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ABSTRACT

This dissertation explores the art and architectural patronage of Doge Cristoforo Moro (1462-71) in Renaissance Venice. Given that Moro ruled over a Venice that was dealing with new threat to its territory, its religion, and its public health, I seek to understand what the ideological charges were that informed Moro’s acts of patronage throughout Venice and how they diverged from understood modes of ducal representation.

Moro’s sponsorship of San Giobbe, a charitable institution in one of the poorer neighborhoods of fifteenth-century Venice, serves as the point of departure for this study. Drawing on a wide range of sources including testamentary bequests, building and confraternity histories, and landholding policies, I examine how Moro transformed a site that was associated with social and spiritual abjection into a showcase of ducal power. In formulating a set of questions for Moro’s work at San Giobbe, I try to move beyond questions of attribution and chronology that have typically dominated studies of Doge Moro’s work. I examine in particular Moro’s tomb, a burial slab placed in the ground in the high altar chapel of San Giobbe; his funerary slab represents a temporary break from ducal burial tradition in Venice. I root my study of the tomb in the evolving nature of Renaissance commemoration practice by devising an approach for the study of a commemorative object that can not be read as an iconographic text like many other contemporaneous ducal tombs.

After establishing the nature of Moro’s work at San Giobbe, I reconsider Giovanni Bellini’s San Giobbe Altarpiece both in the history of fifteenth-century Venetian painting and as a reflection of the ducal legacy of the church for which it was painted. My study of the San Giobbe Altarpiece draws on the iconographical and symbolic analyses of previous scholars, but shifts the emphasis of the inquiry from iconography to issues of representation and gesture in the Altarpiece. I argue that the full-figured representation of Job is essential to understanding the role of salvation not only of the worshippers at the altar of San Giobbe, but of the entire Venetian Republic.
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**Introduction**

With few exceptions, late medieval and Renaissance doges, the elected leaders of the Venetian Republic, were commemorated by wall monuments in the large basilicas of Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, Santi Giovanni and Paolo, or the ducal basilica of San Marco. (Figure 1) The doges held the rights of patronage, or *jus patronatus*, over San Marco as the founders of the basilica, but their burials at San Marco declined during the fourteenth century.¹ Andrea Dandolo’s (1342-1354) burial in the baptistery of San Marco represented the last ducal monument in the basilica.² Scholars have speculated that burials at San Marco were forbidden after Dandolo’s in order to diminish the opportunities for personal aggrandizement and dynastic claims to the Republic by the doges.³ The combination of Doge Marino Faliero’s (fl. 1354-55) unsuccessful coup in 1355 and the increasing restrictions on the power of the doges by the governing body of Venice likely contributed to the abandonment of ducal burials at San Marco after the fourteenth century.

After ducal burials in San Marco ceased, the monuments of the doges were housed almost exclusively at one of the two mendicant basilicas, the Franciscan Frari and the Dominican Santi Giovanni and Paolo. The proliferation of ducal burials in mendicant churches points to a
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¹ Peter Landau, *Jus patronatus: Studien zur Entwicklung des Patronats im Dekretalenrecht und der Kanonistik des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts*, Köln: Böhlau, 1975. The idea of *jus patronatus* took shape as canon law in the mid-twelfth century. It signified jurisdiction over an ecclesiastical or secular space to serve the special interests of patron, most often the local ruler without intervention from the bishop or another religious leader. Galante, 288. Around 830, San Marco was established as a ducal church, separate from Episcopal duties.


powerful relationship between the rulers and the friars. The mendicants played a large role in Venetian civic life, absorbing many of the charitable duties of the state including the care of the sick and destitute. Both the Franciscans and the Dominicans developed well-functioning hospices throughout the city-states and deployed powerful preachers who attracted large groups of listeners from all social classes. Because the doges were responsible for settling and supporting the mendicants in Venice, they likely understood the ability of the preachers in reaching large audiences. Doge Jacopo Tiepolo, for example, built the church of Santi Giovanni e Paolo in 1226 specifically to house the preachers. By displaying their burial monuments in mendicant churches, the doges announced the mutually beneficial rapport they had, or hoped to have, with the popular preachers in Venice.

The tombs of the doges illustrate the great disjuncture between the asceticism of the mendicant orders and the ducal urge to display. During the fifteenth century, the ducal tombs were increasingly architectonic and often included elaborate sculptural programs, replete with figural representations, effigies of the doges on sarcophagi, framed by triumphal arches and putti bearing the Doge's coat-of-arms and inscriptions recounting his virtue. Niccolò Tron's (d. 1473) monument has four registers with two images of the Doge, one recumbent and one standing, surrounded by figural sculptures. (Figure 2) These monuments announced the prestige and power of the Office of the Doge through relative size and repetitive tropes. There were obviously variations among the ducal memorials, but they promulgated the glory of the deceased doge and

---

5 The first extant tomb of a doge is the sarcophagus of Jacopo Tiepolo (1268–1275) from 1254 placed on the façade of Santi Giovanni and Paolo, a church which stood on land donated by Doge Tiepolo. Its placement on the façade of the church exemplifies the conspicuous display of funerary monuments by the doges.
the Republic under his watch. Problematic predicaments endured by the Republic during the
tenure of the doge could be rewritten in stone.

My dissertation takes as its initial point of inquiry a fundamental break in this burial
convention. In contrast to other extant fifteenth-century ducal tombs, the burial of Doge
Cristoforo Moro (1390-1471) was located at San Giobbe, a small church that served a hospice
for the poor on the western edges of Venice. In the fifteenth century, San Giobbe was in one of
the more peripheral parts of the city. Census reports, views, and maps of the area illustrate that
this was one of the poorest neighborhoods in Venice. A group of ascetic and impoverished
Observant Franciscans inhabited the convent of San Giobbe. As their name suggests, Observant
Franciscans favored a more rigorous adherence to the prohibition of ownership and the absolute
poverty advocated by St. Francis in contrast to the Conventual friars, who relaxed Francis' Rule
of religious poverty and who buried most doges at the Frari.

If Moro's choice of burial site was unusual for a doge, his commemoration by a floor slab
was equally unique. In relation to other ducal burials, Moro's is modest. His burial marker does not present an overtly idealized narrative of the Doge like many other
prominently displayed fifteenth-century ducal memorials in Venice. Rather, it is a large stone
slab inserted into the ground that can not be seen from outside of the high altar chapel. There is
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6 For copies of Moro's testament: ASV, Testamenti, Atti Tomei 1240.15 and ASV, Procuratore di San Marco, Busta
2, Fasc. 1, Processo 45, c.143. 27 January 1659.
7 Marc' Antonio Sabellico, De Venetae Urbis Situ, Venice: Antonium de Strata Cremonese, 1488, copy at Houghton
Library, Cambridge, MA. Third Region (Cannaregio), Book II. The area was described by Marc' Antonio Sabellico
at the beginning of the sixteenth century as "in the extremities of the island, on the margins."
8 BMC, Codice Cicogna 3062, c.8. A census report of 28 January 1773 shows the contrada of S. Geremia in the
Cannaregio, the location of San Giobbe, to be particularly impoverished. 1463 residents of the contrada were needy,
the highest number in Cannaregio after 1600 in the contrada of San Cancian. Overall, Cannaregio had by far the
most poveri, 11453, of any neighborhood in Venice. The sestiere of Castello had the second highest population of
people designated as impoverished at 7250. John McAndrew, Venetian Architecture of the Early Renaissance,
9 John Moorman, A History of the Franciscan Order from its Origins to the Year 1517, Oxford: Clarendon Press,
1968, 50.
no figural representation, but Moro’s image is consigned to his family *stemma*, the ducal crown, and an inscription that reads “Christophaurus Maurus Princeps XX septembris 1470,” in bold roman letters.

This dissertation places emphasis on one object, but I evaluate the circumstances of Doge Moro’s burial to understand how he attempted to formulate an alternative representation of the dogate by subverting the common tropes of display to construct his image as a divinely ordained and pious ruler of the Republic. I will focus on Moro’s burial plans as a unique act of commemoration within the context of Venetian leadership, one engendered by personal and political penance. Evaluating the conditions of Moro’s burial, will offer an opportunity to explore the theological and liturgical implications for commemoration with a floor slab and the politics of burial space during the fifteenth century in Venice and beyond.

**Literature on Commemoration**

Burial is one of the most ubiquitous themes in studies of the Renaissance. Treatments of burial rituals and commemoration practices, however, diverge across disciplines. Samuel Cohn and Michelle Vovelle have mined testamentary bequests throughout Italy and France respectively to gauge the changing attitudes towards death with the rise in outbreaks of the Black Death. With the increase of mortality from the Black Death in the fourteenth century, they believe testaments became more detailed and adapted a more humble tone. Testators increasingly saw the importance of bequeathing property and money to charitable organizations, offered more detailed descriptions of how possessions should be distributed, and exercised a greater degree of control over the rituals which would accompany them into the afterlife. Norms in testament

---

formulations and burial locations suggest that when death seemed immanent or more likely, greater strides were made to fashion a more comfortable afterlife.

Social historians have identified the emergence of a more nuanced conception of the afterlife in the late Middle Ages. Jacques le Goff, Eamon Duffy, and Vovelle have explored the importance of engaging the living in prayers for the souls of the deceased. The regions of the afterlife—heaven, hell, and purgatory—are seldom mentioned by name in testaments, but the requests for masses said over the dead, suggests the presence of all three. The clear cut definitions of heaven and hell were made more permeable with the expansion of rituals for the exoneration of sin after death in purgatory. Historians have been fascinated by the phenomenon of an emerging purgatory during the Middle Ages allowing for the reintegration of the deceased back into society through prayer. The finality of death was rarely accepted; masses and other suffrages would benefit a soul experiencing the trials of purgatory before they were admitted to heaven. That the dead could benefit from suffrages shows the increasing permeability of boundaries between the regions of the afterlife. With the increase in favors the living could do for the dead, death was manipulated into a parallel existence to civic life in which social alliances continued to serve the participants.

While historians concentrate on the preparations for death, art historical scholarship on funerary monuments of the late Middle Ages and Renaissance has placed emphasis on how the iconography of the early modern Christian tomb was bound to the rhetoric of future salvation.

---

12 Ibid. Duffy, 300-3.
Explorations of commemoration during the Renaissance have traditionally been rooted in iconographical analyses, the stylistic and sculptural aspects of burial monuments and chapels, and issues of attribution and chronology. Research generated on funerary monuments in churches and private family chapels of the late Middle Ages and Renaissance tends to concentrate on what Erwin Panofsky termed the "prospective" nature of tomb imagery, the concern with the hope of salvation and the forging of new and improved identities for the purpose of commemoration. In his four lectures on death and commemoration through early modern tomb sculpture, Panofsky noted that in medieval and Renaissance Italy, images that emphasize the putrification of death are not prevalent. Rather tomb sculpture consists of the virtues, equestrian figures, and sleeping or standing figures, under triumphal arches. They express the glory of man, and even apotheosis. Panofsky concluded that the shift in memorials from death to the glorified past expresses both fame and the hope for the soul's redemption.  

Most Renaissance biographies and later histories of the doges are framed by the burial contexts for their rulers. Tombs were seen as extensions of the biographical tradition and in the Renaissance they prolonged the social life, or activity, of the doge. Jacob Burckhardt noted the pracht graben, the tombs of late Medieval and Renaissance princes, professors, and distinguished people in Civilization of the Renaissance. He believed that the splendor of the tombs derived in part from the ancient Roman tradition of burial inscriptions that announced the virtue of the deceased. Descriptive inscriptions of the deceased including the name, date of death, and some indication of occupation or mortal glory tended to mark a slab. Many of the Renaissance tomb inscriptions were taken from funerary orations that idealized the public

---

16 Other decorative elements often included tools of the deceased's mortal trade or family insignia.
persona of the deceased. That Francesco Sansovino's 1581 guide to Venice faithfully copies prominent inscriptions left by the patrons and testators at the church in the descriptions of the sites illustrates the importance of inscriptions to one's popular memory.

Recent investigations about early modern commemoration increasingly accommodate the social, cultural, and political factors. Julian Gardner has identified similarities in burial monuments across Europe during the Papal Schism based on the status, or desired status, of the deceased. The typologies of tombs placed in and around churches overlap and some are resistant to true categorization, but the general assessment of burial monuments as undertaken by scholars like Gardner has helped to determine the social class of the deceased. Wall monuments, floor slabs, and sarcophagi—free standing, canopied, or inserted into the wall—were among the most common types of burial monument found in churches at the time of Doge Moro's death in 1471.

Before the fifteenth century, the burial slab was the most common type of monument chosen by the wealthy due in large part to the greater ratio of floor surface to wall space in most churches. The less ornate types of burial, such as the floor slab, offer the appearance of being common and were accessible to artisanal and patrician classes, but church burial was a privilege and a costly enterprise. For example, in the grids of marble floor slabs which cover the cathedrals in Mdina and Valletta, it is hard to pick out the individual knights of Malta, but the costly fees belie the commonality of such a burial. (Figure 5) The commissioners of the floor slabs in churches needed to pay the burial fees in addition to the materials and handicraft of the slab itself. Burial under a slab in a church was a declaration of wealth.

17 The practice of translating a funerary oration from the oral tradition to the written was persistent. In Florence, for example, Leonardo Bruni's burial inscription on his tomb in Santa Croce in Florence derives from a funerary oration delivered at his funeral, while Doge Andrea Gritti's funerary inscription at San Francesco della Vigna also derives from an oration given to the Doge.
Andrew Butterfield looked closely at the constraints local Florentine sumptuary laws placed on representation in death based on profession and social standing in the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{18} By focusing on an elite lay and ecclesiastical class in Renaissance Florence, Butterfield pooled a sample of burials, illustrating that the choices in type increase in proportion to elevated social status. Powerful laymen like Cosimo de’ Medici (1389-1464) rejected the more visual modes of burial chosen by his social equals and instead seized on the implications of a burial marker in the ground in his family church of San Lorenzo in Florence.\textsuperscript{19} Along with the hundreds other citizens of Florence who were buried in the church pavements throughout the city, Cosimo took his place in the crypt of San Lorenzo, acknowledged by a slab in the ground. (\textit{Figure 6 & Figure 7}) He challenged the visual expectations of his class by asking for something that is not “noteworthy” and “humble.”\textsuperscript{20} The request translated to a marker in the transept that—despite its lavish materials—could only be seen by those in the transept of in the high altar chapel, raised above the transept by a few steps. Like Cosimo de’ Medici, Doge Moro’s slab was also located before the high altar and low in the ground, but in the high altar chapel and not the transept.

That Moro’s tomb is not visually prominent may play a significant role in its scholarly neglect and its absence from art historical discourse. Scholarship on the subject of Venetian ducal tombs has identified repetitive imagery particular to the social rank of doge that alludes to the glory of the Republic under the deceased ruler. Art historians have explored how, as a genre, ducal tombs promoted a well-functioning Venetian government. They place emphasis on the rich symbolism and iconography of the monuments as visual representations of the Venetian political

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
ideology. Debra Pincus has mapped out a history of the monumental tradition of ducal tombs in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. She evaluated the ways in which the ducal tombs in Venice not only perpetuated the memory of the individual ruler, but also represented the Office of the Doge in her study on the medieval Venetian ducal tombs, *The Tombs of the Doges*. She identified the importance of the mendicant orders in burying the doges. Pincus has explored the rich symbolism and iconography of the late medieval tombs to understand the deceased leader’s continual presence in the networks of power that underpinned the Republic. Through these early tombs, Pincus looks at the nuances in the iconographic and stylistic programs of the tombs to see how the tombs situated the Republic in a historical continuum spanning Byzantium to the contemporary mainland city-states.

In her 1971 monographic study of the monument of Doge Andrea Vendramin, Wendy Stedman Sheard examined the monument’s iconography and the history of Santa Maria dei Servi which originally housed the monument. By piecing together the iterations of plans for the original tomb, Sheard looked at how the placement and program of the tomb showed the Doge’s civic virtue. Like Vendramin, other fifteenth-century doges in Venice, namely Moro’s immediate predecessors, Francesco Foscari and Pasquale Malipiero, and his successor, Niccolò Tron, constructed wall monuments near the high altar of a church with several registers of figural sculpture and inscriptions announcing their virtue and sure salvation. (Figure 2)

Monuments like Moro’s, which do not easily lend themselves to narrative or iconographical interpretation, have been overlooked. In part, I set out to explore how Doge Moro converted the entire high altar chapel—framed by a triumphal arch opening and adorned with the doge’s coats-
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of-arms—into his monument. (Figure 8) Moro’s ownership persisted posthumously, indicated by the executors of his will barring other burials from the high altar chapel. In patronizing his own chapel, Moro was concerned with his reputation, though many historians have glossed over his efforts due to the lack of visual evidence for his memorial project.

I discuss Moro’s monument in the context of other fifteenth-century ducal tombs in Venice, but the brief epigraph on Moro’s tomb accompanied only by the ducal insignia and his coat-of-arms would seem to preclude profound iconographic interpretation of the sculpture itself. Doge Moro not only cast out his funerary monument to the periphery of the city, but he rendered it invisible from the nave of San Giobbe. These measures of concealment embody an economy appropriate for the Observant Franciscan friars, but as a floor slab, Moro’s monument presents an anomalous case for the more general study of ducal tombs. His slab is not visually arresting and it is not immediately obvious how his tomb represents the highest office of the Republic. Rather, I try to understand how Moro’s burial monument expands the parameters of interpretation in its prominent position within the architectural ambient.

That Moro’s marker is inserted into the ground as opposed to a wall like most other ducal burials changed the parameters of how the leader of Venice wished to be consigned to popular memory. The image of Venice constructed in early chronicles of the city, and the identity that Venice would continue to project, has been identified by contemporary historians as standing at

---

23 The Doge’s testamentary directive to the executioners of his will to replace themselves as his advocates in perpetuum offers an idea of how Moro continued to hold sway well into the eighteenth century over the church and high altar chapel which housed his burial monument. From Moro’s testament. MCV, Codice Cicogna 3115 /12. “Item voio et ordeno che caduauno de mie commessieri posti ala sua morte substituir uno commissiar e per el simel I substituir de di tempo in tempo imperpetuo possi substituir.”

24 In 1585, the friars of San Giobbe gave permission to Daniel Priuli, the patriarch of Venice, to construct his sepulcher and burial monument in the high chapel on one of the side walls. For debates on whether or not the Priuli family could install their tomb: ASV, San Giobbe, xlviii, 24rv.
the center of a debate on Venice’s appearance.\textsuperscript{25} Citing the calls for the abandonment of sumptuousness in building by the bishop Gasparo Contarini (1483-1542) in his \textit{On the Office of the Bishop} written in 1516, Manfredo Tafuri believes that there was a great deal of pressure on aristocratic patrons to conform to the prevailing \textit{mediocritas}—in short, modesty—in their building commissions.\textsuperscript{26} In this argument, less grandiose designs would more precisely represent the government’s projection of itself as a Republic, whereas more ostentatious designs would emphasize the disparity of wealth distribution and political representation. Tafuri takes \textit{mediocritas} to be the more outward expression of republicanism based on the recurring calls for modesty and restraint in building throughout sixteenth-century Venice. Tafuri’s interpretation of style as an indicator of ideology is compelling but given the conflicting trends entering Venice from the East and the West, the projection of civic identity through architecture is fallible. If we take Tafuri’s assessment of design ideology in Renaissance Venice as valid—that a group of senators made a conscious effort to temper outward extravagance in their building projects—then, in many ways, Moro’s funerary monuments heralds the sixteenth-century debates. In the design of his tomb, Doge Moro took a visually penitential approach in the design of his tomb, initiating a program of \textit{mediocritas} in his final plans for burial. As a member of the power elite, Moro solidified his image of piety by supporting a simple church inhabited by friars with strong vows of voluntary poverty.

In addressing these wider issues of representation, my dissertation also engages the art historians who have written on the specific individuals, institutions, and groups in Venice that I analyze as subjects, artists, or patrons. The work of Rona Goffen has been useful as a model and


as the stimulus to further research. She studied two issues that encompass the core of my dissertation: the Franciscans and Giovanni Bellini (c 1430-1516). Goffen looked at the patronage of the Pesaro at the church of the Frari through the lens of the Franciscan Order, which I try to do in my work on Moro. She was able to derive a richer theological meaning in the family’s altarpiece painted by Titian by tying a study of the church to its well-documented inhabitants.

I give special focus to the relationship between the doges and the mendicant friars who buried them. I argue that Moro’s relationship with the Observant friars, while unique in Venice, was a part of an emerging pattern of patronage. The ascetic friars offered patrons struggling with religious invectives against wealth and ostentation a way to define their spiritual and civic identities. More specifically, I believe that enterprising patrons may have regarded the prohibition of ownership by Observant Franciscans as a means to pious expression. If the friars were obliged to relinquish all claims of property, and turn ownership rights over to the control of the absent pope, the patron may have seen a *tabula rasa* on which to project a spiritual identity.

Goffen also provided a rich analysis of the San Giobbe Altarpiece by Giovanni Bellini and identified major themes in the Altarpiece. She suggested that the ducal heritage of the church of San Giobbe informed the scale of the painting and the presence of certain motifs, but that that Doge had lost much of his clout at the church by the time the Altarpiece was painted. For Goffen, the simple slab which marked Moro’s death demonstrated that his posthumous reputation was negative. After studying the documents about the church of San Giobbe and the
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28. John Moorman, *A History of the Franciscan Order from its Origins to the Year 1517*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968, 50; Kajetan Esser, *Origins of the Franciscan Order*, Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1970, 164. Most likely, the tension that was beginning to arise between the necessities of preaching and the itinerant life and Francis’ belief in poverty provoked Francis to write the Rules. The Rules were consistently amended by the popes, which concerned the Observants. As outlined in the papal bull, *Quo Elongati* issued by Gregory IX in 1230, the papacy allowed the Franciscans to use and not to own property. The nuances of this point was one of the contributing factors in the split between the Observants and the Conventuals.
doge who was buried there, I believe, contrary to Goffen, that Doge Moro was a powerful presence at the church even after his death, his reputation guarded by an attentive group of executors he assigned to protect his interests.

Like Goffen, I was also curious about a few gaps in our understanding of the San Giobbe Altarpiece, namely the date and patron. But in my analysis, I have tried to suggest that when the evidence is so circumstantial and speculative, we should radically redefine the questions we pose to the Altarpiece. I explore the history of the Altarpiece as a discreetly produced object, but I also inquire into the Altarpiece’s function as a ritual object used on specific feast days by a specific confraternity that used the church for its meetings. By focusing on the Altarpiece as a ritual object, I was able to return to questions of the Altarpiece’s patronage. I link Doge Moro to the patronage of the San Giobbe Altarpiece painted by Giovanni Bellini for the church.

Deborah Howard problematized several of the issues that I discuss regarding the building history of San Giobbe. Howard picked out the elements of San Giobbe that she believes relate specifically to architecture of the Observant Franciscans. She asked why the friars in particular may have built double storey buildings with retrochoirs. Though she focused on mendicant churches of the sixteenth century and the plans for San Francesco della Vigna in Venice, her attempt to find meaning in the typologies she identified brought her to a greater anthropological understanding of churches as sites for ritual chanting.

**Visual Denial and Spatial Humility of the Elite**

As Cosimo’s burial shows, Moro’s unique expression of Venetian ducal burial, however, was not as unique for burial and patronage practices beyond the waters of the lagoon. The history of the burial slab as the embodiment of theological precepts about death has not been written, though it is the most ubiquitous type of monument in a church setting. When Renaissance
testators requested burial in the ground, it is often referred to as an expression of humility.

Several rulers and elite citizens throughout Europe were buried with markers in church pavements. Medieval French and English kings often placed their effigies in church pavements to commemorate their deaths and during the fifteenth century, a few popes including Martin V (d. 1435) and Sixtus IV (d. 1484) were commemorated with effigies on the ground. Most of these tombs share at least two major characteristics: the engraved or sculptural effigy portrait of the deceased and prominent placement within the spatial hierarchy of the church. 29

(Figure 9)

These images of the deceased rulers related to the idea that the king had two bodies—a natural body, dying at the end of the human life—and a body politic, carrying on beyond natural death and taking representational form in the successor. The division of the king into two bodies was devised under the Tudors. 30 The effigy helped bridge the two states of being. As Ernst Kantorowicz describes in his explication of the law of two bodies, the theory derived from Byzantine and Ottonian ideas about the divine ruler activated by an enthroned Christ. The divine power of the ruler infused the perception of the ruler in the later Christian west. In Venice, effigies of the doges were often deployed on large wall monuments. The representation of the doge became a mimetic substitution, controlled not by the contingent natural body but by the idealized political one. 31 The effigies recall the glorious life lived serving the Republic rather than the decaying body. Moro fuses the two bodies of the princely ruler and the mere mortal, a fusion that would take on added meaning with the sacrament of the host was performed over his...
tomb, summoning yet another body. Yet, despite the powerful fusion and parsing of bodies taking place at Moro’s tomb, I do believe that there is an effigy of Moro at the church of San Giobbe, a notion explored further in my chapter on the San Giobbe Altarpiece.

