VISUAL CULTURE IN EARLY MODERNITY

ROUTLEDGE

Santi Gucci Fiorentino, Artist and Entrepreneur in Early Modern Poland

Olga Maria Hajduk

Santi Gucci Fiorentino, Artist and Entrepreneur in Early Modern Poland

The original research in this book analyzes the artistic activity of Santi Gucci (1533–c. 1600), a Florentine sculptor active in Poland in the second half of the sixteenth century, and his workshop.

Chapters examine the organization of the artistic workshop (sculpting and masonry) and the model of the artist's functioning as an entrepreneur in Renaissance Poland, using Santi Gucci's activity as an example. Gucci shaped the image of Polish sculpture in the sixteenth century for more than 50 years, even though his work has not yet been fully examined. The author sets Gucci's emigration within the context of the cultural exchanges between Italy and Poland that contributed to the development of the Polish Renaissance.

The book will be of interest to scholars working in art history, Renaissance studies, architectural history and economic history.

Olga Maria Hajduk received her PhD from the Institute of Art of the Polish Academy of Sciences. Her area of focus lies in interdisciplinary studies on Italian artist activities in Renaissance Poland with special attention on sculptors and goldsmiths, and the women's representation in early modern Poland.

Visual Culture in Early Modernity
Series Editor: Kelley Di Dio, University of Vermont

A forum for the critical inquiry of the visual arts in the early modern world, Visual Culture in Early Modernity promotes new models of inquiry and new narratives of early modern art and its history. The range of topics covered in this series includes, but is not limited to, painting, sculpture and architecture as well as material objects, such as domestic furnishings, religious and/or ritual accessories, costume, scientific/medical apparata, erotica, ephemera and printed matter.

The Procaccini and the Business of Painting in Early Modern Milan
Angelo Lo Conte

Hybridity in Early Modern Art
Edited by Ashley Elston and Madeline Rislow

The Influence of Italian Culture on the Sevillian Golden Age of Painting
Rafael Japón

A Patron Family Between Renaissance Florence, Rome and Naples
The Del Riccio in the Shadow of Michelangelo
Vincenzo Sorrentino

The Cults of Raphael and Michelangelo
Artistic Sainthood and Memorials as a Second Life
Tamara Smithers

Art, Patronage, and Nepotism in Early Modern Rome
Karen J. Lloyd

Portraiture, Gender and Power in Sixteenth-Century Art
Creating and Promoting the Public Image of Early Modern Women
Noelia García Pérez

For more information about this series, please visit: www.routledge.com/Visual-Culture-in-Early-Modernity/book-series/ASHSER2107

Santi Gucci Fiorentino, Artist and Entrepreneur in Early Modern Poland

Olga Maria Hajduk

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
NEW YORK AND LONDON

Designed cover image: Detail of the Monument to Queen Anna Jagiellon, Kraków: Wawel Cathedral, Sigismund Chapel, Photo: Piotr Jamski

First published 2024
by Routledge
605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158

and by Routledge
4 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Translated into English thanks to support from the Lanckoronski Foundation.

FUNDACJA
LANCKORONŃSKICH

ISBN: 9781032657875 (hbk)
ISBN: 9781032657882 (pbk)
ISBN: 9781032657899 (ebk)

DOI: 10.4324/9781032657899

Typeset in Sabon
by Newgen Publishing UK

To my beloved son Wojtek

Never cease exploring the unknown, the intriguing,

the beautiful…

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

Contents

Illustrations

Acknowledgments

This book would not have been possible without the support, kindness and constructive criticism of many people I had the pleasure of meeting during my research.

First, I would like to thank Professor Katarzyna Mikocka-Rachubowa, who undertook the supervision of my doctoral dissertation at the Institute of Art of the Polish Academy of Sciences, for providing scholarly and moral support throughout all stages of writing this book. I should like to express my gratitude to Professor. Zbigniew Bania and Professor Przemysław Mrozowski, who reviewed my dissertation that I defended in February 2021 and offered me valuable criticism that I have tried to consider when adapting the thesis to this book. I am also most appreciative of the helpful conversations with Professor Stanisław Mossakowski.

I owe the deepest gratitude to my patient editor, Karen Lloyd, for her interest in my research and for making this book happen. I am equally grateful for the assistance and guidance provided by Isabella Vitti and Loredana Zeddita in preparing the manuscript for publication. My special thanks go to reviewers for their insightful feedback.

I should also like to extend my heartfelt thanks to Professor Mario Bevilacqua from the University of Florence for his unwavering support during my three months research stay in Tuscany funded by the Italian Government. I had great privilege to spend three months at the Medici Archive Project (MAP) as a research fellow funded by the National Science Centre in Poland.

My sincerest thanks to Dr. Alession Assonitis, who invited me, and to all the generous scholars at the MAP with whom I enjoyed many fruitful discussions during my stay.

Many thanks to the Lanckoronski Foundation that financed the translation of this book.

I would like to thank my translator Aleksandra Paszkowska and photographers: Anna Domańska and Piotr Jamski.

A special thank you goes to all the wonderful archivist and librarians, both in Poland and abroad, who have assisted my research for over six years. I am indebted to many colleagues and friends who have supported my scholarly development. Among them I would particularly like to thank my friends: Professor Kelley Helmstutler Di Dio, Dr. Paweł Ignaczak and Dr. Jarosław Pietrzak.

Since 2020 the Centre for the history of Renaissance Knowledge at the Institute of Art of the Polish Academy of Sciences is my academic home, a big thank you to my lovely colleagues there—it is a pleasure to work with you! Above all, I owe many thanks to my brilliant and generous colleague Gniewomir Hawrasz, for reading the entire manuscript draft and supplying me with insightful suggestions.

Finally, I wish to thank those "for whom and without whom…"—my loved ones: Mirek Tomicki and our son Wojciech to whom I dedicate this work.

