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Peruzzi's later years in Siena, spent as architect to the Republic of Siena from 1527 to 1535, remain shadowy and indistinct.¹ There have been, until now, few secure dates or certain facts. With the help of unpublished documents from the Archivio di Stato in Siena and five drawings in Peruzzi's hand, this article focuses on one episode during this period: a tour of inspection made by Peruzzi to the Valdichiana in 1528-29.² The documentation of this trip not only casts some light on this phase of Peruzzi's career, but also demonstrates vividly the extraordinary importance of the military architect during the Renaissance.³ It also allows some tentative observations to be made about the nature of military strategy and the defence of the hill town during the sixteenth century.

The towns of Chiusi, Cetona, and Sarteano formed a southern buffer for the Sienese Republic during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.⁴ Overlooking the Chiana valley, the towns guarded the Rome-Florence road, the sometimes hostile Perugian territory to the east, and Florentine territory to the north (Fig. 1). From time to time this position was threatened. Nearby Montepulciano, for example, slipped back and forth between the Florentines and the Sienese many times during the fifteenth century, and Chiusi itself, the continual object of attention from passing armies, was taken from Sienese control on more than one occasion.⁵

In 1527 Chiusi was again overrun. A band of 500 men under the Roman condottiere Pirro Colonna succeeded in taking Chiusi without firing a shot and with the traitorous help of the local aristocracy.⁶ Colonna's crew sacked the town and only on the payment of a large ransom was Chiusi returned to Sienese control.⁷ In order to ensure that such an outrage would not be repeated, the Sienese transferred one of their Roman officials, Girolamo Massaini, to Chiusi and set him the task — or so it would seem from the documents — of putting the Sienese towns of the Valdichiana into fighting trim.⁸ Massaini soon scouted the territory and saw the state of the defences: Montepulciano, Monte Fallonica, Chiusi, Sarteano, Cetona, and Chianciano all needed attention.⁹ He requested money from the government to make the necessary repairs and, as he wrote on 23 August 1528, the advice of Baldassare Peruzzi:

Io ho riveduta le mura in modo che io piglio ardire il dire a Vostre Signorie che in facto senza alcuna

¹ Modern studies have continued to reprint information derived from the published documents; see Isa Belli Barsali, Baldassare Peruzzi e le ville senesi del Cinquecento (S. Quirico d'Orcia, 1977), for the most up-to-date example.

² My gratitude goes to Professors Kathleen Weil-Garris (New York University) and Wolfgang Lott who advised in the preparation of my dissertation, 'Baldassare Peruzzi: Architect to the Republic of Siena 1527-1535' (New York University, 1977), from which this paper is partially excerpted.

³ The trip is conventionally dated March 1529 (note: all dates have been modernized); see Barsali, 135, or C.L. Frommel, Baldassare Peruzzi als Maler und Zeichner (Munich and Vienna, 1967), 21.

⁴ On the importance of the military architect during the Renaissance, see James S. Ackerman, The Architecture of Michelangelo (Hardmondsworth, 1970), 125-28.

⁵ On the importance of the region and its architecture, see Enrico Guidoni and Angela Marino, Territorio e città della Valdichiana (Rome, 1972), xlvi-1xxi.

⁶ Emanuele Repetti, Dizionario Geografico Fisico Storico della Toscana (Florence, 1833), 1, 719.

⁷ Giovanni Antonio Pecci, Memorie Storico-Critiche della Città di Siena dal 1480 al 1552 (Siena, 1780), ii, 8.

⁸ These letters were referred to by Pecci (ii, 3a) but have not, so far as I know, ever been transcribed.

