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Résumé de l’article
Le portrait de Pontormo à Baltimore que l’on croyait être, depuis 1940, celui de Maria Salviati et son fils Cosimo serait plutôt celui de la jeune femme et Giulia de’ Medici, reprenant ainsi la description avec “una puttina” de l’inventaire Riccardi de 1612. La grande ressemblance entre la fillette et son père Alessandro de’ Medici que l’on peut observer dans un portrait exécuté par Pontormo en 1534-35 (Philadelphie), et dans un second de Lucca, identifié récemment comme celui d’Alessandro de’ Medici, jeune homme permet d’identifier Giulia avec certitude. L’âge de la jeune fille, les signes de la maladie qui emportèrent Maria Salviati et les circonstances de la commande permettent d’avancer la date de 1540 pour le portrait de Baltimore. Ce portrait a une fonction politique évidente. Il affirme le rôle de Cosimo comme “gardien légal” de la branche aînée de la famille Médicis contre les intrigues du frère de Giulia pour le titre de Cosimo. La représentation de Maria Salviati vient probablement du portrait Castello (perdu) de Pontormo de 1537. Cet article analysera aussi les relations intimes entre Giulia et Cosimo et leurs ancêtres médicéens dans un portrait d’Alessandro Allori, la Dame au camée, exécuté en 1559, (Offices) où, âgée de vingt-cinq ans environ, elle est représentée en veuve.
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Résumé

Le portrait de Pontormo à Baltimore que l'on croyait être, depuis 1940, celui de Maria Salviati et son fils Cosimo serait plutôt celui de la jeune femme et Giulia de’ Medici, reprenant ainsi la description avec “una puttina” de l’inventaire Riccardi de 1612. La grande ressemblance entre la fillette et son père Alessandro de’ Medici que l’on peut observer dans un portrait exécuté par Pontormo en 1534–35 (Philadelphia), et dans un second de Luca, identifié récemment comme celui d’Alessandro de Medici, jeune homme permet d’identifier Giulia avec certitude. L’âge de la jeune fille, les signes de la maladie qui emportèrent Maria Salviati et les circonstances de la commande permettent d’avancer la date de 1540 pour le portrait de Baltimore. Ce portrait a une fonction politique évidente. Il affirme le rôle de Cosimo comme “gardien légal” de la branche aînée de la famille Médici contre les intrigues du frère de Giulia pour le titre de Cosimo. La représentation de Maria Salviati vient probablement du portrait Castello (perdu) de Pontormo de 1537. Cet article analysera aussi les relations intimes entre Giulia et Cosimo et leurs ancêtres médicis dans un portrait d’Alessandro Allori, la Dame au camée, exécuté en 1559, (Offices) où, âgée de vingt-cinq ans environ, elle est représentée en veuve.

Cosimo de’ Medici was no amateur propagandist when he promoted the legitimacy of his sudden succession as Duke of Florence following the murder of his cousin, Duke Alessandro, in 1537. According to Vasari, the seventeen-year old Duke first routed his fuoricittà enemies at the Battle of Montemurlo and, peace established, promptly commissioned Jacopo Pontormo to fresco his mother’s villa at Castello. Tribolo’s garden program there promoted Cosimo both as a new Augustus and as Apollo. Vasari also noted that Pontormo’s commission included portraits of both mother and son.1

Whether the portrait of Maria Salviati was on panel or intended solely for the now-lost Castello frescoes is unclear. Fresco portraits of her exist in propagandistic cycles in the Palazzo Vecchio, all painted after her death in 1543,2 and several panel portraits have been identified,3 but the focus of this study will be the Pontormo panel known as Maria Salviati with her son Cosimo (Fig. 1) in the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, believed by some scholars to be the Castello version.4 Pontormo’s Medici portraits in the decade before and after Cosimo’s accession are also explored for the light they cast on a moment of internal change to Medici succession. New dates and identities, and one reattribution, will be proposed for some of these.

In November 1526 the death in action of Giovanni delle Bande Nere de’ Medici left Maria widowed at twenty-seven when her only child Cosimo was almost eight. Declaring herself exclusively committed to him, she assiduously groomed the sole legitimate Medici scion for his place in history.5 As in all subsequent portrayals of her, the Baltimore portrait shows Maria pale, serious, unadorned and heavily veiled—a paradigm of decorous widowhood.6 Its attribution to Pontormo has been almost universally accepted,7 and a few scholars have proposed that it may be the Castello work referred to by Vasari, which would make it the first official portrait of Maria as mother of the new Duke.8 Certainly, Maria’s appearance in the portrait accords with this assumption: she was thirty-eight at the time of Cosimo’s accession. (She died in 1543 at Castello at the age of forty-four.9) Other scholars take the child’s age and evidence of Maria’s widowhood—her heavy veiling and lack of adornment—into account to arrive at 1526, the first year of her widowhood, to accommodate the very tender age of the child.10 The child seems younger than almost eight, however, so that a few scholars have proposed that this was a retrospective commission, made either after Cosimo’s accession in 1537 or after Maria’s death in 1543, presumably to commemorate her guiding role in his life.11

The portrait, previously in the Riccardi collection, was acquired by the Walters Art Gallery in 1902. Maria’s identity was secured by Edward King in 1940, when he matched her image to Vasari’s tondo in the Sala Giovanni delle Bande Nere in the Palazzo Vecchio, painted in 1556, where Vasari’s program extols Cosimo’s parentage (Fig. 3). King believed that the panel was the source for the Palazzo Vecchio tondo. X-ray examination and cleaning of the panel in 1937 had revealed the presence of the child, proposed by King as Cosimo.12 In 1959, however, Keutner discovered that a 1612 Riccardi inventory recorded Pontormo’s portrait but described the child as “una puttina.”13

This unequivocal reference to a little girl has largely been ignored in favour of the child Cosimo, but in 1956, even before Keutner’s discovery, Carlo Gamba had noted the child’s girlish appearance. He too, however, decided the child was Cosimo.14 Luciano Berti alone has steadfastly maintained that the child is a girl,15 but most scholars con-
cur that the inventory record was an error and that the portrayal of any child other than Cosimo with Maria is "inconceivable."

There are demonstrable inconsistencies in this assumption. As noted, Maria is in widow's weeds, but the child looks too young to be nearly eight, Cosimo's age when his father died. It is even more extraordinary that Pontormo would portray Maria not in her twenties but in middle age and partner her with a Cosimo of such tender years—born when she was only twenty. Artistic convention in Vasari's Florence was to idealize, not to prematurely age a female sitter. Moreover, a direct source for her appearance in early widowhood was available to Pontormo. A preparatory drawing, usually attributed to Pontormo (but probably Bronzino's) shows her veiled, but still youthful, and hardly more than about twenty-six (Fig. 4).

Also, in assessing Maria's age in the Baltimore portrait, it is logical to take into account a very late drawing of her by Pontormo in the Uffizi (Fig. 5), and posthumous portraits derived from the death mask made by Santi Buglioni on the day of her death, 12 December 1543. In sum, as Maria looks older in the Baltimore panel than in the Bronzino drawing (Fig. 4), but younger than in the late drawing or posthumous portrayals derived from her death mask, a date in the late 1530s, and before her decline in health soon after 1540, would be appropriate.

Vasari would have us believe that his identical tondo portrait in the Sala Giovanni delle Bande Nere (Fig. 3) depicts Maria as she appeared in life and in her rank as mother of the Duke, that is, between 1537 and 1543. Casting himself in his Ragionamenti dialogue with Cosimo's heir, Francesco, he instructs the boy on his Medici ancestry as they tour the complex propagandistic cycles in the Palazzo Vecchio. Francesco, born in 1541, unhesitatingly "recognizes" his grandmother on sight:

P: [Principe Francesco I] Lo scompartimento di questa volta è così ricco, quanto altro che fin ad ora aviamo veduto, ed in particolare avete molto bene accomodate queste armi di casa Medici e Salviati; perché avete voi messo rincontro a queste l'arme di casa Sforza?


P. Benissimo; dichiaratemi questi tondi sostenuti da que' putti di basso rilievo sotto questo storie, ove sono que' ritratti, e fra gli altri in questo mi par vedere Giovanni di Pierfrancesco de' Medici, padre del signor Giovanni.

G. Vostra Eccellenza l'ha cognosciuto benissimo, e quest'altro qua al dirimpetto è il signore Giovanni.

P. Lo riconosco da me, si come in quest'altro riconosco la signora Maria, figliuola di Jacopo Salviati, madre del duca mio signore: ma in quest'ultimo qua non raffiguro quel giovanetto.

G. Quello è il signor Cosimo, padre di Vostra Eccellenza, e figliuolo del signor Giovanni, ritratto a punto sei anni avanti che fusse fatto duca.
This last portrait is a copy of Ridolfo Ghirlandaio’s Portrait of Cosimo de’ Medici at Age Twelve of 1531 (Fig. 6), and Pontormo’s profile portrait of 1537 is the source for another portrait of Cosimo as a youth in this setting. Oddly, the Baltimore child does not reappear in the cycle or in any of the multiple sets of Medici family portraits commissioned by Cosimo. These include Medici children from babyhood to adolescence.22

From the earliest time of his accession, Cosimo never missed an opportunity to glorify his status.23 Although it might be expected that the Baltimore child would appear in the room eulogizing Cosimo’s childhood and parentage, it is hard to imagine it serving as model for a putative prince and ruler. The “Cosimo” in Baltimore is too puny to have been at least seven and a half years old, the minimum age allowable for the child as determined by the portrayal of his mother in widow’s weeds. Its nondescript costume is at odds with mythology surrounding Cosimo, whose biographer, Manucci, describes him as a boy persistently “clad like a cavalier and seeming such in his actions.”24 Valour was accorded him at birth by his long-dead godfather Pope Leo X, and his father’s reputation and military abilities were gratuitously bestowed on him on his father’s death.25 In fact, by 1532 he was so dedicated to wearing military costume that Clement VII—intent on promoting his illegitimate son Alessandro as future ruler of Florence—was irritated by this mode of dress and ordered him to abandon it during a boyhood visit to Rome. In 1534, the fifteen-year old Cosimo marked Clement’s death by a return to military dress and, one assumes, his overt evocation of his father, the heroic Giovanni delle Bande Nere.26 This paternal patterning, emphasized in Bronzino’s state portrait of ca. 1545 where Cosimo wears armour identical to Giovanni’s, was acknowledged by Paolo Giovio.27

Artistic documentation of Cosimo’s single-mindedness and virtù in childhood is expressed in the Ridolfo Ghirlandaio portrait of 1531 (Fig. 6). This was painted when Alessandro was young and likely to produce heirs, but Ghirlandaio’s unabashed gaze for the lofty boy indicates that Cosimo is a force to be reckoned with. He is sumptuously dressed in velvet embroidered with an overlapping scallop pattern reminiscent of plate armour, suggesting a man of action. Its white fur lining implies high rank, and the luxurious red velvet is appropriate for a potential ruler. His book documents his humanist education28 and balances the soldierly symbolism. Cosimo leans easily
against a pilaster, symbol of fortitude, fulfilling a decorum only recently prescribed by Castiglione, a sprezzatura that augments the implied courage of a potential man of arms. The pilaster may also be a veiled reference to the new Medici principato under the protection of the Emperor Charles V, one of whose impres showed the eagle between two pillars. Finally, the identity of this boy raised from birth as the legitimate Medici scion is elaborately inscribed in the upper right field, COSMO.MED.