Introduction

For the entire second half of the sixteenth century, the Florentine artist Santi Gucci (1533–ca. 1600) charted the course of sculptural art in Lesser Poland, introducing Mannerist forms of the purely Tuscan style to the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth. Despite that fact, his oeuvre has long awaited truly in-depth analysis. Especially the Italian beginnings of his career, which hold the key to understanding Gucci's artistic profile, have been largely overlooked by scholarship. Suffice it to say that the last monograph devoted to the Florentine appeared over five decades ago.[1] Meanwhile, in recent years, new source information emerged on Santi Gucci's life in Florence, allowing the broader definition of the circle of the artists with whom Gucci collaborated or came into contact.[2]

This interdisciplinary study of the sculptor's career operates from a broad research perspective, referring to a panoramic image of the art of the period. It looks at the Florentine's oeuvre not only through the prism of the works attributed to him, but also—primarily—through a reconstruction of the dynamics that underlay his career advancement as well as his role as an entrepreneur. I aimed to provide a comprehensive assessment of Gucci's body of work, a discussion of the processes that shaped his sculptural and architectural works and a broader evaluation of his career considering the economic and social factors that impacted his workshop's functioning. In particular, the reconstruction of the operations of Gucci's shop—including the character of its products, the division of labor as well as its influence on its contemporary artistic culture—brings to the fore the material conditions for sculptural art in sixteenth-century Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth. Examining this aspect of the artist's activities sheds light on the relationships between the architect-designer, his collaborators and his patrons, thus revealing the mechanisms of artistic life in the 1500s and the social, political, ideological and mental circumstances.

Santi Gucci as an artist sparked the interest of art historians as early as the late 1800s. Starting from the turn of the century, numerous inventory actions, research expeditions and archive queries initiated mostly by Kraków's academic milieu gradually enriched the body of information on the Florentine's life and work. Concurrently, Polish scholars engaged in animated correspondence with Italian archivists and researchers in order to gain greater knowledge on Gucci's background and career before his relocation to Poland.[3] Their findings were published in *Sprawozdania Komisji Historii Sztuki* (The Reports of the Art History Committee).[4] In 1911, in the fifth volume of the *Allgemeines Lexikon der Bildenden Künstler*, alongside a biographical entry dedicated to the artist Francesco Camilliani who was Santi Gucci's stepbrother (see Chapter 1), a short note on Gucci appeared, assigning to him the manufacture of the royal tombs of Sigismund II Augustus, Anna Jagiellon and Stephen Báthory in Kraków.[5] Later, in the fifteenth volume

DOI: 10.4324/9781032657899-1

of the same German lexicon, a more extensive description was provided, including the Florentine's approximate date of death (ca. 1600) and a longer list of attributed works, such as the expansion of the Łobzów royal residence, the erection of the Baranów Sandomierski Castle as well as the palaces of the magnates Myszkowski in Mirów and Pińczów. The lexicon entry also named such sculptures by Gucci as the Sancygniów tombs and the Firlej Chapel interior in Bejsce.[6] Around the same time, in 1922, Stanisław Tomkowicz presented new source documents on Santi Gucci's work.[7] In 1931, a concise summary of the previous findings by Polish scholars was contained in a dictionary entry on Gucci in the second edition of *Słownik architektów i budowniczych Polaków oraz cudzoziemców w Polsce pracujących* (*A Dictionary of Architects and Builders Polish and Foreign Working in Poland*) by Stanisław Łoza.[8]

Two studies have played a seminal role in research on Santi Gucci's oeuvre: an academic monograph on the artist by Krystyna Sinko and its review article by Witold Kieszkowski, who introduced a great number of corrections and additions.[9] Both works dictated the course of post-WWII research, which thrived especially in the 1950s and 60s. At that time, previous findings on the artist and his work were synthesized by Adam Bochnak in an entry to *Polski słownik biograficzny* (Polish Biographical Dictionary).[10] Based on the successively published volumes of *Katalog zabytków sztuki w Polsce*,[11] more studies expanding scholarly knowledge on Santi Gucci and his oeuvre were written, bringing new viewpoints on the problems related to the subject. The most significant ones include first and foremost studies by Helena and Stefan Kozakiewicz devoted to the problems of funerary art in Poland,[12] articles by Alicja and Mieczysław Kurzątkowski on Gucci's activity in the Lublin area,[13] publications that contributed to a discussion on the history of the Báthory Tomb and the Anna Jagiellon Tomb,[14] and examinations of selected works of architecture assigned to the Florentine.[15] Among the literature published at that time, Zbigniew Hornung's papers on the artistic origins of Santi Gucci's sculpture proved to be especially compelling.[16] These findings were collected, summarized and critically reviewed by Andrzej Fischinger in a second—and, so far, the last—monograph on Santi Gucci, published in 1969.[17] The author categorized and characterized the artist's own work, the products of his shop and those by his imitators. Importantly, the dissertation discussed the genesis of the Florentine's art as well as its significance for Poland.

Since the publication of Fischinger's monograph, researchers primarily concentrated on specific objects attributed to Santi Gucci, causing some of them to be described multiple times.[18] Regarding Gucci's oeuvre in general, and specifically its chronology and development, some problems were signaled rather than analyzed, chiefly from the perspective of research on one object or on the margins of studies on other matters.[19] Markedly, Jerzy Łoziński's synthetic study on domed funerary chapels discussed the works with which Gucci was associated and characterized the role of stylistic solutions used by the Florentine in the architecture of the late 1500s and early 1600s.[20] A breakthrough for a greater understanding of the final years of Gucci's work and of the circle of his artistic successors was made by Franciszek Stolot in a paper that introduced a newly identified source document: the last will of Gucci's collaborator and inheritor of his Pińczów shop, Tomasz Nikiel.[21]

As a consequence of the studies of individual works and the resultant new attributions that have emerged over the last 50 years, the body of works attributed to the Florentine master has expanded significantly. The sources on Gucci's life discovered by Fernando Loffredo have opened the doors to tracing the artist's first steps and influences in Florence.[22] Moreover, new source information on previously unknown aspects of the

artist's activity in the Lublin area and his participation in architectural work in Warsaw has come to light.[23] Danuta and Rafał Quirini-Popławski have recently resolved the lively debate around the tomb of Queen Anna Jagiellon by publishing a new source document on the object's history.[24]