⁹ Massaini had been familiar with Peruzzi and his talents while in Rome. There he had arranged for Peruzzi to be ransomed from the Imperial forces and sent to Siena; see Adams, 232-34.
dilatazione a la ricevuta di questa, quelle ci dovariamo mandare maestro Baldassarre.\textsuperscript{10}

The request was repeated on 9 October 1528:

Signori Conservatori ali quali molto mi recomando... felicità et publica et privata: con ricordarlo mandino maestro Baldassarre a vedere questa rocha et altri loci che non ci verra in vano.\textsuperscript{11}

And again, on 13 October 1528, in reference to the towns of Cetona and Sarteano:

... el venire di maestro Baldassarre da queste bande sara molto al proposito perché vedra quello che si fa tuctavia per la refectione di questa rocha.\textsuperscript{12}

Massaini seems to have received some sort of governmental confirmation, for a week later he appears to be awaiting Peruzzi’s arrival:

Expecto maestro Baldassarre per sicurare in tutto et per tutto di mura Chiusi et Sartheano più presto et meglio si puo.\textsuperscript{13}

But only a day later he is less sanguine about Peruzzi’s arrival. He fears that Peruzzi’s illness will prevent his coming and he requests, as a substitute, another architect:

Ricordarei a Vostre Signorie se non è molto indisposto mi mandasseno maestro Baldassarre; se non, con il consiglio di altri di buona intelligentia.\textsuperscript{14}

But Massaini must have been denied, for a month passes and two more letters plead for Peruzzi to come to the Valdichiana.\textsuperscript{15}

The situation seems finally to have been resolved in November, when Massaini writes as if aware that Peruzzi had left Siena and was due in Chiusi:

... le Signorie Vostre faceriano buona provisione in havere mandato maestro Baldassarre adli Chiancianesi li quali con suo consiglio vorriano fare due torrioni, et di poi qui ad Chiusi per sapere dove et come si habbi da murare.\textsuperscript{16}

And in fact we have a letter in Peruzzi’s own hand, published by both Milanesi and Gaye, which is dated 23 November 1528 and sent from Bagni Vignoni, where Peruzzi was then inspecting the bridge across the Orcia.\textsuperscript{17} Vignoni is three-quarters of the way to Chiusi, and it may probably be assumed that Peruzzi was on his way there. But he did not immediately arrive in Chiusi — or at least there is no record of it — and on 11 December 1528 we learn from Massaini that Peruzzi had fallen ill:

... li precessori di Vostre Signorie mi promessero far venire qua maestro Baldassarre lo quale per haver hauto qualche indispositione et facende non è mai venuto. Et la venuta sua saria molto necessaria con el consiglio del quale li Chiancianesi vorriano fare due torrioni.\textsuperscript{18}

On 22 December 1528 the need for Peruzzi’s advice had seemingly become critical. Massaini pleads for Peruzzi.\textsuperscript{19} And twice again, on 26 December 1528 and 2 January 1529, he begs for his help.\textsuperscript{20}

At long last, on 6 January 1529, Peruzzi comes to Chiusi. Massaini writes on 7 January 1529:

Maestro Baldassarre venne hiersera da Vignone; si expedira presto.\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{10} Archivio di Stato Siena (hereafter Ass) Balìa 581, no. 61.
\textsuperscript{11} Ass Balìa 583, no. 90.
\textsuperscript{12} Ass Balìa 584, no. 12.
\textsuperscript{13} Ass Balìa 584, no. 14.
\textsuperscript{14} Ass Balìa 584, no. 49.
\textsuperscript{15} Ass Balìa 584, no. 79; Balìa 585, no. 95.
\textsuperscript{16} Ass Balìa 586, no. 23.
\textsuperscript{17} Gaetano Milanesi, Documenti per la storia dell’arte senese (Siena, 1854), iii, 106-107; Giovanni Gaye, Carteggio inedito d’artisti (Florence, 1859), ii, 171.
\textsuperscript{18} Ass Balìa 586, no. 51.
\textsuperscript{19} Ass Balìa 588, no. 3.
\textsuperscript{20} Ass Balìa 587, no. 20; Balìa 600, no. 6.
\textsuperscript{21} Ass Balìa 600, no. 14.
It seems probable that Peruzzi had been forced to remain in Vignoni by his illness.

