with Holofernes,<sup>74</sup> and to these might be added their probable influence over Uccello's fictive sculpture alluding to Fabius Maximus' conflict with Hannibal. Although the first two were nominally private commissions, they would have been visible to the many important visitors to the Medici palazzo. Uccello's celebrated *Battle* paintings commemorating (at least in part) an episode in the war with Lucca (now in the National Gallery, London, the Louvre, Paris, and the Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence) were most probably not Medici commissions as was long assumed, but were more likely commissioned by a Medici

---

<sup>74</sup> For a comprehensive discussion of Donatello's bronze *David* (Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence) and *Judith and Holofernes* (Palazzo Vecchio, Florence), see Francesco Cagliotti, *Donatello e i Medici: Storia del David e della Giuditta*, 2 vols (Città di Castello: Leo. S. Olschki Editore, 2000). Interestingly, Cagliotti (I, pp. 153–81) argued for a date for the *David* in the second half of the 1430s, roughly contemporary with Uccello's *Equestrian Monument*, suggesting that the two works may partake of the same culture of physically grand monuments tempered by a certain iconographic modesty (Hawkwood as a prudent leader, David as a humble youth). In their commissions the Medici developed an idea already formulated in Donatello's marble *David* carved for the Cathedral in 1408, subsequently acquired by the Signoria for its palazzo in 1416, where its inscription read: 'To those who fight bravely for their country God procures victory even against the most formidable enemies' (*Pro patria fortiter dimicantibus etiam adversus terribilissimos hostes Deus prestat victoriam*). The inscription from Donatello's marble *David* now housed in the Museo Nazionale del Bargello in Florence is given in Latin and translated into Italian in Cagliotti, I, p. 206.

supporter, Lionardo Bartolini, in the late 1430s.<sup>75</sup> It may have been because they were commissioned by a less conspicuous patron than the Medici that a much more triumphant and explicit depiction of the defence of Florence could be represented in these works. After Niccolò da Tolentino's death in 1434 the return of the Medici to Florence made it possible for his body to be brought to the city where it was interred in the Cathedral with great ceremony in March 1435.<sup>76</sup> However, it was only decades later, when the Medici were firmly established in power in the city and old resentments had subsided, that a lasting monument to commemorate Tolentino's achievements was painted by Andrea del Castagno as a pendant for Uccello's monument for Hawkwood in the Cathedral.

Hugh Hudson

Honorary Research Fellow

School of Art History, Cinema, Classics and Archaeology

The University of Melbourne

---

<sup>75</sup> Outi Merisalo, *Le Collezioni Medicee nel 1495: Deliberazioni degli Ufficiali dei Ribelli* (Florence: Associazione 'Amici del Bargello', 1999), pp. xvi, 56; Caglioti, I, pp. 266–67; Francesco Caglioti, 'Nouveautés sur la *Bataille de San Romano* de Paolo Uccello', *Revue du Louvre*, 4, (2001), 37–54 (pp. 45–46).

<sup>76</sup> Gordon Griffiths, 'The Political Significance of Uccello's *Battle of San Romano*', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, XLI (1978), 313–16 (p. 315).

## Appendix

Archivio di Stato di Firenze, Arte Della Lana, 39, *Codice membranaceo contenente un registro per le diverse magistrature dell'Arte*

In the fifteenth century the Florentine calendar began on 25 March. The dates in this transcription are in their original form.

[fol. 27<sup>r</sup>]