Most of these rulers were buried in restricted areas of the church, near the high altar or a public altar. Moro’s slab is in the main chapel of San Giobbe, protected from the eroding effects of foot traffic, and given spatial privilege before the high altar. In the high altar chapel, Moro’s slab is not visually accessible to the laymen in the nave but it is closest to the most consecrated space of the church. The placement of these tombs was a complicated rhetorical device that at once gestures towards a humility that derives from its placement in the ground, but also a prestige in the high altar chapel that undercuts that humility. Pope Martin V was buried in front of the ciborium of the papal basilica of San Giovanni in Laterano in Rome, right under the relics of Sts. Paul and Peter. Like Moro’s slab, Martin V’s defies the touch of the lay visitor and the position suggests that the pope is under the special care of the saints venerated at the altar.

In many ways, the experience of the tomb slab is addressed in the discourse about the relationship of the observer to the object in space. Medieval and Renaissance theologians privileged sight over the other senses and, as a result, in discussions of early modern liturgical practices, the visual characteristics of the mass tend to take precedence over other bodily experiences, such as smell and sound, or for our purposes, the space and location of the worshipper within the church. A marker in the ground as an act of commemoration challenges the idea that sight holds supremacy over the other senses. Floor slabs, like Moro’s burial marker, which indicate the burial of a body in a church without many visual cues, constructed a different relationship for both the living and the deceased than those which were more easily seen. But those differences, I argue, help elucidate the theological precepts of death which make the floor
slab different than other modes of burial. Moro’s slab is incorporated into the ritual of the space and derives its power from its place in the church. I believe that the commemorative value of Moro’s tomb was defined by the spatial theatrics of prayer rather than the visible.\(^{32}\)

Moro’s slab stimulates modes of experience beyond the visual but these modes of experience are necessary for the function of the monument: to activate the memory rather than consigning that memory to a distant history. It is similar to what James Young refers to as an anti-monument, the type of monument that refuses to package an event and consign it to the distant and completed past.\(^{33}\) Rather, as a burial slab in a church, Moro’s monument demands interaction. I discuss ways in which the burial slab lent itself to ideas about suffrages for the dead and purgatory. Moro participates in a very common tradition of commemoration by slab but modifies the conventions. The viewer of the tomb becomes more specific—the worshipper, governed in the church by a set of liturgical conventions. Emphasis on the sensorial experience of the monument risks tying the fifteenth-century burial marker to later discussions of aesthetics and phenomenological experiences of art, but approaching the monument as an object that is not merely meant to be gazed upon and read, but more easily stepped on than seen, changes the very nature of the ducal monument. As a slab it is meant to be redemptive in its humility.

**The Other Side of Myth: Venice in the Mid-Fifteenth Century**

This dissertation will focus not only on the Doge’s preparations for his own death, but it will explore the idea that that the Doge ruled over a society that feared its own death and coped with

\(^{32}\) The stress on the tactile qualities of the object and its position in space evoke Riegl’s differentiation between the stages of art based on a move from the haptic qualities to their visual characteristics. Alois Riegl, “Late Roman or Oriental?” *German Essays on Art History*, ed. Gert Schiff New York: Continuum, 1988, 173-190. “It is only finally the sense of touch that can inform us about these limitations, that is, about the relative impenetrability of things...Whereas the optical qualities disappear in the dark, the tactile qualities remain.”

its fear by suppressing the representation of death. Moro’s tenure as doge spanned a tumultuous period of Venetian history—the Republic was under threat of attack and was heavily taxed to support military operations. The loss of key Venetian ports along the Adriatic to the Ottoman Turks during the second half of the fifteenth century threw Venice’s status as a major sea power into question and tested its trade relations with the East. That the threat to the Italian city-states was Muslim placed Moro in the midst of plans for a Crusade; the language of moral absolutes was introduced into the struggle to maintain territory and protect objects that were considered the property of Christianity, including manuscripts and relics. In 1463, Doge Moro staged a grand but failed attempt to acquire the relics of Saint Luke the Evangelist, a bad omen for the Venetian-led Crusade that would never leave Ancona a year later. The loss of Venetian territory and naval authority translated into an identity crisis for the Republic that was concentrated in the image of the Doge. News of foreign struggles colored the talk around the Rialto, but at home Venice was under the threat of pestilence during most of Moro’s dogate. Moro recast these events in the best possible light through the imagery placed at ceremonial sites through visual
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34 David Chambers and Brian Pullan, Venice: A Documentary History, 1450-1630, Buffalo: Renaissance Society of America, 2001, 137. The tax on ten percent of all financial gains was levied on 15 June 1463.
37 In August 1463, Moro arranged for a group of Franciscans to import a body believed to be St. Luke the Evangelist from Bosnia—currently invaded by the Ottoman Turks—to Venice. The relic was ceremoniously transported from its initial point of entry into the Venetian lagoon on the Lido to its ultimate place of rest, the small church of San Giobbe in the western periphery of the city. As the Benedictine monks of Santa Giustinia in Padua had been venerating a body without a head as St. Luke the Evangelist, found in a leaden coffin and ceremoniously deposited in the church, they launched a determined challenge to the authenticity of the Venetians’ claim to the torso of St. Luke the Evangelist. BMC, PDD, 727 Vol. 1, 104. Reprinted in P. Barozzi, “Orazione al Doge Christoforo Moro,” Orazioni, elogi e vite scritte da letterati veneti patrijzi in lode di dogi ed altri illustri soggetti, Venezia, 1795, 88. The Doge’s encomiast, Pietro Barozzi writes that a solemn procession marked the arrival of the relics from the Spalatro galley to the nave of San Niccolò of Lido, then to San Giobbe, where the relics now rest in the sacristy.
representation. I argue that the stresses on the Republic required a new visual imagery, but one which was tied to the Venetian conception of itself as a divinely ordained republic.

Venetian history famously begins with the narrative of the *translatio* of St. Mark’s relics from Alexandria to the lagoon. According to the story, in the ninth century, the Caliph tried to destroy the church in Alexandria which held St. Mark’s remains and Venice was determined to save the body of the Evangelist who had predicted he would be buried in Venice. St. Mark was surreptitiously ferried from Alexandria to Venice by two Venetian merchants who slipped the body past its Muslim guards by covering it with pork, thereby ensuring that it would not be closely examined. When the body arrived in Venice, it was ceremoniously transported by the Doge to the ducal chapel of San Teodoro located where the current basilica of St. Mark’s is.

The story took shape based on the growing Venetian belief that Mark was destined for burial within the Republic, and it gained popularity as Venice struggled for independence from both Aquileia, a Byzantine stronghold just to the north of Venice, which also claimed St. Mark as its patron saint, and the Byzantine Empire itself. As a newly formed Republic at the time of the theft, claims to apostolic relics offered Venice credibility as a divinely ordained republic, worthy of its prosperity. Chronicles of Venetian history written during the Renaissance often reinforce the idea that Venice was saturated with providential good will, particularly as the Republic faced danger from internal and international strife. Mark’s journey to Venice from Alexandria and the subsequent revelation of his relics at San Marco in the eleventh century after a long loss only reinforced that notion that Venice was blessed.

---

This history of Venice, as one guarded by a divine sentinel, has become inextricable from the glorified triumphs and successes of the city. The focus of much of the cultural historiography on the city is constituted by contemporary historians who believe that a conscious program of myth-making about the efficacy of the Venetian government drove visual culture in the Republic.\footnote{The so-called myth of Venice was identified by Fasoli (1958, 477) and has been much-analyzed over the past fifty years. The historiography has been summarized by Grubb 1986, 43-94.}

The image of Venice as a “mythical” and idealized Republic protected by St. Mark the Evangelist has been assimilated into the real history of Venice.\footnote{Gina Fasoli, “Nascità di un mito,” Studi storici in onore di Gioacchino Volpe, vol. 1, Firenze: Sansoni, 1958, 477. Edward Muir, Civic Ritual in Renaissance Venice, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981, 13ff. Muir offers a comprehensive historiographical treatment of how the myth of Venice as a serene republic was shaped and how historians have tried to parse reality from the idealized portrait of the city.}

For Roland Barthes, a myth:

Does away with all dialectics, with any going back beyond what is immediately visible, it organizes a world which is without contradictions because it is without depth, a world wide open and wallowing in the evident, it establishes a blissful clarity: things appear to mean something by themselves.\footnote{Roland Barthes, Mythologies, translated by Annette Lavers, New York: Hill and Wang, 1972.}

The one-dimensional nature of a myth as described by Barthes is what makes those constructed in Venice so appealing. For many historians of Republican Venice, the myths of Venice succeed because they are immediately accessible as visual representations, put forth in narrative painting, icons, chronicles, and ceremony. The visual representations of Venetian history were produced under the assumption that they would be believed and they were reproduced to self-legitimize. Visual imagery, for example, gave the initial sense of eye-witness reporting. In written prosopography, the challenge to chart an individual genealogy back to the day of Venetian foundation operates as a rhetorical device that persuades even the modern historian of an individual’s blood ties to the lagoon, as will be seen. The numerous genealogies that comprised a who’s who of Venice rigorously defended the venerable age of every family listed.
Several later historians of Venice colluded with the earlier Venetian project. Jakob Burckhardt believed that, "Venice recognized itself from the first as a strange and mysterious creation the fruit of a higher power than human ingenuity." He reinforced the idea of Venice's unique Republican values in relation to the other Italian city-states. But the fragility of the Venice led to obsessive recording that contemporary historians have used to look behind Venice's representation of itself. Decisions regarding plagues, wars, murder, and the problems of infrastructure and engineering were frequently the subject of the Council of Ten meetings.

Writing from the vantage point of post-monarchical and post-Jacobin France, Jean-Jacques Rousseau lambasted the Venetian governing body, Council of Ten as "a tribunal of blood" and condemned the alternative history of serenity and well-balanced rule projected by the Venetian government. In order to further unravel the visual and literary evidence left behind, scholars are increasingly looking beyond the confines of the lagoon to learn what the skeptics—the Florentines, the Ottoman Turks, and often the popes—thought of Venice. In Venice, myth and history commingled, but the obsessive reproduction of Venice as a successful Republic coupled with rigorously bureaucratic compulsion makes it possible to disentangle the two.

Chapter Outline

My research is informed by visual sources, legislation, and an interdisciplinary body of texts including theological, liturgical, and humanist treatises to form a broad social narrative. I begin in Chapter 1 with an overview of Venetian domestic and foreign policy during the 1460s under

---

43 Burckhardt, 48-49. Prohibited from accessing the Vatican archives because he was a protestant, in the nineteenth century, Leopold van Ranke assessed the documents left by the Venetian Senate in the State Archives in Venice. The Leopold von Ranke manuscripts of Syracuse University, the first one hundred titles dealing primarily with the Republic of Venice in the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries, its colonial possessions, and its relations with other powers, Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1951.
Moro. I do not offer a biography, but I evaluate Moro’s political persona through his artistic and architectural commissions throughout the Republic, in addition to the praise and the plentiful criticism of him. Historians often offer scathing assessments of Moro. Even his great-nephew, the chronicler Marino Sanudo (1466-1536), noted his *cattiva fama*. But at the time of Moro’s election and his death, glowing descriptions of his political acumen and religious fervor were written. The ambiguity of Moro’s tomb, at once modest in type but boldly situated in relation to the altar, resonates with the competing claims of piety and vanity made in early biographies of the Doge.

I evaluate the persona of Doge Moro as a patron and the socio-economic circumstances of Moro’s rule as doge to explore the commission of Moro’s tomb and the political, economic, and theological precepts which informed it. I begin my study by asking not about the architect at San Giobbe or the sculptor of Moro’s slab, but about the patron. I have written a biography of Doge Moro: a Crusader, humanist, and a leader who oversaw a difficult time in Venetian history. I will argue that Moro tried to turn San Giobbe into a representation of ducal power. Central to my study is the idea that Moro’s acts of patronage, particularly at San Giobbe, strive to counter his own poor reputation, his difficult dogate, and the waning authority of the doge.

This section is based on chronicles of Venetian history, orations praising Moro, and the numerous diplomatic letters between Venice and Pope Pius II (1405-1464) regarding plans for what turned out to be a failed Crusade. I focus here on Moro’s participation in the ritual removal of property in the form of manuscripts and relics from the East. By drawing on the narratives that

---

describe the translation of St. Mark’s relics to Venice from Alexandria in the ninth century, I argue that the Doge and his encomiasts wrote Moro into the divinely ordained history of Venice by drawing on the rich symbolism parsed from Venetian history.46

In Chapters 2 and 3, I reconstruct the early history of San Giobbe and Moro’s patronage of the site, using unpublished confraternity histories, testaments, landholding policies, and the palimpsest of physical evidence for the building history. The information in these chapters speaks to the monographic nature of this study: the history of San Giobbe is based on archival material that had not been addressed in previous studies or was in need of critical reassessment. I also contextualize the work at San Giobbe with the building theories of the Observant Franciscan friars who inhabited the space, the hospice administrators, and the numerous confraternities hosted by the church. In addition, I have evaluated the urban impact of the hospice of San Giobbe, a charitable institution destined to become a showcase of ducal piety. San Giobbe served as a site in which the Doge could construct a public image of a socially concerned ruler, legitimizing the concentration of power in his hands through charitable patronage.

In order to put Doge Moro’s plans for burial into the larger architectural context, I have undertaken a critical reassessment of the building history of the church of San Giobbe. Assessments of Doge Moro’s contributions to San Giobbe are entrenched in chronology and attribution. That research on San Giobbe has been mired in questions of attribution reveals how little is known about Moro’s work at the church; there has not been very much information to use in an analysis.47 The absence of a named Proto for work at San Giobbe under Moro in the extant

47 An article on the church of San Giobbe by Matteo Ceriana revaluates the documents published by Cicogna to further the discussion of attribution and dating.
documents is revealing. It suggests that San Giobbe was a part of a system which privileged the named patron, but not yet the artist or architect who oversaw the craftsmen.

Chapter 4 explores Moro’s use of a burial slab. I rely on theological propositions about death and commemoration to see how the burial slab contained remnants of medieval ideas about spiritual humility. As Jacques le Goff has shown, death brought about a revelatory sense of piety, manifested in the form of testamentary bequests and burial requests.\(^{48}\) On paper, the rich gained an understanding of Job’s assertion that, “Naked came I out of my mother’s womb, and naked shall I return thither. The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord.”\(^{49}\) I also look at what the spatial positions of floor slabs still in situ might reveal about the how the tomb represents the soul of the deceased and receives the prayers of the living.

Chapter 5 is a discussion about the San Giobbe Altarpiece by Giovanni Bellini painted for the altar of the confraternity of St. Job in the church. The Altarpiece has been the subject of many studies, but a reevaluation of a long funerary oration given for Moro by his friend Pietro Barozzi has allowed me to reassess the Altarpiece.\(^{50}\) As both a site of ducal power and a hospice, San Giobbe revives a discourse about the healing powers of the ruler—a belief that translated into political authority in periods of intense state-building.


\(^{49}\) *Book of Job*, 1:21.

\(^{50}\) BMC, PDD, 727 Vol. 1, 104. Barozzi, 1795, 88.
Chapter 1

"Religionis et Iustiae Cultor:" Cristoforo Moro’s Biography, his Role in the Crusades, and his Work in Venice

Cristoforo Moro in the Venetian Patriciate

The Venetian Republic underwent a series of identity changes and profound upheavals in foreign policy under Doge Cristoforo Moro, but his role at San Giobbe and as the leader of Venice has not been given adequate consideration. The difficulty in reconstructing Moro’s reign in Venice is further complicated by the lack of information regarding his ancestors and early biographical information. Most of the information about the Moro family comes from detailed genealogies which situate important residents of Venice into the earliest years of Venice. The point of origin is 25 March 421, the feast day of the Annunciation and the day which was believed to be Venice’s foundation date.¹

The Moro family has been firmly rooted in Venetian history though the precise prosopography of Cristoforo’s branch has been debated. In his sixteenth-century, Arbori de’ Patriti Veneti, a compendium following the origins of Venice’s more prominent families, Marco Barbaro tracked the Moro to Padua, placing the family within the mythic origins of the city.² Barbaro wrote that an Albino Moro from Padua helped build the original Realtine Island in 423, just two years after the legendary foundation date of the city. Barbaro mentions that Marc’

² Marco Barbaro, ASV, Miscellanea Codici, La Storia Veneta, 21, 259-261.
Antonio Sabellico dated the family’s arrival in Venice to 1000 from Negroponte, present day Euboia, but Sabellico believed that Doge Cristoforo Moro’s branch of the family settled in Padua before Venice, in agreement with Barbaro on the possibility that Moro’s family participated in the physical development of Venice.

The Venetian chronicler Marino Sanudo reports that Cristoforo’s family arrived first in Candia, or Crete, from Negroponte, a Venetian territory inherited from Byzantium in 1204, and that they purchased their nobility. He specified that one of Cristoforo’s ancestors, named to the Great Council in 1318, Francesco Moro, was “da Negroponte.” Like several genealogists who outlined the Moro family roots, Pietro Antonio Moti tried to place the origins of the family in Mauritania based on their name in his seventeenth-century *Augusta Biceps*. Moti wrote that the family passed through Rome before they dispersed all over Italy.

Despite the variations in the genealogies of notable Venetian families, these chronologies establish the Moro among the first inhabitants of Venice and as early participants in the political life of the Republic. Yet, most of these histories of the Moro family were written after Cristoforo had served as doge and may have lengthened his family’s tenure in the Republic to validate his suitability to the post. Longevity in the lagoon was considered a requisite for the job as if the soil needed to penetrate the bloodline. Long-standing attachments to the lagoon seem to have primed one to participate in Venetian history. When he became doge, Cristoforo Moro reached back to earlier moments of ducal glory to form his own identity as doge.

---

3 BNM, Ital.VII.2569, 22r (=12461). Marino Sanudo writes that, “Francesco Moro da Negroponte fo fatto del grande consevo percerto servixio che feixe ala signoria. Che fo del 1318 adi xx zugno.” BMC, PDD, 727 Vol. 1, 90r. This manuscript is a compilation of several genealogies of the Moro and orations praising Moro, including a copy Marco Barbaro’s genealogy and Pietro Barozzi’s Latin funerary oration for Moro, translated into the vernacular.

The Moro family is recorded as one of 244 patrician families during the late thirteenth-century serrata, in which members of the Venetian patriciate class began to limit the number of families who could hold membership in the Great Council to those with ancestors who had served. Genealogists fix the Moro in the upper-echelons of Venetian society before the initiation of the serrata in 1297, justifying the family’s inclusion in the Great Council. After the serrata, the status of a family and its pedigree assumed even more significance in the political restructuring and the proliferation of genealogies and chronicles of Venice.

However, the Moro family was one of the sixteen newer patrician families, called i curti, who could not claim ancient, more specifically pre-ducal, Venetian extraction. Thus, the claim of chroniclers like Marco Barbaro, that the family helped found Venice, does not ring true. In the larger political context, Cristoforo’s 1412 marriage to Cristina Sanudo helped, in part, to solve the problem of the family’s Venetian heritage. The Sanudo were one of the twenty-four older more established families, considered to have founded the city, called i lunghi. While the Moro-Sanudo marriage illustrates that i curti and i lunghi did not function as exclusive class enclaves, it points to alliances gained by the marriage and the navigation of political tensions it sustained.

The existence of these two factions illustrates that some amount of conflict continually existed among the patrician families in Venice. The tension eventually impinged on the electoral

---

process of the doge. The Venetians attempted to allay the threat of factionalism, which gripped Florence, beginning with its complex election system which made it near-impossible for voters to elect someone due to political alliances. However, in 1450, the curti families, which included the Moro, breached the electoral system in order to halt any member of the lunghi from ascending the dogate, a move which caused heightened friction between the two factions throughout the second half of the fifteenth century.

One well-documented incident regarding Christoforo Moro exposed the extent of patrician in-fighting. In 1470, one of the lunghi family members, Bartolomeo Memmo, angered by the election of a newer curti family as podestà—a position akin to the mayor—of Padua proposed to his cohorts that the following Sunday, they hide arms behind their cloaks to kill those responsible for the election, beginning with the “boor Moro.” Word of the assassination plan reached both Doge Moro and the Council of Ten, which called for Memmo’s swift arrest. Though the respected humanist scholar and future Senator Bernardo Giustiniani (1408-1489) provided the defense of Memmo claiming youthful bravado, the Council of Ten condemned Memmo to be hanged on the red column of the Ducal Palace. In this case, curti-lunghi fighting transcended

---

9 Lane, 1973, 196. Lane believes that the influx of nobles to Venice after the fourteenth-century War of Chioggia may have shifted the power in favor of i curti.
10 Malipiero, Vol. II, 656. Malipiero records the incident as happening in 1470, but the misti, says it occurred in 1471. ASV, Misti, Consiglio, Reg. XVII, fol. 129v-135v. 14 July 1471. Memmo said to his companions, “Questi traditori no ne vol mai far in nessun luogo; se volé, vegnimo die se de nu a Consegio, Domenegha che vien, co le corazzine sotto le veste, e ammazzemoli; comenzando da questo becco de Christofol Moro.” Marino Sanudo, “Vitae Ducum Venetorum italicæ scriptæ ab origine urbis sive ab anno CCCXXXI usque ad annum MCCXXII,” in Rerum Italicarum Scriptores, ed. by L. A. Muratori, vol. 22, Milan, 1733, 1174. One of Memmo’s companions told his wife of the events and through her, word of the incident reached a Procurator who then relayed the information to the Doge and his advisors. The Council records say that the sister was rewarded for telling her husband. The Council of Ten convened and decided secretly to take Memmo into custody. The news of his impending arrest leaked and Memmo escaped and got as far as Treviso before he was caught. The incident was likely the cause for the reinforcement of anti-ducal defamation laws in the Promissione for Moro’s successor, Niccolò Tron.
marriage alliances. Memmo was a relative of Doge Moro’s wife, Cristina Sanudo, through her mother, Barbara Memmo.11

Cristina was the great aunt of the popular chronicler of Venice, Marino Sanudo (1466-1536) who obsessively documented events relevant to Venice during the course of the sixteenth century ranging from the quotidian to foreign policy in diaries that comprise fifty-eight volumes of dense text.12 Sanudo remembered his aunt as charitable and beautiful, a description that matches a depiction of the Dogaressa on a deck of playing cards in the collections of the Correr Museum. (Figure 10) Sanudo’s description of his uncle is less kind: the Doge was sickly and gruff. But Marino’s assessment of Moro’s mien may not be based on extant images. Most portraits of the Doge do not offer a standard physiognomy. A profile of the Doge in his scarlet ducal robes and corno attributed to the school of Giovanni Bellini, now in the cappella maggiore of San Giobbe in Venice near the doge’s site of burial, does not reveal anything unusual about his looks, but a hook nose. (Figure 11) Other representations of the Doge ease the severity of the downward point of the nose. A sculptural bust that Debra Pincus has identified as an original portrait of Moro once on the Arco Foscari at the Ducal Palace depicts the Doge with a harsh expression.13 (Figure 12) In one of a series of paintings celebrating Pope Pius II in the Piccolomini Library in the cathedral of Siena, Moro is shown kneeling before Pius II in Ancona as they prepared to depart for a Crusade in 1464. (Figure 13) The paintings in the Piccolomini Library were completed by Bernardino Pinturicchio about thirty years after the Doge’s death, and Moro is shown with a penitential beard as a warrior preparing for Crusade. In the frieze of double portraits of the doges by Jacopo Tintoretto in the Chamber of the Great Council in the Ducal

11 Malipiero 2, 656-8.
Palace, Moro is shown in profile, paired with his predecessor Pasquale Malipiero wearing ducal garb. His most notable attribute is the banner he holds. It summarizes his somewhat self-defined legacy as a pious crusader: "Iustitiam colui pius, et si fata fuissent pro patria in turcos disc moitos eram."14

**Locating the Moro Family in Venice**

Histories of the noble families of Venice call attention to prominent members of the Moro family as if Cristoforo’s dogate were the culmination of a long line of Venetian political participation among his family members. The Moro held several high-level ecclesiastical positions. After Albino Moro, Cristoforo’s Paduan ancestor singled out for helping to establish Venice in the fifth century, the next significant relative mentioned is Domenico Moro, the bishop of what was then Venice, known as Olivio in 936.15 The Office of Cancelleria Inferiore, the early notary position in Venice generally held by religious clerks before the fifteenth century, lists four members of the Moro clan in office between 1195 and 1278.16 Cristoforo’s great-uncle, Antonio Moro, and his grandfather, Giacomo, each served as Procurator of San Marco, the most important office in Venice after the doge. There were nine Procurators of San Marco who worked as financiers directly under the doge to protect the city’s investments.17 Giacomo helped secure a temporary peace between Genoa and Venice in 1356 and served as the ambassador to what was Constantinople. Like his grandfather, Cristoforo would also be appointed as Procurator and would assume a similar diplomatic role in Venetian politics. Francesco Sansovino wrote in

---

15 Sansovino, 56.
16 Others include Pasquale in 1195, Marco in 1252 Andrea in 1276, Stefano in 1277-78, and Querini in 1428.
his 1581 guide to Venice, *Venetia Città Nobilissima et Singolare*, that in 1280, a rich sailor from
the family, Marino Moro, founded the hospital of Santa Maria della Misericordia in the
Cannaregio after leading an armada to defeat rebels from Trieste, as Cristoforo Moro would at
the beginning of his dogate.\(^{18}\)

The Moro controlled one of the major charitable confraternities, the *scuola grande* of Santa
Maria della Misericordia in the *sestiere* of the Cannaregio in the northwest area of Venice. It was
a pious organization which offered charitable services and burial rites to those in need. The
designation of a confraternity as a *scuola grande* did not only refer to size, but it was a legal
distinction in place after 1467. The members of the *scuole grande* were more religiously
oriented, coming together originally as flagellants. The *scuole piccole*, on the other hand, were
regulated by the state and uniquely gathered together members from outside of the privileged
patrician class.\(^{19}\) Membership tended to cut across gender and social status, but was based on
trade or parish. As in the case of the Misericordia and San Giobbe, the *scuole* often had meeting
houses attached to a church, called *alberghi*, and held legal rights, or *jus patronatus*, over an altar
in the church.