Peruzzi's help in Chiusi was much appreciated by Massaini. Peruzzi was not just a good military adviser, but as a recognized military authority he was an excellent psychological weapon:

La venuta di maestro Baldassarre sara stata utile et al governo di Vostre Signorie hara data reputazione etiam apresso li inimici. Imperoche come noi nel loro, cosi loro nel nostro hanno le spie, le quali et uno Perugino che per suoi negocii si trovava qua et Montepulcianesi deli primi in Citona, et Orvietani in Sarteano hanno inteso et visto essere stato mandato da queste bande un buono architector a vedere le roche et le terre di questi confini.  

Of the nature of Peruzzi's work for Massaini we gain little direct evidence from the documents; what there is will be reviewed later in connection with the drawings.

Peruzzi spent about a week in the Valdichiana area. On 15 January 1529, Massaini wrote the government to ensure that all had gone well on Peruzzi's return.  

A postscript to an earlier letter, perhaps dated 13 or 14 January but now misfiled in the Archivio di Stato and separated from its text, states that Peruzzi would return to Siena via Chianciano, Montepulciano, and Monte Falonica; that is, along the Foenna valley.

During this period Peruzzi must have done a great deal of drawing, preparing plans for the fortifications of the various towns. Later in 1529 a commission of the Sienese Balia was formed 'sopra el vedere li disegni di maestro Baldassarre per Chiusi.'  

It is fortunate that some of these drawings have survived.

Five drawings from the Uffizi in Florence can now be grouped together and associated with Peruzzi's trip of 1528-29 to the Valdichiana.

Four of the five drawings, Uffizi Architecture (hereafter UA) 608, 609, 612, and 617, are on paper having the same watermark.  

Three of these sheets, UA 608, 609, and 612, are executed in the same technique, further implying the unity of the group.  

It is evident that the fifth, UA 2070, is related to UA 617, and that it too belongs in this group.

The drawings are best considered one by one in relation to the documentary information provided by the letters of Massaini.

22 ASS Balia 588, no. 28.
23 ASS Balia 560, no. 37.
24 ASS Balia 588, no. 16.
25 ASS Balia 391, fol. 9.
26 With the exception of UA 612 (Fig. 4) and UA 617 verso (Fig. 4), these drawings have been published by Guidoni and Marino, 224 (UA 608), 240 (UA 609), 205 (UA 617), and 204 (UA 2070), but were not dated accurately.
27 This mark cannot be dated, but it is similar to one published by C.M. Briquet, Les Filigranes: dictionnaire historique des marques du papier des leur apparition vers 1282 jusqu'en 1600 (Leipzig, 1923), no. 2510.
28 Peruzzi appears to have used only pen and brown ink, brown wash, and red and black chalk.
29 Guidoni and Marino, 224-40.
30 ASS Balia 384, no. 12.
Intorno alle mura del dicto Sarteano andiamo hieri per tucto el Signore Bracco et io insieme con piu soldati et homini della terra et vedemo esser di bisogno il fianchegiarla in alcuni loci et farvi alzare le mura da due bande dove facilmente si potrebbe scalare.\(^{31}\)

We can now identify the weakened areas along the walls, and it can be seen that what Peruzzi sought to do was to provide the flanking coverage that Massaini called for. As at Cetona, Peruzzi’s proposals for Sarteano include the addition of bastions.

At one end of the town Peruzzi notes the presence of an obstruction to the best defence of the town. ‘Casa di Cento,’ he writes, ‘logo facile a pigliare.’ It was the practice to clear the area around the walls of a town or houses or large structures behind which the enemy might hide. It is possible that Peruzzi was suggesting that this house might be removed.