Cosimo’s face in the Ghirlandaio panel, as described by Benedetto Varchi later, is inscrutable: “ne lieto, ne mesto,” denoting a stoicism patterned, according to his contemporaries, on that of his father. In contrast, the face of the child in the Baltimore panel is “inedecorously” anxious in expression. Such lack of mettle is difficult to justify in any retrospective portrayal of Cosimo after his succession, but especially so in a double portrait with his mother. Contemporaries applaud Maria’s role in forming her son’s stoic, brave and urbane character. Manucci, Cosimo’s official biographer, refutes any notion of his seclusion, giving Maria credit for Cosimo’s exposure in influential places and for directing her son’s education in Latin and Greek. Manucci also notes her insistence that he be widely read in the Tuscan language and its history, which the boy did “con ardore a gli studi delle lettere.” Maria moved him to Venice within a year of her widowhood—the earliest date that can be proposed for the Baltimore portrait—exposing him for two years to powerful European interests. He was received officially by the Doge, the Papal Legate and the Venetian Council, and was presented to the ambassadors of France and England. Cosimo’s exile with her in Bologna shortly after allowed him to witness Clemente’s historical coronation of Charles V in 1529. When the frugal Maria hesitated to attend the marriage of Caterina de’ Medici in Marseilles in 1533, her father, Jacopo Salviati, urged her not to forgo this opportunity to keep Cosimo at the forefront of European interests.

This boy was not sheltered during his early years, and such contemporary documentation fully supports the assured decorum of Ridolfo Ghirlandaio’s portrait of the young Medici scion of 1531. The pose, dress, decorum and expression of the Baltimore child are incongruous with the historical facts. If the portrait’s conflicting late age for Maria and too childish appearance for Cosimo are to be explained...
by a retrospective ducal commission, about 1537-43,\textsuperscript{37} it seems illogical that the propagandistic Duke would have had himself portrayed in childhood as sheltered, poorly dressed or anxious.

The relationship of mother to child in this case is at odds too with contemporary pedagogical philosophy. Cosimo was diligently groomed by his mother, to whom he wrote at about the time Ghirlandaio painted his portrait, "Your words are my precept and law."\textsuperscript{38} The sheltering relationship between Maria and the anxious, dependent child conflicts with a décorum which would reflect current pedagogical admonitions to widows with young sons, that they be raised stoically.\textsuperscript{39} Leo X and Clement VII each promoted this for Cosimo.\textsuperscript{40} Varchi lauded this trait in him, and he was recognized to be stoical by historians.\textsuperscript{41}

Maria’s own stoicism in promoting her son’s interests is also documented. On Cosimo’s election, she declared herself unflinching in the face of any dangers to which he would be exposed, even if it were a matter of life or death for him.\textsuperscript{42} Finally, the stoic calibre of the boy and his mother, and her diligent response to contemporary urgings on the strict upbringing of noble, orphaned sons,\textsuperscript{43} are eulogized in Diego di Sandoval’s elegy for Maria, written for her obsequies in 1543.\textsuperscript{44} The tender age of the Baltimore child—incogruous anyway with Maria’s widowhood—is also insufficient reason to overlook its unusual décorum. Leo X, Maria’s uncle and Cosimo’s godfather, warmly believed Cosimo fated to continue the Medici line, and encouraged Maria to promote this destiny from the moment of his birth.\textsuperscript{45}

In sum, these consistent references to his destiny and his stoicism occur from his birth until Maria’s death and include descriptions of Cosimo’s earliest years. \textit{Any} official portrayal of Cosimo as a child, whether painted ca. 1526, 1537, or after Maria’s death, should presage or emulate Ghirlandaio’s staunch boy, suggest Cosimo’s role as legitimate scion and guardian of his father’s patrimony, and make his mother’s role in forming his character evident.

Precedents for dynastic portraits in this tradition existed in Italy. In each of two portraits of Guidobaldo da Montefeltro with his father executed in the 1470s in Urbino, the child is given great dignity of bearing.\textsuperscript{46} In the earlier version, Guidobaldo’s jewel-encrusted costume is in effect a robe of state, and he holds a sceptre, symbol of rule. The boy has been tellingly positioned beneath the tiara of Urbino and at the knee of his father, knight and humanist, and is surrounded by the accoutrements of war. The second portrait includes scholars, orators and courtiers. Together the portraits supply contexts for the physical and intellectual commitment of a scion to his destiny.\textsuperscript{47} Guidobaldo’s portrayal and décorum emphasize his resemblance to his father, his conscious patterning on him, his princely responsibility to rule, and his integration into affairs of the court in progress around him. His age in each portrayal is no more than that of the child in the Baltimore portrait.\textsuperscript{48}

Apparently anxious to offset any suggestion that the death of Giovanni delle Bande Nere left Cosimo bereft of such an exemplar, contemporary chroniclers endowed Maria with compensating qualities that cast her as her husband’s surrogate. Adriani described her as both father and mother to Cosimo ("a cui ella era stata invece di padre, di madre").\textsuperscript{49} In his eulogy on Maria’s death in 1543, the court poet Sandoval recalls the stoic virtues that Maria had nurtured in Cosimo. Severance of their deep bond is perceived as a potential threat to Cosimo’s fortitude:

\begin{verbatim}
E tu gran Cosimo, cui verrà e fortuna
Han posto in mano la città ch’è in freno
A’ magnanimi Toschi allenta e stringe.
Ben che mai pianger non potresti a pieno
Tanto e tal Madre, qual sotto la luna
Non fu già mai, come’l tuo duol ti spinge
\end{verbatim}
sandroval had cosimo, segni in the figure so the 1531, 1911, lauded A Ti good La In 6. Ridolfo Urbino and lei Castello the casts governance his Marías Adriani Al dirô, a Maria the child (1916-18), the child is not in question, it must be concluded that the child may not be Cosimo, and that this identification deserves closer scrutiny than it has received since King proposed it in 1940.

Two scholars have argued that the child is a girl. Keutner's discovery of the "puttina" reference in the Riccardi inventory of 1612 made him conclude that this could not be Cosimo. Since 1973, Luciano Berti has consistently maintained that the portrait shows Maria with a little girl and was painted some time after Cosimo's accession in 1537.

Logic suggests that the 1612 description of the child is not spurious. When the painting was recorded in the Riccardi inventory, Cosimo's son, Grand Duke Ferdinando was only recently deceased. Medici power was then at its height, and a portrait of the first Grand Duke of Tuscany as a child would have been of considerable consequence, but the Riccardi recorded unequivocally that Maria is shown with "una puttina." As the child was painted out while the panel was in unbroken Riccardi possession, it is possible that it was always known not to be Cosimo, and its identity came to be so obscure that its portrait was obliterated from the panel.

Several girls in Maria's circle have been entertained as possible contenders, but all have been dismissed as unlikely partners for the Duke's mother: Giulia, the illegitimate daughter of the late Duke Alessandro; Bia, Cosimo's illegitimate daughter of a premarital liaison; and two Salviati nieces who were frequent visitors to Maria's villa, Cassandra and Francesca. In spite of failure to identify the dark-haired, dark-eyed child, pictorial evidence does support the inventory record that this is a girl. Her hair is coiffed in exactly the same way as Maria's, the outlines of which show beneath her veil. Tightly curled at the forehead, the little girl's hair is gathered into a smooth, halo-like rosette around the back of her skull, possibly in a net to hold it in place. It is a coiffure which can only be dressed with hair several inches long. Contemporary portraits of young boys by
Titian and Parmigianino show them all close-cropped. The child's hairstyle was, however, popular during the 1530s and 1540s for Florentine women. It imitates that of Bronzino's Lucrezia Panciatichi of about 1540. Further, his Laura Battiferri of around 1560 shows such a coiffure in profile.

Who is the child? Cosimo's daughters may all be eliminated by age and by comparing Bronzino's portraits of them. Bia, illegitimate, was born before Cosimo's marriage in 1539 and died in 1542; she had straight, reddish-blond hair, as Bronzino's portrait of her in the Uffizi shows. Maria, born in 1540, had grey-blue eyes and is also known from Bronzino's portrait in the Uffizi; Isabella, blond with dark eyes, born in 1542, was in early infancy when Maria Salvati died. The child cannot be the dark-eyed Lucrezia, who was born after Maria's death.

If the Baltimore portrait was commissioned around 1537 in conjunction with the Halberdier—as proposed by Keutner and Langedijk, both works being of identical dimensions and forming part of the Riccardi holdings by 1612—then the child, who appears to be about four or five years old, would have been born about 1534 and fathered when Cosimo was around fourteen. But contemporary sources mention only Bia in this context, who is recorded as being in the ducal nursery and under Maria's care in 1541.

There was, as already noted, another girl in Maria's direct charge—Cosimo's ward, Giulia d'Alessandro de' Medici. Giulia's father, the recently murdered Duke Alessandro—then usually referred to as Pope Clement VII's nephew—was Clement's natural son with two illegitimate children, Giulio and Giulia. These namesakes of Alessandro's father, the Pope—the former Giulio de' Medici—were promoted by Clement as potential Medici heirs. For a brief moment of history, they were extremely significant in Cosimo's life. Until well into their maturity, they were intimately linked to the ducal court and Cosimo's good offices.