The 1280 foundation date of the *scuola* of the Misericordia offered by Sansovino conflicts
with the *mariegola*, or official record, of the *scuola* instituted twenty years earlier in 1261.\(^{20}\)
Regardless, the family’s longstanding authority at the church and the *scuola* is evident by
Cristoforo Moro’s placement of the family *stemma* over the door in of the *scuola* in January

\(^{18}\) Sansovino, 56.

\(^{19}\) Peter Humfrey, “Competitive Devotions: The Venetian Scuole Piccole as Donors of Altarpieces in the Years

\(^{20}\) ASV, *Scuola Grande di Santa Maria della Misericordia*, Busta 7, Mariegola.
In his 1464 testament, Doge Cristoforo’s nephew, Lorenzo Moro, Duke of Candia, left 1,000 ducats to the Misericordia, while Doge Moro left five ducati to the confraternity as a member of the scuola of the Misericordia, a relatively small amount in comparison to his other gifts.22

Santa Maria della Misericordia served as the burial site of Moro’s high-profile ancestors and his descendants. Cristoforo’s grandfather Giacomo, the Procurator of San Marco who died in 1369, was buried under a slab dated 10 January 1377 near the high altar of the Misericordia.23 In 1649, Gasparo Moro paid for a renovation of the facade of Santa Maria della Misericordia as a monument to himself and he requested burial within the church despite the presence of a Moro doge, Cristoforo, at San Giobbe after his burial there before the high altar.24

The work the family began in the Cannaregio had a lasting effect.25 (Figure 14) In the 1464 testament of Cristoforo’s nephew, Lorenzo, he describes the Misericordia as, “That place near the Ca’ Moro.”26 The Ca’ Moro was likely located on the very northwestern end of the

---

21 Martin Gaier, Facciate sacre a scopo profane, Venice: Istituto veneto di scienze, lettere, ed arti, 2002, 50-56. In 1369, Luca Moro served as lay prior over the hospital, noted for having protested the visit of the Patriarch of Grado to the hospital.

22 Several copies of Moro’s September 1470 testament exist. I consulted the following versions: ASV, Testamenti, Busta 1238, nos. 178 and 188; ASV, S. Giobbe, Busta 5, 46r-50v; ASV, Testamenti, Atti Tomei, Busta 2394; ASV, PSM, Busta 2 Fasc. 1, Proc. 45c.; BMC, Codice Cicogna 3115. For information on the value of the ducat: Jutta Gisela Sperling, Convents and the Body Politic in Late Renaissance Venice, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, c1999, 242-3.

23 The inscription is recorded by Sansovino, 177; Lorenzetti, Venezia e il suo Estuario, Bestetti & Tumminelli, 1926; and F. Corner, Notizie storiche delle chiese e monasterie di Venezia e di Torcello, Vol. 12, Padua, 1758, 135. The church is currently under heavy restoration and the Photographic Archives of Venice do not have an image of the tomb.

24 Gaier, 56.

25 Deborah Howard, Venice and the East, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000, 151. Deborah Howard believes that the Moro family was associated with the Ca’ Mastelli on the Campo dei Mori, close to the Misericordia, due to the presence of the family stemma in the building and on the well in the cortile. G. Tassini, Curiosità Veneziana, Venice: Scarabellin, 1933. Tassini said that the Ca’ Mastelli belonged to non-noble spice merchants. There is a relief of a man leading a camel on the exterior of the Ca’ Mastelli. Only Venetians could sell oriental merchandise in Venice so unlikely that this was the seat of an Arab Fondaco, but he does not link the building to the Moro. The turbaned figures on the Campo dei Mori may have adorned the Campo before its fifteenth-century remodeling. Tassini believes that they were meant to advertise the merchants of eastern spices in the Campo.

26 ASV, Testamenti, Atti Tomei 1240.15. “Quel luogo nur da cha Moro.”
Cannaregio, the site of a palace commissioned and possibly designed by Senator Leonardo Moro in the sixteenth century. There is not very much information about the site, but it is likely that it was Moro family property in the fifteenth century and that Leonardo Moro inherited it. The Moro family sunk into financial straits, but in the mid-sixteenth century, three of Cristoforo’s nephews became senators and helped restore the family’s financial security. After their deaths, the only heir of the nephews, the senator Leonardo Moro, found himself the sole recipient of the family’s wealth and political inheritance. Vasari attributed the Ca’ Moro to Jacopo Sansovino, but Jacopo’s son, Francesco, makes no mention of his father in his description of the palace in his 1581 guide to Venice and instead attributes the palace to a design of its owner, Leonardo.

Sixteenth-century plans of Venice show that the site was not well-developed. Francesco Sansovino described the palace as a large fortress-like castle, with one of the most beautiful gardens in Venice behind it, near the church of S. Girolamo. As it is described, the residence may have served as an urban villa and may have looked like the Villa Trissino in the Veneto. Leonardo Moro’s palace had four large towers marking each angle of its square plan. Two of the towers still exist on the fondamenta, or embankment, now bearing the family’s name; the Moro coat-of-arms can still be seen in a pilaster at the bottom of one of the towers. (Figure 15)

While the Moro were deeply engaged in the affairs of the Cannaregio, Cristoforo’s branch of the family took an active role in their parish of San Giovanni Decollato, known in Venetian as S. Zandegola, in the sestiere of Santa Croce. The church contained some of the oldest frescoes in Venice, including a thirteenth-century fresco of St. Helen showing her relic of the True Cross. Cristoforo’s father, Lorenzo, was a prior of the church and described his palace “in the vicinity

---

of S. Zandegola,” but he left the residence to his brother, Antonio when his will was drawn up in 1405. Most members of the family left money to San Giovanni Decollato and several of Cristoforo’s immediate family members requested burial there, including his father, his beloved nephew, Lorenzo, Duke of Candia, and the Duke’s son, Antonio. In his testament, Moro left forty ducats to the Chapter House of S. Zandegola for construction at the church and forty ducats to be distributed to the poor around the church. He also asked for prayers at S. Giovanni Decollato in memory of his parents and “mio fio,” his son, identified by Marco Barbaro as Niccolò. Because the Doge left a “caxa grande in S. Zandegola” to Niccolò, Barbaro may have confused this Niccolò as the name of Cristoforo’s deceased son, but the father of this Niccolò is named as Marco in Moro’s testament. Moro left another house in the vicinity of Zandegola, without the qualifier “grande,” to Cristina. Because he left orders for the executors of his will to sell the house in Zandegola “al publico” after the death of Cristina, it is likely that Moro did not have any living children when he first wrote out his testament in 1470. In addition, Cristoforo eventually inherited his father’s palace and the family villa near the Commun of Noale in the Veneto, a residence he passed on to his wife, Cristina.

Moro compensated for the loss of the son who predeceased him by cultivating close relationships with his nephews. During his dogate, Moro was likely assisted with military affairs by his brother Niccolò’s son, Lorenzo Moro, who held the key position of Duke of Candia, overseeing the protection of this Venetian territory susceptible to capture by the Ottoman Turks.

28 ASV, Atti Zane, 1255. c.196, 24 November 1405. Marino Sanudo, Diario, Vol. 7, 342. On 6 March 1508, the elections of Savi posts were celebrated with a public party at the Ca’ Moro with the Bragadin, investors in the hospital of San Giobbe. Sanudo located the palace in the vicinity of San Giovanni Decollato so would not be the same residence which the Moro owned in the Cannaregio.
29 ASV, Atti Zane, 1255. c. 196. Marco Barbaro, ASV, Miscellanea Codici, La Storia Veneta, 21, 277. Barbaro provides the names of Cristoforo’s relatives.
30 BMC, Codice Cicogna, 3115.
31 Ibid.
Lorenzo was an ambassador, sent by Doge Francesco Foscari (1423-57) in 1451 to meet and renew peace with the Turks through the new young Ottoman Sultan Mehmet II (1451-81), who sought to push his territorial sovereignty west. Little is known of Lorenzo’s appointment as Duke of Candia, but Cristoforo specifically asked for Lorenzo, “his consort,” to accompany him in 1464 on a Crusade he had been planning under the leadership of Pope Pius II. In his testament, Lorenzo refers to himself as the Commissioner of the Republic’s bridges, and noted that in his life, he accompanied Moro on, “questa fornita expedi oytter el turcho chome ducha de crede.” Because the Crusade was cancelled before its participants even left Italy, Lorenzo’s role as advisor to his uncle is unclear, but in the letters congratulating Moro on his election to the dogate, one of the letters claims that Lorenzo “is certainly destined to be doge.”

Cristoforo Moro’s nephew by marriage, Piero Sanudo, served as one of the executor’s of the Doge’s will along with Giacomo Morosini and his brother, Domenico Morosini, the political theorist. When he became Doge, Moro employed another of Cristina’s nephews, Leonardo Sanudo, as treasurer of the Republic and ambassador to Rome. Leonardo was the father of the diarist, Marino Sanudo, and he was partially responsible for executing several of Moro’s commissions, overseeing his library, and ostensibly, for helping Moro to construct his public identity. Leonardo Sanudo possessed a great library and the marginalia in his hand in several of the manuscripts proves that he was a scrupulous reader of the books in his library. He also

33 Malipiero, Vol. 1, 22-3. Malipiero quoted from Sanudo, but the line is also quoted in Tassini, 431. Moro said, “Voria co mi sier Lorenzo Moro, che xe Duca, asmiragio su una galea, perche mi no me ne intendo de armade, al che il Senato acconsenti colle parole: se fara come la dice ela.” ASV, MC, Regina, 47v. 30 November 1463.
34 ASV, Testamenti, Atti Tomei, 1240.15.
35 BNM.Lat.XIII.90, f.65r. (=4143), 24a “...magni et excellentis ai vir Laurentius Maurus nuper a senatu dux certe desinatus.”
36 BMC, Codice Cicogna, 3115.
compiled the orations and letters honoring Doge Moro on his inauguration in a manuscript now held at the Marciana. Among the letters is one addressed to Leonardo, from his friend, the humanist scholar Georges of Trebizond, congratulating him on his uncle’s election to the dogate.\(^{38}\) Sanudo likely advised on the design for Moro’s *Promissione*, the doge’s inaugural oath. (Figure 16) The *Promissione* contained the same floral and filigree decorative combination in Leonardo Sanudo’s personal copy of a 1458 Virgil illustrated by Leonardo Bellini, the same illustrator of the *Promissione*.\(^{39}\) The *Promissione* was illustrated in 1462 for within three months of its public proclamation, the doge had to supply the Council of Ten with two extra copies of his *Promissione* at his own expense.\(^{40}\) If Sanudo advised on the design, he may have helped Moro conceive the miniature on the first page which depicts the newly elected doge kneeling before the Virgin and Child, flanked by his personal saint protector, Bernardino of Siena, and Venice’s patron saint, Mark. (Figure 17) The *Promissione* shows the way in which Moro represented himself as divinely protected and rooted in Venice’s program of self-fashioning. It also showed him adapting the common trope of ducal representation, kneeling before the Madonna and Child.

**Moro as Model Republican: The Career in Politics**

Most of the information about Cristoforo Moro’s political life has been accumulated by the epigrapher, Emmanuele Cicogna.\(^{41}\) Cicogna had just abandoned focused studies on Giovanni Boccaccio when Napoleon passed a law in 1810 to suppress the monasteries. The destruction of

---


convents on the fringes of Venice, falling to evocative ruin, must have struck a chord with Cicogna. He filled dense volumes with every inscription in Venice he could find, employing archival material to determine the nature of the textual references he recorded. In the case of Moro, Cicogna provided fragments of the Doge’s testament and his political activity which he culled from the earlier Venetian historian, Domenico Malipiero. The epigrapher also compared his inscriptions about Moro with laudatory odes for the Doge written on the occasion of his election and death. Thus, his overall impression of Moro was positive.

Cristoforo Moro became Procurator of San Marco in 1448, but his political life is first recorded about twenty years earlier when he served as the podestà of Chioggia, at that time still recovering from the devastating years at war with Genoa. As Chioggia’s podestà, Moro acted as a grand judge in the city’s tribunal system and oversaw the city’s revenues on behalf of the Republic. Little information exists about Moro’s individual role as podestà, but in his lengthy 1471 funerary oration honoring Moro, the Bishop of Belluno, Pietro Barozzi (1471-87), presented Moro as wholly committed to the Venetian Republic, upholding those values more resolutely than the ancient Romans. Barozzi praised Moro’s development of Chioggia’s salty and brackish marshes into arable land. While Barozzi inflated Moro’s efforts in Chioggia to reap praise on the newly deceased leader, certain assertions about Moro’s work could very well be true. Barozzi emphasized Moro’s introduction of a tax system in Chioggia to aid the institution of public services, including the improvement of the city’s granary. Barozzi’s excursus on Moro’s granary in Chioggia was a part of the recurring theme in his speech, which highlighted

43 Ibid.
44 Ibid. Lorenzetti, 1926, 787. The granary in Chioggia was rebuilt in 1328, so if Barozzi’s assessment of Moro’s work in restarting the granary is correct, he revitalized, rather than started the granary.
Moro’s ability to make land more fecund, and placed Moro in the tradition of a great Roman Republican. The early popes, like the emperors of Rome, oversaw granaries to supply the populace with bread. In naming the Doge as the inheritor of a Roman republican tradition on the cusp of imperialism, the orator reconfigured the Doge as the successor of the Roman Empire. After describing the fratricide and monarchical ambitions of the early Romans, Barozzi wrote, “How, therefore, did these thieves and murderers, pretenders to wisdom and incautious to prudence; seekers of tyranny and dominance like Romulus, Brutus, and Caesar come to be reputed as just and pious men dedicated to the wellbeing of the public and liberty, when Christoforo Moro, is in fact superior.” According to Barozzi Moro helped the poor, not “as a doge, or a prince, but like a brother or father,” evoking the Republican title bestowed on Caesar and Augustus, *pater patriae*, father of the country.

Moro followed his work in Chioggia with brief roles in local government throughout the Republic’s mainland territories. He became podestà and capitano of Belluno in 1432, capitano of Brescia in 1436 and, in 1442, Moro served as podestà of Padua. Barozzi characterized Moro as a

---

45 Peter Partner, *The Lands of St Peter; the Papal State in the Middle Ages and the Early Renaissance*, London, Eyre Methuen, 1972, 9.
46 Fortini Brown, 1996, 9-10. Venice often presented itself as a sort of New Rome. Ironically, it was one of the few cities in Italy that could not claim a Roman past.
diplomatic leader whose generosity appeased the residents of his dominions. Soon after his tenure in Padua ended, his role in the government became more focused in Venice. In 1444, Council of Ten records list him as an Advocator, a position generally held by those men who became Procurators of San Marco. It is unclear whether or not he was one of the few Advocators of the Senate, overseeing tribunals, or a Patrician Advocator, a position which would not have required a law degree. Emmanuele Cicogna credits him with obtaining a degree in canon law from the University of Padua, suggesting that he was one of the privileged Advocators of Senate. At different points throughout the 1440s, Moro also served on the Savi di Terraferma, monitoring the territorial concerns of Venice, and the Censore, an office which checked the legality of the senatorial and council meetings of the Republic.

Moro assumed his penultimate political position, as Procurator of San Marco de Ultra, on 14 September 1448. The nine Procurators of San Marco were elected to life terms and typically, the Procurators provided the pool for the ducal candidates. The Procurators oversaw the upkeep of the basilica of San Marco, they intervened in matters related to the city’s property and finances, and they often administered private bequests. Moro’s particular domain as a Procurator of San Marco de Ultra put him in charge of the land of the three sestieri to the

---

48 Ibid. Emmanuele Cicogna, *Delle Inscrizioni Veneziane*, Venice, 1824, Vol. 6, 574. In 1436, as capitano of Brescia, where the Venetians were always under the threat of Sforza, Barozzi said that Moro had been troubled by the poverty of the inhabitants. Thus, he rallied the people through his charitable works so that no one would cede the city to Sforza.

49 ASV, Avogardi di Commune, Reg. 3649, l c.107r; ASV, Collegio Notatorio 8, 166. 14 February 1445. Moro heard the wife of the incarcerated Antonio Fusculo plead for his early release.

50 Cicogna, Vol. 6, 553.

51 Ibid.

52 Ibid, 574. With the death of Federico Contarini, Procurator of San Marco, Moro was substituted to Procurator de Ultra in 14 September 1448.


southeast of the Grand Canal: Santa Croce, Dorsoduro, and San Polo. The Cannaregio was not under Moro’s particular domain as Procurator, but soon after he assumed the office, Moro became intensely involved with the building of the hospital and church of San Giobbe in the Cannaregio. The first documented mention of him in connection with San Giobbe exists in a 1451 donation of land to the church by Elizabeth Bragadin, in which she left eight Venetian passi of land in the care of Moro as a Procurator of San Marco de Ultra. As Procurator, Moro may have had an easier time securing private bequests to San Giobbe, but the ownership of property by his family in the neighborhood likely turned Cristoforo into something of a land baron.

Pietro Barozzi asserted in his funeral oration that the pre-ducal Moro had served as an ambassador to Popes Eugene IV (1431-1447) and Nicholas V (1447-1455).66 He claimed that Moro had accompanied the Holy Roman Emperor, Sigismund (fl. 1419-1437), to Rome in 1432 to meet with Pope Eugene IV. The story may be apocryphal or embellished but it fits into a Venetian topos of the doge intervening between the pope and emperor. Doge Sebastiano Ziani (1172-78) played a pivotal role in renewing diplomatic relations between Pope Alexander III from the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa in 1177 after the Venetians sheltered and defended the pope during the near twenty-year Alexandrine Schism.67 The incident was represented throughout the history of the Republic. As I will argue throughout the dissertation, Doge Moro

55 ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, f. 38r-39v. 8 & 20 May 1451. The document will be discussed in Chapter 3. 56 Cicogna, 574. Cicogna has called Moro’s service into question as his name is not in the book of ambassadors. However, few diplomatic documents exist for Venice before 1500. ASV, Miscellanea Codici, La Storia Veneta, 21, 259-261 Sabellico, 663. 57 As recounted in the chronicle of Martin da Canale, Les estoires de Venise: cronaca veneziana in lingua francese dalle origini al 1275, edited by Alberto Limentani, Florence: L. S. Olschki, 1972, 214. Muir, 1981, 123-5. For his accomplishment, the pope offered the doge a ring to symbolize the Republic’s claim to the sea. The event is commemorated in Venice’s Marriage of the Sea ceremony on the Day of Ascension.
fostered a connection between his rule and that of the earlier Doge Ziani to try to portray his rule as one governed by diplomacy and peaceful domestic affairs.

According to the orators, Moro also played a significant role in effecting the Peace of Lodi in 1454 to unite the city-states against the Ottoman Turks after the 1453 Fall of Constantinople. Ending the hostility between Venice and Milan stood at the center of the Treaty. The Florentines had aligned with Milan against Venice, leading to the expulsion of Florentine merchants and bankers from Venice and the exacerbation of old aggressions. Moro met with envoys from Venice and Milan in Rome on 24 October 1453 to strategize against the Sultan Mehmet II after Constantinople fell to the Ottoman Turks. Barozzi was joined in his praise of Moro’s attempt to allay the tensions between Venice and Milan by the Sforza court poet in Milan, Francesco Filelfo (1398-1481). In his letter congratulating Moro on his election to the dogate, Filelfo remembered working with Moro in the early 1450s to restore peace between Milan and Venice. According
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58 Barozzi. Bernardo Bembo, Gratulatio ad Christophorum Maurum pro Clarissimo Divini atque Humani Iuris Scolasticorum Ordine Patavini Habita, 1462 (1462BNM, Lat.xi.130 (=4011), 5r-24v. Composed in 1462 on behalf of the law faculty at the University of Padua where the young Bembo studied law. This redaction is dedicated to Ludovico Trevisan, 2r-5r. King, 1986, 31. The different redactions of the oration are discussed in N. Giannetto, “Un’orazione inedita di Bernardo Bembo per Cristoforo Moro,” Atti dell’Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti 140 (1981-2): 271-88, 282-3. Reinhold Mueller, Money and Banking in Medieval and Renaissance Venice, Volume II, The Venetian Money Market: banks, panics, and the public debt, 1200-1500, Baltimore: J. Hopkins University Press, c1997, 253. The hostility was exacerbated when Florence took sides. In 1452, the Florentines had aligned with Milan against Venice, leading to the expulsion of Florentine merchants and bankers from Venice. The doges believed that the forced expulsion of Florentine businessmen from Venice would have terrible fiscal repercussions. One example of the diplomatic benefits of an open market with Florence was revealed when Venice offered the Medici amnesty during their exile from Florence in 1433, at which time the Venetian branch of the Medici bank was the center of its operations. In gratitude, in 1434, Cosimo gave Venice money for its fight against Milan. Sanudo, 1773, 1151-3. Sanudo discusses Moro’s role in concluding peace with the Sforza against the Turks in 1453. Sabellico, 706.


60 Cicogna, 590. Letter from Francesco Filelfo to Doge Cristoforo Moro, from Milano, 15 March 1464. “Quis [...] ignorat decere eos omnis qui rempublicam gerunt, qui magistraribus præsunt, qui in principatu sunt et imperio constituuti, iis imbutos esse preeceptis quae a sapientiae fontibus manant? [...] Nam quid dicam de splendidissimo isto tuo amplissimoque senatu, quem non modo senatum multorum regum appellare licet, ut de Romanorum senatu quondam fertur divisse Cynneas, sed philosophorum quoque et plurium et illustrium. Quem enim Ariopagum, quam Academiam, quem peripatum, quos stoicos, quos pythagoreos, quos ullos in omni doctrinae genere præsetantissimos viros, cum venetis patriciis conferendos existimem?” James Hankins, “Renaissance Crusaders: Humanist Crusade
to the Venetian chronicler, Pietro Dolfin, however, Moro failed to reach an agreement with Milan and instead, the future Pope Paul II, the Venetian, Pietro Barbo, signed off on the final terms of the Peace of Lodi.61

Cicogna said he could not find evidence to confirm Moro’s role as ambassador, but the flurry of papal indulgences granted to Moro’s ecclesiastical investments in Venice during 1454, when Barozzi says he was ambassador, offers confirmation of his post. In one of the papal indulgences, Moro is named as an ambassador to Rome by Pope Nicolas V.62 In 1454 and a year later, while Moro was Procurator of San Marco, Nicholas V issued a papal bull conferring indulgences on those who fulfilled their religious duties—through burial, mass, confession, or donation—at San Giobbe or through the confraternity dedicated to St. Bernardino of Siena at the church.63 The indulgences suggest that Moro’s heavy investment at San Giobbe predated his dogate. The set of indulgences offered to the worshippers and patrons of the church of San Giobbe and the scuola of Bernardino by Nicholas V in the 1450s may have been an oblique gesture of thanks to Moro from the Pope for helping to effect the Peace of Lodi. The coincidence of the papal indulgences with the Peace of Lodi suggests that the Pope had Moro on his mind in granting favors to institutions supported by his family. In April 1454, after Moro’s purported stint as ambassador,
Nicholas V, put the hospital at Santa Maria della Misericordia under the protection of the scuola, of which the Moro were members and major donors. Moro’s precise position in the political affairs of the city-states directly after the Fall of Constantinople is obscure, but his engagement in preparations for a Crusade—in the conflicting roles of prevaricator and supporter—would inform the rest of his career.