**UA 617** (Fig. 3): The most important and extensive of the drawings was for Chiusi.\(^{32}\) While the technique of distinguishing wall already built from wall that is proposed is generally followed here, there are some exceptions and local problems worth noting.

In the area of the *rocca* it is unclear what was already built and what constituted Peruzzi’s proposal.\(^{33}\) I have found no record of the construction of so elaborate a fortress at any time during Chiusi’s history, and today the site is occupied by an eighteenth-century villa.\(^{34}\) Furthermore, the walls surrounding the area designated ‘Monte che fa cavaliere contra la cipita’ (that is to say, a hill overlooking the city) are called *nove* (new). These walls, it would appear, were then under construction, although not as a result of Peruzzi’s initiative. Massaini writes to the Sienese government on 17 October 1528 asking whether he may use money intended to pay ‘al gran circuito delle mura nove’ for restoring the old walls.\(^{35}\) This large circuit of walls is almost certainly the area surrounding the *Monte*.

By referring to Massaini’s letters to the Sienese government, we can understand the manifold problems of Chiusi’s defence:

1. On the hill adjacent to the town (‘Monte che fa cavaliere’), enemy soldiers could set up their artillery and fire down into the town. Hence this new area had to be enclosed as shown on Peruzzi’s drawing.
2. The old walls needed to be rebuilt and given new, flanking bastions. The addition of these bastions form the bulk of Peruzzi’s proposals.
3. Like many border towns, Chiusi was politically divided. It became Peruzzi’s task, as architect, to resolve or mitigate these factors in Siena’s favour.

Chiusi was one of the most important outposts in the Sienese *contado*. It not only guarded the route from nearby towns such as Arezzo and Perugia, where many exiles had taken refuge, but also oversaw the north-south corridor between Rome and Florence. With Chiusi in the west and Grosseto in the east, the Sienese were able to control, or at least observe, all peninsular traffic. Perched above the Chiana valley, Chiusi was, as Massaini wrote, ‘la chiave della Chiana e un bastione a Siena.’\(^{36}\)

In 1527 Chiusi had been occupied by the army of Pirro Colonna.\(^{37}\) One of the major landowners in the town, Deo Dei, seems to have been among those who had treated for favours from the invaders and his loyalty, as Massaini wrote, was doubtful.\(^{38}\) One of the effects of the expansion of the walls was to deny to Deo frontage along them, and the result was that he no longer controlled who entered the town. Peruzzi, as we can see, placed a bastion to cover the remaining edge of his property, marked ‘Colomboa di Deo.’

On **UA 617 verso**, Peruzzi attacked the problem of the calculation of the number of *canne* of wall needed to build the wall and the restorations. The calculations appear to begin in the lower section of the *Monte* with the figure of 177 *canne*, but thereafter the numbers on the recto do not correspond with those on the verso.

---

\(^{31}\) Ibid.

\(^{32}\) On the history of Chiusi, see F. Bargagli Petrucci, *Montepulciano, Chiusi e la Valdichiana senese* (Bergamo, 1907); M. J. Gori, *Histoira della Città di Chiusi* (ms Siena, Biblioteca Comunale), A.v.16.

\(^{33}\) The scale of Peruzzi’s drawing does not allow one to make the distinctions that are possible in the other drawings.

\(^{34}\) The remains, indicated on a map published by Guidoni and Marino (201) bear little relation to Peruzzi’s plan. The remains are not sufficiently clear today to make possible any hypothesis on the site.

\(^{35}\) AS Siena 9, 584, no. 33.

\(^{36}\) AS Siena 9, 588, no. 3.

\(^{37}\) Pecci (ii, 8-9) notes that the papal forces, ‘... sotto la condotta di diversi colonelli, tra quali uno fu Pirro Colonna di Casel Piero con 500 fanti, e lo spedi a danni de’Sanesi, onde portosi a Chiusi con intendimento di alcuni Chiusini s’impadroni di quella Citta, ed entratovi dentro, senza conservare la fede a’Traiditori, lo pose a Sacco. Questo non pensato accidente cagione disturbo grandissimo ne’Sanesi.’