Benedetto Varchi records that in 1537, Cardinal Innocenzo Cibo, the late Pope Clement's Apostolic Legate to Florence, proposed Alessandro's four-year-old son Giulio as successor to the murdered Duke. When Cosimo was the unanimous choice of the Florentine senators, Cibo insisted that the new Duke agree to avenir Alessandro's death and also “see that Signor Giulio and the Signora Giulia were well treated.” Contemporaries record that Cosimo responded to this demand in good faith. Giulio would always be well loved by the Duke, and Maria's letters to the ducal couple report on Giulia's progress in 1540. A letter dated 1541 from Cibo's sister Caterina to her sister Eleonora Gonzaga, Duchess of Urbino, details the luxury of the Florentine court and the full integration there of Cosimo's and Alessandro's children, natural and legitimate:

. . . They all live in great pomp. The Signora Maria has her rooms adorned with fair blue leather hangings with but a touch of gold, and a bed of black taffeta. . . . The children have their rooms hung with gold stamped leather and all, both legitimate and bastards are in the care of Signora Maria . . . Firenze, July 8, 1541.

Evidently, the degree of luxury in which the children lived was supplemented by Maria's dedication and tenderness, as recorded by Cosimo's major-domo, Pierfrancesco Riccio, on 4 February 1542: “La Sig. Maria con questi Sig. Figli (grazia di Dio) e di bonissimo essere, la Bia ha la sua febbretta, et la Julia sta bene.” Bia, then about seven years of age, died shortly after and was buried in San Lorenzo on 1 March 1542.

Following Maria's death in 1543, Cosimo and Eleonora continued as guardians to Alessandro's children until adulthood. Giulia became greatly loved by the ducal couple. In 1550 Cosimo ennobled her by arranging her marriage to Francesco Cantelmo, Lord of Abruzzi, and provided her with a generous dowry of 25,000 scudi. If her age at marriage was typical, about fifteen, she was younger than Giulio (born 1533) and was born probably around 1534-35.

A cogent argument for accepting the “puttina” as Giulia is the child's manifest likeness to Pontormo's so-called Alessandro de' Medici as a Boy, now in Lucca (Fig. 7). For this painting—originally at Poggio Imperiale—the identity of the red-haired boy is usually given as Alessandro at twelve or thirteen, thus dating it to 1523-24.

This cannot be Alessandro, however. The Lucca boy's hair is bright red, and Vasari, who details his labours on his own Alessandro in Armour, records the Duke's hair as black ("ricci neri"). Vasari knew Alessandro well, as did Pontormo. His hair is black in Pontormo's Philadelphia portrait (Fig. 8), a related miniature (Fig. 9), and in an adolescent portrayal now in Madrid (Fig. 10). The resemblance of the Lucca boy to Alessandro (Fig. 8) is nevertheless indisputable. Gamba first identified the Lucca boy as Alessandro in 1929, but a seventeenth-century Tribuna inventory describes the Pontormo panel and names the subject "Giuliano." Trapani' and Nico-Fasola each suggested that this might be a “Giuliano," based on a tradition that had persisted at Poggio into the nineteenth century, before the panel was located at Lucca. Fresh doubts about the identity of the Lucca youth have recently been expressed. Karla Langedijk and latterly Carl Strehlke, each discussing Pontormo's Philadelphia portrait of Alessandro, have abandoned the modern "Alessandro" identity for the
Lucca boy. Neither have offered an alternative proposal; as recently as 1990, Luciano Berti also left the identification of the youth open.  

The traditional appellation of “Giuliano” for the Lucca portrait is solved if a close relative of Alessandro’s is considered for the identity of the red-haired boy with his features. Alessandro’s only immediate male relative of historical note was his son, Giulio. Once that link has been made, the resemblance of the “puttina” (Fig. 2) to the Lucca portrait (Fig. 7) emerges readily as that typical of a sibling, where nature and nurture combine. The contours of the temple, jaw and chin are similar; so are the broad noses of each, the round, full pout of the lips, and the very tightly curled hair. It is not only physiognomy that links the two, but a slightly quizzical air, a suggestion that Giulio’s direct gaze supplies us with the precise look that would engage us should the “puttina” suddenly connect her eyes to the viewer’s. The girl in the Baltimore portrait is apparently the sister of the boy in Lucca.

Giulio, born in 1533, is portrayed in early adolescence, establishing a date of around 1544-46 for the Lucca portrait. It has been noticed that its style is inconsistent with Pontormo’s style in the mid-1520s, when Alessandro was a boy. 77 The style fits comfortably with Pontormo’s Monsignor Giovanni della Casa in Washington, painted in the mid-1540s. 78 The expansion of the figures across the picture plane, the looming forms, the concentric curves provided by the garments to frame the face in each, the play of light on crumpled drapery on sleeves, and the scumbling of paint to enrich the surfaces of fabric all suggest that Pontormo painted these two portraits in close succession. Each is designed to take life from the same vibrant colour. The luscious changeant pinks in the Lucca Giulio clearly derive from or influenced the brilliant pink arcs of lining glimpsed at the hem of della Casa’s mozzetta. In conclusion, the Lucca panel portrays not Alessandro but his son Giulio at about the age of twelve, and his resemblance to the Baltimore child identifies her as Giulia. Taking her probable birth date above into account, her age, about four or five years, would date the Baltimore portrait to about 1539-40. Maria Salviati would have been close to forty then, and Giulia was at that time in her charge. 79

Giulia was described in a detailed Medici history covering the years up to Francesco’s death in 1587 as “the living image of her father.” 80 There is a strong resemblance between the child in the Baltimore portrait and Alessandro (Figs. 2 and 9), and their Moorish ancestry contributes to a unique physiognomy. 81 The roundness and set of his eyes, his long nose, full lips, tightly curled hair, and even the fold in the skin around his neck are all replicated on the “puttina” in Baltimore. This familial resemblance is evident in several of Alessandro’s portraits. 82 Pontormo’s Alessandro de’ Medici in Philadelphia (Fig. 8) may even provide a context
for the artist’s Maria Salviati with Giulia d’Alessandro de’ Medici. Giulio and his sister were apparently named for Alessandro’s father, Giulio de’ Medici—Pope Clement VII—who died on 15 September 1534. Given the linkage of the children’s names, it may be assumed that Giulio’s mother, often recorded as a member of the powerful Malespina family, was Giulia’s mother too. As discussed, Giulia was probably born around 1534-35, precisely the period when, according to Vasari, Pontormo’s Philadelphia portrait was commissioned as a gift to Taddea Malespina, “sorella della marquesa di Massa.” Alessandro is dressed in mourning for his late father the Pope, firmly dating the portrait to between September 1534 and September 1535. He is shown drawing the head of a woman in silverpoint, a profile all’antica. Evidently, the female head is linked to the destination of the painting, a gift to Taddea, but it may covertly commemorate the birth to Taddea of Giulia. Alessandro was constantly at the extremely wealthy and emancipated Malespina-Cibò household, then installed in the Palazzo Pazzi, according to Bernardo Segni, a contemporary historian. The Duke’s attentions were directed at Taddea, a young widow, from the early 1530s until his murder in 1537. The house served as Alessandro’s unofficial court, and Pontormo was a member of this circle. Significantly, the painting destined for Taddea has been described as “dono giovannescu” in expression and details.

Later circumstances too make it highly probable that Taddea was the mother of Giulio, age four when Alessandro died, and Giulia, then about two. Firstly, there is evidence of the persistent association of Alessandro’s children with the Philadelphia portrait. Decades after its execution, Cosimo issued a public decree in 1568 offering a reward for its recovery. It was through “Julia, daughter of Taddea Malespina” according to a former courtier of Alessandro’s, Constantino Ansaldo, that the painting was revealed to be in possession of the late Taddea’s nephew and heir, Alberico Cibò. Ansaldo, Giulio’s former tutor, then sought Giulio’s help in recovering it. A trusted dependent of Cosimo’s, Giulio procrastinated and eventually passed a poor copy to Ansaldo in 1571, presumably to ensure that the original remained in possession of Taddea’s family. His risky subterfuge, and Giulia’s knowledge of Alberico’s ownership of the painting, strongly suggest that Taddea was their mother. Also, Giulio’s association with his Malespina-Cibò relatives began at birth; until the time of Alessandro’s murder, the boy had been under the guardianship of Taddea’s brother-in-law, Clement’s Papal Legate, Cardinal Innocenzo Cibò, in Massa. This continued up to the time the powerful Cibò proposed Giulio as the murdered Alessandro’s successor in opposition to Cosimo. All of these circumstances tend to confirm that Taddea, Cibò’s relative, was Giulio’s mother.

The immensely wealthy Malespina-Cibò family had ties to the Emperor Charles V and to Clement’s papacy. Cibò’s diligent promotion of Giulio arose not only from ambition, but from strong ties of ancestry which he held in common with these two children. Innocenzo (1491-1550) was
a direct descendant of Cosimo the Elder through his mother, Maddalena, daughter of Lorenzo the Magnificent. (His father, Francesco Cibò, was the natural son of Pope Innocent VIII.) His determination to have Giulio accepted as Alessandro’s heir was reinforced also by ties of kinship: his brother Lorenzo was married to Ricciarda Malespina, Taddea’s sister. Elected cardinal in 1513 during the reign of Leo X, Cibò’s influence in Medici affairs and in Florentine government had been considerable. As Clement’s Papal Legate he had ruled as regent for Alessandro from 1532 and continued to wield power after his accession.  

Clement had intended that Giulio be Alessandro’s successor, and left this charge to his Apostolic Legate, Cardinal Cibò. As a seasoned survivor in Medicean political fortunes, Cibò was a formidable opponent to the young Duke. Committed to perpetuating Cosimo the Elder’s line, the principal Medici branch to which he, Clement, Alessandro and now Giulio and Giulia belonged, Cibò was as antagonistic as Clement had been to Cosimo, a legitimate descendant of the cadet Pierfrancesco branch. As ally to Charles V, Clement had been in a powerful position to eventually legitimize his infant grandson Giulio to succeed Alessandro, but the closeness of Clement’s and Alessandro’s deaths forced Cibò’s hand. Giulio, four, and Giulia, then an infant, were thus important pawns in a struggle for power between representatives of each branch of the Medici line at the time when the unmarried Cosimo unexpectedly succeeded their father. Until Cosimo produced heirs—which was not until his son Francesco was born in 1541—these two children with powerful political connections represented Medici continuity. Cosimo’s agreement to keep them by him on achieving his accession was a shrewd political move. It prevented any further split in Florentine political loyalties and promoted his image as conciliator of his family and head of a revitalized, united Medici dynasty. Ironically, as he was without legitimate issue as yet, the prospect of legitimizing Alessandro’s son Giulio—and thus Giulia—to maintain Medici hegemony must have loomed in Cosimo’s own mind. It was a two-edged sword: Giulio might be legitimized, for example, by Charles V—father-in-law of the late Alessandro, to whom Cosimo now owed allegiance—who was sympathetic to the Malespina-Cibò family. In the historic contexts outlined here, the portrayal of Maria with Giulia carries the moral force of a document proving that Alessandro’s children were under Cosimo’s guardianship, in accordance with his promise to Cibò and the Florentine Senate.