In subsequent stages of research, the ongoing discussion was summarized by biographical entries published in Polish and international dictionaries.[25] The most recent of such articles is my short biography of Santi Gucci, which appeared in the 2016 *Słownik architektów i budowniczych środowiska warszawskiego XV–XVIII wieku* (*Dictionary of Architects and Builders of the Warsaw Milieu in the Fifteenth–Eighteenth Century*).[26] Since 2010, the Florentine artist's oeuvre has been the main subject of my research. Especially my study on the history of Paweł, Anna and Wojciech Kryski's monument in Drobin near Płock, published in part in the *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki* (Art History Bulletin), has arguably contributed to the characterization of Santi Gucci's work.[27] Moreover, my article on Gucci's first projects in Poland that appeared in the edited volume *Artyści włoscy na ziemiach południowo-wschodniej Rzeczypospolitej w czasach nowożytnych* (*Italian Artists in South-Eastern Areas of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth in the Early Modern Times*) offers the most recent discussion of his early sculptural work.[28] In recent years, I have published several studies of selected individual works by the Florentine master.[29]

This book takes as its point of departure the early stage of Santi Gucci's career in Florence and the analysis of his presumed relationships with some members of the Gucci family who were based in Poland from the late 1400s. Thus, in Chapter 1, I refer to newly identified archive sources in order to discuss the roots of his art, situating it in the context of the Florentine milieu. I characterize the artistic profiles of Gucci's family members, presenting documents discovered in Florence. Because the influence of Florentine masters and his training in their shops shaped the artist's style, I touch upon the operations of Italian sculptors' and architects' shops in the Cinquecento, particularly those of Benvenuto Cellini, Bartolomeo Ammannati and Baccio Bandinelli. Gucci's source-attested collaboration with Cellini on the master's foremost sculptural project that was *Perseus with the Head of Medusa* points to a connection to a circle of young artists involved in the creation of that famous work, which will be analyzed later in the chapter.

Researchers have not gone beyond noting the matter of kinship between artists and their connections by marriage to other families, asserting without any specific analysis that familial relationships fostered business enterprises in which each relative specialized in a different construction trade. With regard to Santi Gucci, this aspect—although mentioned very briefly in the first works by Krystyna Sinko[30]—was not elaborated upon in later publications, not least in Andrzej Fischinger's monograph. Sinko unsuccessfully attempted to establish the exact relations between the Italians noted in Kraków from the 1530s that bore the surname Gucci. She only sought to discover their genealogical connections without undertaking an analysis of the possible impact of their professional pursuits and economic background on Santi Gucci's beginnings in Poland.[31] Therefore, Chapter 1 reconstructs and discusses the possible relationships between the young artist and the Gucci family members active in Poland and Italy from the late 1400s, which crucially informs the question of his migration to the Polish–Lithuanian State.

An extensive query in Florentine archives, primarily the Archivio di Stato, has allowed me to verify, supplement and reinterpret known facts from Gucci's artistic biography as well as reconstruct his family history. The later chapters of this book, which focus on the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth, present the results of my queries in selected archives

in Poland: materials mainly held in Kraków, Warsaw's Central Archives of Historical Records (Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych, AGAD) and Kielce, where a collection of documents still awaits identification and inventory, and its size is therefore difficult to estimate. Consolidating the numerous scattered and fragmentary records of Santi Gucci's life and work in Poland led me to a critical analysis of the state of research and the verification of previous findings. In the course of my archive queries as well as my survey of previous publications, I have compiled a considerable body of sources including a number of unpublished documents pertinent to Santi Gucci's life and work. Due to spatial constraints, I am unable to quote them in full in this book. Instead, I have listed them in an annex, divided into three groups. The first group contains sources referring to Santi Gucci's private life as well as some of his projects. The sizable collection of documents concerning the expansion of the royal palace in Łobzów, including the Florentine's contract, constitutes its own group. For the first time, archive sources from the numerous minor academic contributions on the history of that palace are gathered in one place and supplemented by newly discovered and/or previously unpublished documents. The third group comprises largely unknown sources pertaining to the investments of royal treasurer Jacek Młodziejowski.

In the mid-1550s, when Gucci arrived in Poland, the Italian master Giovanni Maria il Mosca, called Padovano, held the monopoly on the Krakovian art market. Then, in the 1560s, Padovano's former apprentice Girolamo Canavesi became independent. In Chapter 2, I provide a characterization of the Krakovian artists' milieu, including the Italians who moved in it. I go on to discuss Santi Gucci's first projects in Poland, presenting the corrected dating of some major works by the Florentine as well as indicating an unknown episode of his activity in Poland: a collaboration with Padovano.

In many academic and literary texts discussing Renaissance art, the patron who commissioned a work has tended to overshadow those who enacted his will, including artists. There is a lingering conviction on the collective nature of artistic undertakings with the investor being the driving force and the highest authority. Admittedly, a comprehensive analysis of the five decades of the Florentine's career in Poland cannot be analyzed without considering his service for the king and high-ranking noble families. Research on artists' circles in early modern Europe has crucially taken into account the social relationships that impacted their careers. Therefore, I sought to capture the interpersonal connections that possibly led Santi Gucci to more commissions, for example by recommendation. Chapter 3 elaborates on these findings by presenting the Florentine's successive projects in chronological order, thus allowing me to trace the artist's cliental network and show how he amplified his business potential based on familial relationships. The use of state-of-the-art technical capabilities of the digital humanities, not least social network analysis, proved to be instrumental for that objective.

In my examinations of sculptural and architectural works associated with Santi Gucci, upon which I expound in Chapters 2, 3 and 4, I investigated the extant objects themselves as well as source materials and secondary literature. Apart from the consultation of historical sources, my principal methodology was the stylistic analysis and laboratory testing of works, aimed at determining their age and the material used and reconstructing the process of creation. I collaborated with monument conservators and became indebted to the fruits of their labor (in the form of their documentation of specific sets of works and their specialist research). On their findings as well as my own, I based the analysis of the technical and technological structure of the funerary monuments in question,

establishing the varieties of stone used, the ways of their processing and the methods of their installation. Moreover, I was able to note a great number of transformations, mainly damage and repair, that the works underwent over the last century, relying on carefully selected iconographic material identified during queries in the photographic collections.