Cam[erariis] Op[er]a

Andreas verij de rondinellis	p[ro] vj m[en]sib[us] Inceptis die p <sup>i</sup> mo Iulij 1432
Pierus Ioh[ann]is de panciaticis	p[ro] vj m[en]sib[us] Initiadis [sic] die p <sup>i</sup> o Ianuarij 1432
Laurentius ceffi masinij	p[ro] vj m[en]sib[us] Inceptis die p <sup>i</sup> mo Iulij 1433
postea vigore reformationis sup[er]stetit p[ro] totum m[en]sem Ia[nuar]ij. d[ic]ti An[n]j.	
Iohan[nes] d[omi]ni raynaldi de Albizis	p[ro] vj m[en]sib[us] Inceptis die p <sup>i</sup> o febr[uarij] 1433.
[‘Albizis’ crossed out] gianifglazis	
Andreas raynaldi di rondinellis	p[ro] vj [‘j’ crossed out] j me[n]sib[us] Inceptis die p <sup>i</sup> mo febr [‘febr’ crossed out] <u>Agusti</u> [inserted above] 1434.
Nicolaus Iohan[n]oz debiliottis	p[ro] v m[en]sib[us] Inceptis die p <sup>i</sup> mo febr[uarij] 1434
Nicolaus luce deAlbizis	p[ro] vj m[en]sib[us] Inceptis die p <sup>i</sup> o Iulij 1435
Iohan[ne]s Andree Minerbetti	p[ro] vj m[en]sib[us] Inceptis die p <sup>i</sup> o Ia[nuar]ij 1435
Antonius barth[olom]eij corbinelli	p[ro] vj m[en]sib[us] Inceptis die p <sup>i</sup> o Iulij 1436.
Nicolaus Andree giugnj	p[ro] vj m[en]sib[us] Inceptis die p <sup>i</sup> o Ia[nuar]ij.1436.

[fol. 41<sup>r</sup>]

Operari[is]

Pierus Iohan[n]is Andree nerij lippi	p[ro]. iiij <sup>or</sup> . mensib[us] Initiadis die .13. octobris
Iohan[n]es Niccolai manetti defilicarij	1432
Antonius tom[m]asij gucij martinij et Filippus d[omi]nj blaxij deguasconibus	p[ro] iiij <sup>or</sup> mensib[us] Initiadis die p <sup>i</sup> mo novembris 1432.

Franciscus d[omi]nj raynaldi degianfiglazio	p[ro] iii <sup>or</sup> mensib[us] Initiatis die p <sup>o</sup> Ia[nuar]ij.
Antonius tedicis de Albizis	1432.
Alexius gherardi mattei doni	
Bonus Niccolai buoni dibusinis	
Lucas gregorij fecci Ubertini	p[ro] iii <sup>o</sup> m[en]sib[us] Initiatis die p <sup>o</sup> martij 1432
Angelus bindi Vernaccia	
Nerius ginj de capponibj	p[ro] iii <sup>o</sup> . m[en]sib[us] Initiatis die 23 Ap <sup>l</sup> is 1433.
Andreas verij derondinellis	
Nicolaus barth[olom]eij decorbinellis	p[ro] iii <sup>o</sup> m[en]sib[us] Inceptis die p <sup>o</sup> maij 1433
Niccolus matteij decorsinis	
Matteus Nuccj desolosmeis	
Franciscus b[e]ned[ic]ti carocij stroz	
Stefanus salvi filippi p[ro] a die 12. Iunij Inantea loco mattei nucci om[ne] officij[um] finivit do de p[ro]pter ex[e]c[ut]ionem Ad officij[um] xij bonor[um] miror[um] comu[n]is flor <sup>e</sup> .	
Miccael Johan[n]is di Riccialbanis	p[ro] iii <sup>or</sup> m[en]sib[us] Inceptis die p <sup>o</sup> Iulij 1433.
Guido soletti pere de baldovinettis	
Nicolaus Andree degiugnis	p[ro] iii <sup>or</sup> me[n]sib[us] Inceptis die p <sup>o</sup> mo
Bernardus Iacobi de Arrigis	settembr[is] 1433.
Filippus bernardi deguadagnis	
Laurentius Andree dnj ugonis	
Pierus Niccolai defilicaria p[ro] a die 29 . octobris Inante loco sti Bernardi di Arrigis om[ne] officij[um]/ finivit do die p[ro] adsu[m]ptionem officij[um] duor[um] prior[um]	
Iohan[n]es dni foresis desalviatis	p[ro] iii <sup>or</sup> mensib[us] Inceptis die p[‘p’ crossed out] xxi <sup>o</sup> mo octobr[is] 1433.
Matteus nerij defioravantibus	
Iacobus bartoli noffi deridolfis	p[ro] iii <sup>or</sup> me[n]sib[us]. Inceptis die p <sup>o</sup> mo