Giulia’s age puts the date of the Baltimore painting within two or three years of Cosimo’s accession, about 1539-40. This would explain Maria’s appearance as a widowed matron of about forty in the role of caretaker of Alessandro’s bereaved orphan. Unlike Bronzino’s sumptuous portrayal of Cosimo’s illegitimate daughter Bia, Giulia is portrayed without any jewellery, a poignant token of her temporary impoverishment and fatherless state. Giulia’s pathetic expression is also particularly appropriate to her status as an
The portrait of Giulia of the Medici as a Youth, ca. 1525. Oil on panel, 44 x 29.5 cm. Madrid, Thyssen-Bornemisza Collection, no. 330 (Photo: Fundación-Colección Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid).

Uffizi drawings, one dating from early widowhood, ca. 1527 (Fig. 4), the other showing her prematurely aged, ca. 1543 and probably drawn from her death-mask (Fig. 5), may be ranked chronologically on either side of the Baltimore panel. The portrait of Maria with Giulia appears to have no art historical precedent, but peculiarly pertinent circumstances may have provoked its commission. In 1539—only two years after his accession—the welfare of Alessandro’s children was the focus of a serious diplomatic crisis for Cosimo, from which he emerged in triumph. He was enraged at hearing a rumour, manufactured by Papal Legate Cibo’s cohort, that he was plotting to poison Giulio. Because of Cibo’s ready access to Charles V, the late Alessandro’s father-in-law, Cosimo was compelled to write to the Emperor to exonerate himself. Cibo, a thorn in Cosimo’s side much resented by the Florentines, was forced to recant and to retire to Massa, the seat of his Malespini relatives. By January 1540, during Eleonora’s first pregnancy—a daughter, Maria, was born in 1540—Giulio and Maria were sequestered in Naples (Eleonora’s former home) under Cosimo’s orders, with coded messages concerning how to house and when to return them recorded in political correspondence with the Duke’s agent there. Evidently, Cosimo hoped to settle the question of succession before returning the boy to Florence, where his presence would still be contentious.

Whether a pendant portrait of Giulio existed is impossible to determine, but in the contexts described, a portrait of the Duke’s mother as protector of Giulia would carry a strong political message. As discussed, Maria’s appearance and especially Giulia’s age both indicate a date around 1540, consonant with this period of Cosimo’s rule, when he was consolidating his strength in diplomacy and in dealing with his enemies. The portrayal of Cibo’s kinswoman Giulia, showing her visibly orphaned and anxious under the protection of Cosimo’s mother, documents fulfilment of the Duke’s legal obligation as guardian of Alessandro’s child. Its dynastic import is equally inescapable: the new Duke now controls and represents both branches of the Medici.

This theme is identical in spirit to Cosimo’s adoption of the broncone, the revivified laurel, at the outset of his succession to the dukedom to symbolize his claim as sole, legitimate Medici successor. It was a theme with which Pontormo had long been acquainted. His fresco commission in 1519 for the salone at the Medici Villa at Poggio a Caiano in the year of Cosimo’s fortuitous birth was the first instance in which the broncone alluded specifically to Cosimo’s legitimate right to succeed.

In conclusion, the Portrait of Maria Salviati with Giulia d’Alessandro de’ Medici is commemorative, not retrospective.
The impact of the Baltimore portrait on Cibò and the Malespina—his sister Caterina, as mentioned, was a strong presence at the Florentine court—must remain in the realm of speculation.\(^{107}\) The painting documents Maria's political stature in the early period of Cosimo's reign when her young son "usando assai il consiglio di Madonna Maria sua Madre, che amministrava coll'autorità sua molte faccende."\(^{108}\) Having acted as his agent in fighting his political enemies, the well-loved Maria is promoted in this portrait as a visible symbol to Florentines of her son's authority and benevolence.\(^{109}\) The Baltimore Maria Salviati with Giulia d'Alessandro de' Medici is a timely statement of dynastic, political and moral suasion.\(^{110}\) The identity, rank, sex and ages of the sitters are historically accurate, as are the linkage of widowed exemplar and female orphan.

Alessandro's children were politically eclipsed once Cosimo produced heirs, and the child had little relevance to the program in the Sala di Giovanni delle Bande Nere or elsewhere in Vasari's Palazzo Vecchio cycles. Another cogent reason for her later obscurity may be that, in adulthood, Giulia alienated herself from Cosimo and Eleonora.\(^{111}\) It is possible that the obliteration of her image by the Riccardi sometime after 1612 responded to a Medici-instituted *damnatio memoriae* of her.

**Postscript**

Reattrtribution of the youthful drawing of Maria Salviati ca. 1526 (Fig. 4), and revised identifications and datings for Pontormo's Baltimore and Lucca portraits (Figs. 1 and 7) emerged in this study. Further art-historical implications also arose, concerning Giulia de' Medici. Allori's Uffizi portrait of a Medici widow, the *Lady with a Cameo*, dated 1559 (Fig. 11), originally in Cardinal Leopoldo de' Medici's collections, resisted identification in an earlier study by this writer.\(^{112}\) It is almost certainly the widowed Giulia de' Medici in the year of her remarriage, this time to Cosimo's kinsman, Bernardetto de' Medici, son of Ottaviano. Comparison of her features with Alessandro's as a youth (Fig. 10) is pertinent, as is comparison with his adult portrayals (Figs. 8 and 9) where the North African ancestry of Giulia and her father,\(^{113}\) and their mutual resemblance, is evident. In the Uffizi portrait, iconographical references to Leo X, Clement VII, Cosimo and Florence\(^{114}\) all confirm her Medici ancestry—of which she was extremely proud. The copious Medici symbolism has served to document Giulia's ancestral and political associations and subsumes reference to her new alliance with Bernardetto, himself a Medici and courtier in the Florentine court.

* This study arises from ongoing research for a full-length study, *Portraits of Medici Women in the Reign of Cosimo I*, funded by a Postdoctoral Research Fellowship of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, for which I am very
grateful. Partial research for it occurs in my dissertation, "Decorum in Portraits of Medici Women at the Court of Cosimo I, 1537-1574," University of Michigan, 1992, Chs. IV and VII, and I must acknowledge the advice and encouragement of my former advisors, Graham Smith, Ward Bissell, Marvin Eisenberg and Ralph Williams. Special thanks are due to Mario Valdes, former researcher of Afro-European history for PBS Boston's "Say Brother!" for identifying the adult Giulia de' Medici and for generously sharing genealogical material. I thank Jannell Mellamphy for assistance with my résumé. The essentials of this study were presented at the Universities Art Association of Canada Conference, Victoria, British Columbia, 14 November 1992.


2 Maria usually passed several months of the year in her villa at Castello. Cosimo Conti, La Prima Reggia di Cosimo de Medici nel Palazzo gia della Signoria di Firenze coll'appoggio di un inventario inedito del 1553 (Florence, 1893), 44-45, 275-76, describes her death there and quotes Francesco Campana's letter to Pierfrancesco Riccio of 12 December 1543, arranging for the transfer of her body to Florence and the relocation of children there with her: "Sonsene ritornate a Fir. S.K inquest' hora mad. S.K Franc.s sua sor. e mad. S.K Cassandra in la leticia della S.K, sarà necessario rimandarla per conduur q.1.3 filioulini bensè al vetturale si dicese che facessi aspettar' alla porta per ritornarsene fuor e tutto per vostro aviso et a V.S. mi rac.do Da Castello li xii Xbre del 43." See also Anna Baia, Leonora di Toledo. Duchessia di Firenze e di Siena (Todi, 1907), 32.

3 Besides Fig. 3 here, Vasari's Maria for the Sala Giovanni delle Bande Nere in the Palazzo Vecchio, Maria appears as a spectator in the Marriage of Catherine de' Medici to Henry of Valois in the Sala di Clemente VII, 1556-59. The event took place in Marseilles, in 1553, with Clement, her kinsman, officiating. See Ettore Allegri and Alessandro Cecchi, Palazzo Vecchio e i Medici: Guida storica (Florence, 1980), 167-74, pl. 34.3, and Langedijk, Portraits, II, cat. no. 87, 11. Jacopo da Empoli's large panel copy of this fresco was painted in 1600. See Langedijk, Portraits, II, cat. no. 87, 8. In a double portrait with her husband, painted by Battista Naldini in 1585-86 as part of the Serie Aurea, she is inserted to the left of Giovanni in a copy of what was believed in the sixteenth century to be Titian's Giovanni delle Bande Nere. There Maria appears copiously veiled, aged and extremely ravaged; the source for this must have been executed close to the time of her death in 1543, or posthumously. (For her deathmask, see text and note 19). A tiny shoulder-length portrait in the Ambrosias series in Vienna inscribed MARIA SALLIVATTI [sic] was painted in 1587; see Langedijk, Portraits II, cat. no. 87, 2. It is clearly derived from the same source as the insert in Naldini's double portrait, but Maria has been made more youthful. She appears heavily veiled and unadorned in all these portraits.

4 Gertrude Rosenthal, Italian Paintings XIV-XVIII Centuries, exhibition catalogue, Baltimore Museum of Art (Baltimore, Md., 1981), no. 37.596, 87.6 x 71 cm. The painting had been acquired in 1902 with the Masserian Collection as Vittoria Colonna by Sebastiano del Piombo. Clapp's attribution to Pontormo in 1916 has not been challenged; Frederick M. Clapp, Jacopo Carucci da Pontormo, His Life and Work (New Haven and London, 1916). See notes 7, 8, 10 and 11 below, recording the wide range of scholarly dating.

5 A letter to this effect dated 3 May 1531, addressed by Maria to a "Giovanni" in Rome supports a claim made by Giovambattista Adriani, Istoria de' suoi tempi di Giovambattista Adriani, 2 vols (Florence 1583; reprinted Prato, 1872), I, 195, that her devotion to Cosimo was exclusive: "Subito che quella benedetta anima del signor mio consorte venne mancho, in quell' istante io mi proposi vivere sempre col mio figliuolo per molte cause che sarebbe
longo il narrare per lettera; et per una molto speciale considerato che il mio figliolo per essere nato maximamente di quelle felice ossa, non era da essere abbandonato da me; molto più possedendo giovare io stendo con lui, che lasciandolo, et la medesima mente ho tenuto insinui et principalmente tengo.”