Lastly, in Chapter 4, I discuss the mature phase of Gucci's art linked to the development of his workshop in Pińczów. Conveniently located in a quarry region and engaged in diverse projects including works of sculpture and architecture, the shop operated under the supervision of Gucci as an artist and entrepreneur who employed a great variety of specialized sculptors and artisans. Toward the end of his life, the master enjoyed great commercial success. In fact, the largest number works were produced by his shop in the final years of the 1500s, which necessitated the collective nature of the creative process and a division of labor. As the operations of the Pińczów shop played a vital role in Gucci's late oeuvre, this final chapter is devoted to their analysis. For this purpose—as well as for other such considerations in Chapters 1, 2 and 3—I conducted prosopographic investigations of the functioning of artist-entrepreneurs in early modern Europe. They involved the analysis of data on the identification of the artist in society and the tracing of his familial, social and economic relationships pertinent to the development of his career. The method allowed me to define the artistic relationships and workshop practices of the epoch.

This book combines a variety of approaches to the same subject from different perspectives and emphases, with special attention paid to source testimonies. I have coupled traditional methods of the art historian, such as inventory work involving the observation of art objects on site and archive queries, with the achievements of other fields, including technological research and conservatorial analysis. As such, this book constitutes a comprehensive study on the operations of one Renaissance artist's workshop in the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth. Hopefully, the findings will contribute to the further development of Renaissance art research in Poland and abroad, and the interdisciplinary methodology implemented here will foster a further collaboration between the representatives of humanist and technical disciplines.

Notes

1 See Fischinger 1969.
2 See Loffredo 2007.
3 Traces of such late 1800s correspondence between Konstanty Przeździecki and the municipal officials of Florence were discovered recently by Jan Władysław Woś, who published the letters (see Woś 2019). In response to the Polish academics' request, Gaetano Milanesi (the publisher of the 1880 edition of Giorgio Vasari's *Lives*) performed a query into sources in Florentine archives, whose results were sent to Marian Sokołowski. The whole affair was relayed in detail by Krystyna Sinko, see Sinko 1933, 5.
4 See Odrzywolski 1896, 1900; Cercha 1906; Piekosiński 1912.
5 Biehl 1911, 440.
6 "Gucci" 1922, 184.
7 See Tomkowicz 1922.
8 Łoza 1931, 113.
9 Sinko 1933; Kieszkowski 1934/1935. See also Bochnak 1933.
10 Bochnak 1960/1961.
11 Published by the Institute of Art at the Polish Academy of Sciences, the academic series *Katalog zabytków sztuki w Polsce* has inventoried historical art and monuments since 1951.

12 Kozakiewiczowa, Kozakiewicz 1952; Kozakiewiczowa 1955, 1956. In addition, Mazovian monuments tied to Gucci were investigated by Anna Gradowska, see Gradowska 1964, 1965.
13 Kurzątkowska, Kurzątkowski 1961; Kurzątkowska 1964, 1965, 1968.
14 See Eckhardtówna 1955; Fischinger 1955.
15 Madejski 1950; Gostyński, Guerquin 1953; Fischinger 1956b, 1961; Fischinger, Lepiarczyk 1957; Miłobędzki 1968; Majewski 1969.
16 See Hornung 1962, see also Hornung 1955.
17 Fischinger 1969.
18 For instance, the Kryski Tomb in Drobin and its relationship to the Jordan Tomb have been discussed in the following publications: Kozakiewiczowa 1984, 169–176; Fischinger 1987, 175–182; Kowalczyk 1991; Mikocka-Rachubowa 1995, 1996. Notable are also: the study of the Young Tęczyński Tomb in Kraśnik by Jerzy Kowalczyk (Kowalczyk 1986); an article by Mieczysław Morka on Magdalena Koczmerowska's tomb in Czchów as a work by Santi Gucci's shop (Morka 1993) as well as a further debate on the royal tombs by Gucci in works by Katarzyna Mikocka-Rachubowa and Jerzy Kowalczyk (see Mikocka 1984; Kowalczyk 1987, 2009).
19 As an example, works by Mieczysław Zlat on the typology of effigies in Polish funerary art of the 1500s can be mentioned here, see Zlat 1976, 1979.
20 See Łoziński 1973.
21 Stolot 1970.
22 Loffredo 2007.
23 Respectively: Aleksandrovych 2006 and Pytka 2000/2001; Wrede 1990/1991. Earlier, on Gucci's work at the service of the Firlej, see: Kurzątkowska 1998; Kowalczyk 2001.
24 Quirini-Popławski 2017.
25 See Fischinger 1975; Kowalczyk 1996; Doti 2003; Mikocka-Rachubowa 2009a.
26 Hajduk 2016b.
27 Hajduk 2013, 2016c.
28 Hajduk 2016a.
29 See Hajduk 2017a, 2018a, 2018b, 2018c, 2018d, 2018e.
30 Sinko 1933, 5.
31 I was the first scholar to point to this aspect during my presentation at the annual session of the Polish Art Historians' Association (Stowarzyszenie Historyków Sztuki w Polsce) *Migracje* which was held in 2017.