\(^{38}\) On 17 October 1528, Massaini writes to the Sienese government that Deo Dei has returned to the city, but with men described as ‘molti suspett’ (AS Siena 9, 584, no. 33). On 18 October 1528, Massaini suggests that Dei should be exiled; ‘... sia meglio sua sua stare qualche mese in Siena o nel territorio suo dove li parra altrove che qua ...’ (AS Siena 584, no. 79).
The copying of an antique inscription from the church of Santa Maria in Chiusi suggests something of Peruzzi's lively and diverse interests. A column of marble, found there and shown next to the church on UA 617 recto calls to his mind a similar column in Rome.

UA 612 (Fig. 5): Not all of Peruzzi's stops on this journey are documented in the Archivio di Stato. Near to Chiusi was, and is, the fortress of Becati Quest'Altro, an old Sienese outpost. Peruzzi proposed that two angle bastions be built at the corners of the old recinto. Lightly, in chalk, Peruzzi adds the cannon traces to show the shooting angle that his new bastions could provide. Today only the octagonal tower at the bottom apex of the recinto is still standing, so it is impossible to tell whether any work was ever done to conform with Peruzzi's plans.

In the lower right-hand corner of the sheet Peruzzi has drawn a small square fortress with angle bastions and cannon traces. In this sketch he does not use the rounded orecchioni that he used on the sketches for Chiusi and on the bastions he built at Siena. It is possible that Peruzzi thought of building this fortress to surround the tower of Becati and making it into a mastio for a new structure.

Guidoni and Marino, 264, attribute this drawing to Antonio da Sangallo the Younger. While the lines are somewhat sharper and more erratic than Peruzzi's usual hand, this may be because it was executed on site; and the handwriting seems to be close enough to Peruzzi's in its essentials to warrant an attribution to him.

The name Becati Quest'Altro needs some explanation. The Perugians and the Sienese did not always enjoy easy relations. Sections of the Valdichiana were often bitterly contested. As a challenge to the Sienese, the Perugians built a small tower on a hill overlooking the Chiana during the late thirteenth century and gave it the provocative name Becati Questo, which means 'Take that!' In response, the Sienese built their tower adjacent and called it Becati Quest'Altro, 'Here's back at you!' Guidoni and Marino, 198; Nello Manelli, Chiusi: Becati Questo! Becati Quest'Altro! (Siena, 1961), 8.
UA 609 (Fig. 6): From documents we learn that Peruzzi visited other towns on his return to Siena. Massaini tells the government that Peruzzi is expected to return via Monte Fallonica, Montepulciano, Chianciano, and Torrita. Unfortunately only one drawing, for Torrita di Siena, survives to record this phase of Peruzzi’s journey.

Peruzzi’s proposals for Torrita generally recall those that he made for Cetona and Sarteano. They attempt to give the old walls better flanking coverage from new bastions. Like the Cetona-Sarteano sheet (Fig. 2), Peruzzi uses the same technique of red chalk and wash to indicate his proposals.

At the head of the town, overlooking the Foenna valley, Peruzzi has drawn a fortified church. This peculiar form appears to combine a bastion and its salients and orecchioni with a church. There are, today, two churches near the site, one within the town walls and the other without. Neither is close enough to the walls to suggest that it was the model for this plan. Furthermore it is hard to understand what Peruzzi intended for this site since the land falls off so sharply that it would hardly have been possible to build a bastion partially within and partially without the walls.