C.O. Tosi, “Una Lettere di M. Francesco Campana,” Arte e storia, XXV, nos. 13-14 (July 1906), 106-107. For Maria’s direction of Cosimo’s humanist education as a child, see Aldo Manucci, Vita di Cosimo de’ Medici Primo Gran Duca di Toscana descritta da Aldo Manucci (Bologna, 1586), 33-34.


7 See note 4 above. Kurt W. Forster, “Probleme um Pontormos Porträtmalerei,” Pantheon, XXIII (1965), 223ff; and again in his Monographie no.33, alone disagrees, giving the portrait to Bronzino and dating it to 1526-27.

8 See Luciano Berti, La Casa del Vasari in Arezzo e il suo museo (Florence, 1955), 53ff; Carlo Gamba, Contributo alla conoscenza del Pontormo (Florence, 1956), 15ff; Federico Zeri, Italian Paintings in the Walters Art Gallery, 2 vols (Baltimore, 1976), II, 325; Langedijk, Portraits, 1, cat. no. 81-82, and II, cat. no. 87, 5, makes Cosimo’s accession of January 1537 its terminus post quem but believes that it may have been painted after Maria’s death in 1543.

9 See note 2.

10 Edward S. King, “An Addition to Medici Iconography,” Walters Journal, III (1940), 74-84, first identified the double portrait as Maria and Cosimo and described the child as about seven to eight years, presumably to tie Maria’s widowhood of late 1526 to Cosimo’s age at that date; see also Janet Cox-Rearick, The Drawings of Pontormo (Cambridge, Mass., 1964), 311; Forster, “Pontormos Portratmaleerei,” 223ff; and Forster, Monographie, no. 33.

11 Berti, La Casa del Vasari, 53; and Luciano Berti, Opera completa del Pontormo (Milan, 1973), cat. no. 127; Zeri, Walters Art Gallery II, 326, is certain this is so, that the child looks unlike Cosimo because it was not painted from life, and that its Maria is probably the missing portrait which Vasari had recorded was painted after the Battle of Montemurlo, August 1537. See also Langedijk, note 8 above. Other scholars also revised earlier proposals: Berti, Opera, cat. no. 127, suggested that the child is Bia de’ Medici, thus dating the panel to about 1541; Janet Cox-Rearick, “Bronzino’s Young Woman with Her Little Boy,” Studies in the History of Art, XXII (National Gallery of Art, Washington, 1982), 74 and note 33, allows that it may date to 1537. (See note 10 above for her earlier proposal, 1526).

12 King, “Medici Iconography,” 76-77. Before King’s revelations, Jeno Lanyi, “Pontormos Bildnis der Maria Salviani de’ Medici,” Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florence, IV, nos. 2-3 (January-July 1933), 99, had held that the source for the tondo was the Pontormo Maria Salviani with a Book, Uffizi, Inv. 1890, no. 3565. See Langedijk, Portraits, II, cat. no. 87, 14. For discussion of this latter portrait, see Gabrielle Langdon, “Decorum in Portraits of Medici Women at the Court of Cosimo I, 1537-1574.” Ph.d. diss., University of Michigan, 1992, Ch. IV.


14 Gamba, Conoscenza del Pontormo, 15.


16 Simon, “Portraits of Cosimo,” 194.

17 See Vasari-Milanesi, Vite, VIII, 171: Titian “[does not] improve the things which he copies from life, giving them the grace and perfection which in art goes beyond the scope of nature.”

18 Uffizi, 6690F, Langedijk, Portraits II, cat. no. 87.15, universally agreed to be Maria and generally attributed to Pontormo. Forster, “Pontormos Portratmaleerei,” 224, suggests a different hand, that of Bronzino. I agree. Her head, as in Bronzino’s Lady with a Lapdog in Frankfurt of about 1532-33, is conceived as a solid rhomboidal geometric sphere mounted on an elongated cylinder and the finely defined contour and underlit modelling for the face is similar. Although there is no doubt that this portrait study was done from life, dating is problematical. Maria’s lack of chic suggests that her clothing might be outra and thus inconclusive for dating: “. . . The Signora Maria . . . usually wears bombazine with coarse black silk, and often of plain camlet without a pattern, and it is heavy, as if of wool, and by no means contents me . . .” Letter dated 8 July 1541, from Caterina Gibb, Duchess of Camerino, to her sister Eleonora Gonzaga, Duchess of Urbino, translated in Cecily Booth, Cosimo I, Duke of Florence (Cambridge, 1921), 117, citing Alfred von Reumont, Beiträge zur italienischen Geschichte (Berlin, 1855), IV, 275. (I have modernized Booth’s translation).

19 Battista Naldini’s portrait, e.g., painted 1585-86 (see note 3). (Santi was directed by Niccolò Tribolo to make Maria’s effigia. Conti, Inventario, 44.) For discussion of the drawing, see Langedijk, Portraits, II, cat. no. 87, 14a, and my “Decorum in Portraits of Medici Women,” Chapter IV.

20 See note 3.

21 Vasari-Milanesi, Vite, VIII, 183-186. The dialogue continues with a history of Giovanni delle Bande Nere for Francesco’s edi-
lication; the dialogue was written before 1557; see King, "Medici Iconography," note 7. On the expository intent in the Ragionamenti, see P. Tinagli Baxter, "Rileggendo i 'Ragionamenti:'," in Giorgio Vasari: tra decorazione ambientale e storiografia artistica (Consegni di studi, Arezzo, 8-10 Ottobre 1981), ed. G.C. Garfagnini (Florence, 1985), 83-94.

22 See Langedijk, Portraits, I-I, for entries on Cosimo and his children, and Edi Bacchesci, L'Opera completa del Bronzino (Milan, 1973), nos. 134-57, which include an infant Giovanni (derived from the Uffizi panel of 1545), no. 53, and Garzia, no. 155, about three, the subject of no. 159.

23 See note 1.


25 Giovanni, according to Clement, had on his death instantly become a legendary condottiere, and all Maria's hopes must now be placed in Cosimo. The demand by the Duke of Urbino from Francis I of France within days of Giovanni's death not just for outstanding mercenary fees, but also a company of cavalry for the orphan reflects current identification of Cosimo with his heroic father. See Pierre Gauthiez, Jean des Bandes Noires, 2nd edn (Paris, 1901), 117-18, quoting Leo X's response to Cosimo's birth, and 327-28, describing Giovanni's stoic, agonizing death and Clement VII's condolences to Maria.

26 Christie's sale cat., 11, citing B. Baldini, Vita di Cosimo de' Medici Gran Duca di Toscana (Florence, 1578). Clement had good reason to be irked. Cosimo's overt imitation of the clothing and demeanour of a cavalier was attracting some of Giovanni delle Bande Nere's former followers to Cosimo's side. He was commanded to abandon this "foreign dress" and in its place wear the long robe or bucco of a Florentine citizen. He stubbornly remained in seclusion until Alessandro de' Medici allowed him to revert to his usual dress ten days later; see Cecily Booth, Cosimo I, Duke of Florence (Cambridge, 1921), 45-46. (Cosimo's identification with his father must have been acute: Gauthiez records that immediately on Giovanni's death, the Bande Nores requested that Maria turn Cosimo over to them to be raised on the field, but she refused; see Gauthiez, Jean des Bandes Noires, 328.) For promotion of him at this time as a leader of a cavalry troupe, see note above. For public acclamation of him as Giovanni's son, see note 34.

27 See Robert Simon, "Bronzino's Portrait of Cosimo I in Armour," Burlington Magazine, CXXXV, no. 966 (1983), 527-39 and figs. 9-13, showing Cosimo, and fig. 15, showing Giovanni in identical armour, by a Florentine artist, ca. 1545, in the Galleria Sabauda, Turin. Giovio, who was responsible for the iconography of the Cosimo I in Armour, received an autograph version by Bronzino from Cosimo in 1546. In his letter of thanks to Majordomo Pierfrancesco Riccio, written from Rome on 30 July 1546, Giovio refers to the "mirabile ritratto" and instructs him: "Dil che mi trovo obligato molto al signor Duca, avendo vostra signoria che nelle tre parti delle quatro mi ha rappresentato l'effigie del bravissimo signor Giovanni suo Padre, delle quale


29 A. Alciati, Emblemata cum commentariis (1531; reprinted Padua, 1621), 233a. Charles would warmly summon Cosimo at the Neapolitan court in 1536, as son of "a cavalier who made France and Spain tremble." Booth, Cosimo, 50.

30 Langedijk, Portraits, I, 81.

31 See Albéri, Ambasciatori, Série II, I, 350ff.

32 See Baldassare Castiglione, The Book of the Courtier [Venice, 1528], trans. Charles S. Singleton (New York, 1959), 32: "... the reputation of a gentleman whose profession is arms, if ever in the least way he sullies himself through cowardice or other disgrace, always remains defiled after the world and covered with ignominy."

33 Albéri, Ambasciatori, Série I, 335, quoting Fedeli, 1561, suggests childhood seclusion with Maria.

34 Manucci, Vita di Cosimo, 33-34. In 1526, the newly widowed Maria fled Trebbio for Venice to avoid marauding Lutheran soldiers, Cosimo following with Pierfrancesco Riccio, then his tutor. The child was fêted, his father enjoying a legendary posthumous reputation there as a brilliant condottiere and Captain General of the Republic. Gauthiez, Jean des Bandes Noires, 211, 233; Booth, Cosimo, 15-20; and Gaetano Pieraccini, La stirpe de' Medici di Caffaggiolo. Saggio di ricerca sulla transizione eritaria dei caratteri biologici, 3 vols (Florence, 1947), I, 470-72. Gauthiez documents Maria's earlier success in persuading Clement VII to allow her to move Cosimo to Rome in 1524, to keep him in the public eye and to eclipse Clement's illegitimate son, Alessandro de' Medici; see Gauthiez, Jean des Bandes Noires, 324-26.

35 Pompeo Litta, Famiglie celebri in Italia, 13 vols (Milan, 1890-1902), Serie I, G-O, Medici; Booth, Cosimo, 27; Pieraccini, Stirpe, I, 472.