1 Florence

Rubbing shoulders with the great masters

The artist's biography and his arrival in Poland

Archive materials referring to Santi Gucci mainly contain a wide range of information on the Florentine's family and financial affairs from the period of his life and work spent in Poland, including some works he executed. Facts about his family in Italy are known from Florentine records, which were excerpted by Gaetano Milanesi for Marian Sokołowski.[1] Santi Gucci was the son of Giovanni di Niccolò Albenghi Gucci, also called Giovanni della Camilla, a restorer of the Florentine Duomo, and his second wife Marietta, daughter of Santi Birbi di San Gervasio. Until recently, Santi Gucci's year of birth was hypothetically established as 1530 based on his date of death and the first mention of his activity in Poland. However, the baptismal records of Santa Maria del Fiore—cited also by Fernando Loffredo—state that "in July 1533, on Friday the 11, Santi Romolo, the son of Giovanni di Nicolò d'Arrigho, sculptor of the S. Pier Maggiore parish was born at 4 o'clock".[2] As Loffredo observes, the identified document has not only corrected earlier scholarly assumptions on Gucci's date of birth, but—as a precious source of knowledge about his family—it has also assured researchers that Santi was in fact the son of the stonemason Giovanni di Niccolò d'Arrigo (also called della Camilla), and thus the half-brother of sculptor Francesco Camilliani.[3]

The discrepancies in the family names mentioned in records are crucially explained by Loffredo's remarks on Gucci's surname. As the researcher notes, already Milanesi wrote that although Giovanni di Niccolò, called della Camilla, "bore the surname Gucci", there was no trace of such a name in official documents referring to him.[4] Both the father and his sons were always called by their cognomen; even Cosimo Bartoli wrote about "Santi della Camilla".[5] One hypothesis suggests that after his arrival in Kraków, Santi contacted the locally known Florentine artists Alessandro and Matteo Gucci to then adopt their surname.[6] On the other hand, because it was a common sixteenth-century custom to use patronyms or cognomens from which modern surnames were then derived, Loffredo argues that the name Gucci, which has nothing in common with the cognomen "della Camilla", could have emerged through an evolution of the diminutive form of the Latin version of Giovanni di Niccolò's name: Arrigo.[7] As the diminutive of Arrigo was Arriguccio, Loffredo believes that it could have been shortened Guccio, and finally resulted in the form Gucci. Moreover, Loffredo finds it very likely that Matteo and Alessandro Gucci were in fact related to Giovanni as cousins or even brothers, and Arrigo was a common ancestor. In Poland, their patronym could have transformed into a surname, and subsequently been adopted by Santi after his arrival in Kraków due to actual kinship and the renown already attached to it.[8]

DOI: 10.4324/9781032657899-2

From the information collected by Loffredo in Florentine archives, it is also known that Santi Gucci's family lived in the San Pier Maggiore parish of the San Giovanni district. A 1552 Florentine census stated that *maestro Giovanni di Nic[ol]ò scarpellino* lived in *Via della Crocetta ovvero del Rosario*, and that his family consisted of seven men and three women.[9] The later *Descrizione delle bocche della città e stato di Fiorenza fatta l'anno 1562* indicated that only one man, the patriarch Giovanni, and two women remained in the home; all the sons had left.[10] Thus, Santi Gucci must have arrived in Poland in the 1550s.[11]

The results of my queries in Florence have shed new light on the hitherto vague idea of the first phase of Gucci's artistic activity when he still lived in Florence. I have been able to date his arrival in Poland more precisely and to identify the people involved in his decision to abandon a highly promising career in his native Italy in favor of Poland. For a broader view of this, it is key to outline the artistic profiles of Santi's family members.

Giovanni di Niccolò d'Arrigo Gucci (called della Camilla)

The biographical information on Santi's father Giovanni di Niccolò d'Arrigo Gucci, also called della Camilla, and his artistic activity, has been limited to mentions of his participation in the restoration of the Florentine Duomo.[12] However, the results of source queries I conducted during a number of research visits to Florence have shed new light on his artistic personality.

I have been able to identify Giovanni di Niccolò as one of the sculptors employed in the erection of the monumental work of architecture and sculpture that was the Santa Casa in Loreto. His name was recorded several times among the large group of *scarpellini* who worked on the marble screen around the Holy House in the first phase of its construction, that is in 1515–1531,[13] under the heading: *scarpellini d'intaglio per l'ornamento della cappella* as Giovanni Niccolò da Rigo di Firenze *scarpellino*. The *Libro dei salariati* [Book of the salaried] first mentioned him on October 10, 1516.[14] In the following year of 1517, the artist received five more payments for his work on the ornamental decoration for the period ending in September of that year.[15] At that time, the work on the Santa Casa was managed by architect and sculptor Andrea Sansovino and sculptor Benedetto da Rovezzano.

From 1490, Benedetto da Rovezzano (Benedetto Grazzini, 1471–ca. 1554)[16] moved in the closest circle of Giuliano da Sangallo, Andrea Sansovino and Simone del Pollaiolo, called Il Cronaca. It was likely Rovezzano who executed the column capitals for the vestry of the Santo Spirito church between 1490 and 1496 under the supervision of Giuliano da Sangallo and according to the master's models. As Sangallo's assistant, Rovezzano worked on the construction of the Florentine Palazzo Gondi (1490–1501) and a chapel for the same family, located in the Santa Maria Novella church (1503–1508). Rovezzano's collaboration with Sangallo ran parallel to an apprenticeship with Andrea Sansovino, for whom he worked on the Corbinelli altar in the Santo Spirito church in Florence from ca. 1485. He likely also collaborated with Sansovino on the grand funerary monuments to Cardinals Ascanio Sforza and Girolamo Basso della Rovere at the Santa Maria del Popolo in Rome (1505–1509), to finally become one of the main sculptors of the decorations in Loreto's Santa Casa (1515–1518).[17]

Rovezzano's and Giovanni Gucci's paths may have crossed in 1512–1517 when Rovezzano, commissioned by the Opera del Duomo in Florence, carved a statue of John

the Evangelist for a bay in the Cathedral[18] and when he manufactured a relief pedestal for a statue of Orpheus by Baccio Bandinelli.[19] Meanwhile, Bandinelli was employed at the manufacture of the Loretan Holy House in 1518–1519, 1524–1531, 1533, 1535–1537, 1541.[20] Sources confirm that Rovezzano participated in the Loretan works in 1515–1518 as did his son in later years.[21] Apart from them and Andrea Sansovino, other Florentine artists working in Loreto should be mentioned, including: some members of the Cioli family of sculptors, namely Valerio, Simone and Alessandro; Antonio da Sangallo the Younger; Battista da Sangallo; as well as the representatives of such art centers as Carrara, Venice or Milan.