Peruzzi’s plans for these outpost towns can be compared strategically to the work with which he was then involved in Siena. There, in a series of defensive additions, he was reinforcing the old walls with five new bastions. Those that are still standing, such as the one at the Porta S. Viene, show a plan similar to many of those proposed in these sheets. But what distinguishes the bastions in Siena from those Peruzzi planned for the Chiana towns is not so much their form as their strategic location. The bastions in Siena are sited to make a specific defensive contribution based on the needs of key areas, while the drawings for the Chiana towns have bastions dotted all along the walls. The ambitiousness of the proposals for the Chiana towns contrasts sharply with the spare solution to the defensive dilemmas of Siena.

Why is there this difference? To answer this question we must turn to look at the graphic stage of the drawings. Clearly, none are final copies intended for presentation to a government committee. The Chiusi maps have many corrections, and underdrawings of one sort or another are visible on most of the sheets. Yet this does not
mean that they all were, necessarily, drawn on the site. Only a drawing such as UA 2070 seems to be the kind of drawing that would have been made on the site. The lines are extremely rough, overlapping one another in stretches. By comparison the other four drawings seem much more finished. In all likelihood they are secondary drawings, executed while Peruzzi was still able to consult the actual outline of the walls, but nonetheless somewhat farther along than a first sketch. A series of sketches made while standing before the walls, like UA 2070, would then have been followed by an underdrawing on sheets such as UA 608, 609, and 617. It is possible that prior to his departure Peruzzi would have made a final corrected version of a kind we do not have. Certainly when it came time for presentation he would have offered something a good deal more finished than the sheets that have survived.

How seriously are we to take Peruzzi's proposals? Did he, in fact, want to build a fortified church in Torrita overlooking the Foenna valley? Did he imagine that it would have been possible to build seventeen bastions around the walls at Chiusi when only five had been constructed at Siena? These sketches seem almost like fantasy fortifications for the defence of towns with infinitely large budgets. But apart from the fact we have no information about the elevation of the fortifications he planned (and they might only have been planned as metre-high walls in packed earth), we cannot pass judgment on this point. It has been fashionable for modern critics to complain that Peruzzi was overly fond of drawing and that he occasionally let his imagination run away with him. In the case of these drawings, however, it can be objected that we simply do not know the instructions given to Peruzzi nor the circumstances under which they were drawn. Was he asked, in fact, to provide an ideal defensive system that could be pruned away as it passed through the governmental committees? Perhaps local pressure was brought to bear on Peruzzi; local officials often dream in a grandiose way and they may have asked to see an ideal plan for their town. It is possible that Peruzzi used these drawings as instructional pieces when he returned to Siena. One thing is sure. The final drawings that Peruzzi submitted to the government, and which we no longer possess, looked much different. Peruzzi knew the difference between a possible and an impossible solution.

44 There is no evidence that more than five bastions were ever planned for Siena; see Adams, 21-42.
45 In reference to Peruzzi's drawings for the church of S. Domenico in Siena, Howard Burns writes: 'he displayed in these all his inventiveness, all his skill as a draughtsman, and all his compulsive dedication to the elaboration of innumerable alternatives, which may well have absorbed energies which would have been more profitably spent in selling a rather clearer and more limited choice of alternatives to his patrons.' Andrea Palladio 1508-1580: the Portico and the Farmyard, ed. Burns, Bruce Boucher, and Lynda Fairbairn (London, 1975), 266. I have challenged this assumption about Peruzzi elsewhere; see Adams, 'Congenial Fictions: Vasari's Baldassare Peruzzi,' paper presented at the thirty-first annual meeting of the Society of Architectural Historians, San Antonio, Texas (April 1978).
46 One of Peruzzi's responsibilities as architect to the Republic was to teach younger architects. Peruzzi made other trips of this nature. In 1532 he was back in the Chiusi area and also visited the Maremma in that year to inspect the fields after a recent flood; see Adams, 'Peruzzi,' 4-6, 242, 252-57.