36 See his letter, Pieraccini, Stirpe, I, 467. The portentous event, linking the house of Medici to the kingdom of France, was recorded later by Vasari on the ceiling of the Sala di Clemente VII; see note 3. Langedijk, in her review of Cox-Rearick, Dynasty and Destiny, 288, notes that Maria ensured that Cosimo paid his respects in all the "right" places.

37 See notes 7, 8 and 10 and 11, concerning scholarly dating.

38 Booth, Cosimo, 38, quoting Cosimo's letter to Maria, 28 January 1530.
Vives, *De institutione femina Christiana*, Bk. II, Chap. 9, especially cautions on “coddling” and advises that a mother’s love should not be overly expressed.

Leo had enthusiastically named Cosimo for his “wise, prudent and most valorous” ancestor, Cosimo the Elder. Gauthiez, *Jean des Bandes Noires*, 117-18, 327-28. See also note 25 above.

See text and note 31 above.

Maria was responding to the concerns of her brother. Cardinal Salviati, for Cosimo’s safety. Guglielmo Enrico Saltini, *Tragedie medicee domestiche* (1557-87) (Florence, 1889), xxviii.

Maria’s encouragement of Cosimo to be urbane, literate and sophisticated, but solidly and stoical in imitation of his famous father, is as contemporary treatises advise for widows with young sons. See Vives, *De institutione femina Christiana*, Bk. III. Chaps. I, II, III; Fusco, *La vedova*, 36; and Ruth Kelso, *Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance*, 2nd edn (New York, 1977), 128.

*Canzone di Don Diego di Sandoval*, lines 140ff, in C.O. Tosi, “Maria Salviati Medici,” *Arte e storia*, XXVII, nos. 9-10 (1908), 74-75. Sandoval, a Spanish retainer at the court from the time of Eleonora’s wedding in 1539, has passed into obscurity.


The tradition was reiterated in Titian’s *Guidobaldo II della Rovere and His Son* (location unknown) of 1552, where the child appears to be about three years of age. See Harold Wethey, *The Paintings of Titian* (London, 1971), II, pl. 165, cat. 91; see also pl. 113, cat. 31, *Ranuccio Farnese as a Knight of Malta* of 1542, where the boy is sumptuously dressed and girded with a sword; he proudly displays the insignia of the Order.

“... imperocché la Signora Maria madre del Duca ... era trapassata all’altra migliore, lasciando nome di buona e valorosa donna, la quale rimase vedova del Signor Giovanni de’ Medici nel fiore della giovinezza con l’unico figliuolo molto piccolo, travagliata da molte noje mantenne la caso in buona riputazione, e il grado suo con dignità; e di maniera allevò il figliuolo, che di lui s’era presa si fatta speranza, che mancando principe alla città, a lui ricorsero i cittadini, che n’ebbero a deliberare. Dolse assai al Duca la morte di lei, come quegli, a cui ella era stata invece di padre, di madre, e d’ogni altra persona cara, non avendo conosciuto altri, che gli avesse fatto benefizio, e tenutone cura. Incredibile a tutto il popolo, perciò che’l era molto umana, e a molti bisognosi e afflitti soccorreva ...” Adriani, *Suoi tempi*, I, 195.

Tosi, “Maria”; see lines 140-50.

See note 49. Fusco, *La Vedova*, 41-42, cites Lavinia Colonna as an exemplar of the young widow who “rimase vedova belissima, e vertuosa nel flor della sua gioventù, di quel sole marito si contento ... & inalzat tanto March’ Antonio suo figliuolo alla sublimita della vertù ch’egli sopra ogni altro patrizio della sua età hoggidi si trouva per ciò rare & illustré [sic].” Contessa Clelia, to whom Fusco dedicated his treatise, widowed in her youth in 1552 and faithful to her deceased husband, is also praised.

See note 15.

Langedijk, *Portraits*, I, 3. Ferdinando, 1549-1609, formerly a cardinal, succeeded Francesco, who died without heirs. Ferdinando was succeeded by his son Cosimo II, 1590-1621.

Zeti, *Walters Art Gallery*, II, 325, proposed that the elimination of the child was made much later to support the fanciful identification of the sitter as the renowned poetess, Vittoria Colonna (1492-1547), by which it passed into the Walters Collection in 1902.


Titian’s *Filetto and his Son* (now separated) in Vienna, 1538-40, have hair cropped close and brushed forward, as do *Ranuccio Farnese as a Knight of Malta*, 1542, now in Washington, the six boys in *The Vendramin Family group*, and *Guidobaldo II della Rovere and His Son of 1552* (location unknown). See Wethey, *Titian*, II, pls. 133, 113, 136 and 165. Parmigianino’s *Portrait of the Countess of San Secondo with her Three Sons* in Madrid, 1533-35, is another case in point. See Sydney Freedberg, *Parmigianino: His Works in Painting* (Cambridge, Mass., 1950), pl. 143, 213-14.

See Bacchesci, *Opera completa*, colour pls. XXI and XXIII for *Lucrezia*, pl. 29 for the Washington portrait, and colour pl. LXIII for Laura.

Uffizi, P299; see Bacchesci, *Opera completa*, colour pl. XLIII.

Uffizi, P306; see Bacchesci, *Opera Completa*, no. 87.


For example by the Venetian ambassadors to Florence, Marco Foscari in 1527 and Carlo Capello in 1529, in Albéri, *Ambasciatori*, I, 129.
62 Cosimo and Vasari must have been aware of this—Alessandro appears prominently in Vasari's fresco cycle in the Sala di Clement VII in the Palazzo Vecchio program. Langedijk, in her review of Cox-Reearck's *Dynasty and Destiny*, 288, notes that Vasari portrayed the two together in his *Supper of St. Gregory, and Emma Michelelli, The Medici of Florence* (Florence, 1992), 42, accepts Clement as Alessandro's father.


64 Adriani, *Suoi tempi*, 25, 99, who describes Cibo's efforts to make Giulio, then his four-year old ward, the legitimate prince of the State. Nicholas Tenhove, *Memoirs of the House of Medici from its Origin to the Death of Francesco*, the Second Grand Duke of Tuscany and of the Great Men Who Flourished in that Period, trans. Sir Richard Clayton, 2 vols (Bath, 1747). 387, indicates that it was Giulio's infancy, not his illegitimacy, that made the Florentine Senate choose Cosimo over Giulio. I am indebted to Mario Valdes for furnishing this reference and for pertinent discussions on Alessandro's two children.

65 Referring to Cardinal Cibo's efforts to discredit Cosimo's guardianship of the child in 1539, Adriani, *Suoi tempi*, 101, recorded: "... il Duca aveva amato sempre il Signor Giulio e avuto in animo di tenerlo onorato secondo sua condizione, come egli poi sempre mai feci; di che Giulio, stesso poteva esser testimone." See also Saltini, *Tragedie*, XIV; Luigi Alberto Ferrai, *Cosimo I de' Medici, Duca di Firenze* (Bologna, 1882), 392ff; and Pieracini, *Stirpe*, 414ff. Cosimo's letters to Giulio document his promotion of the boy through his youth, marriage and career. When the boy was in kept in Naples in 1540 (see text and note 103), Cosimo's agent Pyro Musipsilo affirmed that he will reassure Giulio; Archivio di Stato di Firenze (hereinafter A.S.F.) MSS M.D.P. filza 4068, 10 January 1540. Giulio is said to have been raised at Cosimo's court. See *Bibliografia Universale Antica & Moderna*, XXXVI, 478. The loving reports to Cosimo from his mother concerning the boy (A.S.F. MSS M.D.P. filza 3, vol. 1, c.70 and 70v, for example) and correspondence between Cosimo and Giulio in later years (A.S.F. MSS M.D.P. filza 1175, Giulio to Cosimo from Rome, 1 September 1549, among others), Cosimo's to Giulio (A.S.F. MSS M.D.P. filza 6373, c.28v) concerning armaments, 1561 (A.S.F. MSS M.D.P. filza 6373, c.36), and on the occasion of Giulio's wedding, 11 August 1561 (A.S.F. MSS M.D.P. Filza 6373, c.36v), all document Cosimo's close relationship with Giulio. (In 1562 he was one of the first Knights of Santo Stefano to be ennobled by the Duke, who made him First Admiral of the order, specially founded for war against the Turks; see Booth, *Cosimo*, 214.)

This pattern is similar to the ducal couple's abiding care of Giulia, indicated in correspondence (Maria Salvati to Cosimo, A.S.F. MSS M.D.P. filza 345, c.364 and c.380), and Cosimo's large dowry settlement of 25,000 scudi. (A.S.F. MSS M.D.P. filza 6357, c.8, 29 December 1549).

66 See note above. Her welfare is mentioned in passing, as is the infant Maria's.


69 Bernardo Segni, *Storie fiorentine di Mesher Bernardo Segni gentilissimo fiorentino dall'Anno MDXXVII al MDLV colla vita di Niccolò Capponi ... descritta dal medesimo Segni suo nipote*, 3 vols (Milan, 1805), II, 389, noted Cosimo's abiding care of Giulio, who in his teens was given a commission in Pisa with an income of 1,000 ducats per annum.

70 Concerning ducal affection and Giulia's marriage settlement, see note 65. Her second husband, Bernardesto d' Ottaviano de'Medici, whom she married in 1559, was a relative and intimate of Cosimo's family; see Litta, *Famiglie*, Serie I, Medici.

71 Giulio, recorded as four years of age in 1537, was born in 1533, Giulia just before or after, of the same mother, here proposed as l'addetta Malespina. In 1550, when Giulia married Francesco Cantelmo—whose titles also included Conte d'Alvito and Duke of Populi (see Litta, *Famiglie*, Serie I, G-0)—I propose that she was fifteen or sixteen, about the age when Cosimo's daughters were intended to marry (Maria at seventeen, Isabella at fourteen, and Lucrezia—a replacement for Maria on the latter's death—when she was only thirteen). Giulia was born probably around 1534.

72 Langedijk, *Portraits*, I, cat. no. 1, 55, "Rejected Identifications" pertinently links it to the Uffizi Tribuna inventory of 1638: "Un quadro in tavola, di un ritratto del Sig[il] Giuliano de Medici da Giovanniotto rosso e sotto nero, con una berretta in capo, nero, di mano di lascopo Puntronio, con adornamento di noce con 4 filetti d'oro, alto braccia 1 7/8 largo braccia 1 1/2." The portrait was removed from the Tribuna on 29 February 1678, and is believed to have been at Poggio Imperiale, where it was called "Giuliano" until recent times. For scholarly discussion, see notes 75-77 below.