“...vindictive, mendacious, greedy, and hated by the people:” Cristoforo Moro becomes Doge

According to the Venetian chronicler Marino Sanudo, after Moro was elected Doge on 12 May 1462, he was inaugurated in a solemn ceremony at the Ducal Palace, followed by an eruption of dancing and games, “to celebrate the era of peace heralded by Moro.” The details of Moro’s political sympathies before he became doge are unclear, but his encomiasts commonly attributed to him a religious zeal. In an oration celebrating Moro’s election, Bernardo Bembo fit Moro into a humanist topos, emphasizing his commitment to scholarship and his piety. Moro “devoted his adolescence to the study of theology and with his Christian virtue, he merited not only the highest office of the city, but a place in the heavens.”

---


65 Sanuto, 1773, 1171. ASV, Dieci, Deliberazione, Regina, 23, 40 r. “Nel 1462, Cristoforo Moro fece venir la Dogaressa, col Bucentoro pomposante in Palazzo, la quale fu Fiola dl q Ms Lunardo da la Sanudo.” BMC Codice Cicogna 2853, Cronaca Agostini, 5v-6. Agostini wrote of Moro’s election, “…and in his (Pasquale Malipiero) place was elected Cristoforo Moro, Procurator of San Marco, aged 72 years, held in high regard for his wisdom and integrity. He made sharp wars with the Turks in Greece with diverse and various success.” John E. Law, Venice and the Veneto in the Early Renaissance, Burlington, VT: Ashgate/Variorum, 2000, 100. The election of Moro was announced in a Ducale of 13 May 1462. A.S.Verona, A.A.C. reg. 61, f.225v, 229r-v. Cronaca di Anonimo Veronese, 1446-1488, edited by Giovanni Soranzo, 1915. A group of ambassadors from Verona was sent to congratulate the new doge as was customary. Gasparo Contarini, The commonwealth and the government of Venice, London 1599, 224.

66 Barozzi, 88.

67 B. Bembo, Gratulatio ad Christophorum Maurum pro Clarissimo Divini atque Humani Iuris Scolasticorum Ordine Patavini Habita, 1462.
occasion of his election was designed with a garland and the inscription, “Religionis et Iusticae Cultor,” defining the Doge by his sense of religion and justice. William Wey, a pilgrim passing through Venice at the time of Moro’s election to the dogate in 1462, noted that the new doge was said to be “strong in his Catholic faith.”

Moro’s nephew, Leonardo Sanudo, compiled the sycophantic letters from religious, secular, and cultural beacons that poured in from throughout Europe commending the inauguration of the new Doge.

Among the letters addressed to Moro is one sent to the Venetian Senate by Pope Pius II (1458-64) in November 1463, which exhorted Moro to join the Crusade. Pius’ letter is written as if to an old friend who shares his deep passion for the Crusade. It emphasizes their mutual suitability to the effort by praising their common backgrounds as soldiers and captains. The Pope even enclosed a sword he had blessed with the letter. (Figure 18) He assured Moro that the earthly Trinity formed by the Christian soldiers—Moro, Pius, and Phillip III, Duke of Burgundy—would be aided by a celestial Trinity.

---

70 BNM, Lat.XIII.90 (=4143).
71 Ibid, 1-2. In the letter, Pius II officially asks Moro and Duke Filippo di Burgundy if they will participate in the Crusade. “...veni ergo, fili, neque laborem recuses quem nos sponte subimus. Neque te senem debes excusari Philippus quoque senex est et multo longiorem quam tu ipse facturus est viam: et nos etiam senectus invasit, anno dio de sexaginta natos. Accedunt norbi, qui nons dies ac noctes urgent; nec tamen detectamur in bellum ire...” “moriendum est omnibus in hoc saeculo, neque quicquam melius est, quam benne mori, nec honesties mori licet quam in causa Dei. Veni ergo et consolare nos; aut cum victoria prastante Domino revertetur, aut si aliter in caelo decretum fuerit, eam sortem feremus, quam nobis male esse non poterint, voluntatem nostram cælesti bene placito subicientibus. Datum Romae Viii kal. Novembres mcccclxiii anno sexto.” The letter was delivered by the Papal Legate, Cardinal Bessarion, and it was read to the Senate on 9 November 1463.
72 Cicogna, 543. Cicogna made reference to a sword at the Arsenale with the same inscription. Phillip, the Duke of Burgundy, was also courted by Pius II as a principal participant of a Crusade. ASV, Misc.Atti.Dipl, Busta 41, 1218. There was record of a secret pact between Rome, Burgundy, and Venice in 1463.
73 Malipiero, Vol. I, 7-10. On 8 September 1459, at the Diet of Mantua called by Pius II, the Consilio Rogatorum was published in which Pius praised the work of the Hungarians and called for help from the Burgundians, Sabaudia, Ferrara and Florence. Venice did not formally support the Diet, so Pius did not formally call on the Republic for help.
codex portray Moro as committed to Pope Pius II’s plan to lead a Crusade East to, “save Christians from the threat of the cruelty and persecution of the Ottoman Turks”\textsuperscript{74} When the Pope gave Moro a sword, he was appealing to the historical weight of the doge’s office. When Doge Sebastiano Ziani offered shelter to Pope Alexander III in the twelfth century during his tension with the Emperor, the Pope offered the Doge a sword, in addition to a parasol, as a gesture of thanks.\textsuperscript{75} (Figure 19) These objects became symbols of the doge and Venetian civic ritual.\textsuperscript{76}

In building his coalition of crusaders, Pius II concentrated on the alliance with Duke Phillip of Burgundy and Venice. Phillip matched Pius II in enthusiasm for crusade, but did not invest as heavily as had been expected after Philip’s ten years of intense lobbying for a mission.\textsuperscript{77} In Venice, Pius saw strong naval crews, wealth, and an active business relationship with the East. With prodding, the Pope had a good chance at winning over the two leaders. Despite the diplomatic ties between Venice and the East, Mehmet II was attacking the Republic’s territory throughout the Aegean and constantly threatened its Dalmatian colonies. In 1461, when Moro was not yet Doge, Pius granted a set of indulgences to the worshippers of San Giobbe, indicating that Pius II wanted either to offer something to the church patronized by a potential doge in exchange for support of his impending Crusade or seduce him to the cause.\textsuperscript{78}

A recurring feature of the oratorical praise for Moro on his election emphasized his support for the Crusade as a sign of his evangelical piety. The Papal Legate to Venice, Cardinal

\textsuperscript{74} BNM, Lat.XIII.90 (=4143), 15. “Contra…impios furors iniquisimi turci christiani nois accerimus crudelissimique persecutoris pertinent protectionem.”

\textsuperscript{75} Agostino Pertusi, “Quedam regalia insignia: ricerche sulle insegne del potere ducale a Venezia durante il medioevo,” Studi veneziani 8 (1965). Pertusi discusses the significance of several objects, including, the ring, the umbrella, and the sword on ducal ceremony.


\textsuperscript{77} At the Feast of the Pheasant in 1454, Phillip committed to Crusade.

\textsuperscript{78} BAV, T 514, f. 60. Dated 30 June 1461. Rewritten in ASV, Scuola Piccola, Busta 260, c27. Barozzi, 90-91. “Quibus omnes qui certo anni tempore peccatis poenitudine atque confessione deletis, fanum quantum quisque adeam rem posset pecuniae collaturi...”
Bessarion (1403-72), called the Doge “a defender of the faith,” and lauded the Republic as one of the only Christian lands willing to follow the Pope. The astronomer and philosopher, Candiano Bollani, and the physician, Giovanni Caldiera (1400–74), weighed in with dedications in their treatises to the Doge. Caldiera dedicated his 1465 *De Virtutibus moralibus et theologicus* to Moro and took credit for reading Moro’s dogeship in the stars and publicly announcing the event before it happened. He echoed Pius’ triangulation of the Doge as part of a Holy Trinity with the Duke of Burgundy and Pius due to their commitments to the Crusade.

Echoing St. Francis’ attempt to convert the Fatimid caliph of Egypt in 1218 during the Fifth Crusade, Pius II wrote a letter to Mehmet II attempting to convert him. This last ditch attempt to break off plans for the Crusade by peacefully acquiring lands taken by the Sultan, suggests that the hawkish-sounding Pius II cared more about the geographic expansion of Christianity than the mere procurement of land. As a participant in Pope Pius II’s plans for Crusade, Moro’s religiosity was emphasized. The picture of Moro as a devout doge trying to save Venice and Christendom stands in conspicuous contrast to the unsympathetic descriptions of Moro in chronicles of Venetian history. As the threat by the Ottoman Turks to Venetian territories
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81 BMC, PD.727, Vol. I. Giovanni degli Agostini, *Notizie istoriche critiche intorno la vita e le opere degli scrittori Veniziani*, Vol. 2, Venice, 1754, 179-88. Drawing on earlier sources about Moro’s rule in the crusade, Giovanni degli Agostini wrote in 1752 that Pius II, Philip and Moro entered into a “Holy League” together. Caldiera’s claim to have predicted Moro’s dogate indicates that he may have done astrological work for the Doge. Margaret L. King, “Personal, Domestic, and Republican Values in the Moral Philosophy of Giovanni Caldiera,” *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 28, No. 4. (Winter, 1975): 568. King believes that Caldiera’s mention of his astrological prediction was meant to cull favor as a court magus looking for future work.

increased throughout the fifteenth century, Doge Moro was accused of lacking political strength. In 1463, Moro instituted a high citywide tax which he tried to impose on the clergy as well. It was meant, in part, to upgrade the naval resources, but the justification for the tax remained theoretical: during the 1460s, the city suffered financial and territorial losses, including the loss of the key port city Negroponte in 1470. The Venetian historian Domenico Malipiero characterized Moro as “gloomy, hypocritical, vindictive, mendacious, greedy, and hated by the people.” He added that, “In his time, the land has always had expense, war, and tribulation.”

Marino Sanudo, Moro’s great nephew by marriage, created a portrait of the Doge’s cattiva fama that overrode familial fealty. In describing Doge Agostino Barbarigo, Sanudo wrote that he died in 1501, “In worse repute than any other doge since the time of Cristoforo Moro.” The fear of imprisonment over speech crimes in Venice did not stop the circulation of prose and caricature against Moro, one of which is recorded by Sanudo:

Cristoforo Moro, Doge of Venice

He is an impious and idle, cruel and greedy thief.

Cristoforo Moro, to whom the unjust brother of demons is entrusted his corpse

Comes to desire pomp from the pure waters

Turning towards the dead below, he will not return.

The image of Moro constructed by the chroniclers illustrates how deteriorated his public relations were. Most judgments on the Doge’s problematic reign, however, are rooted in his ambiguous relationship to the Crusade. The epistolary praise for Moro at the beginning of his reign

---


dogate posited Moro as a Crusader. Regardless of whether Moro was an active proponent of the Crusade before he became doge, by portraying Moro as a Crusader, he could eventually capitulate.

The conflicting portraits of the Doge were not only personal; they also epitomized the friction caused by the gradual reduction of the doge’s authority in the fifteenth century and the preservation of his figurehead status. After Moro’s election, in 1464, the Council of Ten flexed its power by cutting off the hand of a Ludovico Contarini because they found his caricatures of the Doge and the official Advocators offensive. 87 The dignity of the dogate was essential. In fact, when the young Bartolomeo Memmo was condemned to death in 1470 for his arrogant assassination plot against Moro, the inclusion of the detail that he referred to the Doge as a *becco* gives weight to the insult and not just the agitation to murder the doge.

**Recreating 1204: Venice joins the Crusade**

While Venice gained territory on the mainland, Moro’s rule was framed by the loss of key coastal possessions in the Aegean and along the Adriatic: Lesbos was taken from the Venetians in September of 1462 without adequate military intervention and Argos fell to the Sultan Mehmet II after an attack of the island’s citadel on 3 April 1463. Morea in particular, had three strategic military promontories that joined with the Isthmus of Corinth and bordered the Ionian Sea, but Venice steadily lost the towns in the years leading up to Moro’s dogate. In 1463, with the help of the Albanians, the Venetians attempted to recapture the Peloponnese, a potentially

---

87 ASV, Senato, Misti, XXX, 35; ASV, Senato, Misti, XXXIV, 51. ASV, Dieci, Misto, XXIII, 55, 85v, 57; Giuseppe Cappelletti, *Storia della Repubblica di Venezia: dal suo principio sino al suo fine*, G. Antonelli, 1849-1855., 46-7. ASV, Dieci, Misto, xxiii, 55, 85v. The Council of Ten cut off the right hand of Ludovico Contarini in 1464 because he had caricatured the doge and the Avogadori.
rich source of taxes. In 1464, Giacomo Loredan, who had been appointed as captain of the Republic’s naval fleets in the East, replaced Orsato Giustiniani, responsible for several of the Republic’s failures, but Loredan could not reclaim the losses. The biggest defeat came a year before Moro died in 1470, when the Republic lost Negroponte after the Venetian capitano, Niccolò da Canale, and his galleys fled the city. Negroponte was the largest Venetian territory in the Aegean, but it also represented Venetian colonial power. Venice acquired sovereignty over the island after its success in the Fourth Crusade of 1204.

Since his 1459 proposal to lead a Crusade to the Holy Land, Pius II rallied support for his mission, but most rulers either demanded compensation or ultimately broke their promises to participate. Throughout the city-states, leaders were prepared to offer only enthusiasm or meager resources for the Crusade. Cosimo de’ Medici, for example, provided only one galley, for Phillip of Burgundy’s participation. Demonstrating the breakdown of the Peace of Lodi just ten years after it was initiated, Florence and Milan refused to participate in the Crusade on the grounds that only Venice would profit.

The celebration of a mass at San Marco in June 1464 to ensure a safe Crusade signals the commitment from the Venetians, but before 1464, the city’s commitment to the Crusade was wavering. When the king of Bosnia was captured in April 1463 and Ragusa fell into Mehmet’s

---

88 Pius II, Commentaries, 327. The Peloponnese bought in 30,000 gold ducats a year in taxes.
89 ASV, Senato, Reg. 9, 73.
93 Codice Cicogna, 2043, 60. 26 June 1464, there was a celebration of mass for the Crusade.
hands soon after, the Venetians seem to have become more committed to participation in the Crusade. The Venetians besieged Corinth, but abandoned the siege too soon and lost it. On 22 June 1463, Cardinal Francesco Gonzaga wrote that the Venetians were not committing to the Crusade for they wanted control of Morea in exchange for help. Pius II sent Cardinal Bessarion to Venice as apostolic legate to urge the Venetians to commit wholeheartedly to the Crusade, apparently after he became exasperated by their non-committal response. From Venice in 1463, Bessarion noted in a letter to Pius that the Republic was moving slowly. A few months before the Crusade, on 11 April 1464, just a few months before the mass in San Marco, Pius II wrote to the Republic offering to help buffer the Venetian military if they would commit to partake in his “sacred work.”

The Venetian Senate likely temporized when it came to publicly dealing with the Sultan due to the Republic’s strong economic interests in the East. Under Moro, Venice’s eventual consent to the Crusade in 1464 offered a change from the policy of his predecessor, Doge Pasquale Malipiero, who prohibited the papal congress from meeting in Udine in 1459, for fear it would generate pro-Crusade sentiment and jeopardize both Venetian business interests across the Adriatic and relations with the East. Instead, the Congress met in Mantua where the newly elected Pope Pius II officially announced his plans for a Crusade to reclaim the Holy Land and began his movement to rally support. Pius’ principal backers, Phillip of Burgundy, Matthew of Hungary, and the Venetians did not participate in the Congress, though Phillip committed to

94 Arch.Segr.Vat.Arm XXXI, Tom. 52. To Ludovico II from Francesco Gonzaga on 22 June and 1 July, 1463.
95 The letter is in Arch.Segr.Vat.Arm. XXXIX, Tom.10; Setton, Vol. II, 221.
96 ASV, Bolle Pont., Busta 7, Proc 268.
participate two months after the Congress ended.\textsuperscript{98} When Constantinople fell to Mehmet in 1453, Venice was officially a neutral party, though it had made peace with Mehmet II in 1451.\textsuperscript{99} But Venice seems to have hedged on its position in the intervening ten years between the Fall of Constantinople and the launch of the Crusade in 1464. With full understanding of Venice’s military, economic, political, and geographic importance to his mission, Pius II assessed the economic ramifications for Crusade in his \textit{Commentaries}, concluding that merchants need not advocate Crusade for reasons of profit, but for spiritual motivation.\textsuperscript{100}

Venice supported the Crusade to the East under Moro, but it advanced to action sluggishly. The lengthy deliberation reveals the cautious view of the Crusade taken by several outspoken humanists. In fact, several writers who called for the Crusade in the early 1460s had been courting the Sultan Mehmet II just a few years earlier.\textsuperscript{101} Bernardo Giustiniani believed that the major forces of Europe needed to confront the Ottoman Turks as a unified entity before the Venetians could wholeheartedly commit to participation.\textsuperscript{102} Moro seems to have been more enthusiastic about the Crusade early in his rule and tried to persuade the Venetian government to join the Pope. Moro offered the Milanese court poet Francesco Filelfo a paid residency in Venice to help with the attendant rhetoric that would be needed to rouse support for Crusade. Filelfo

\textsuperscript{98} Setton, Vol. II, 236.
\textsuperscript{99} Ibid., 271.
\textsuperscript{100} Pope Pius II, \textit{Commentaries}, 223.
\textsuperscript{101} Hankins, 130. John Monfasani, \textit{George of Trebizond: a biography and a study of his rhetoric and logic}, E.J. Brill, 1976, 133. Francesco Filelfo, for example, had written an ode to Mehmet, though it may have been motivated by an attempt to secure a release for his family imprisoned under the Sultan. George of Trebizond, who wrote Moro's nephew, Leonardo Sanudo, a note of congratulations on his election, had once helped Mehmet secure maps of Venice.
\textsuperscript{102} Labalme, 1969, 86.
responded, “Science can never be paid, but if the Venetians are ready to give me two thousand zucchinì, I will accept the position...”

In part, the Republic had to change its policy and move towards aggression after losing territory in the Aegean and along the Dalmatian coast. When Moro became Doge, Venice reversed the previous policy on staving off war with the Turks, first by declaring war on Mehmet II in July 1463 and then by supporting the Crusades of those in Christian held territory closer to Constantinople. Hungary had asked Pius II for relief in sustaining frontline fighting against Mehmet. In trying to rally the support of the Hungarians to join the Crusade, Venice pledged 60,000 ducats and begged the Duke of Burgundy to contribute. Moro went into a treaty with Hungary on 12 September 1463 for after Bosnia fell, Hungary served as a buffer between the European and the Ottoman strongholds. Its participation in the Crusade would provide logistical support, but Hungary then retracted and pulled out of plans for the Crusade claiming France prohibited it. As the war progressed, Moro called for a vote in the Great Council on Pius’ request for assistance in his Crusade against the Turks. “We depend on the goodwill of the Signoria,” Moro said. In July 1463, the majority of Republic’s governing body, the Great Council, consented to Moro’s request and voted for war, but had still not signed onto Pius’ Crusade.

---

103 From Milano 23 December 1463. “La scienza non può mai esser pagata, ma se i Veneziani sono pronti a darmi mille e due zucchinì, accetterò il partito... ho inteso che siete stato scelto per legato del Sommo Pontefice per trattare alla Repubblica Veneziana circa ai preparativi contro a’ Turchi.”

104 Arch.Segr.Vat.Arm. I-XVIII, No. 1443, fol. 44. ASV, Senato, Reg. 22, 35-37. BNM. Lat X, 416, c5. 3 June 1462. Pro factis regni Ungarie... Cristoforo Moro wrote to Niccolò Sagundino regarding the necessity to combat the Turks in the Balkans, 1462. BNM.Lat X, 416., f.5. 3 June 1462. Pro factis regni Ungarie. “Dices preterea B. Sue habuisse in mandates a nobis: sub iuris nostris credentialibus: quas ad te mittimus his adiunctas: visitandi R. um cardinalem S. Angeli: nihilque omnio pretà rimittere: ut persuadeatur nostre parte: que velit taque Christianissimus ac sapientissimus dominus: et ni rebus omnibus, sed presertius in his negotiis Hungarie expertissimus, suscipere pondus legationis istius: Omnemque curam: diligentiam: et operam suam in re tam Sancta: et laudabili: que salutem totius xpiane religionis concernit... litteris tuis nos solitim advisabis.”

Moro’s direct role in the Crusade is opaque but most early Venetian historians suggest that he supported the Crusade and acted as an intercessor between the Pope and the hesitant Venetian Senate. Moro’s bad reputation in Venetian chronicles begins with a real or apocryphal moment of reluctance in his capacity as intercessor. An indelible smudge on Moro’s passion for the Crusade came after the Great Council obliged the Doge to lead the Venetian galleys in person during deliberations on Pius’ November 1463 exhortation to Venice to commit formally to his plan.\textsuperscript{106} The requisition that Moro captain the galleys heading off on the mission summons images of Doge Enrico Dandolo leading the galleys on the 1204 Crusade in which the Venetians pillaged its former sovereign, Constantinople. The Crusaders returned to Venice with the spoils of the Sack and gained control over most of the Eastern Empire, earning the doge the title, “Lord of a Quarter and a Half a Quarter of the Byzantine Empire.”\textsuperscript{107} 1204 would not be repeated in 1464.

According to Malipiero, Doge Moro tried to dodge his draft by the Republic for the Crusade by claiming old age and inexperience at sea.\textsuperscript{108} Pius II’s November 1463 letter to the new Doge Moro urging him to crusade cites their common advanced age, their failing health, and the dwindling chances for them to attain one last glory as soldiers.\textsuperscript{109} These geriatric dreams, while meant to impart a sense of intimacy, have been interpreted as the basis for Venice’s

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{ASV, MC, Regina, 47r. 9 November 1463. The Senate voted that if they joined the Crusade, the participation of the Doge would be necessary. Then, in ASV, MC, Regina, 47v. 30 November 1463. The Senate voted that Moro would lead the expedition against the Turks, with the assistance of the Duke of Crete.}
\footnote{Pincus, “Hard Times and Ducal Radiance,” 95. In the thirteenth century, Pietro Ziani was the first doge to assume this title. Pincus believes that around this time, the Doge was increasingly paired with Christ, deriving from a Byzantine model.}
\footnote{BNM.Lat.XII.90 (4143) “...nec decrunt robuste militum cohortes que nobis oratione pugnantibus ferro dimicent.”and “Veni ergo, fili, neque laborem recuses quam nos sponte subimus. Neque te senem debeas excusari Philippus quoque senex est et multo longiorem quam tu ipse facturus est viam: et nos etiam senectus invasit, anno dio de sexaginta natos.”}
\end{footnotes}
tergiversation. Moro could retain popularity through vocal support of the Crusade, but could hold back resources and spare himself the ridicule of potential failure as he waited for the aging protagonists of the Crusade—the Ottoman Sultan Mehmet II and Pius II—to die. Because Moro equivocated on physically leaving for the Holy Land, his initial enthusiasm for the Crusade can not be established and the political fallout within the city-states from the failure of the Crusade is difficult to gauge.