Giovanni Gucci's employment at the manufacture of the Florentine Duomo under the direct supervision of Baccio Bandinelli is well documented. It came in a later period of his activity: the 1540s. Evidence of this in source documents was first uncovered by Anne Markham Schulz and Fernando Loffredo, who cited records from the Duomo's accounting books for 1540 and 1541 listing Giovanni among the artisans employed there.[22] Based on Louis Waldman's findings, Loffredo expanded the source base by identifying the artist in further entries from the accounting books for 1541[23] and 1542.[24] The 1542 entry also makes mention of Santi's half-brother, Giovanni's son Francesco Camilliani, which makes it the first record of Camilliani's art production. *Francesco di maestro G[i]ovanni* received a payment equal to his father's.[25]

In the next decade, Giovanni Gucci was recorded in the 1552 Florentine census as the owner of a property on Via della Crocetta. This foggy period in his activity is somewhat illuminated by an entry in the Duomo books which seems to have been overlooked by researchers. On October 16, 1561, a substantial reduction of the wages of one Giovanni di Niccolò was documented: from 18 soldi to four, due to the artist's poor health which prevented him from being of service.[26] A limited number of extant documents from that period referring to Giovanni supports the assumption that the artist could also have worked on the expansion of the Florentine Duomo in the 1550s.

Giovanni Gucci was active in the Florentine artist community at least from the 1530s as a member of the Compagnia di San Giovanni Battista, also called dello Scalzo, which gathered Florentine patricians as well as representatives of various arts and crafts. Although the structure of the organization has been the subject of recent studies,[27] no researcher found evidence of Giovanni Gucci's membership in the guild. However, a comprehensive archive query I have recently conducted, which encompassed all extant books documenting the organization's business, has brought surprising results. Giovanni di Niccolò's name did in fact appear in the Compania's registers multiple times, starting in the early 1440s.[28] At that time, lists of members included such artists as Aristotile da Sangallo, Niccolò Tribolo, Stoldo Lorenzi, Benvenuto Cellini, Jacopo Pontormo and others.[29]

One can only speculate about the possible membership of Giovanni di Niccolò's son Santi in the dello Scalzo confraternity. Records for the period 1550–1553, when the young artist could have been enrolled, are missing or incomplete. However, such a hypothesis is supported by the fact that Santi's brothers also became members of the organization.

Giovanni di Niccolò had six sons from two marriages: with his first wife Camilla and second wife Marietta.[30] I have determined that Francesco and Santi were not the only ones to follow in their father's footsteps.[31] I have identified Piero di Giovanni,[32] a goldsmith (described as *orefice*, *orafo*) recorded multiple times as Giovanni Gucci's son in the documents of Compagnia dello Scalzo in the decade between 1557 and 1567.[33] Although

Francesco Camilliani's membership has been noted by O'Brien, comprehensive references to sources should be added, including a number of documents about the artist that she has overlooked.[34]

By the early 1560s, Giovanni Gucci lived in the family town house with just his wife and daughters. The first formalized academy of the arts—called Accademia e Compagnia delle Arti del Disegno[35]—was established in the Florentine artist community of that time at the behest of Giorgio Vasari under Cosimo I de'Medici's patronage. The Gucci patriarch became a member of the academy in 1564. In the next year, the academics chose him to be the *consigliere infermiere*.[36] Giovanni remained active, as evidenced by his purchase in October 1565 of two blocks of marble valued at 100 lira that were left behind by Giovanni Angelo Montorsoli, who died in 1563. Another one of Montorsoli's marble blocks was purchased by the famous sculptor Zanobi Lastricati for 42 lira.[37]

Surviving fragments of archival documents referring to a confraternity at the Gucci's neighborhood church of Santissima Annunziata called Compagnia della Santissima Annunziata[38] solidified my belief that the Gucci family extensively participated in the life of their local community. Although the registers of the organization for the years 1543–1565 and 1557–1586 have partially survived,[39] data from the early 1550s is missing, and Santi Gucci's name could have appeared there at the start of his independent career. Meanwhile, there are many vague mentions of other members of the family, mainly in 1560–1563, likely pertinent to Giovanni's sons Piero Gucci and Lorenzo di Giovanni Gucci[40] who have been overlooked in research. Their identification is hampered by the arbitrariness and inconsistency in recording patronyms; for example, Francesco is repeatedly noted in one document, sometimes with the patronym *di Giovanni*, and other times with the cognomen/surname Gucci.[41] The considerations on the transmutations of Santi's father's patronym *d'Arrigo* are informed by an interesting pattern present on the pages of that bound volume: the two forms *Arrigo* and *Arrigucci* were used side by side to refer to the same person.[42]

The challenge of determining the dates of death and locating the last wills of Santi's family members is closely tied to the investigation of the inconsistent usage of the patronym's various forms. Giovanni Gucci's date of death—identified after Milanesi as sometime around 1566[43]—should be defined more exactly as May of that year, based on a record in the *Libro dei morti della Santissima Annunziata*. Furthermore, it should be noted that Giovanni was buried inside that church.[44] Intriguingly, the same register includes one *Francesco di Giovanni scultore*, who died in September 1572 and was buried in the Gucci's parochial church, San Pier Maggiore.[45] The patronym and profession listed in that record match Francesco Camilliani's. However, rather than 1572 found in this record or 1576 suggested by some researchers, Camilliani's death should actually be dated to October 13, 1586. Under that date, the death registry at the Santissima Annunziata recorded *Francesco di Giovanni Camilliani scultore*, buried inside the church.[46] The obstacles to accurate personal identification resulting from the common practice of using generic patronyms (*di Giovanni*) and names of professions are well-illustrated by the fact that the same book of records, under the same year, lists yet another *Francesco di Giovanni scultore*, who lived in a different part of the city and was thus buried at the Sant' Ambrogio church.[47]

In all cases known to me, the cognomen Camilliani was added to Francesco di Giovanni's patronym only in documents where people of the same profession or patronym were mentioned in close proximity. Lastly, I was only able to examine a small fragment of the extensive collection of sources called Notarile Moderno which includes the last

wills of the residents of Florence, indexed according to the names in the *notai*. Ultimately, the search yielded no results with regard to the Gucci family.[48]

Francesco Camilliani

Apart from their father, the half-brother Francesco Camilliani, older by almost a decade, must have influenced Santi's artistic development.[49] Camilliani took his first steps in the art world in the early 1540s at his father Giovanni's side and in Baccio Bandinelli's shop where he practiced the making of low reliefs, the famous product of the Medici's favorite Florentine sculptor. For example, a relief depicting the drunkenness of Noah, currently stored at the Museo Nazionale del Bargello in Florence, has been assigned to Camilliani—although some researchers considered it to be Bandinelli's work.[50] As well as his skill in the art of the relief, the Florentine master developed a characteristic type of a statue, carved using the technique of hard sculpting with a glossy finish.[51] These features are evident in later works by Bandinelli's former students.