73 Berti, *Opera*, 101. The first Duke's ancestry has long been debated. For the purpose of this study, where his putative portrait in Lucca is reidentified as his red-haired son and descendants are compared to his secure portraits, his unique physiognomy is important and deserves consideration. Ceccherelli, writing in 1587, described "capelli ricci neri e bruno in viso," Ammirato, in 1647, described "color bruno, labbri grossi e capelli crespi," descriptions consonant with extant portraits of him. See Langedijk, *Portraits*, I, series 1. He was widely believed to have been the son of Clement VII and a Moorish slave, Simunetta, in the household of Alfonsina Medici in Rome. Certainly, Alessandro's mother was a "Simunetta [sic]," as testifies a letter, addressing him as "Alessandro Figliuolo carissimo" and begging his help because of her destitution (see Ferrai, *Cosimo*, 449, and Pieracini, *Stirpe*, 397. His paternity is variously given by contemporaries: Varchi, whose *Storie fiorentine* was commissioned by Cosimo, believed Clement was his father, as did Segni, *Storie*, I, 165, who accepts the tradition of Alessandro's mother as a Moorish slave. Ammirato, a historian commissioned by the Medici late in
Cosimo’s life, preferred Clement and a servant, Pieraccini. *Stirpe*, 398. During Clement’s lifetime, Marco Foscaro, Venetian Ambassador in 1527, and Carlo Capello in 1529, refer to Alessandro as Clement’s nephew, Albèri, *Ambasciatori*, Serie II, 1, 74-75. Albèri opines that he was certainly Clement’s son. Clement’s devotion to Alessandro, and associated portrayals of them (see note 62), in spite of his reputation as a bad lot, suggest that Clement was his father. With regard to his mother, overtones of contemporary racism tend to confirm Segni’s opinion that Simonetta was Moorish. When Cosimo placed Alessandro’s body in Lorenzo’s tomb in San Lorenzo, Agostino Lapini, *Diario fiorentino di Agostino Lapini dal 252 al 1596* (Florence, 1906), 10, recorded a resulting “phenomenon:” “Fu sepoltio detto duca Alessandro in Santo Lorenzo, in Sagrestia nuova, nel sepolcro a man sinistra: quale è sudicio e nero per causa del suo corpo.” Alessandro’s dissolution and alleged forays in convents (see note 83) may be exaggerations to make him seem egregious. (Ferrai, *Cosimo*, 163, notes Alessandro’s benevolence, kindness and generosity to Cosimo and to the poor.)


74 Philadelphia Museum of Art, John G. Johnson Collection, no. 83; see Carl B. Strehlke, “Pontormo, Alessandro de’ Medici and the Palazzo Pitti,” *Bulletin of the Philadelphia Museum of Art*, LXXXV, no. 348 (Fall 1985), 3, note 1, for bibliography. For the adolescent portrait, until recently in Lugano, see Langedijk, *Portraits*, 1, cat. no. 1, 12. Its provenance is unknown. Alessandro’s very long nose, poring mouth, short, dimpled chin and rich black, tightly curled hair identify him. Attributions to Giulio Romano and Raphael seem not incongruous, as Alessandro spent much of his adolescence in Rome, but Raphael died in 1519, when Alessandro was eight. As he looks adolescent in the Madrid panel, the hand is unlikely to be Raphael’s.

75 The inventory entry of 1638 is quoted in note 72. T. Trapesnikoff, *Die Porträtdarstellungen der Medicier des XV. Jahrhunderts* (Strasbourg, 1909) noted a tradition identifying the panel with Giuliano di Piero de’ Medici, victim of the 1478 Pazzi conspiracy—this would mean it was posthumous—but Giuliano too had black hair. See also Luciano Berti, *Pontormo* (Florence, 1964), 37-38. Giuliano di Pierfrancesco the Younger, born 1520-21, was also considered as a possible subject by Trapesnikoff, followed by Pieraccini, *Stirpe* (“Giuliano, Vescova di Beziers”). See also G. Nicco-Fasola, *Pontormo o del Cinquecenio* (Florence, 1947) caption, pl. 39, “Giuliano”; Forster, *Monographie*, 140; and Berti, *Opera*, 101. This would give a date of 1532-34. The “Giuliano” debate seems to have been gradually abandoned after Carlo Gamba, “A Proposito di Alessandro Allori e di un suo ritratto,” *Rivista del R. Istituto d’Archeologia e Storia dell’arte*, V (1929), 11, proposed Alessandro, who, according to Vasari, was portrayed by Pontormo between 1524-1527—at twelve years of age. See Vasari-Milanesi, *Vite*, VI, 273.

76 For Langedijk, see note 72; see Strehlke, “Pontormo, Alessandro,” 5; and Luciano Berti, ”Un ritrovamento: il Ritratto di Francesca Capponi del Pontormo,” *Critica d’arte*, LV, nos. 2-3 (1990), 20-33.

77 Janet Cox-Rearick, The *Drawings of Pontormo*, 2 vols, rev. and aug. ed (New York, 1981), 55-56, accepts its identity as Alessandro and also links it to Vasari’s reference to the adolescent portrait of him which was painted at the same time as one of Ippolito de’ Medici (Vasari-Milanesi, *Vite*, VI, 273). She has, however, noted a jump from realism and a Puligesque quality in the preparatory drawing for the lost *Ippolito* of the early 1520s (Cox-Rearick, *Drawings*, cat. no. 223, fig. 219), to abstraction, distortion, a loss of the Puligesque sfumato and a difference in handling in the Lucca portrait. Recently, Berti, “Francesca Capponi,” 30, noted its loss of refinement compared to the late-1520s Pontormo *Francesca*. This can be explained by the new identity here proposed as Giulio as a boy in the 1540s. These supposed stylistic “anomalies” are pertinent to a logical change in Pontormo’s style over a two-decade interval. Patricia Rubin, “The Art of Color in Florentine Painting of the Early Sixteenth-century: Rosso Fiorentino and Jacopo Pontormo,” *Art History*, XIV, no. 2 (June 1991), 185, noting Vasari’s documentation of Pontormo’s luminous colour experiments at Santa Felicità between 1526 and 1528, surmises that Pontormo had moved from the influence of his old master Leonardo to that of Michelangelo, which would explain the difference in luminosity between the drawing for the lost *Ippolito* and the Lucca portrait, and Berti’s observations vis-à-vis *Francesca* and the Lucca panel.

78 National Gallery, Washington, D.C., Kress Collection, cat. no. 1635, pl. 273, cat. by Fern Shapley (Washington, 1968), I, 377. Monsignor della Casa was in Florence between 1541 and 1544, when he returned to Rome to assume the title of Archbishop of Benevento. See Cox-Rearick, *Drawings*, 308-309, who identified della Casa from portraits of him by Francesco Salvati of about 1537-38 (Vienna), and documentation for a lost work by Titian, ca. 1545.

79 See text at notes 67, 68 and 69.

80 Tenehove, *Memoirs of the House of Medici*, II, 388, who unfortunately did not refer to documents or portraits. It would appear that Giulio’s resemblance to Alessandro is close enough to have caused some of his portraits to be identified as his father’s. Langedijk recently reidentified a portrait in St. Louis—formerly attributed to Francesco Salvati and identified as “Pierfrancesco di Lorenzo Popolano”—as a posthumous portrait of Alessandro; see Langedijk, *Portraits*, II, cat. no. 73, 4, and III, cat. no. I, 56 (addenda). It is, however, probably by Vasari, as the subject’s hands are similar, and the figures of Arno, Martuccio and Fiorenza correspond with identical motives in the *Alessandro* of the Sala
di Leone X described in note 82 below. As the St. Louis siter's hair is not black but reddish brown and the costume style is ca. 1555, I propose that this is Giulio. Also Langedijk, Portraits, 1, cat. no. 1, 6c, has identified a drawing by Daniele Ercmita in the Biblioteca Marucelliana (No.1.18) inscribed GIULIO DE MEDICI Fo.1) ALLENNANDO, as Alessandro. Unless there is reason to suppose that the inscription is spurious, Giulio probably is its subject.

81 Micheletti, Medici, 41. Alessandro was nicknamed "the Moor." See note 73 for Alessandro's mother, Simunetta, allegedly a Moorish slave.

82 The unidealized Fig. 9 here, Uffizi, Inv. 1890, no. 857, 16 x 12.5 cm., inscribed ALEX.MED.FLOR. DUX I. LAUREN.F., one of the Medici series on tin executed after 1553 and now in the Museo Medico, Florence, strongly supports Giulio's paternity. Its meticulous rendering, inscription and short-bust format make this especially suitable for comparison with the Giulia in the Baltimore portrait. See Langedijk, Portraits, 1, cat. 1.6, and Bacchieschi, Opera completa, no. 145. Besides Figs. 8 and 9 here, Langedijk, Portraits, 1, cat. no. 1, 48 (the fresco showing Alessandro in armor all'antica in the Sala di Leone X, Palazzo Vecchio) shows that his features mirror the expression of the Baltimore child.

83 Adriani, 1583, whose Suoi tempi is dedicated to Francesco de' Medici, prefers not to hazard the name of Giulio's mother. Segni, Storie, II, 137-38, writing in the late sixteenth century, gives Giulio's mother as "una Pazzi." Not warm to the Medici, he expresses his outrage at Alessandro's lechery, which he records as well known from at least his late teens, noting that Alessandro was known to despoil women of honourable Florentine families and make forays into convents. See Segni, Storie, II, 19-20 and 59-60; see also Ferrai, Cosimo, 159-160. Litta, Famiglie, Serie IA, Medici, gives Giulio's mother as a lady of Pazzi, noting that others believe that Angelica Malespina, a nun, was his mother. I will argue that she is most likely to have been Taddea Malespina; see text and note 87.

84 Vasari-Milanesi, Vite, VI, 278. See Strehlke, "Pontormo, Alessandro," 5.

85 Langedijk, Portraits, 1, cat. no. 1, 75. Pontormo has given an air of wistfulness and gentility to the sitter, compared to other portraits of Alessandro. Langedijk proposes that its destination to Taddea suggests that Alessandro wished to present himself as a connoisseur of feminine beauty—as Castiglione had proposed was an appropriately princely pursuit in his Cortegiano.

86 Francesco Berni, the poet, who frequented the Palazzo from about 1533, satirized his boredom with the frivolity and pedes trian character of the Malespina-Cibò-Alessandro circle. Strehlke, "Pontormo, Alessandro," 11.