Pierus Ioh[ann]is dnj Ioh[ann]is deoricillarijs	novembris 1433.
Bernardius francisci desapitis Antonius leonardi deraffacanbj Iacobus dnj Raynaldi gianfiglaz Antonius ghez dellacasa	Fueru[n]t electi Inop[er]arais die qui[n]to Ia[nuar]ij. 1433. p[ro] totum/ Ip[r]m[o] mensem Ianuarij. Et refrenati [?] p[ro] totum/ mensem Aprilis 1434
Barth[olom]jeus ser benedicti ser landi fortinj Ubertinus gherardi risaliti	p[ro] iii <sup>or</sup> mensib[us] Inceptis die p <sup>o</sup> mo martij.1433.
Antonius barth[olom]eij ridolfi Andreas tomasi minerbetti	p[ro] iii <sup>or</sup> me[n]sib[us] Inceptis die xxij feb[ua]r[ij] 1433. Ult <sup>o</sup> [...]
Iacobus lionardi filippi stroz loco sti barth[olom]eij p[ro] a die p <sup>o</sup> mo Ulti[m]o Ap <sup>o</sup> lis 1434 Adp[ro]totum m[en]s[em] Iunj d[ict]j An[n]j.	
Matteus pieri banchi de Albizis Nicolaus Anselmi Anselmi Blaxius Iacobi dnj blaxi guasconi donatus miccaelis Velluti	p[ro] iii <sup>or</sup> me[n]sib[us] Inceptis die p <sup>o</sup> mo maij 1434.
Nicolaus Iohan[n]oz biliotti Nicolaus pieri popoleschi	p[ro] iii <sup>or</sup> me[n]sib[us] Inceptus die p <sup>o</sup> mo Iulj 1434
[fol. 41 <sup>v</sup> ] Operari[is]	
Laurentius Lapi deNiccolinis Mariottus d[omi]nj Niccolaj baldovinetti	Ult[imo] [...] p[ro] iii <sup>or</sup> me[n]s[ibus] Initiatis die nono/ Iulij 1434
Paulus vannis deoricellarijs Bartolus honofrij de bischeris	Quattuo[r] operari[is] p[ro] quattuor me[n]s[ibus] Initiatis/

B[ar]th[olom]eus bertaldi d[omi]nj filippi die p<sup>i</sup>mo settembris 1434  
decorsinis

Dominicus Niccolaj maghaldi

B[er]nardus ser lodovicj doffi loc [<sup>'loc'</sup> crossed out] op[er]arius loco mariottj di baldovinettis  
p[er]moti Ad offi[ci]um/ consulat[us] p[ro] residuo t[em]p[or]is [...] p[ro] A die p<sup>i</sup>mo settembris  
[...] Adp[ro] totu[m] die ottana me[n]sis dece[m]bris

Zenobius chocchi donati p[ro]toto m[en]se[m] decembr[is] 1434 Ind[e]

Tomasius barth[olom]eij corbinelli

Giuntinus guidonis giuntinj p[ro] iii<sup>o</sup> mensib[us] Inceptis de p<sup>i</sup>mo Ianuarij

Paulus gian[n]oz Vectorij 1434

Iohan[n]es pauli morelli

Clemens ciprianj ser Nigij

Raynerius xpofanj delpace p[ro] duob[us] mensib[us] Inceptis de p<sup>i</sup>mo

Iohan[n]es filippi cappelli Ia[nuar]ij. 1434.

Biancus silvestrj mag<sup>i</sup> benvenutj p[ro] iii<sup>o</sup> m[en]sib[us] Inceptis die p<sup>i</sup>mo martij

Simon francisci defilicaria 1434.

Laurentius Antonij spinelli p[ro] Adie ultimo Ap<sup>l</sup>is Inantea loco sti simonis

Lucas gregorij fecti ubertinj p[ro] iii<sup>o</sup> mensib[us] Inceptis die p<sup>i</sup>mo maj 1435.