The Doge’s hesitation in embarking for the Crusade apparently irritated the Venetian Senate. They concluded in a meeting on 1 August 1464 that Moro would have to leave that night for Ancona where Pius II planned to convene his forces. According to Malipiero, the Great Council responded to Moro’s reluctance by reminding him that he was only a state symbol: “If your Sereneness does not want to go with good will, we will make him go by force because we have more care for the well-being and honor of this land than for you personally.” With that, on 31 July 1464, Moro led twenty-four Venetian ships to Ancona. While he waited for reinforcements in Ancona, the feverish and gouty Pope Pius II died on 13 August 1464, just one day after Moro arrived. In spite of Pius’ exhortations to carry out the Crusade, Moro returned to a cool reception in Venice on 23 August 1464 with the 40,000 ducats collected for the Crusade. The cardinals who had accompanied the Pope returned to Rome for

---

11 ASV, Senate, Reg. 22, fol. 28.
113 Sanudo, 1773, 1174. Moro left with the 24 galleys, 5000 silver ducats, and 4 counselors. He was accompanied by his nephew Lorenzo, his future successor as doge, Niccolò Tron, and Pietro Mocenigo. Moro’s more popular successor Niccolò Tron, lost his son, an official in the military, when the Turks impaled him in an attempt to recover Negroponte.
conclave. While the Doge’s ultimate willingness to participate in and supply resources for the Crusade provided encomiasts with examples of his piety, Moro’s association with the Crusade’s breakdown resounded with the lackluster performance that the Republic would experience throughout his dogate. Moro stepped into a tenuous political situation and emerged a weakened diplomat and military leader.

The nineteenth-century epigrapher, Emmanuele Cicogna, was baffled by the negative characterizations of Moro. Working almost exclusively with Pietro Barozzi’s fifteenth-century funeral oration for Moro, he interpreted the Doge’s reluctance to join the Crusade as an example of Moro’s pacifism. Barozzi portrayed the doge as a diplomat who unified the city-states against the Ottoman Turks and protected Christianity in peril, by giving “fear to Mehmet II.” Barozzi’s Moro was as a reluctant leader who did not see out his power, but who accepted his post as doge in order to assist the Republic.

The orator cast Moro in the role of ancient leader, likening his attempt to reclaim Morea to Hannibal’s campaigns to reclaim Carthage. Moro was not only destined for his role as doge, but was a cultivator of the land and patron of the “templum” of San Giobbe. Barozzi credited Moro with abetting the election of the Venetian Pietro Barbo, to the papacy as Paul II (1464-72) after the death of the Piccolomini Pope Pius II in compensation for his willingness to invest and participate in the Crusade. Throughout his papacy, the Venetians received Paul’s attention in matters of protection against the Ottoman Turks, though he does not seem to have been as fanatic

115 Malipiero, Vol. 2, 659. The money was to be given to Hungary to carry on with the mission.
117 Ibid, 88.
118 Ibid, 83.
119 Ibid. ASV, Senate, XIX, f.217b-219; Pastor, Vol. IV, 3-11.
about the Crusade as his predecessor in that there is no evidence that he tried to resuscitate the Crusade after Pius II.

After the Crusade fell apart, the Venetians continued to lose territory. Pope Paul II wrote to Doge Moro on 19 October 1465 advising him that together with Hungary, Venice should curtail its losses and strike a peace with the Turks. Though Mehmet II failed to take Croatia in 1466, Venice could not compensate for the loss of Argos through its war with the Turks. The extant letters between Moro and his envoys in the Republic’s vulnerable territories exhibits fear of impending territory loss and no clear solution for defense. In 1468, Moro’s Provveditore, or commissioner in Albania, designated to oversee the mercenary army’s expenditures, wrote to Moro in frustration about the Republic’s futile expenditure on securing its Adriatic territories. Moro followed with a letter to Pope Paul II warning him that without reinforcement from the expanding papal troops, success would elude the Venetians in their attempts to stave off the Ottomans. When Venice lost Negroponte a year later, Pope Paul II wrote to Moro offering the Republic use of its lucrative alum mines in Tolfa to help reclaim the fallen territories.

Devaluing the Dogate: Moro’s Troubled Venice

The ubiquitous menace of Mehmet II marred Moro’s reign, but the Republic faced crises on the domestic front as well during the 1460s. Moro’s rule began with an uprising in Trieste that
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120 ASV, Bolle Pontificum, Buste 8, 244. ASV, Collegio Notatorio, 11, 223, 55v. Venice enters into a league with Paul against the Turks, “Contra turchi crudelissimi inimici del nome christiano.”
121 Setton, Vol. II, 254. Andrea Dandolo, Provveditore of Morea, and his successor, Jacopo Barbarigo, wrote letters to Moro. Barbarigo wrote to Moro on 25 July 1465 saying he was distressed at the expenditure in Morea with little result. He suggested that even if Hungary joined forces with Venice, they could still not do much to stave off the Turks. Niccolò da Canale was writing with bad news from France about Louis’ lapsing commitment to the Crusade, and Moro’s condottiere in Albania, similarly reported dismal military performances against the Ottomans.
122 ASV, Senato, Reg. 23, 115v-116v. Letter of 7 June 1468 from Cristoforo Moro to Paul II. BNM,Lat.CL.XIV,229 (=4679), 66v, 80v.
123 ASV, Bolle Pontificum, Busta 8, no.243. 7 July 1470. Pope Paul II writes to Moro from Rome ceding alum to the Republic to help in the war with the Turks at Negroponte.
sapped a part of the city’s naval resources needed in the East. During most of 1463, the Venetians tried to occupy Trieste with military strength.\textsuperscript{124} Without much respite after the Venetians coerced Trieste into a peace, Venice fell under the grip of a pestilence between 1464-8, which wiped out large sections of the population.\textsuperscript{125} The wet cityscape that resulted from the harnessing of islets off the Grand Canal and the land reclamation that comprise the great engineering of the Venetian landscape made for particularly virulent outbreaks of the plague in the cramped, wet, and rat-infested neighborhoods.\textsuperscript{126} Though a provisional office had been established to deal with the plague in 1459, a formal office to deal with the numerous outbreaks in the city was not established until 1485 when the Magistero alla Sanità was formed.\textsuperscript{127}

Deliberations in both 1464 and 1468 to find a place for sufferers to convalesce in quarantine on an island in the north lagoon illustrate that the epidemic was serious.\textsuperscript{128} This event is one of the few recorded times in which a successful social service was inaugurated in Venice under Moro’s watch.

The fragile landscape provided an apt backdrop to a Republic constantly challenged by changes in the balance of power. Moro’s reign was largely blemished by his association with the change in the language of the Republic. At the beginning of Moro’s dogate references to the “Commune of the Venetians” disappeared from the Doge’s 1462 Promissione, his oath of office.

\textsuperscript{127} ASV, Senato Terra Registro, 6. c29r; Venezia e la Peste, 366.
\textsuperscript{128} Ibid. ASV, Senato Terra, Reg. 5, c.76. 17 April 1464. A move to close several plague houses received unanimous approval. ASV, Senato, Terra, Reg. 6, 30r, 18 July 1468 on constructing a place for the convalescence who leave Santa Maria di Nazareth. ASV, Senato, Misti, Reg. 54, 140v, 28 August 1423.
outlining his obligations. The government was not called the “Commune Venetiarum” as it had been in the past, but became the Signoria or “Dominio Venetiarum.” Venice had been referred to as a dominion in the past, but the publication of the change in as formal a document as the Promissione was antithetical to the mores of the Republic, throwing Moro’s subsequent acts of patronage—discussed below—in a more aggrandizing light. That the Promissione was read aloud by the doge at his inauguration may have made Moro the focus of dissatisfaction with the change. The Doge and the Republic collapsed into “La Serenissima.”

Significantly, the shift in the definition of Venice coincided with the dwindling powers of the doge in the fifteenth century. The doge was still the leader of Venice, but the Council of Ten held more power than the doge and instituted legislation limiting his powers. With the death of each successive doge, the Council of Ten placed more stringent controls on the authority of the Office of the Doge in policy-making and ceremony. The doge’s power of expression over what was in name his private church—the basilica of San Marco—was increasingly circumscribed. The figurehead of the state could be placed in danger, leading the galleys on the Crusade, while at home, the Signoria could pin the ailments of the Republic including the subtle implementation of an enlarged governmental authority on the doge.

In the midst of the changes to the definition of Venice under Moro, the government bureaucracy expanded. Sanudo credits Moro with initiating several new communal offices and

---

Sanudo, *De Origine*, 186. He comments, “Titolo si deva al Dose Moro quando era in la galia al Dominio, qui: "Christophorus Mauro Dei gratia Dux Venetiarum et cetera, Illustrissimo Ducali Dominio Venetiarum et cetera, salutem et sincerae dilectionis affectum." A tergo: "Illustrissimo Ducali Dominio Venetiarum, et cetera. Et utitur solito sigillo pumbei, et subscriptio est: "Ducale Dominium Venetiarum."’ King, 1986, 178-180. The institution of three inquisitors in the sixteenth century to abjure cases of high policy provided a limited system of checks and balances which staved off the possibility of a more dictatorial regime.
131 Finlay, 110-5, 119-20.
adding more administrators to existing offices of the Republic at the beginning of his dogate, presumably to buffer the city’s resources for Pius’ Crusade. He established the Offices of the Commissioner of Armor and the Commissioner of Wood to supply materials to the commune for shipbuilding. Moro increased the unsalaried Advocates of the court from 10 to 14 and doubled the Councils of the Rialto from two to four.

Economically, Venice faltered during the reign of Moro. In 1463, Pius II enforced the dormant ecclesiastical tithe to help fund the Crusade. Furthermore, Venice raised taxes on rent and income and forced loans were instituted to pay for the Crusade and public works right at the beginning of Moro’s reign. A notice from the Senate dated to September 3, 1463 notes that Venetian currency continued a downward devaluation in silver and gold. The devaluation continued as Venice lost more territory to the Ottoman Turks in the 1460s and experienced two rounds of pestilence. With the beginning of Moro’s successor Niccolò Tron in 1472, and until 1517, most economic historians note that Venetian currency steadied, but Moro did not seem to
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133 Sanudo, De Origine, 95, c46v. Of the Commission for Armor (Provedadori sora l’Armar) Sanudo writes, “Non hanno alcun salario, poleno esser eletti in ogni loco, sentano in Collegio di sotto i Savij a i Ordeni, in Pregadi non hanno loco. Questo officio fu prima creato in tempo di Christophoro Moro dose per la Guerra del Turco, et si faceva per Collegio, ma sotto questo Principe si fa per Pregadi.” Ibid.123, c58r. Moro also increased the number of Avvocati per le Corte. “Sono 16 per numero ordinario, erano prima 6, et al tempo de Cristoforo Moro dose per le molte cause non potendo supplier, ne fu azonto altri 4; poi a tempo di Nicolo Marcello dose fo azonto sie, si che sono XVI, stanno doi anni, et e di anni 25 in suso; ma pochi prova l’eta.” 272, c41r. “Provedadori ale Legne, sonno do da 40 in suso, stanno doi anni, si fi per 4 man di eletione; et hano salario ducati 100 a l’anno, et di regalia 100 cara di legne per uno; sentano a Rialto sopra la Becharia. Questo officio fu creado a tempo di messier Christofolo Moro dose, provede alle legne del Commun accio la Terra habbi abondantia.” Ibid.136, c63r. Avvocati per i officij a Rialto: “Questi parlano, et avocano per loro clienteli per li officij di Rialto; et prima erano doi solum, i quali fonno creati in tempo di Christoforo Moro dose, et sotto questo Principe per l’augmentatione delle facende, ne fo azonto doi altri, si che sono quattro. Polen esser eletti dentro et di fuora.”

134 ASV Senato Terra, Reg. 5, 73. March 1464. Bartolomeo Cecchetti, La Repubblica di Venezia e la Corte di Roma nei rapporti della religione, P. Naratovich, 1874, 153. Pope Eugenio IV passed a bull in 1438 to order an ecclesiastical tithe, but it was not enforced until 1463 under Moro. ASV, Bolle Pontificum, Busta 8, 23: 15 July 1465. Paul II rescinded the tax.

135 Chambers and Pullan, 137. The tax on ten percent of all financial gains was levied on 15 June 1463.

136 ASV, Senato, Terra, Reg. 5, 70. 26 September 1463.
have the capability to alleviate the Republic's financial travails. The city's financial heart was physically compromised as well in 1464 when the mercanzia underwent significant damage by aqua alta.\footnote{Niccolò Papadopoli Aldobrandini, \textit{Le Monete di Venezia}, Formi, 1967. Gino Luzzatto, \textit{Storia Economica di Venezia dall’ XI a XVI Secolo}, Centro Internazionale delle Arti e del Costume, c1961, 214.} \footnote{In addition, Malipiero Vol. II, 654, 1463 reports that a costly drudging process of the Canale Grande was initiated in 1463. In May of 1465, renovations to the Palazzo dei Camerlenghi began.}

\textbf{The Circumstantial Evidence for the Learned Doge}

Moro’s political popularity suffered after his failed Crusade, but Venice flourished and even transcended political tensions as a cultural center during the 1460s. Moro’s reign saw the initiation of the first printed material in the Republic, when on 1 May 1469 the Venetian Senate granted its first printing privileges to a German, Johann von Speyer.\footnote{Peter Burke, “Early Modern Venice as a Center of Information and Communication,” \textit{Venice Reconsidered: the History and Civilization of an Italian city-state, 1297-1797}, edited by John Martin and Dennis Romano, 400. Rudolf Hirsch, \textit{Printing, Selling, and Reading, 1450-1550}, Wiesbaden, 1974.}\footnote{Leonardas Vytautas Gerulaitis, \textit{Printing and publishing in fifteenth-century Venice}, Chicago: American Library Association, 1976, 1.}\footnote{In the 1471 copy of Cicero’s \textit{De finibus bonorum et malorum}, at the Houghton Library in Cambridge, the colophon reads: Venetiis, M.CCCC.LXXI. Christophoro Mauro duce. Ioanne ex Colonia agrippinensi sumptu ministrante impressum.} Shortly after its initiation, printing boomed in the city and Venice was soon responsible for an eighth of all books printed during the fifteenth century.\footnote{Sanudo, 1772, 1189. Crouzet-Pavan, Vol. II, 991.} Johann von Speyer designed and patented one of the first printed Roman fonts in Venice, used for the first editions he printed in 1469 of Cicero’s \textit{Epistulae ad Familiares} and Pliny’s \textit{Historia Naturalis}. In several of the books, the colophons mention Moro as the doge or they contain brief dedications to him.\footnote{Sanudo, 1772, 1189. Crouzet-Pavan, Vol. II, 991.} Von Speyer was also given one of the earliest copyrights, granting him exclusive rights to print the epistles of both Pliny and Cicero until 1474, though his death in 1470 voided all the exclusive rights of his press.\footnote{Sanudo, 1772, 1189. Crouzet-Pavan, Vol. II, 991.}

Assertions of Moro’s dedication to scholarship and the recovery of ancient learning made in orations to him are unsubstantiated, but they are not groundless. When Moro would have been
thirteen, in 1403, new public schools opened in Venice with a focus on rhetorical and philosophical studies.\(^{143}\) Little is known of Moro’s education aside from Cicogna’s supposition that he had a degree in canon law, but given his background, Moro was one of the patrician nobles who received an education that focused on the humanities at the cost of the state.\(^{144}\) Moro was likely a book collector for his arms appeared on several frontispieces to manuscripts including a copy of Petrarch’s *Trionfi e Canzoniere*, a work mined by contemporaries for expressions of triumph.\(^{145}\) A doge who had been responsible for overseeing the construction of the triumphal arches at both the Ducal Palace and in the church of San Giobbe would certainly have been familiar with both the built and literary references on triumph.

Though Venice was in a diplomatic feud with both Florence and Milan before the Peace of Lodi in 1454, the cultural exchange, paradoxically, thrived.\(^{146}\) Moro must have realized the financial advantages of maintaining diplomatic relations with Florence to keep banking and business interests in Venice. Leonardo Sanudo, Moro’s nephew, worked with Cosimo de’ Medici and accompanied him to Florence, according to Malipiero.\(^{147}\) In 1468, the Doge renewed efforts to establish more secure diplomatic ties with Florence and in February 1469, Lorenzo de’ Medici wrote a letter to Moro thanking him for his diplomatic efforts. The Venetian ambassador to Florence, Bernardo Bembo, wrote an *Oratorio Gratulatoria* to celebrate Moro’s ducal inauguration in 1462 on behalf of the law faculty at the University of Padua where Bembo studied. A copy of the *Oratorio* from 1465 has a dedication to Cardinal Ludovico Trevisan, the

\(^{143}\) Ibid. Labalme, 17. Guarino of Verona, Gasparino Barzizza, and Francesco Filelfo all taught private or public classes in Venice during the beginning of fifteenth century.


\(^{147}\) Malipiero, 242.
humanist cardinal who wrote a letter of congratulations to Moro when he became doge.\textsuperscript{148}

(Figure 20) Bembo formed relations with the Medici and Florentine humanists including Cristoforo Landino, Poliziano, and Marcilio Ficino.

The strongest evidence for Moro’s sympathy to the cause of ancient learning was in naming Domenico Morosini (1417-1509) as one of the executors of his will. In 1497, Morosini authored \textit{De Bene Institutiones}, a political treatise in Latin on governmental theory.\textsuperscript{149} It linked the political stability and virtue of a city’s inhabitants to its physical appearance. Morosini believed that the outward manifestation of the Republic’s institutions and the infrastructure of the city gauged the health and stability of those institutions. He had not written his treatise by the time of Moro’s death, but Moro must have conferred with his friend on the themes which emerged from the treatise and he must have been familiar with precedents for his treatise, such as Leonardo Bruni’s \textit{Laudatio Florentinae Urbis} (1403) and Leon Battista Alberti’s \textit{De Re Aedificatoria} (1444). Like Alberti (1404-72) and Bruni (1369-1444), Morosini drew heavily from ancient sources which likened the Architect to the Statesman and the superficial qualities of a city to its government.\textsuperscript{150} Morosini spoke of the physical demeanor of a city as its “ornamentum,” revealing its “decorum” in its outward appearance.\textsuperscript{151} Morosini’s idea that building should


\textsuperscript{151} Morosini, 84, 116. “Opes ac divitie civium melius quidem in ista hedifitia quam in civitati oramentum et decorem pravos mores in clienteles amicicias sodalitatesque profundantur.” Moreover, Morosini had become wholly disillusioned with the transgressions against the Republic undertaken by the doges by the time he wrote his treatise. As a member of Moro’s commission, Morosini likely directed his indignation towards Moro’s successors
express political motives would hold particular relevance for Moro, whose acts of patronage reveal an engagement with architecture and symbols to make assertions about his rule. Moro was likely familiar with contemporary architectural and urban theorists who prescribed ways for social codes of decorum and the definition of space to shape the relation of a city to its inhabitants. Morosini believed that the rich have a moral obligation to invest in the city and engage the lower classes in the manual upkeep of the city.152

Morosini added specifically Venetian flourishes to his ideas by emphasizing the importance of defense and the reclamation of land from marshes.153 In 1467, Morosini was elected to the position of camerlengo, or public treasurer of Brescia, at which time he was able to hone his ideas on a well-functioning government.154 He not only oversaw Venice’s mercantile interests in the territory, but he oversaw the distribution of money for the upkeep of the city’s physical appearance. As Venice was frequently at war with the other city states and the East, Morosini’s assertion that the beautiful city would serve as a defense mechanism against enemies had particular resonance.155 Even the stresses on infrastructure and monumental spaces were made acutely Venetian in order to manage the obstacles presented by a landscape dominated by water.

Venice becomes “Another Byzantium”

Venice’s longstanding relations with the East for trade purposes made it a particularly inviting entrepôt for immigrants. Most humanist activity in the city-states was partially shaped by the influx of scholars from Greece. Both Florence and Venice hosted two former students of who ruled when he was writing his treatise, Doges Marco and Agostino Barbarigo. He called for further limits on the doge’s power after experiencing the outward aggrandizing of the Barbarigo clan. But Morosini’s praise for preaching and communal piety may have stemmed from his role as a subordinate of Moro, whose deep devotion to Bernardino shaped the Doge’s acts of patronage.

152 Ibid., 134.
153 Ibid., 93.
154 BMC, PDC 837 24. 5 September 1467.
155 Morosini, 51.
the Greek expatriate Gemistos Plethon, Marcilio Ficino in Florence and Cardinal Bessarion, the papal legate to Venice. Both were fierce defenders of the Latin Church and they translated Plato in Italy. Bessarion provided a translation of Plato’s *Republic,* and he brought a copy of the *Hermes Trimegestria* to Italy in 1457, a year before Cosimo de’ Medici purchased his copy from Macedonia. As Italy braced for a Crusade in 1463, Cosimo de’ Medici supported a Platonic Academy in Florence and Bessarion brought his manuscript collection to Italy. Under Moro in 1463, the first Greek chair was established at the University of Padua. Its recipient, Demetrius Chalcondyles, gave a speech that year exhorting the doge to launch a Crusade to save “oppressed Hellas, prostrate like the damned in Dante’s *Inferno*” from the Turks.

The idea of the Crusade appealed to those scholars wishing to protect ancient manuscripts left vulnerable in territories susceptible to the regime of the Ottoman Turks. Indeed, this Greek contingent of scholars promoted the Crusade throughout the city-states. As the political and religious situation in Greece faltered during the first half of the fifteenth century, scholars brought their manuscripts west for protection and began programs for Greek studies throughout the city-states.

The papal ambassador to Venice, Cardinal Bessarion was one of the more vociferous transplants from the East in calling for a Crusade. Though Bessarion came from a Greek Orthodox tradition in Nicaea, he supported the ambitions of the Latin Church. He was a major force in the delegation representing the Eastern Church during the 1438 Council of Florence, in

---


158 Bessarion was born in Trebizond, but emigrated from Nicaea, where he was named archbishop at the time of the Council of Florence in 1438. Pius II, *Commentaries,* Book I.28.4-6. The Piccolomini pope, Pius II gives an account of how Bessarion was competitive for the position when he was elected.
which the Greek and the Latin Church united on a number of theological issues in order to forge a military alliance enabling them to defeat the Turks. But Bessarion was not only engaged in trying to reclaim Byzantium’s cultural primacy, but seems to have served as an amateur military strategist as well. After the Fall of Negroponte in 1470, several of the leaders of the city-states, including Doge Moro, conferred with Bessarion over the defense. The Cardinal’s coat-of-arms, two different hands holding up the Cross, symbolized the unity sought at the Council. (Figure 21) In 1204, the Latin Church helped justify Venice’s Sack of Constantinople by declaring the Eastern Orthodox Church far removed ideologically from the concerns of the Latin Church and just a few degrees away from Islam. Now, in the fifteenth century when an Islamic power asserted territorial claim over Eastern Orthodox lands, the two Churches searched for common ground. Bessarion summarized his participation in the Council of Florence in an epistle to the Greeks, in which he exhorted obedience to the decrees set out in the Council.

Bessarion seems to have considered Venice not only “another Byzantium,” but a second home for in several letters he signed his name, “Bessarion Venetus.” Cardinal Bessarion made reference to Venice as the center of what Otto Demus has referred to as an early Christian Imperial renovatio when he declared that Moro presided over “another Byzantium.” For

162 Monfasani, 133. Sanudo reported that Bessarion was made a member of the Great Council during his residence in Venice in 1463.
Bessarion, nostalgic for his endangered homeland, the conceit that Venice had inherited the cultural magnificence of Byzantium was a high complement. As the capital of Byzantium, Constantinople was under severe threat in the fifteenth century, scholars transferred their praise of cultural and spiritual golden age that they believed had existed in Constantinople to Venice. Venice became the site where the rich cultural heritage of Byzantium could be memorialized, resurrected, and celebrated. In situating Venice and Constantinople as near equals culturally, Bessarion summoned Venice’s own deep-rooted ties to Constantinople as both dominion of Byzantium and later, an independent Republic with power over Constantinople.

Bessarion’s oratorical and written diatribes for a Crusade focused on the need to save both manuscripts containing ancient learning and the relics of saints buried in territories threatened by the Ottoman Turks. Scholars have argued that Bessarion’s impassioned support for a Crusade in Florence was the reason for Bessarion’s appointment as a cardinal in the Western Church. The move would have been political, for his position would allow him to intercede on behalf of the Eastern Church. It has been proposed that in elevating Bessarion to the position of cardinal, the Latin Church was angling for his manuscript collection and was trying to bring him to their side for the Crusade. Indeed, his most significant act of protest against the Ottoman Turks was to secure his vast manuscript collection in Italy. He directed Michael Apostiolis, who lived in Venetian Crete, to save Greek manuscripts from Turkish destruction, “for the sake of the Greeks.”