87 Campbell, "Alessandro di Giorgio Vasari," 340; see also Strehlke, "Pontormo, Alessandro," 3. The Palazzo Pazzi was Cardinal Cibò's residence, where Alessandro amused himself with Ricciarda and Taddea Malespina. Caterina Cibò, the excommunicated Marchesa of Camerino—Cibò's sister and widow of Giovanni Maria da Varano—was also in residence in the early 1530s. The independently wealthy Ricciarda, Marchioness of Massa and Cararra, Cardinal Innocenzo's separated sister-in-law and mother of several of his children, had extremely influential links to Charles V. The Emperor's ambassador to the papal court was also the father of one of her children. Taddea was her sister. The linking of the nun Angelica Malespina's name rather than her sister Taddea's may be seen as a predictable result of rumours of Alessandro's forays into convents (see note 83). Taddea was the object of Alessandro's attentions in the Via Proconsolo over several years, and Giulio's links to the family remained unbroken into adulthood (see text following). It is much more likely that Taddea, who did not remarry after Alessandro's death, was the mother of Giulio and Giulia.

88 Relations between the Medici and Cibò-Malespina families are extremely convoluted and ambiguous: in 1532, at the time of Alessandro's association with them, Maria Salviali had petitioned Pope Clement to provide a wife and estates for Cosimo (then thirteen), apparently proposing Maddalena Cibò, niece of Innocenzo and Caterina Cibò, but Caterina was obstinately against the proposal. Booth, Cosimo, 32, who exhaustively corrects scholarly references to Giulia Varano Cibò, another niece, as the prospective bride. In spite of this snub and mischief by the Cibò-Malespina over Giulio at the time of Cosimo's succession, Caterina, as her letter quoted in my text demonstrates, was a courtyer of note at the Florentine court.

89 See Clapp, Pontormo, 280-82, for Ansaldo's long, indictant letter to Cosimo's regent, Francesco, 23 November 1571, A.S.F Mediceo del Principato, MSS Carteggio Universale, filza 567, c.187. For Cosimo's close relations with Giulio, see note 65.

90 Ferrai, Cosimo, 159, note 1, quoting G. Viani, Memorie della famiglia Cibò (Pisa, 1808).

91 Minor and Mitchell, Festivities for the Marriage of Cosimo I, 129, note 58, and Gamba, Conoscenza del Pontormo, 14-15 and fig. 13, who believes that the Portrait of a Cardinal in the Galleria Borghese variously attributed to Salviali and Pontormo, is Cibò.

92 Albéri, Ambasciatori, I, 75, note 1.

93 Adriani, Suoi tempi, I, 410.

94 On the currency of this message, see Graham Smith, "Cosimo I and the Joseph Tapestries for the Palazzo Vecchio," Renaissance and Reformation, VI (1982), 187, 191, 193. The tapestries were commissioned soon after May 1540.

95 Baia, Leonora di Toledo, 1-2, notes that on his election by the Florentines on 9 January 1537, Cosimo waited six months before the Emperor declared his title valid and legitimate. Cox-Rearick, Dynasty, 238, citing Cantini's Vita di Cosimo de' Medici Primo Gran Duca di Toscana (Florence, 1805), 73-74, notes delivery of documentation on 30 September 1537. Cosimo pro-
claimed his status in an edict of 16 October. For this period of Cosimo's dukedom, see also Saltini, Tragedie, xxvff.

Legitimization of Giulio in the event of Cosimo not producing heirs would ultimately have been a papal or imperial matter. There were precedents for this. Federico da Montefeltro's son Buoncorte was legitimized (but died of plague in 1458) before Battista Sforza gave birth to Guidobaldo in 1472. Federico had himself been legitimized to enable him to succeed when his half-brother Oddoantonio was murdered in 1444. See Rosenberg, "The Double Portrait of Federico da Montefeltro and Guidobaldo," 218. More recently, Charles V had arbitrated the illegitimate Ippolito de' Medici's challenge to Alessandro's dukedom after Clement's death in 1534. Strachlike, "Pontormo, Alessandro," 3, and Booth, Cosimo, 53-98.

See Bacchesci, Opera completa, colour pl. XLIII, where Bia appears beaded in diamond-and-pearl earrings, a pearl collar, a heavy gold chain with a pendant gold cameo of her father, and a gold chain girding her waist. She is dressed in white satin.

Kelso, Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance, 129-30.

Caterina Cibò recorded Maria's ill-health in 1541. See Booth, Cosimo, 117, quoting the letter of 8 July 1541 to Cibò's sister. Maria does appear ravaged by ill-health in posthumous works; see note 3.

Cox-Rearick in Christie's Pontormo sale cat., note 8, proposed that the separated drawings of head and torso on Uffizi 6503F suggest studies for a posthumous portrait. I concur, and have discussed physiognomical evidence at length in my "Decorum in Portraits of Medici Women," Ch. IV.

Albèri, Ambasciatori, 1, 99-101; see also Tenhove, Memoirs of the House of Medici, 386-87. See especially Booth, Cosimo, 94-98.

Albèri, Ambasciatori, 1, 101; and Booth, Cosimo, 94-98.

Albèri, Ambasciatori, 1, 101. As Cibò was Maria Salviati's first cousin, perhaps kinship was a factor in Cosimo's leniency toward him.

Florence, A.S.F. MSS M.D.P. filza 210. The long letter from Naples, signed by Pytro Musipsilo, giving Cosimo detailed news of hostilities with the Turks, concludes with a passage coded in numerals, with a halting, truncated gloss inserted in a different hand above: "Ho un grand secreto di buon luogo come al vivere. Stato massa practica [. . .] del casamento con la signora Donna Giulia e in si e concluso cosa alcuna ne nunca, esclusa una sin[. . .] cosi tra il si . . . l'anno[?] fino abito c l'huomo suo tornera. C'è questo lui ha detto ch'i viavi[?] mai da S.Mra e per trattave suo casamento con la mona di gioventu moglie fu già del [cast. . .] del Nas. sao [. . .] si justa conclude potrebbe[?]. [End of gloss]. La Lma haver affetto suplico v. Ex[celleuto] . . . basio li mani et in sua buona grazia mi rac[.]o. [. . .] S^a Duchessa et S^a m^a Maria. Di Napoli alli X di juniaro MDXXX. [sic]"

The Duke's fears of Giulio being promoted or manipulated by Medici enemies are evident from the time of his accession. When Margaret of Austria, the fifteen-year-old widow of Alessandro and natural daughter of Charles V, wished to take Giulio with her to the Farnese Court on her marriage to Ottavio Farnese in 1538, Cosimo intervened, writing to the Marchese d'Angoulême, imperial ambassador in Rome. "The Signora Duchessa, it is reported to me, designs to take to Rome the Signor Julio, (son of Duke Alessandro of happy memory), as one who has ever had, and has, a singular affection for the boy, due both to the memory of her husband, and to his own gracious disposition. Thus carried away by this affection, she unfortunately does not consider of how great import it is that she should now take him from her house to lodge him in the house of the Farnese, nor what blame and prejudice to my honour and my house would follow on such a decision. Whence it seemed good to say a word concerning this to your Excellency, begging you consider the importance of the event. . . ." Quoted in translation, Booth, Cosimo, 93-94 (adjusted here to eliminate archaisms). Cosimo may have seen the Farnese environment as potentially hostile or dangerously alienating for the young Giulio, a pretender to his title with powerful interests backing him. Ferrai, Cosimo, 143; and Booth Cosimo, 98, indicate that Cosimo was also deeply wounded that Margaret was bestowed by Charles on the Farnese, enemies of the Medici.

Henk Th. van Veen, "Vasari e l'analisi logica della pittura," in Letteratura artistica e arte di corte nella Firenze granducale, ed. Henk Th. van Veen (Florence, 1986), 15-17, demonstrates that Cosimo's power was consolidated gradually, beginning with the confirmation of his dukedom by Charles V. See also note 95.

Langedijk discusses its symbolism and believes that the broncone became less important as Cosimo's power was established. Langedijk, Portraits, 1, 68 and 86; John Sparrow, "Pontormo's Cosimo il Vecchio, a New Dating," Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, XXX (1967), 163-175; Graham Smith, "Bronzino's Portrait of Stefano Colonna: A Note on its Florentine Provenance," Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte, XL (1977), note 18; Cox-Rearick, Dynastie, 237-38, and Campbell, "Alessandro di Giorgio Vasari," 356-57.

Cox-Rearick, Dynastie, 43.

Later, Giulio spent time at Massa with the Malespini, presumably with Taddea; see Segni, Storie, II, 214. (See also notes 65 and 69 above.) Maria Salviati founded a convent for Alessandro's other illegitimate daughters—all born of noble women—where they were enclosed "al servizio di Dio," Segni, Storie, II, 214.

Segni, Storie, 214 and 138ff, who describes her role in challenging the Vitelli, Cibò's allies, at the time of Cosimo's accession.

Baia, Leonora di Toledo, 65, refers to Eleonora's role as regent, "specialmente dopo la morte della succora, donna Maria Salviati," implying that Maria's political stature was understood.

The modal in Maria's hand may have been a crucial clue to the iconography of the portrait, but it is now indecipherable. Langedijk, Portraits, II, cat no. 87, 5, has proposed that it may have shown the joining of the two branches of the Medici, which seems appropriate for the historic circumstances described here.

Giulia de' Medici's pride in her Medici ancestry was intense. She identified strongly with her father, Alessandro, the first Duke
of Florence. In the early years of her marriage to the equally proud Bernardetto, her insistent demands that she be treated as the equal of Eleonora di Toledo in every respect caused a rift between Cosimo and the couple. Eventually, in 1567 Bernardetto and Giulia removed themselves from Florence to Ottaiano, near Naples, having purchased the Principality from the Gonzaga at enormous expense—50,000 ducats; see E. Grassellini and A. Fracassini, Profili medicei (Florence, 1982), 81. For more on Bernardetto de' Medici, see Iodocco del Badia, Miscellanea fiorentina di erudizione e storia (Florence, 1902), II, 56; and Litta, Famiglie, Medici, tav. XX.


113 Mario Valdes's expertise in Afro-European history and genealogy prompted him to alert me to Giulia's distinctive features when my article "Allori's Lady with a Cameo" appeared, and he suggested that this might be Alessandro's illegitimate daughter.

114 Langdon, "Allori's Lady with a Cameo."