---

CATALOGUE OF DRAWINGS

1 UA 608 recto (Fig. 2)
Map of the walls of the towns of Cetona and Sarteano.
Pen and brown ink, wash, red and black chalk.
57.2 × 42.2 cm (heavily folded in middle).
Watermark: Briquet, Les Filigranes, 2510 (similar)
Script: (Cetona) Gironde dela Rocha di Cetona / via Navacca / rocha / rivellino
(Sarteano) Ciptadella di Sarteano / Casa di Cento logo facile a pigliare / porta rocha

2 UA 609 recto (Fig. 6)
Map of the walls of the town of Torrita di Siena.
Pen and brown ink, wash, red and black chalk.
27.9 × 47.0 cm.
Watermark: As in 608.
Script: fosso con Carbonaia / Torrita / fosso con Carbonaia / fosso con carbonaia / porta a pago / fosso / M.S. / chiesa / porta ala Lavina.

3 UA 612 recto (Fig. 5)
Plan of the fortress of Becati Quest'Altro.
Pen and brown ink, wash and red chalk.
37.7 × 26.4 cm.
Watermark: As in 608.
Script: Chiane / Chiane / Porto di Beccati Quest'altro / Torre di beccati quest'altro / Chiane / Chiane.
4 UA 617 recto (Fig. 3)
Map of the walls of the town of Chiusi.
Pen and brown ink, wash, red and black chalk.
65.4 × 40.5 cm (unevenly cut).
Watermark: As in 608.
Script: porta del Soccorso / rivellino / mastio / fosso /
Roche / fosso / fosso / ripe / ripe / porta a le vigne /
Clusio Sancta Maria / mura bassa / Orto di dei / ripe /
principio del palazzo di dei / casa di dei /
Colombaio di dei / canne 120 el betussio / sancto
antonio / ripa / Monte che fa Cavaliere contra la
cipta / San Silvestro / novo / ripe / nove / Porta
vechio a San Silvestro / torrione nove / ripa / ripe /
nove / nove / muro novo / Torrione novo / ripe /
novo / mura nove / vecchio / canne 43 / vecchio /
fosso / fosso / vescovado / San Socondiano / ripe /
ripe / ripe
Verso. Script: el muro gia facto da farsi al braccia
4 in longo / Canne 177 et grosso braccia 3 fa
canne 331 / per un pezo di muro dove e la citerna
longo canne 15 grosso braccia 3 fa canne 135 / el
muro novo da farsi e lungo canne 43 alto braccia 8 e
grosso braccia 3 fa Canne 458 / una torre di drietto
canne 9 de simile grosseza e altezza fa canne 71 et el
botusso lungo Canne 104 alte braccia 8 e grosso
braccia 11/2 fa canne con deci fianchi fa canne 260 /
la porta a San Silvestro longo braccia 14 alta braccia
3 grosso braccia 4 fa canne 31½ / Saranno tulti li
sopra dicti muri canne 1,486½.
(in chalk) muro da farsi / canne 93 longo canne 450 /
muro facto canne 177 grosso braccia 3 fa canne 531 /
canne 41 grosso braccia 3 / el resto grosso braccia
2½ /
(new hand) per (illegible) Chiusci et fiorenza
5 UA 2070 recto (Fig. 4)
Sketch of a section of the walls of the town of Chiusi.
Pen and brown ink.
28.3 × 20.9 cm.
Watermark: not traceable in Briquet.
Script: a chiuci in Sancta Maria / A. ORSMINNIUS. ONICVS
SIBI ET VETRIVIAE PRIMI GENIAE VXORI ORSMINNIO
PRIMO FILIO ORSMINNIAE ANTOGONAE / Trovasi in
Sancta Maria di Chiuci una Colonna di uno mischio
bellissimo grossa circa 2/3 di braccio e alta circa
braccia 4 dela qual sorte ne hara una sopto el mazo
dela spina in capitolio e due altre di simile pietra
sonno in la chiesa di marcelli in Roma / casa di dei
(illegible) / torre del colombo di deio / canne 41½ /
casa di deio
Verso. Script: Deio