Simon mariotti orlandinj

Barth[olom]eus sandri baroncelli

Crescius Laurentij crescij

Franciscus giacinotti boscolj p[ro] iii<sup>o</sup> mensib[us] Inceptis die p<sup>o</sup> Iulij 1435.

Filippus barth[olom]eij Valoris

Iohan[n]es ser falconis falconj p[ro] iii<sup>o</sup> m[en]sib[us] Inceptis die p<sup>o</sup> settembr[is]

Iohan[n]es silvestrj p[ro]p[ro]leschi 1435.

Iohan[n]es tedicis de Albizis  
Pazinus Iohan[n]is cicciaporci

Griolamus francisci delloscarfa p[ro] 4 m[en]sib[us] Inceptis die 6. sette[m]br[is]  
Iacobus Iohan[n]is giugnj 1435 ult<sup>a</sup> [...].

Bernardus francisci sapiti Ultarnj p[ro] 4. m[en]sib[us] Initiandis die p<sup>i</sup>mo novembr  
Antonius Ioh[ann]is dni Ioh[ann]is rucellaj 1435.

Alexander loysij Alexandri ser lamberti p[ro] 4. mensib[us] Inceptis die p<sup>o</sup> Ianuarij 1435  
Laurie[n]tius Andree d[omi]nj Ugonis  
destufa  
Zenobius Iodovici dellabadessa  
Alexander Iacobi Arrighi

Nicolaus francisci businijs p[ro] iii<sup>o</sup> m[en]sib[us] Inceptis die 18 Ianuarij  
Iohan[n]es chocchi donati 1435

Bertus francisci defilicariar p[ro] iii<sup>or</sup> m[en]sib[us] Inceptis die p<sup>i</sup>mo martij  
Giovincius Antonij demedicis 1435

Filippus giachi miccaelis p[ro] iii<sup>o</sup> m[en]sib[us] Inceptis die pmo maj 1436.  
Marchion Niccola gerij  
Antonius marsilij Vecchietti  
Franciscus tomasj Iohan[n]is

[fol. 42']

Operari[is]

Anfrione Laurentij pierj lenzi p[ro] lo[co] Antonj marsilij Vecchietti p[ro] a die 13 Iunij 1436  
Ad/ p[ro] totum mensem Agusti erus de[us] Dnij ./.

Nerinj ginj nerij capponj p[ro] iii<sup>or</sup> m[en]sib[us] Inceptis die 14 Iunij 1436.  
Bettus signorinij Mannj

Franciscus benedicti carocci stroz p[ro] iii<sup>or</sup> m[en]sib[us] Inceptis die p<sup>i</sup>mo Iulij 1436.  
Donatus miccaelis Velluti

Simon nofrij bonacursij p[ro] A die 13. Iu [date crossed out] Ultimo Iunij Ad die[i] 14 octobris  
1436. loco nerijginj

Nicolaus carioli macignj p[ro] iii<sup>o</sup> m[en]sib[us] Inceptis die p<sup>i</sup>mo settembris  
Nicolaus Ugonis de Alixandris 1436.  
Bernedetus Iohan[n]is pazani cicciaporci  
Alaman[n]us miccaelis Van[n]is dealbizis

Antonius tomasij de albertis p[ro] iii<sup>o</sup> mensib[us] Inceptus die p<sup>i</sup>mo  
Mariottus Laurientij benvenutj novembr[is].1436.

Laurentius lapi Niccolinj Ult<sup>a</sup> [...] p[ro] iii<sup>o</sup> m[en]sib[us] Inceptis die.6. ch  
Barth[olom]eus ser benedicti fortini m[e]s[em] novembr[is]

Iohan[n]es dominici giugnj p[ro] iii<sup>or</sup> mensib[us] Inceptis die p<sup>i</sup>o Ianuarij.1436.  
Nicolaus iohan[n]oz biliotti  
Raijsalitus Iacobi risaliti  
Pierus silvestri p[o]p[o]leschis