Camilliani spent the subsequent years in Rome, apprenticing at Raffaello da Montelupo's studio.[52] Da Montelupo came from Raphael Sanzio's circle and worked as a restorer and an antique dealer like his master, the Florentine sculptor Lorenzo Lotti, called Lorenzetto. As suggested by Cosimo Bartoli, Camilliani could have also practiced the restoration of ancient sculpture in Raphael's shop.[53] Apart from Francesco, two other young Florentine sculptors were apprenticed to Raphael in the late 1540s: Valerio Cioli and Giovanni Antonio Dosio.

In the early 1550s, when a teenage Santi was gaining his first experiences in the profession, Francesco was already an independent and mature artist. He represented a generation of Florentine sculptors who hailed mostly from Bandinelli's circle and developed in the period between the death of Niccolò Tribolo (1550) and the rise of Giambologna.[54] This group comprised sculptors born between 1510 and 1540, including—apart from Camilliani—Bartolomeo Ammannati, Domenico Poggini, Vincenzo de'Rossi, Battista Lorenzi and Giovanni Bandini.

Camilliani and Ammannati enjoyed the patronage of Cosimo Bartoli, an agent of the Medici who was friendly with Michelangelo and collaborated with Giorgio Vasari on *The Lives of the Most Excellent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects* in 1549.[55] In a letter to Vasari on April 5, 1550, Bartoli suggested Camilliani as the potential executor of the sculptural decoration of the Del Monte chapel at the San Pietro in Montorio church in Rome, founded by Pope Julius III shortly after his election. The main designer for that enterprise was Michelangelo, and Vasari's Florentine protégé Ammannati was selected as the main manufacturer.[56]

Cosimo Bartoli's *Raggionamenti Accademici* provide more information on Camilliani's later activity after the return to his hometown.[57] A friend of the Ricasoli family, Bartoli consulted the remodeling of their Florentine garden residence at Via San Gallo in the early 1550s. Camilliani was commissioned by Bartoli to manufacture the sculptures that were part of the lucrative contract.[58] The Via San Gallo façade was adorned with a row of fashionably framed windows called *finestre inginocchiate*,[59] while its main entrance was flanked by two herms (a male and female one), carved in deep relief with mustachioed faces, bared teeth and braided hair.[60] Two wall fountains by Francesco were decorated with the figures of Venus and Neptune, their outer walls flanked by pairs of herms portraying the four seasons and finished with a group of sculptures depicting monsters and sea creatures. The garden was also equipped with trick apparatuses known

as *giochi d'acqua*, which were popular in Italy of that time. Busy with the construction of another palace in 1552–1554, Ricasoli did not make the completion of that project his priority, and sold the estate in 1555. Camilliani's sculptures became separated and have not survived; some were mentioned in Francesco Bocchi's 1591 guidebook to Florence as features of Ricasoli's other property.[61]

Since 1551, Francesco Camilliani had been making the sculptural decorations for the garden of Don Luigi di Toledo,[62] including a monumental fountain that was only completed in 1567. Vasari himself assessed its two figures of river deities Arno and Mugnone as excellently made.[63] In the 1570s, the garden sculptures and the fountain from Toledo's garden were transported to Palermo and reassembled by Francesco's son Camillo Camilliani, with added components that transformed them into the Praetorian Fountain.[64] It has been called Francesco Camilliani's most significant piece, which dominated the most productive period of his career.[65] In his doctoral thesis, Anatole Tschikine outlines a model of collaboration between the patron and the client based on Camilliani and Don Luigi's relationship. While analyzing the process of creation and the participation of various workers from the artist's studio in the construction of this Florentine garden, Tchikine discusses the problem of the master's direct engagement in production, which will become particularly relevant for me later in this book with regard to Santi Gucci's shop in Poland. Tchikine underscores high standardization and the extensive role of teamwork in workshops headed by masters who were also entrepreneurs.

Notably, Francesco Camilliani had several Spanish patrons, including a draper who settled in Florence in 1580: Pietro di Montoia.[66] Entering a Spanish clientele milieu in Florence allowed Camilliani to continue working independently in his hometown, where it was challenging to earn a living without the Medici's support.

As Suzanne Butters has established, before 1561 Francesco had been renting the ground floor of a building on Via Ricasoli for his shop; from 1561, this interior housed the *bottega* of the famous sculptor Francesco di Giovanni Ferrucci, called del Tadda.[67] By that time, Camilliani's shop had moved to a building on Via San Sebastiano (today's Via Capponi), which he co-rented with a weaver.[68]

Apart from completing the projects discussed above, it is very likely that, having returned to Florence from Rome, Camilliani also engaged in renovating ancient statues. From the descriptions of objects offered by the artist in August 1562 to Cosimo I de'Medici as prizes for a small lottery, including three busts with a classical theme and two polished octagonal plaques, Tchikine concluded that they could have been antique monuments restored by Francesco.[69]

Camilliani, who was listed alongside Vincenzo de'Rossi (1525–1587) and Battista Lorenzi (ca. 1527–1592) as a member of the Accademia del Disegno educated at Baccio Bandinelli's shop, is briefly characterized by Vasari in *Lives*.[70] Recall also that Francesco, like his father, was active among the members of the Florentine Academy and the numerous societies that united the artist community, which I have indicated above.