In 1468, Bessarion donated about 482 Greek manuscripts and 64 Latin codices from his collection to Venice, in a deal brokered by Doge Moro’s advisers, Leonardo Sanudo and Pietro Vespasiano. During the conclaves, he might not have ever been a particularly strong contender, perhaps, due to his eastern roots. Cardinal Marco Barbo, appointed by his relative Pope Paul II, gave Bessarion one of the six votes he received during the August 1471 conclave after the death of Paul. Setton, Vol. II, 313.

Geanakoplos, 172.
Morosini. Bessarion’s collection formed the basis of the Marciana Library, the “Biblioteca Sancti Marci.” At the time of the donation, the collection comprised the largest library in the city-states. In the letter explaining his donation to Moro and the Senate written from Viterbo on 14 May 1468, Bessarion recapped those issues dear to his heart, including unification of the church, but he focused on bibliophilia and learning. He stated that he had begun to collect books as a young boy and that he had always continued to acquire as many as he could through copying and spending. He expressed the need for a new building in Venice to house the books with preference for San Marco over the library on the island of St. Giorgio built by Michelozzo for Cosimo de’ Medici.

---


While Venice was in negotiations to secure Bessarion's collection of manuscripts, Moro also negotiated with Cardinal Bessarion to donate his staurotheke, or reliquary container, containing the relic of the True Cross to Moro's Venice.\textsuperscript{170} The relic was in the hands of the eastern emperor John VII Palaeologus until 1459 when during the Diet of Mantua he gave the relic to Bessarion. It was ceremoniously delivered the Scuola Grande of Santa Maria della Carità in 1468 and the annual procession of the relics was depicted by several artists. (Figure 22)

However, Bessarion’s commitment to a Crusade was given public definition much earlier during the translation of the head of St. Andrew, brother of St. Peter, from Greece to Rome for protection after the Fall of Constantinople.\textsuperscript{171} In 1462, Bessarion brokered the transfer of the relic west and accompanied Andrew’s head to Rome. Andrew was the major patron of the Eastern Church, on a par with St. Peter in the West. An apostolic head in Rome would surely give strength to the legacy of St. Peter in the city as the head of the church. A grand procession to bring the head to the pope culminated in an anti-Turkish speech by Bessarion.\textsuperscript{172} (Figure 23) The salvation of the relic was used to point out the vulnerability of other relics scattered throughout the East. In Bessarion’s speech, the Cardinal told his listeners that since its arrival in Rome, St. Andrew’s head had asked Pope Pius II to “destroy the barbarians and defend the church,” as his brother, St. Peter, would have wanted.\textsuperscript{173}

\textsuperscript{170} Bellini and the East, 38. The relic arrived in Venice after Doge Moro’s death in 1472. On 29 August 1463, Bessarion became a member of the Scuola of the Carità, which receive d the relic.
\textsuperscript{172} Pius II, Commentaries, Book 8.
\textsuperscript{173} Ibid.
The Franciscans, the Cardinal, and the Crusade

As both papal legate to Pius II in Venice and a student of ancient learning, Bessarion assiduously promoted the Crusade and lavished particular praise on the rulers and people of Venice for fighting the Turks. Because Venice was a key maritime power and was necessary for any success in the Crusade, Bessarion granted preachers the papal authority to preach the benefits of Crusade in Venice without obstruction from the Republic. In their sermons, preachers designated Crusade as a means of penitence. The Franciscan preachers, in particular, became the most vociferous promoters of the Crusade. St. Francis joined the Fifth Crusade, providing precedent for the Franciscans meddling in the affairs of the Holy Land. The Sultan was not converted as Francis had hoped, but allowed Francis to preach. St. Francis’s more ascetic, Observant followers emerged in the beginning of the fifteenth century as the most talented preachers, traveling around the city-states to preach sermons against sodomy, Jews, and usury, while singing the benefits of a mission to the Holy Land. The Franciscans held custody of Palestine since 1434 which gave them cause to celebrate the benefits of a Christian led voyage East, but the Crusade was driven in equal measure by an evangelical spirit of conversion and the desire to stop what was seen as the theft of Christian land from Europe by the Muslim Ottomans. The preachers of the Observant Franciscans, such as Bernardino of Siena (1380-1444) and Giacomo della Marca (1394-1476), seized on the vulnerability the city-states felt towards the Turks.

174 Bessarion’s strong connection to the Franciscans is often overlooked. As Carlo Ginzburg pointed out, on 10 September 1458, Bessarion was appointed to the position of protector of the order of the grey friars of the Minori. Ginzburg, 35.

Itinerant preaching had reached such a pitch during the fifteenth century that on 24 August 1463 Bessarion released *De Periculis Imminentibus*, a set of instructions for preachers of the Crusade. He exhorted preachers to remind the masses that Christian lands were falling into the hands of Muslims, and as a result, religious sites in Constantinople were desecrated. He assured potential missionaries that those who die for the cause would be assumed into heaven. As if foreseeing the untimely end of the Crusade in Ancona, Bessarion granted indulgences to the Crusaders based on their intentions, including those who died en route to fight.

On 26 May 1443, Pope Eugenius IV asked Bernardino da Siena, the Vicar-General of the Observant Franciscans, to distribute indulgences to those who would take part in a projected Crusade against the Turks. The popes exploited the use of indulgences to win support for the Crusade. Though he died twenty years before Pius’ 1464 Crusade was meant to leave on its mission, Bernardino of Siena represented the moral call to protect Christianity. As Pius II tells it in his *Commentaries*, Bernardino came to him in a dream and persuaded him to fight for a Crusade, as the Emperor Constantine who sought revenge for invasion of his Christian city.

Twenty years later, at the beginning of Moro’s dogate, the Observant Franciscan friar Michele Carcano da Milano preached in favor of Crusade in San Marco. Fra Michele was partially responsible for the foundation of the Monte di Pietà, the no-interest loan system set up by the Franciscans to counter the need for Jewish moneylenders. Along with Doge Moro and his

---

176 BAV 3586, fol. 4r. *Orationes et epistolae ad Christianos principes contra Turcos.*
177 Monfasani, 1995, 180.
179 Pius II, *Commentaries*.
appointed Patriarch of Venice, the friar was given the key to the iron deposit box in which funds and taxes were collected for the Crusades. 182

**Bernardino da Siena Predicts Moro’s Dogate**

After his 1450 canonization, at least three prophesies attributed to St. Bernardino of Siena were written into the hagiographical literature on the saint and then incorporated into the repertoire of Venice’s mythical existence. The preacher predicted that Venice would exercise her versatile military strength as the city’s ships sailed towards the hills and its horses crossed the sea. 183 The focus on an amphibious landscape reinforced Venice’s claim to control both the sea and the land. Bernardino’s first prophesy was seen as coming to fruition soon after his death in 1438, when Venice successfully fought the Milanese under the Visconti, for control of the Lago di Garda. 184 The second prophesy was interpreted as foretelling Venice’s participation in the 1464 Crusade which was originally to disembark in Morea before heading to Palestine. That the prophesy referred to the horses of Venice as a synecdoche of battle evokes an earlier Venetian victory across the sea in which the four horses were taken as *spoglia* by the Venetians from Constantinople during the Fourth Crusade in 1204. The horses were used to decorate the façade of the basilica of San Marco.

Bernardino’s third prophesy related to Moro. While Moro’s lengthy and diverse career in politics and his patrician background primed him as a perfect candidate for the dogeship, Moro’s election thirteen years after he became a Procurator is often described in tandem with the

182 Malipiero, 18.
prediction of his dogate by Bernardino of Siena. When Moro served as the podestà of Padua in 1442, Bernardino allegedly predicted Moro’s election as doge during a Capital General meeting of the Franciscan Order in Padua and in a series of sermons he preached in the city. By the time of Moro’s death, Bernardino’s prophesy had sparked the invention of a vivid mythology concerning the newly minted saint’s role as a divine intercessor for Moro. Bernardino’s prophesy about Moro’s dogate reinforced Moro’s claim as legitimate heir of Venetian power and, as well, to Bernardino’s sanctity. Bernardino’s later biographers describe the two men as intimate spiritual friends.

Bernardino’s prediction of Moro’s dogate is not in early hagiographic sources concerning the saint’s life. A Venetian friar, Sancte Boncor, quickly wrote one of the first lives of the saint directly after Bernardino’s canonization and before Moro’s dogate. Boncor distanced Bernardino from meddling in specific political affairs and he does not mention Procurator Moro, but rather he marshaled Bernardino’s life and recent death into the topos of sanctity and miraculous events. In the six year interim between Bernardino’s death and canonization, his holy status was at a peak. A mutually reinforcing relationship of piety was constantly reconfigured between preacher and patron culminating in Bernardino’s transformation from extreme outsider
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185 Sansovino, 58; F. Corner, Notizie storiche delle chiese e monasterie di Venezia e di Torcello, Padua, 1758, Vol. 12, 180. Cicogna, 571.
186 Wadding, Vol. XI, 165, Corner, 1758, 180. In some accounts of the meeting, reconstructions of the prediction add a reply by Moro, “Se io saro Dose, e voi sarete Santo.” Bernardo Bembo, Gratulatio ad Christophourum Maurum. Bembo said that after he was declared doge, Moro “crescete piu la fede et devotione in detto San Bernardino.” Sansovino, 56. Et sapite come un zorno molti anni avanti disnando con lui (cioè il Moro) san Bernardino, del qual era molto domestego, ditto san Bernardino li disse che dopo la morte de ms. Francesco Foscari lui saria dose, et quando fo fatto in logo dil foscari lui teniva indubitamente di essere fatto et visto fare il Malipiero lui quadammodo perse la fede che haveva in ditto Santo per parole lui li disse disnando essendo ditto Moro capitano di Padoa; e poi venutoli a mente la parola dil ditto Santo siando sta fatto ns. Pasqual in vita di Foscari, et lui lo disse dopo la morte, lui (il Moro) si aquieto.”
187 Though Bernardino’s prophesy serves as the hallmark of his dogate, Caldiera boasted in his dedication to De Virtutibus that he had predicted the doge’s rise to power, and that under his rule, the Republic would always be happy. Giovanni Caldiera, De Virtutibus, Bodleian Library, Oxford, Cod.Laud.misc.717.Bk.8, fol. 2.
Sancte Boncor wrote that when an altar was installed to Bernardino directly after his canonization in the Frari, where Fra Boncor was a clergy member, it was the site of many miracles. Thus, Bernardino’s legitimacy as a saint was solidified and the friars at the Frari received more visitors to worship at the miracle-producing altar.

Bernardino’s prophecies benefited all parties. Twenty years later, after the reigns of Francesco Foscari and Pasquale Malipiero, Bernardino’s prophesy about Moro was fulfilled and Moro was elected Doge in 1462. Bernardino’s Jubilee year canonization in 1450, just six years after his death, rendered the prediction of Moro’s political future all the more consequential.

After he became doge, Moro trumpeted his devotion to Bernardino through artistic commissions at sites of ducal importance and at San Giobbe. Bernardino’s canonization coincides with Moro’s first documented activity at San Giobbe in 1451, an *inter vivos* donation made on the first celebration of the saint’s feast day.

Regardless of the veracity of Bernardino’s prediction about Moro, it circulated widely and the orations for Moro’s inauguration as doge emphasized the prediction of his election by and friendship with the future saint. Most humanists constructed an alternative, more prophetic narrative for the Doge’s rise to power. The ascriptions of virtue and piety to Moro derived in large part from his devotion to San Bernardino. Bernardo Bembo’s dedication to Ludovico Trevisan in his *Oratorio* records the friendship between Bernardino and Moro. When Sanudo discussed the events that took place in Venice for the canonization and death of Bernardino, he added that the newly minted saint, “was a great friend of our gentleman, Cristoforo Moro, whom

---


190 Boncor, 54.

191 ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, f. 38r-39v. 8 & 20 May 1451.

192 Bembo, *Gratulatio ad Christophorum Maurum*, 2r-5r.
he predicted would be doge. Moro became allied with the cause of the Crusade through his relationship with Bernardino and his order of itinerant preachers who rallied support for the Crusades throughout Italy.

Moro announced his devotion to Bernardino in his 1462 Promissione. (Figure 17) The title page contains a small miniature of the Doge kneeling before a Madonna and Child flanked by Sts. Bernardino da Siena and Mark, the patron saint of Venice. A similar image in sculptural form was erected by Moro on an altar in the Ducal Chapel of San Clement in San Marco as will be discussed in the following chapter. By placing the saint’s image in sites of ducal authority, Moro proposed an additional angle of devotion in Venice—a recently made saint who had lived during the life span of most living adults. As a historical figure, Bernardino could be tied more securely to Venice. On 15 May 1470, St. Bernardino joined saints Magno and Teodoro as co-protectors of Venice by declaration of the Senate. It was one of Doge Moro’s last acts as doge, undertaken just before he drew up his last testament.

The Triumph of Election: The Arco Foscari

Doge Moro’s acts of artistic and architectural patronage throughout Venice illustrate how he constructed a program to promote his rule and his rank as a leader. Demonstrations of Moro’s right to the dogate became a principal mission, and its traces can still be seen. Moro initiated a program to alter sites of ducal power right after his election, in the summer of 1463. He funded

---


195 Moro’s Promissione, Sr. 24. It was illuminated in 1463 by Leonardo Bellini. The Promissione were commonly illustrated with portraits of the doges and magistrates from the Middle Ages onwards.

the completion of the Arco Foscari, the name commonly given to the termination of a covered passageway in the courtyard of the Palazzo Ducale. The Arco Foscari is linked to the Porta della Carta entrance of the Palazzo Ducale in the Piazzetta San Marco by a covered passageway with six bays. (Figure 24 & Figure 25) It faces the staircase on the interior of the courtyard of the Palazzo Ducale where the coronation of the doge took place. The entire passageway was designed to create a more convenient route from the eastern side of the palace to the new rooms completed on the west. Moro’s addition of the second arch would have corrected the potentially awkward visual effect of a passageway cutting into the courtyard on a lower elevation than the palace itself.

The work was initiated by Moro’s predecessor, Doge Francesco Foscari (1423-57), but the second-storey courtyard arch contains Moro’s coats-of-arms in the spandrels and large scale figures holding the Moro insignia. Directly after his election, Moro commissioned Antonio Rizzo to add the second story to the facade. The lower Foscari arch motif evokes the design of the sculptural arched entrance to the Arsenale, the locus of Venetian military power, completed between 1457 and 1460 while Moro’s arch on the second register has a flatter more muted apex. (Figure 26)

Moro’s additions to Foscari’s passageway over the arch situated him in ducal stratigraphy at the Palace but it also evoked an emerging form of monumental entranceway throughout the Italian city-states—double-storied arched gateways flanked by two towers. The most prominent examples are the Castlenuovo in Naples, constructed to commemorate King Alfonso

197 Ibid.
198 Pincus, 1970, 398. While Sanudo credited Moro with completing the Porta della Carta begun under Doge Pasquale Malipiero, leading into the Palazzo Ducale from the piazzetta of San Marco, there has not been any documentation found to link Doge Moro to the portal of the Palazzo.
200 Ibid. 26.
I's triumphal entry into Naples in 1443, and the later double arched loggia at the Palazzo Ducale in Urbino. (Figure 27 & Figure 28) Like the Castel Nuovo entrance, the arch on the top level at the Palazzo Ducale is shorter than the bottom register. The double arch configuration was a variation on the ancient Roman triumphal arch. The arch expressed anything the doge wished to represent regarding triumph: dominance over sites of economic, administrative, and symbolic importance. As Moro began his dogate and saw Venice prepare for war with Mehmet II, the language of triumph would have served to trump up his associations with the triumphs of ancient Roman leaders even if Moro himself did not have an actual victory to boast of yet. Many doges had intervened around the Doge’s Palace, but at the very beginning of his tenure as doge, Moro’s arch seems to commemorate his election.

While Debra Pincus’ dissertation on the Arco Foscari provides a detailed explanation of Moro’s role in the monument’s history, the imagery associated with Moro warrants repetition in this context. Pincus’ interpretation of Moro’s work concerns the degree to which he incorporated Foscari’s first level of the passageway into a more perceptible representation of triumph. In the second register of the Arco Foscari, a statue group of Doge Moro in ducal garb, genuflecting before the lion, the symbol of Venice, and St. Mark, once stood over the window sill. An eighteenth-century watercolor by Jan Grevembroch and a woodcut by Cesare Vecellio of the Arco depict the sculptural arrangement, destroyed in 1797. (Figure 29) Pincus believes that the pair of marble statues of Adam and Eve in the first-storey niches directly below the window, in Foscari’s register, worked in concert with the grouping of Moro to represent Original

\[201\] Ibid.


Sin and the re-establishment of an earthly paradise to be carried out by the Doge. *(Figure 30 & Figure 31)* The restitution of a prelapsarian state was pledged in the gospel of St. Mark, represented by the lion in the Arco Foscari arrangement. The promise of restitution formed the basis for Venetian *renovatio*, an idea echoed in the scenes of the Creation in the atrium cupola of the basilica. In this understanding, Pincus believes that Moro completed the Adam and Eve in the Foscari register in order to round out his own sculptural program which adorned the second level.\(^{204}\) Though they were not installed by the time of Moro’s death in 1471, if Moro had asked Rizzo to sculpt the figures, together with the work on his register above the figures, they would have recalled the similar investiture group on the Porta della Carta, executed by Foscari.\(^{205}\)

Moro’s commission of the second register of the Arco to make a more monumental entrance for a site of ducal ceremony is important for understanding the work he would carry out throughout his dogate. In his newly elected position, Moro envisioned himself as vital to maintaining the health of the Republic, but in the creation of the second register and the sculptural program, he exposes the paradoxical nature of ducal display. The doge was an elected official and the Republic placed severe limits on overtures of dynasticism, but ducal imagery often inserted the doge into biblical and Christological narrative. From overseeing the Republic’s finances, the newly elected Doge was then assumed into kneeling position that posited him as an intercessor between the Republic and the divine.


\(^{205}\) Anna Markham Schultz believes that the Adam and Eve pair was commissioned before Moro’s election, but Pincus’ analysis still holds even if the statues were commissioned before Moro John Pope-Hennessey, *An Introduction to Italian Sculpture*, Part 2, 1986, 336-7. The Adam and Eve sculptures could have been installed on the Arco Foscari as late as 1491 due to a document from 9 October 1491 ordering Rizzo to finish his work on the palace and the figures for the steps. Sheard, 1976, 406.
The Doge as the Doge: The Lost Frescoes of the Palazzo Ducale

The collapse of the planned Crusade did not deter Moro from commemorating his service to Christianity and attempting to rehabilitate his image as a competent leader. He began to convert the Crusade into a more successful venture on his return to Venice from Ancona. In 1483, a fire in the east wing of the Palazzo Ducale destroyed frescoes which, according to Marino Sanudo, depicted Moro meeting the papal army in Ancona. He said that in the Audience Chamber, also called the Hall of the Two Maps, where the Collegio, the steering committee of the Senate, received distinguished visitors, “There was a historic depiction of when the doge, the Lord Christoforo Moro, went to Ancona to go (crusade) against the Turks.”

Though there is no physical evidence to support Sanudo’s description of the destroyed paintings in Venice, given the approximate twenty year span between Moro’s return from Ancona and the fire which destroyed the frescoes, it is likely that the scheme was devised during Moro’s reign and it depicted the meeting at Ancona between Doge Moro and Pope Pius II. The description offered by Sanudo is similar to Bernardino Pinturicchio’s 1502 cycle.
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206 In 1459, the Senate determined that the Chamber of the Two Maps was not properly decorated, considering that the Collegio held audiences there. Donald E. Queller, “Early Venetian legislation on ambassadors,” in Medieval Diplomacy and the Fourth Crusade, London: Variorum Reprints, 1980. Sanudo wrote that, “According to old customs the ambassadors should be admitted to the sala duarum Napparum (Mapparum?) or to the little hall next to the White Chamber. There with nobles they should await the doge; then with him they should descend to the Church of St. Mark, or they should follow other customary procedures.” Martín Sanudo il Giovane, Le Vite dei Dogi (1474-1494), Vol. II, edited by Angela Caracciolo Aricò, Padova: Editrice Antenore, 1989, 396. “1483. A di 14 septembrio a horre 5 di note se impi6 fuogo in questa Terra nel palazzo dil Doxe, et comenzò a brusar da la parte dove erra la capella che ‘l Doxe ogni zorno udiva messa, causato perché il zago lass6 il stupin dil candelolto acceso, credendolo averlo ben studato, dopoi compita la messa, la matina. Il qual candeloto cazete, et impiò fuogo, et andò brusando; sicché a la ditta horra dete fuora. Brusoe la sala dele do nape—dove si dava audience, e il Collegio se reduseva—attorno di la qual erra depinto la istoria quando el Doxe, domino Christoforo Moro, andò in ancona per andar contra Turchi. Si brusoe la camera li (f. 199v) apresso dove erra la napamondo, et la Italia sopra do quadri, fata novamente per pre’ Antonio de Leonardis, optimo cosmographo, opera excellentissima; e qui li Savij si redusevano a consultar. Si brusò tutto il palazzo dil Doxe, excepto una parte dov’e una camera con tutti li Doxi depenti con li soi brievi, come è in Gran Conseio—et si chiamava la Camera d’l Doxi—, et etiam la sala d’l Pregadi, non si brusoe, ma ben l’Officio dil ZudegA di Proprio, erra soto il palazo.” ASV, Maggior Consiglio, Regina, 37v-38r, 6 November 1459. ASV, Senato Terra, Reg. 4, 1456-61, Carta 27. Refers to the, “Sala duarum naparum trabutra ipsius sale ac medie vete suffitarsistellar et ornari debeant quanto dignius et honorabilius fieri poterit ad expensi nostril Dominii per officium provisorum salis.”
commemorating the life of Pius II in the Piccolomini family Library in Siena commissioned by Pius II's nephew, the future Pope Pius III, Francesco Piccolomini.\textsuperscript{207} (Figure 13) Pius III remembered the life of his uncle in ten panels that showcase his roles as a pope, a soldier, and scholar. The penultimate of the panels in the series shows Pius II disembarking in Ancona with the papal troops for the initiation of his Crusade in 1464. In the panel, the Pope is given a triumphal entrance into the city, carried into Ancona on the papal throne. His appearance is youthful and healthy, concealing the physical afflictions that must have heralded his immanent death from old age and gout. Two figures kneel at the Pope's feet in the fresco and the Venetian galleys can be seen in the background.\textsuperscript{208} The kneeling figure to the left in the ochre ducal robe is likely meant to represent Cristoforo Moro, his ally in the Crusade. In next and last panel, the deceased Pope's body is escorted from Ancona to Rome.

The subject of the destroyed work in the Palazzo Ducale mentioned by Sanudo recalls the meeting between the Doge, Pope Alexander III, and Emperor Frederick Barbarossa at Ancona during the twelfth century, when Doge Sebastiano Ziani helped the Emperor and the Pope forge a peace.\textsuperscript{209} The event is depicted in a drawing by Vettore Carpaccio now in Sacramento, but it

\textsuperscript{207} Vasari, 1878, Vol. III, 519. Milanesi published the document commissioning Pinturicchio to the library in Siena. "The cardinal shall pay him two hundred ducats of gold 'di camara.'"

\textsuperscript{208} The inscription reads, "10 PIVS CUM ANCONA EXPEDITIONE IN TURCOS ACCELERARET EX FEBRE INTERIIT CUIUS ANIMAM HEREMITA CAMALDULEN IN COELUM EFFERI VIDIT CORPUS VERO PATRUM DECRETO IN URBEM REPORTATUM EST."

\textsuperscript{209} Kretschmeyer, Vol. I, 262. As recounted in the chronicle of Martin da Canale, \textit{Les estoires de Venise: cronaca veneziana in lingua francesce dalle origini al 1275}, edited by Alberto Limentani, Florence: L. S. Olschki, 1972, 214. "Et apres s'en vet Monsignor li Dus de sos l'onbrele que li dona Monsignor l'Apostoille; et cele onbrele est d'un dras (a) or, que la porte un damosiaus entre ses mains, que s'en vet totes voies apres Monsignor li Dus." Patricia Fortini Brown, \textit{Venice and Antiquity}, New Haven: Yale University Press, c1996, 37. Francesco Sansovino, \textit{Dellagrandezza et degneta del principe}, Lib. XI, 183. Sansovino bases his description on Dandolo. After the doge gave the emperor and the pope their umbrellas, the pope brought another gave it to the doge and said, "Deferatur tertia, Duci Venetiarum, cui merito congruit, qui nos ab astu turbationis liberans, in refrigerio pacis posuit, quod bene umbella significant, in cuius rei memoria, Duces Venetiarum volumes in suis solemnitatibus uti, cosi dcrive il Dandolo nel x libro." In 840, the Emperor Lothar wrote to the Doge Pietro Tradonico, "Et volumenes ut omnes hominess vestros, postquam pactum anterius factum fuit Ravenna, qui ad nos confugium fecerunt, si cos invenire potuerimus, ad partem vestram restituamus. Similiter repormittimus vobis ut hominess Christianos de potestate ve
was once illustrated in a series of twenty-two paintings by the artist in the Sala del Maggiore Consiglio at the Palazzo Ducale.\textsuperscript{210} (\textbf{Figure 32} \& \textbf{Figure 33}) A meeting between Pius II and Moro in Ancona in 1464 reinforced the historic meeting in 1177, which had become a topos of ducal glory. Chronicles of Venetian history had been trumpeting the 1177 event as the epitome of Venetian diplomacy, charity, and power since it happened.\textsuperscript{211} An association to Ziani in the lost fresco cycle is not far-fetched. In a funeral oration given by Pietro Barozzi on the occasion of Moro’s death, Barozzi lauds Moro’s diplomatic prowess and compares him to Doge Sebastiano Ziani.\textsuperscript{212} That Moro constructed a program of self-projection that would connect him to Ziani is not unusual. He was considered one of the more successful doges due to his radical reconfiguration of the Piazza San Marco and his diplomatic work to reunite the alliance of the Pope and the Emperor.\textsuperscript{213} Moro’s burial inscription, “Christophaurus Maurus Princeps” clearly recalls Sebastiano Ziani’s burial inscription “Sebastianus Ziani Dux,” once in the cloister of San Giorgio.\textsuperscript{214}

I believe Moro wanted to forge a connection to the earlier Doge Ziani to be remembered as a diplomat. Ziani went to Ancona to help bring about peace between the doge and the emperor and was an ally of the pope. This time, Moro, the emperor of Hungary, and the Pope were already allied against the Turks. When the Pope sent Moro a sword to oblige him to accept the charge of

\textsuperscript{210} Frescoes in the Great Council Chamber had deteriorated so badly by the late fifteenth century that Gentile Bellini, followed by his brother Giovanni Bellini, were each commissioned to repaint the scenes on panels. Carpaccio’s work on the cycle is partially confirmed by the drawing and correspondence. The frescoes were destroyed in 1577. Patricia Fortini Brown, \textit{Venetian Narrative Painting in the Age of Carpaccio}, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988, 150-156.


\textsuperscript{212} BMC, PDD, 727 vol. 1, 104. Barozzi, 1795, 90.

\textsuperscript{213} Fortunato Olmo, \textit{Historia della venuta à Venetia occultamente nel 117 di papa Alessandro III e della vittoria ottenuta da Sebastiano Ziani, doge}, Venetia: E. Deuchino, 1629.

\textsuperscript{214} Pincus, 1999, 121.
the crusade I believe Pius was exploiting the importance of Doge Ziani to the image of ducal diplomacy for the earlier Doge was also given a sword by Pope Alexander III. Moro’s trip to Ancona would have been depicted on the walls of the ducal palace to create a juxtaposition with those images of Ziani accepting the gift of an umbrella by the Pope nearby. The parasol had typically been used as a symbol to express the alliance between pope and emperor, but now, the Doge was invited into the alliance. It was converted into a gesture that elevated Venice to a similar power. As Moro confronted a restless Venetian public after an unsuccessful Crusade, he already consigned his reign to history, actively reconfiguring his work with each successive failure. As we will see in the last chapter, these signs of Ziani’s dogate were revived in the San Giobbe Altarpiece.

St. Bernardino Breaks into San Marco: Doge Moro’s Altars

Upon returning from the Crusade, Moro commissioned Antonio Rizzo to sculpt three altars in San Marco to St. James on the left side of the transept, St. Paul on the right, and St. Clement in that saint’s titular chapel in the choir near the main altar. (Figure 34, Figure 35, & Figure 36) Moro prominently placed the two altars dedicated to James and Paul symmetrically in the transept crossing of San Marco. The two transept altars are composed of aedicular niches with figures of the saints and pilasters decorated with vegetal and floral motifs. The dossals of the transept altars announce the Doge’s name and title: “DUCE INCLITISSIMO ET PIENTISSIMO/DNO CRISTOFORO MORO PRINCIPE.” The inscription under the altar to St. James in the right transept includes the title “principe” as on Moro’s floor slab in San Giobbe.

The discovery of Rizzo’s 1469 acknowledgement of 35 ducats he received to close the balance due him for his work on the altars strongly suggests that all three altars were completed

---

215 The transept altars read: “Duce inchlytissimo et pientissimo.”
during the 1460s. Moro’s altars in the basilica of San Marco were adorned with the silk and velvet banners which decorated Moro’s galley during the Crusade. Moro had donated the banners to San Marco a few months after his return from the Crusade in November 1464. It is likely that though Rizzo received final payment for the altars in 1469, they were commissioned to commemorate Moro’s role in the Crusade, sometime after 1464.

There are a few depictions of Sts. James and Paul in the mosaics throughout the basilica of San Marco, but the dedication of the two transept altars to the two saints commemorated the relics of the two apostles held at the church. The altar dedicated to Paul contains a narrative panel that depicts the conversion of St. Paul on the road to Damascus. It likely replaced a fourteenth-century altar to the same saint, perhaps in the same spot as the present altar. The impetus for the dedication of the altar to Paul may also have been the election of the Venetian cardinal Pietro Barbo in 1464 who became Pope Paul II, but the dedicated of an altar to Paul may also have been more spiritual. Moro adapted the emphasis on charitable living promoted by Paul in his letter to the Corinthians.

---


217 Sanudo, *Diarii*, Vol. 13, 1511-12, 131. "...li pulpiti conzati di veludo cremesin rechamati d’oro atorno justa il solito, che fue di la tenda fu fata per il serenissino missier Cristoforo Moro dose, quando andò in galia tempre cruciate." BMC, Codice Cicogna 2043, c.61-2. 2 November 1464, "Dono del S.mo Principe di tenda di gioie d’esser convertito il valor in ornamento della chiesa." Schulz, 1983, 168. Schulz believes instead that the doge may have donated the altars with money he was allocated for ducal celebrations. Moro’s encomiasts mention city-wide games and celebrations on Moro’s election, thus making it difficult to imagine reallocation of the funds to the altars. Furthermore, Moro would have been prohibited from spending allocated funds on a personal donation. Peter Humfrey, *Painting in Renaissance Venice*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995 Caterina Schmidt Arcangeli, "La sapienza nel silenzio: riconsiderando la Pala di San Giobbe," *Saggi e Memorie di Storia dell’Arte* 22 (1998), 30. Schmidt has suggested that the donation of the altars was an expression of Moro’s generosity, but given the unusual nature of the commission of altars by a doge in San Marco, the motive could not only have been piety.

218 Arcangeli, 30. Scholars have suggested that drawings by Jacopo Bellini provided the inspiration for the relief on the St. Paul altar, which depicts the conversion of St. Paul on the road to Damascus.

219 Ibid., 168.
The dedication of an altar to St. James may have held personal appeal for Moro. Moro’s famous grandfather, James, ambassador and Procurator of San Marco, helped bring the body of St. Elena to Venice from Constantinople. In addition, St. James appeared in a dream of the king of Oviedo, predicting a victory over Islam, a theme that would hold resonance for a doge who participated in plans for a crusade. The scene was prominently depicted by Andrea Mantegna in the now-destroyed Eremeti Chapel in nearby Padua. Like St. Mark, the body of St. James was saved by Charlemagne from the alleged desecration of remaining in a non-Christian land. The altar to James stood on the site in the basilica in which St. Mark’s relics were rediscovered in the eleventh century after a period in which they went missing.

The altar of San Clemente is dated to 1465 based on an inscription, but it is different than the other two transept altars which are not dated. The San Clemente altar is not an aedicular niche as the two altars in the transept. It is topped by an image of the Virgin and Child in a coffered, apse-like space flanked by the two freestanding statues of Sts. Mark and Bernardino. The statuary contains chips of gilding, unlike the two transept altars, and it has a sixteenth-century base which depicts St. Andrew presenting Doge Andrea Gritti to St. Nicholas. As the only dated work, the San Clemente altar may have been completed at a different time than the altars to saints Paul and James.

The dedication of the altar in the San Clemente Chapel held great significance for the Office of the Doge. The Chapel was generally associated with the doge in his official liturgical, ceremonial, and political capacity. St. Clemente was Bishop of Rome just before 100 AD, and

---

220 The altars to Sts. James and Paul in the crossing of San Marco have slightly different inscriptions that that dedicated to St. Clemente. Pietro Selvatico, Sulla architettura e sulla scultura in Venezia dal medio evo sino al nostri Giorni, Venezia: P. R. Carpano, 1847. Cesare Bernasconi, Vita ed Opere di Antonio Rizzo, Verona, Vicentini, 1859, 29, 57. Pietro Selvatico attributed the altars to Pietro Lombardo, but Cesare Bernasconi reattributed them to Antonio Rizzo, the author of the sculpture commissioned by Moro on the Arco Foscari.

221 Schulz, 1983, 167-8. The base of the altar was moved to the chapel of San Clemente after 1810, when the chapel of St. Nicholas in the ducal palace was deconsecrated.
like St. Mark the Evangelist, Clemente’s relics were found in the eighth or ninth century in Alexandria. They were bought to St. Peter’s basilica in Rome, but by the twelfth century, the relics of Clemente were also at San Marco in Venice. According to ceremonial tradition, the doge entered the presbytery through the San Clemente chapel, and during mass, the doge sat on a throne in the chapel holding candles. Furthermore, the doge’s body lay in state in the San Clemente Chapel on his death. The mosaic decoration of the chapel reinforces its importance. It contained twelfth-century mosaics depicting the doge’s role in government and the translation of Mark’s relics to Venice.

Here, in the most official chapel of the basilica, Moro deployed an inscription bearing his name and an image of St. Bernardino of Siena to effect a triangle of significance. The image of Bernardino linked the saint to the doge, to St. Mark, and to the Virgin, each node marking significant events in the story of Venice’s foundation. Venice’s given foundation day was the Feast Day of the Virgin’s Annunciation in 425, and the reception of St. Mark’s relics occasioned the construction of the ducal basilica. The inclusion of Bernardino’s statue gave power to the prediction of Moro’s dogeship by the saint and it inflated the place of the saint in the city as the Doge promoted his cult. Moro’s devotion to and intimacy with Bernardino shaped his policy and framed popular explanations for his acts of patronage. This move to align the city’s history with his own in the San Clemente chapel is adumbrated in an illustration in Moro’s oath and rules of office, the Promissione. In Moro’s oath of office, the Madonna and Child sit on a throne in an aedicule also flanked by Mark and Bernardino, like the altar in the ducal chapel. (Figure 17)

Moro’s patronage at San Marco was unusual, according to Peter Humfrey, for the three Procurators de Supra of San Marco and not the doge usually carried out the commission of the altars and altarpieces at the ducal basilica. The proliferation of the Doge’s personal inscriptions and his family coat-of-arms on the altars in San Marco flouted a fourteenth-century ban on the placement of private insignia in the ducal basilica and near images of the ducal corno. The doge was not permitted to refuse the government’s requests, as Moro had initially refused to accompany the galleys on the Crusade nor was he to erect statues—as he had of himself and probably Adam and Eve on the Arco Foscari at the Palazzo Ducale. Officially, the doge was not to get on his knees before the lion—the symbol of Mark, the patron saint of the city—as Moro did in the lost statue of himself kneeling before the lion on the Arco Foscari, though this rule was often transgressed. From the start of his dogate in 1462, Moro aggressively adorned sites of ducal significance—the Ducal Palace and St. Mark’s—with his coats-of-arms or his inscription. In almost every instance of patronage, Moro idealized his role in Venetian history and allied himself to the Republic’s success.

The new set of restrictions implemented by the government after Moro’s 1471 death were read aloud in the Promissione of his successor Niccolò Tron. The oath reiterated the prohibitions on the placement of personal insignia, carvings, or paintings commissioned by the doge in or on the ducal palace, basilica, or on galleys. In addition, the doge was not allowed to depict himself genuflexing before St. Mark or his symbol, the lion, and he was no longer to be represented on coins. That this legislation was reinforced immediately after Moro’s reign supports the dating of

the altars in San Marco to the dogate of Moro, rather than his time as procurator. Moro’s successor, Doge Niccolò Tron, incidentally, did not seem to have been too bothered by the prohibitive policy: his coats-of-arms decorate the spandrel of an arch on the Arco Foscari.

The power which Moro attempted to convey in his patronage was made more poignant by the dwindling authority of the doge in the fifteenth century. The Council of Ten instituted legislation limiting his clout in the fifteenth century. Moro’s constant testing of the restrictions placed on the office of the doge through his commissions suggests a desire to revive the importance of his status. When Venice felt vulnerable to attack after the Fall of Constantinople in 1453, monarch-like ruler and republican values, derived from Byzantium, were idealized. The myths of a serene and functioning republic during the height of Venetian powers in the thirteenth century could be resurrected with the help of St. Bernardino of Siena and the repetition of triumphant imagery.

Conclusion

Several Venetian traditions of representation merge in the character of Doge Moro. Given Moro’s experience of the foreign and domestic tensions during his dogate, he situated his regime within the formula idealized history of Venice. Moro did not necessarily overlay the grid of Venetian history over his own, but he invoked its two key motifs, longevity in Venice and proximity to sanctity in giving public shape to his life. According to Moro’s Promissione which shows him in supplication before the Virgin flanked by Sts. Mark and Bernardino, promotions in government were approved by saintly intercessors. By positing his election as doge as one that

---

225 Francisco Sansovino, *Venetia città Nobilissima et singolare*, Venice, 1581, Reprinted in 1968 by L. Moretti, 188. “Il medesimo fu proibito dell’insegne, & dell’armi l’anno 1471, le quali egli non puo ne dipingere, ne scolpire in alcun luogo col Corno Ducale, ne portar nelle galee su le bandiere: fuori che nelle fabbriche del palazzo.”

226 Cicogna, 647.

227 Pincus, 1999, 1. The burial monuments of the doges were excepted from these rules for they were regarded as outlets of personal expression undertaken at the expense of the doge’s family, despite their representative effects for the Republic.
was inscribed in the stars and predicted by a saint would help to secure his rule as divinely ordained. But his relationship with Bernardino was only part of the way Moro was fitted with the persona of Venetian doge. That Moro’s biography was rescripted in order to place his family firmly on the lagoon early in Venetian history after his election as doge belongs to a distinctly Venetian tradition of making history. Historians excavated a history for Moro’s family that extended back to the earliest days of the lagoon after he was elected doge in order to provide continuity between the development of the land and the bloodline. For a society that eschewed dynastic claims, the Venetian patriciate, which effectively ruled the Republic, embraced the idea that its rulers inherited the landscape.

But the Doge’s connection to the landscape seems to have also been the result of Venice’s conception of itself. In order to project the identity of a well-functioning, divinely ordained society, Venice had to be progressive, but its history also had to be circular so that glorious moments of the past. Moro seems to have culled successful moments of Venetian history to use as models for the projection of his own reign as doge. Moro clearly tried to effect an association with Doge Ziani in formulating his own ducal imagery. To the contemporary viewer, the promotion of an unsuccessful crusade is confusing, but by parsing out those moments that related to Ziani such as the trip to Ancona, Moro could blur the associations between the two doges for historical record.

Positive characterizations of Moro’s reign helped perpetuate the myth of Venice as a well-governed, transparent, and divinely protected Republic. The idealization of the Doge’s rule by his encomiasts fit into a divine program laid out for Venice in the city’s mythical history, but criticisms of Moro illustrate the way the Doge absorbed the Republic’s problems. Moro’s conflicting political and cultural personas—as a devout seeker of peace and promoter of ancient
learning, but also as a political failure, “hated by the people”—are seemingly hard to reconcile but both assessments are products of the Venetian presentation of its past as well. The dual characterizations of the Doge were partially justified. He hesitated on the Crusade, and despite the claims of his piety, he plastered San Marco with his coat-of-arms, explained in the next chapter. But the problems with his reign were also largely circumstantial: outbreaks of the plague overcame Venice during his rule and the city-states had been feeling threatened by Mehmet II even before Moro was elected. Moro inherited a fragile landscape in constant need of maintenance and he ruled when Venice and Christianity were under psychological danger. Moro’s dogate bore the brunt of these internal and external pressures.
Chapter 2

Duce Inclitissimo et Pientisimo: Doge Moro as Artistic and Charitable Patron

The Church on the Margins: San Giobbe as a Hospice and Cemetery

For someone who would become so bold in his commissions as doge, Cristoforo Moro’s patronage of San Giobbe—a site that fit deeply into a narrative of civic and apostolic poverty—at first appears odd. When he was elected to the dogate in 1462, Moro’s interventions in Venice tended to focus around the ritual, political, and commercial center of Venice, the Piazza San Marco. Moro erected three altars in San Marco, he added a storey to the Arco Foscari at the ducal basilica, and he likely devised a fresco cycle at the Ducal Palace which celebrated his role in the Crusade planned for 1464. But throughout his dogate, Moro turned his attention to San Giobbe, far removed by Venetian standards, from sites of ducal power.

As a hospice for the administration of ecclesiastical and charitable services, San Giobbe served as the locus of Moro’s financial and territorial bequests. Understanding Moro’s campaign to enlarge the complex has been pieced together from donations made in his care, the Doge’s 1470 testament, and a codicil to his will from 1471. In his testament, Moro donated money to the church of San Giobbe, its confraternities, the hospice, and those it assisted: the poor, orphans, sailors, and new friars. Moro’s testament serves as a tribute to his commitment to San Giobbe in the breadth of donations made, centering on sizable donations for improvements to the church and the high altar chapel.

Moro’s patronage of the church spanned a twenty year period from 1451, a little more than ten years before he became doge, until his death in 1471. He had contributed to the church since

1 ASV, Procuratore di San Marco, Busta 2, Fasc. 1, proc 45 c.143a, 27 January 1659.
before his dogate and by all accounts, the site was spare when Moro became a benefactor of San Giobbe. Prior to Moro’s involvement, there are records of a hospice for the poor, a small oratory, the beginnings of a larger church, and living quarters for the friars who administered the hospice. The Cannaregio was considered one of the poorest of the six *sestieri* in Venice and the church was located right near the marshes which faced Mestre, making this part of the neighborhood particularly damp and unsanitary. The environmental conditions reflected the social life of the area. In the sixteenth century, one of the priors of San Giobbe complained about the general immorality of the neighborhood and the increasing use of foul language that could be heard on the streets. Moreover, San Giobbe likely felt remote in the fifteenth century. (Figure 1) The area was described by Marc’ Antonio Sabellisco at the beginning of the sixteenth century as “in the extremities of the island, on the margins.” A seventeenth-century testament requesting burial at San Giobbe refers to the church as “outside of the city.”

Despite the absence of ducal pedigree at San Giobbe and its distance from areas of explicit ducal power, he was one of the first doges to take control over the patronage of an entire church and transform it into a site of ducal burial. Moro’s family had established its charitable base in the Cannaregio neighborhood where San Giobbe is located through its continued legal authority over Santa Maria della Misericordia. In 1465, Moro helped the baker’s guild establish a hospital in the Cannaregio between two confraternities in which he held membership, Santa Maria della

---


4 Marc’ Antonio Sabellisco, *De Venetae Urbis Situ*, Venice: Antonium de Strata Cremonese, 1488, copy at Houghton Library, Cambridge, MA. Third Region (Cannaregio), Book II.

5 ASV, San Giobbe, Busta I, V, 55rv, Testament of Zuanne Comin, 1656. “Prima, voglio che il mio corpo doppo la mia morte sia sepulto in Campo Santo di S. Gioppo in una cassa essendo a Venetia et ritrovandomi fora della città sii sepolito in quella contrada overo parochia ove che mi atrovassi come piu parera alla mia consorte…”

6 Sansovino, 188. Sansovino wrote that the hospital of Santa Maria della Misericordia was founded in the tenth century. ASV, Misc. Atti Diversi, Arti 152, Forneri Atti Diversi 1447-1797.
Misericordia and the *scuola* of St. Christopher at Madonna dell’Orto. While the motive for the shift in the emphasis of Moro’s donations from the much bigger Santa Maria della Misericordia to the nearby San Giobbe remains obscure, the particular coincidence of the need of the Franciscan friars in residence at San Giobbe for a larger church and Moro’s search for both a burial space and a center for the worship of St. Bernardino of Siena may have made San Giobbe an ideal choice for his sponsorship.

Reconstructing the events that led to this unusual ducal architectural commission will be the focus of this chapter. The themes I wish to examine will require a critical reassessment of the building at San Giobbe where Moro is still buried. Even after Moro was elected doge, the chronology of building at San Giobbe is not well-recorded. The principal sources of information regarding the early development of San Giobbe are Moro’s testament, donations, papal indulgences for those who supported the church, references to the church in guidebooks and histories of Venice, and solicited “memories” of the building. Testamentary requests for burial in the cemetery on the Canal Regio side of the church or unidentified burial sites within the church have played a large role in understanding the physical demeanor of the early church of San Giobbe. Burial demands at San Giobbe are almost always accompanied by offers of money for perpetual or annual masses said for the soul of the testator. There are also numerous chronologies of the building history of San Giobbe in *pergamene* copied from non-extant sources and compiled after the sixteenth century, and the written histories of the confraternity dedicated to St. Bernardino of Siena housed at San Giobbe soon after the saint’s 1450 canonization, which have documented the site’s physical expansion, though these accounts often sacrifice veracity in favor

---

7 Appendix 1, Document 1.
of creating a legacy for the church that was firmly rooted in the history of both Doge Moro and St. Bernardino of Siena.

**Early History and Layout of the Hospice of San Giobbe**

San Giobbe was founded privately—like most contemporaneous hospitals and hospices—in 1378, along the southern embankment of the Canal Regio by the Venetian priest Giovanni Contarini (d.1407), a descendant of Doge Jacopo Contarini. Contarini’s hospital fit into an established type of charitable institution that provided both long- and short-term *hospitalitas*, a major form of charity, to a societal class categorized as poor: pilgrims, ex-sailors, orphans, widows, the foreign community, and the infirm. In the Middle Ages and into the Renaissance, hospitals often provided services as almshouses more than infirmaries, offering shelter for the underprivileged and pilgrims. Residence in a hospital generally provided proof of a person’s low social standing or widowhood rather than bad health. A review of San Giobbe by the Great Council in the sixteenth century determined that poor sailors were the biggest beneficiaries of the hospital’s services. Such hospices also attracted widows. Giovanni Contarini’s daughter, Lucia, lived in the hospice after the death of her husband, Enrico Dolfin.

Judging from his testamentary bequests and charitable donations, Dolfin was not poor, but as a

---

8 Comer, 181. Contarini acquired the site from Beruccia, wife of Marco Bernardo, of San Samuel, a goldsmith who in 1394 made the silver cross over the balcony of San Marco. 2. ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, no. XLIII, cc.1r-4r. "Item lasso al hospedal pred.to S. Giob tutti, rischedanno terrerio posto in Cannaregio, li quali io in qualonquemodo ho acquistati, facendo nominar le carte in me o nel detto loco." There was apparently a map that outlined the property purchased by Contarini as mentioned in his will.


10 ASV, Maggiore Consiglio, 21 August 1547. Pullan, 184, 205. Pullan discusses the neighborhood of San Giobbe, but also provides general information on the services of Venetian hospitals. BMC, Codice Cicogna Busta 2987/2988, fasc. 19, *Ospitali e Case date da abitare per carità*.

11 ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, 42r: “Che viveva quella volta al principio de miei anni Madonna Lucia Dolfin, che habitava nel ospedal de Sopra del Portico, m. Zuan Dolfin do de M. Rigo, che credo le dice esser so fradello...anzi alla festa di S. Job i frati non voleva permetter che Madona Lucia Dolfin tegnise uno scagneto sotto el portego cum uno Tapel duro con un pan da un soldo, et candelette da do, o tre bagatini che la dava ma era la scola ordinava de San Job dove la ze adesso...."
sign of piety, his widow retreated to the hospice to live modestly and offer her services as a caretaker.