In order to fully capture Camilliani's profile as an artist, I should also note that he designed ornamentation for ceremonial and military architecture. Records show that he prepared decorations for the wedding of Francesco de'Medici to Joanna of Austria in 1565. Moreover, in 1567, he manufactured two rosettes for a bastion of the Fort of Saint Barbara (Fortezza Medicea) in Siena. In the same year, he was commissioned to carve a statue of Melchizedek for a flagship project: the Cappella di San Luca in the

Florentine Church of Santissima Annunziata. The final phase of Camilliani's activity, in the last 15 years of his life, when his son Camillo was working by his side, is still poorly documented.

Santi Gucci's first projects in Florence

At the time when his half-brother was independently and successfully fulfilling his ambitions as an artist, Santi was only beginning his career. Still, he distinguished himself enough among many young, aspiring artisans to deserve a mention in Cosimo Bartoli's *Raggionamenti Accademici* (see above). In the preceding paragraph, Bartoli listed locations in Italy and European courts where Florentine masters were earning their fame, including a brief reference to Kraków at the end.[71] Next, he expressed his delight at the young sculptor, mentioning him alongside one *Francesco di Matteo fabbro*.

My detailed discussion of the passage is motivated by a misreading and mistranslation of Bartoli's original that has been repeated multiple times since Krystyna Sinko's study. Scholars have concluded that the 17-year-old Santi might have sculpted two full-sized statues, one of which portrayed Venus. As a matter of fact, the many complex sentences in Bartoli's grammatically convoluted structure should be understood differently. Crucially, we should keep in mind the entirety of the sentence in which Cosimo Bartoli described Santi's early artwork. The sequence starts with a mention of Francesco di Matteo as someone who, at 19 years old, carved a marble statue of Adonis. Then, Bartoli names Santi della Camilla, the brother of the sculptor Francesco, who manufactured a figure of Venus before (sic!) he was 17. The sentence (or, actually, a part of that sentence) and especially the phrase *una di una Venere* has been taken out of context and consistently repeated by all Polish-language scholars, from Krystyna Sinko to Andrzej Fischinger and others, who believed it described a large-format statue of Venus. In addition, the phrase *l'uno & l'altro* further in the text has misled the researchers to think that Santi made another statue of an unknown subject—although, in fact, these words refer to both of these teenage artists and their works.[72] Further complications have ensued from the translation of this next part. The Italian historian claims that the two artists manufactured their statues (Francesco di Matteo's marble *Adonis* and Santi della Camilla's *Venus* from an unspecified material) without having prepared a large model. Polish scholars have misunderstood that the large model would have measured one-third of the Florentine ell. However, it seems that the information on the size of *un terzo di braccio* actually concerns both of the young artists' completed sculptures. As a result, we should assume that both Santi and Francesco di Matteo each made a small-format statue of 20 cm (one-third of a *braccio*) without a model. I suppose that Santi cast the lost statuette of Venus in bronze. I argue that Santi was very familiar with working in that material and that format. Moreover, making small figurines from existing models in a master's shop was a common practice during an apprenticeship.

Bartoli concluded this short passage on young sculptors with the following words:

> that they have succeeded will surprise none who sees [the sculptures—O.M.H.], and I have no doubt that such works could not be manufactured for half a century by masters who have worked for forty or fifty years; all of this is the fruit of the influence of Michelangelo who opened [people's] eyes to the era of the *maniera* so that many no longer envy the ancient masters.[73]

In light of Gucci's now-known exact date of birth, this information should be dated to sometime around the year 1550. We should also note that although Cosimo Bartoli only published his *Raggionamenti Accademici* in 1567, he had been writing it for many years, often adding new facts as time passed.[74]

Around Benvenuto Cellini's *Perseus with the Head of Medusa*

Florentine archival sources referring to Cellini document a group of his collaborators, working on his most important sculptural project: the statue of Perseus. The artist himself wrote this about the students who were apprenticed to him:

> I had … hired many workers, some from the craft of sculpture and other from the craft of goldsmithing. These workers were Italian, Frenchmen, Germans, and I sometimes employed a good number of them, depending on whether I could find good ones, because I changed them from day to day, taking on those who knew the most.[75]

Santi Gucci belonged to that group.[76]

A receipt of payment to the amount of 2 scudi, 13 lira and 15 denari[77] in 1552 by Santi (*Santi di Giovanni scultore et l'fabro*) who worked without pay between February 7 and February 25 is the first record of Santi's presence in Cellini's shop. Other aspiring young artists employed at Cellini's shop received their fees at the same time; Pier Pagolo Romano (*orafo*), Niccolò Santini (*orafo*) and *Bartolomeo orafo* collaborated with Gucci on one of the figures at Perseus's base (Figure 1.1). Another entry (*a Santi della Camilla per sua opera al Perseo*), from 1553, records the payment of a much larger sum of 6 scudi, 5 lira and 13 denari.[78] Another manuscript lists payments for Pietro Pagolo Romano, Vittorio Santini and Bartolomeo with the words *e a altri* for the same service at one of the four figurines at the base, to the amount of 45 scudi and 6 lira altogether for the period of December 3, 1552—June 9, 1553.[79] The fact that this entry does not mention Santi Gucci's by name may suggest his absence in Florence, which must have therefore occurred between the first quarter of the 1553 and June 9 of that year. This is supported by the last mention of Santi Gucci in documentation enclosed in Cellini's 1554 letters addressed to the ducal court, asking for the reimbursement of the costs contractors' fees paid between July 1552 and March 1554.[80] The sum total paid to Gucci before February 7, 1553, to the amount of 10 scudi, 3 lira and 18 denari,[81] is only higher by about 2 scudi than the sum of the two payments discussed above. This may be the result of an unrecorded payment for minor works or a short contract.[82]

Among other apprentices involved in the creation of Cellini's *Perseus with the Head of Medusa*, arguably his most important sculptural project, one should mention Gugliemo Fiammingo (which was likely another name for the famous Flemish sculptor and bronze caster Willem van Tetrode), Amadio da Sangallo, Francesco di Giovanni Ferrucci del Tadda and Stoldo Lorenzi.[83]

At the Florentine workshop: Art practices and professions

An interesting document that provides insight into Santi's education is a property inventory in Benvenuto Cellini's testament. Apart from movables and valuables, it names numerous items from the master's studio, including a wooden model of the pedestal for