In 1380, the year that the first indigents were taken into his hospice, Contarini successfully petitioned the parish of San Geremia for more space to build a small oratory dedicated to the Old Testament figure Job, who never relinquished his faith despite the loss of his family, his property, and sickness.¹² That San Giobbe was founded by a priest who taught patience and faith as he provided shelter for the infirm and poor fits San Giobbe into an emerging type of ecclesiastical complex during the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance administered by clergymen. The oratory was consecrated in 1389 with the blessing of Pope Boniface IX and it probably served as the institutional base of the hospital administrators and the confraternity to St. Job, established in 1383 to promote the activity of the hospital, though the groups likely overlapped.¹³ Lucia Contarini Dolfin was both a member of the confraternity to St. Job and administered the hospital as a part of her inheritance. Confraternities in Venice were distinct from other confraternity and guild societies throughout the Italian city-states in that membership in them transcended social hierarchy.¹⁴

¹² Joseph Knabenbauer, Commentarius in librum Job, Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1886, 28-32. The cult of Job in Venice will be discussed in greater detail in the last Chapter, on the San Giobbe Altarpiece by Giovanni Bellini.


Eight days before his death on 8 September 1407, Giovanni Contarini left careful instructions in his testament for the administration of the hospital. Though Contarini established the oratory to serve the hospital, he stipulated that the oratory should stay physically separate from the hospital, but remain under its jurisdiction. Contarini obliged the governors of the hospital to celebrate mass at least daily in the oratory of St. Job and to celebrate the Feast of the Annunciation of the Virgin, the day of the mythical foundation of the Republic in 423. Contarini bequeathed his estate to the hospital under the care of his daughter, Lucia, widow of Enrico Dolfin, as part of the inheritance from her mother. The hospital would be administered by seven governors who would share legal rights, *jus patronatus*, over the ecclesiastical structure with Lucia. The governors’ rights to control the hospital were reaffirmed in 1512.

In 1422, the seven governors chosen to manage San Giobbe turned administration duties over to a group of Heronymites, a tertiary order of Franciscan comprised of laymen, as most early hospitals were administered by the mendicant religious orders. The Heronymites relinquished the property only three years after their arrival at San Giobbe, citing the size of the oratory as inadequate. Doge Michele Steno wrote a letter conferring fiscal privilege to the hospital and asked Lucia Contarini to give residence at the hospital to the Observant Franciscans, or another observant religious order. A group of Observant Franciscans under the leadership of Marco

---

15 ASV, S. Giobbe, Busta 5, insert XLIII, 2r. 8 September 1407. “Item havendo io fato fabricar un’oratorio appresso al d.to luogo, et hospedal di S. Giob, Voglio, et ordeno, che il detto Oratorio, et luogo nel quale è esso Oratorio sia divisi et separato da esso hospedal, et da tutto il sudetto luogo di S. Giob di manera, che il d.to oratorio non habbi che far con l’hospedal, et con tutto il restante luogo del d.to Oratorio di S. Giob, voglio però, che il *Jus patronato* del detto Oratorio di S. Giob sia sempre et esser debba del d.to hospedal.”

16 Ibid, 1r.

17 ASV, Prefettura dell Adriatico, Busta 153, 27 October 1512.


Querini took possession of the hospice and church of San Giobbe on 24 November 1428, with the consent of Pope Martin V. 20

The Observant Franciscans Storm the City-States

The Observant Franciscans took over San Giobbe in 1428, on the heels of a major victory. The Order’s most outspoken proponent and preacher, Bernardino of Siena, had just been acquitted of heresy. Bernardino had been put on trial for charges of idolatry made in Viterbo following his use of the tablet declaring the abbreviated name of Jesus in his public sermons. 21

Bernardino would hold the tablet up for dramatic effect to provide a visual referent during his otherwise turgid and tangential musings on how to venerate Christ and Mary and how to behave in the age of mercantile economy. Not only did Pope Martin V dismiss the charges brought against Bernardino for using the tablet, but he offered the preacher a bishopric—which was declined—and he asked Bernardino to preach eighty sermons in St. Peter’s.

The Franciscans were one of the four mendicant, or begging, groups ratified by the 1274 Council of Lyon. 22 The mendicants differed from the monastic Orders in that they were not

---

20 ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, XLIII, f. 33r-35r.
21 Charles Stinger, *Humanism And The Church Fathers: Ambrogio Traversari (1386-1439) And Christian Antiquity In The Italian Renaissance*, Albany, NY: State University Press, 1977, 61-5. “This Bernardino had for some time preached with uncommon applause in crowded audiences in the churches of Florence. The talents of a popular orator generally procure their possessor as many enemies as friends. Several ecclesiastics, who were envious of the reputation of Bernardino, took advantage of a daring flight of rhetoric, into which he was betrayed by the enthusiasm of his zeal, to endeavour to accomplish his ruin. In order to enforce his eloquence, in describing some impressive scene, (probably the sufferings of Christ) he exhibited to the people a picture, in which the transaction to which he alluded was delineated. Of this exhibition his detractors complained to the pope, as a kind of profanation of the rites of the church; and Bernardino was obliged to repair to Rome to vindicate his cause. Though the pontifical court was inflamed with prejudice against him by the artifices of his accusers, so captivating was his eloquence, that when he was permitted to preach in Rome, the ecclesiastics of the highest eminence, as well as the populace, being attracted by his fame to hear his discourse, listened to him with enthusiastic admiration. Martin V commanded him to abstain for the future from the exhibition of pictures; he readily complied with this injunction, and by his prompt obedience obtained the favour of the pontiff, who during the remainder of his life treated him with distinguished kindness.”
22 The taxonomy of economic classes was particularly unstable with the rise of the Carmelites, the Dominicans, the Franciscans, and the Canons Regular of St. Augustine
reclusive and usually established their convents near the city walls. Like other religious Orders, the mendicants subscribed to a poverty that assumed spiritual contours based on the set of prescriptions for how to attain that poverty. They were separated from the actual poor by virtue of choice. The religious Orders attracted wealthy young men as novitiates in addition to those who were born poor and looking to improve their station. The swift rise of the Franciscans likely stemmed from their declarations of obedience to the Pope. When Bernardino sat on trial for heresy before Martin V, rather than demote a popular preacher under his charge, the Pope promoted him and his activity to claim the power that the order allotted him.

Bernardino became the Renaissance Holy Man, carving a reputation for himself as the "locus supernatural." Even the Renaissance bibliophile Poggio Bracciolini whose *On Avarice* is tinged with anti-mendicant sentiment wrote,

> In one thing [Bernardino] greatly excels: by persuading and exciting the emotions, he manipulates the people and leads them wherever he desires, moving them to tears and, when the subject matter allows it, to laughter.  

Bernardino was capable of miracles on earth and those miracles proliferated once he died in 1444. If he was a controversial figure before Rome, his acquittal in Rome solidified his reputation as a powerful agent of the pope. The dramatic turn of events provided a boon to Bernardino's religious Order the Observant Franciscans.

As their name suggests, the Observant Franciscans wanted to return the Order to what they believed was its original calling as defined by St. Francis. In 1369, a fringe group of

---

23 Lesnik, 146. The voluntary poor were usually of better social standing than the "deserving poor," born into poverty.


Franciscans in Umbria, close to Francis’ hometown of Assisi, organized into a small convent calling for a much stricter observance of Francis’ Rule. Divisions within the Franciscan Order were often fueled by debates on the intensity of poverty the friars were meant to endure. More than the other mendicant orders, the Observant Franciscans were prone to dramatic rejections of material objects considered profane—lucre and clothing. Francis’ rejection of his father’s wealth as he stripped off his clothes in Assisi and his disinheritance became the central biographical thread providing justification for the Observants. The Observant branch of the Franciscans believed that powerful leaders of the Order had lobbied the popes for too many exemptions to the Order’s asceticism and they organized to strip the Franciscan Rules of comforts conceded by the popes. By the fifteenth century, when Doge Moro became involved with San Giobbe, the Observant movement was on the rise and dramatically increased its ranks. In 1414, a year before the Observant Franciscans received official papal recognition at the Council of Constance, there were about 200 Observants in 34 convents. For example, San Salvatore al Monte in Florence was founded in 1417 on the site of a private residence, and in Milan, a number of Observant churches were erected. The papal promotion of Bernardino in 1428 after his trial demonstrated the sway of the Order in just thirteen years. After the preacher’s canonization in 1450, the numbers of Observants swelled.

In the thirteenth century, hagiographical texts about St. Francis emphasized his devotion to the revival of the ideal of the *ecclesia apostolica*. The call of religious poverty, however, extended back to the patristic stages of Christianity well before Francis took up its cause. Calls to

---

27 Sevesi, 42.
poverty punctuated various moments identified as decadent by theologians. For example, St. Augustine sang the praises of poverty and almost seven hundred years later at the Roman Synod of 1059, Hildebrand blasted the ownership of property among Aachen canons. That the call to poverty was echoed throughout the Church’s history suggests that it always remained somewhat of an idea, never fully brought to fruition, but invoked in various forms at the inception of religious movements.

The Franciscan ideal of poverty and reform is embodied in the friar Antonio da Romagno’s *Apology for Poverty* written in the fourteenth century. Antonio suffered as a poor man throughout his whole life, regarding poverty as an enemy. When he joined the Franciscans, he embraced poverty and assigned spiritual worth to it. His *Apology* is a dialogue with Francis that champions his voluntary choice. The Franciscans also showed how desirable poverty could be in Francis’ allegorical marriage with the beautiful lady Poverty, depicted in one of the vaults above St. Francis’ tomb in Assisi and the subject of many books after the saint’s death. The voluntary poor in the religious Orders were imitators of Christ, *imitati Christi*, and their willful poverty was like Francis’ who sought to emulate Christ. Francis’ rejection of wealth serves as a microcosm for the way in which they could thrive in a new market economy. The Franciscans and their preachers set down the rules for righteous earning and spending, defining the terms for what constituted a fair loan and how investments could be made without imperiling the revenue of others. That preachers assumed the roles of amateur economists to warn against the sin of

---

30 The first chapters in Antonio da Romagna’s *Apologia* are in, BAV 5223, fol. 31-7r. Also “Poverta,” *Dizionario degli istituti di perfezione*, Edited by Guerrino Pelliccia and Giancarlo Rocca. Rome: Edizioni Paoline, 1974-2003, 310-37.
32 Raymond De Roover, *San Bernardino of Siena and Sant’ Antonino of Florence; the two great economic thinkers of the Middle Ages*, Boston: Baker Library, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, 1967.
avarice, greed for money, with detailed parameters for just financial transactions must have impressed their more affluent listeners.

Nostalgia for the ideals of the past church attracted several patrons to the Observant Franciscans. The patron would be able to reap the awards of a public spiritual identity through an association with the Order. That the choice of religious Order for confession and burial are complex religious and social gestures is made evident in Vespasiano di Bisticci’s fifteenth-century biographies of famous men. He named the burial locations for the men he profiled and the religious Orders which resided at the churches where the bodies lay. In many ways, one’s affiliation with a religious Order could be summarized in a few words and the attendant associations of the degree of asceticism of each Order would then be easily pinned to one’s pious life. Biographers like Vespasiano would collude, lauding one’s piety based on the religious Order to which they consigned their pious life. Judging from testamentary bequests in Venice, all of the Observant Franciscan churches in the city were regarded as a group and donors tended to leave funds for each church affiliated with one particular Order.33 In his chronicles of Venice, Marino Sanudo categorized the churches based on their affiliation to the mendicant Orders.

Bernardino has captured the interest of several historians due to his startling understanding of the money markets. Despite his claim to severe asceticism, Bernardino accepted that he lived within a burgeoning market economy and nuanced the terms of acceptable spending for his listeners.34 “When God sees that a soul can be better saved through riches than poverty, God bestows riches…the rich are necessary to the State, and the poor to the rich.” He was on the hunt

---

33 Sanudo, 60, c30v. According to Sanudo, San Giobbe lay on a ceremonial procession route after San Francesco della Vigna, San Stefano and directly before San Salvador, but it is unclear as to which procession he is discussing.
for usurers so defined the terms of their constitution for his audiences. Bernardino believed that those usurers who escaped convictions in ecclesiastical courts, for lack of concrete evidence, would nevertheless "be found guilty of usury in the confessional and before God." 35

The cult of personality helped drive the Order's success. Their popularity was given a public face in the figure of Bernardino of Siena. Perhaps because of their savvy understanding of contemporary economics, the Observants also became leaders in hearing confession; several leaders throughout the city-states turned to the Observant Franciscans to find personal confessors who then lobbied for his canonization. 36 If a future saint had absorbed your confessions of sin, the path to salvation would be that much smoother Doge Moro, Duke Federico da Montefeltro (1422-82) of Urbino, the wealthy merchant, Francesco Datini (1335-1410) in Prato, and the papal secretary in the late fifteenth century, Niccolò Bufalini in Rome committed projects to the friars and made them their personal confessors. The Observant friars oversaw the religious life of the Milanese leaders and became the spiritual advisors to the Angevin regime in Naples and the Gonzaga in Mantua. 37 Cosimo de Medici's first financial contributions to an ecclesiastical project were given to a remote Observant Franciscan church, Mugello al Bosco near the Villa Cafaggiulo. Here, Cosimo spent more than 15,000 florins on the convent and a part of the


37 According to Luke Wadding, Bernardino was the confessor of René d'Anjou in Naples. The Angevin rulers were the biggest proponents of Bernardino's canonization. J. M. Fletcher, Splendors of the Gonzaga, edited by David Chambers and Jane Martineau, London: Victoria and Albert Museum: 1981, 3-15. In the same year of Bernardino's death one of his staunch supporters, Paola Malatesta, also died. She introduced several Observants to Mantua and was largely responsible for their sway in the area throughout the fifteenth century. Guido Gonzaga and his father cultivated the Franciscans through donations and ultimately built a family chapel in the Observant church of San Francesco in Mantua to be used as the family mausoleum. It was Mantua which hosted the first permanent Observant convent, established in 1418.
church," placed the Medici palle around the altar, and paid for Fra Angelico's altarpiece, now in the Museo San Marco. Cosimo may have been attracted to the site to help his relative the friar Romulo de' Medici. Crispin Robinson offers a 1448 terminal date for the Mugello, for the Observant Franciscan general chapter met there that year, around the time Doge Cristoforo Moro is believed to have begun building at San Giobbe.

Several wealthy patrons also turned to the Franciscan Order to mediate their charitable donations for they were increasingly associated with nursing the sick. The mendicant Orders became involved in the administration of hospitals and hospices throughout the city-states, as they ministered to the poor and acted to protect their interests. By aligning themselves with the Observants through private chapels or the eternal commitment of a burial monument, patrons would effortlessly claim an alignment with the agenda of the Order, while the preachers did all of the footwork.

Throughout the city-states, the Observant Franciscans preached, heard confession, and collected the sick and destitute in need of hospitalization. In 1396, Gian Galeazzo Visconti assigned a commission of mendicants to patrol Milan in search of the sick and poor requiring hospital accommodation. In the early fifteenth century, Bernardino of Siena embodied the Franciscan healthcare worker caring for the poor and the sick and serving as confessor. Bernardino tried to move his listeners to charitable giving by describing the conditions of the poor and discussed his own maltreatment when he was begging for bread. While still a

---

38 Vespasiano, 220. Amonaci, 207.
40 Pullan, 202-3.
novitiate, around 1400, the young Bernardino took charge of the Hospital of Santa Maria della Scala in Siena and briefly caught the bubonic plague while caring for the sick. 42

Medicinal Ministering: The Early Hospice at San Giobbe

The understanding of sin as a root cause of sickness played out in the conception of the Renaissance hospice, where clergymen were on hand to prescribe confession. 43 As Christ could heal the sick and poor through touch, so through confession and communion, his followers ministered to the sick and dying. One of the decrees of the 1217 Council of Lyon demonstrates the overlapping identification of the hospital and church.

Sickness of the body may sometimes be the result of sin—as the Lord said to the sick man whom he had cured, Go and sin no more, lest something worse befall you—so we by this present decree order and strictly command physicians of the body, when they are called of the sick, to warn and persuade them first of all to call in physicians of the soul so that after their spiritual health has been seen to they may respond better to medicine for their bodies; for when the cause ceases so does the effect. 44

Due to the strong hold of confession as a prescriptive cure for sickness and bad luck, hospitals tended to fall under the administrative care of ecclesiasts.

Due to the interrelated roles of medicine and confession, chapels were an integral part of early hospital and hospice complexes. As depicted in his architectural treatise from the 1460s,

---


Filarete placed a chapel near the center of the main buildings of the hospital complex in his plan and description of hospitals. The Franciscans managed the new Ospedale Maggiore in Milan under the Visconti successor, Francesco Sforza. An Observant Franciscan preacher in the Veneto, Michele Carcano, helped rouse enthusiasm for the hospital begun in Milan in 1448. Not far from Milan, at the same time, one of the Venetian strongholds on mainland Italy in Brescia, a centralized hospital opened in 1447, founded by the Franciscan friar, Alberto of Sarteano, and the Bishop of Brescia, Pietro del Monte, both of whom consulted the architects of the Ospedale Maggiore on the design of the complex. Two years later, Venetian emissaries in Bergamo centralized their hospital complexes. At San Francesco Grande in Padua, the hospital complex doubled in size after a visit to the city by Bernardino da Siena. The initiation of Doge Cristoforo Moro’s patronage of San Giobbe was contemporaneous to these instances in which the Franciscans were deployed to carry out the public relations work in the realm of social services. San Giobbe was not at all arranged around a centralized plan and expanded by accretion rather than by a master plan, but the religious building played a large role in the life of the complex, even if it is not explicitly manifest in design. Early references to San Giobbe usually describe the site as the “hospedal et loco of San Giobbe,” revealing that the hospital contained services and property diffuse enough to warrant the qualifier “et loco.”

The comprehensive bird’s eye view of Venice by Jacopo de’ Barbari from 1500 offers what is considered to be an accurate view of the convent of San Giobbe as it was soon after Moro’s

---

47 BMC, PD 830/39. In his testament from the first half of the fifteenth century, Antonio Micheli left, “Ducati vener foret et chiese et loco et hospital San Job di novo fundamenta di veneta e parochial San Geremia,” in the name of the founder, the “nobil viro domino Johan Contareni.”
1471 death. (Figure 38) Undeveloped land, *terra vacua*, and swamps cut the convent off from the city. The walled convent stands to the west of the bend of the Canal Grande, enclosed by the Canal Regio, and smaller tributary canals cutting from the Canal directly into the lagoon. The principal entrance of the church as denoted by the top of the high façade in the Barbari View faces the smaller Rio San Giobbe, one of the smaller subsidiary canals perpendicular to the Canal Regio. A garden protruded from the south side of the convent and there are several buildings to the west, across the small Rio San Giobbe. The constellation of buildings which comprised the hospice at San Giobbe formed the larger part of the complex, but like several other early hospital complexes, the layout of the early hospital is difficult to detect. Judging from the land and house bequests to the hospital of San Giobbe during the fifteenth century, most of the nondescript buildings surrounding the convent in the Barbari View were donated to serve the hospital.

A sketch of San Giobbe from the fifteenth century is similar to the depiction of the site in the Barbari View. (Figure 39) The sketch was made before the wooden draw bridge from the fourteenth century which projected across the Canal Regio was replaced by a stone bridge in 1503, and even later, by the Tre Archi Bridge in the seventeenth century. A wooden drawbridge across the wider Canal Regio made San Giobbe accessible from the north and smaller bridges connected the small *insulae* along the Canal Regio. Perpendicular to the large wooden bridge across the Canal Regio, the smaller Ponte Saponella brings together the two sides of the *fondamenta* along the south side of the Canal Regio. The sketch offers an idea of the undeveloped state of the land, landfill patterns, and the ownership of land and property, even if it

---

does not show the site's exact contours. In roughly the spot where the current church dedicated to the Pietà stands on the *fondamenta* San Giobbe, there is a small church dedicated to “S. Arion,” though there is no record beyond this sketch of any property on the fondamenta belonging to S. Arion. The church labeled S. Job stands closer to the *fondamenta* of the smaller Canal San Giobbe which cuts perpendicularly in front of a communal canal in front of the façade of the church of San Giobbe. On the other side of what is the Rio San Giobbe, there is a house owned by the Dogaressa’s family, the Sanudo.

A description of the site refers to a gate which served as the entrance to the hospice complex. A gate along the Canal Regio, not far from where the campanile went up, that is visible in an eighteenth-century drawing of the neighborhood likely served as the fourteenth-century entry way to the hospital, and a problematic makeshift toilet. It may also have served as the site of impromptu confession sessions. Pope Martin V’s 1428 bull granting the Franciscan friars the use of San Giobbe reveals a bit about the physical composition of the site and describes some of the buildings that comprise “el loco” of San Giobbe. It refers to a campanile, cloisters, and other “necessary spaces” near the “cappella of San Job.” A 1428 donation of land by Contarini’s daughter, Lucia Dolfin’s refers to the “chapel of St. Job” with its gardens, a well and about 90 *passi,* or roughly 155 meters of free land up to the long side of the canal. The area that included

---

50 5 Maggio 1383 (PD 34). The *scuola* di San Giobbe begins, under Doge Antonio Venier. E fu fatto “dove ora el’intrada del Prior dell’ospital di s. Job, sotto il portico suddetto e li frati ricevano la loro prima porta detta del campanello in canton, arente la porta di detta scuola di s. Job pur in fondamenta suddetta ove ora tutti vanno ad orinare.”
51 ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, 5r-v 6 Nov. 1428, “Capellam cupiebat ex affectione quam gerebat ad Religiosam observantiam fratrum Ordinis Minorum de Observantia numcupatorum, quem affectat assiduis incrementis pululare singularem devotionem gerens...Capellam ipsam Beati Iob de Venetii positam in Canareglo in Parochia Sancti Ierimiae cum suo Orto, & Terreno longitudinis a Clausura Claustri, seu Putei dictae Capellae, cum libertate terrandi, usque penes canale longitudinis passuum 90, vel circa. Et in introitu dicti Ortus per latitudinem passuum 17, vel circa, ampliando se in latitudine ad Clausuram dicti ortus, sive Terreni in passus 18, vel circa, cui soheret ab una parte Hospitale Dominarum, & ipsa dom. Lucia Delphino.”
the hospice also included a scuola for the confraternity of St. Job, which paid the hospital forty loaves of bread a year to rent a space.\footnote{ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, XLVII, 49.}

The living quarters in 1428 may have been more makeshift than the cloisters which appear in the 1500 Barbari view for the Heronymites who had administered San Giobbe before the Franciscans did not live on site. But hospitals were emerging as a distinct type. In preparation for his construction of the Ospedale Maggiore in Milan for the Sforza begun in about 1450, the architect Filarete studied hospital complexes in Tuscany including the Ospedale della Scala in Siena and the hospital at Santa Maria Novella in Florence.\footnote{In 1456, the architect, Filarete, was in Florence to study hospital layout for the design of the Ospedale Maggiore in Milan. The research formed the basis for the information in his treatise. Filarete, 153.} That San Giobbe was at its inception and at its core a hospital complex that expanded by virtue of donated “covered and uncovered” houses without a master plan contributes to the lack of clarity. Many of the buildings were houses donated by families in the area and converted into residential quarters for the hospice and they are no longer extant. For example, one of the prior’s of the hospital, Giovanni Dolfin, Lucia’s son who left the Campo delle Canne, west of the Ponte Saponella to the hospital in his 1458 testament.\footnote{ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, xlviii, 1, 19 Ottobre 1458.}

A century after its founding, Bartolomeo Bragadin refers in his 1480 testament to two main hospital buildings, one of which is described “near the church” (a rente la chiesa) and the other is situated in an “empty embankment” (cavo allo squero) along the Canal Regio.\footnote{Archivio Opera Pia Zuanne Contarini, Busta 226. The testament of Bartolomeo Bragadin, 16 June 1480. Bartolomeo married Lucia Contarini’s daughter, Isabetta, who left a donation of land to the church. Members of the Bragadin family are listed as members of the scuola of St. Job consistently throughout the records of the confraternity until the seventeenth century. For example, in 1537 a Daniel Bragadin is listed as absent in a meeting about the confraternity’s search for a new gastaldo.} Three hundred years later, Giuseppe Tassini similarly described the site as bisected by the Rio San
Giobbe. He wrote that since its origins the Ponte della Saponella, perpendicular to the current Tre Archi bridge across the Canal Regio, bridged the two halves of the hospital. The area to the southwest of the Rio San Giobbe was referred to as the Beccarie, after the woman from whom Giovanni Contarini purchased the initial plot of land for San Giobbe. In the view of Venice from 1697 by Vincenzo Coronelli, the Beccarie area is clearly labeled. (Figure 40) Most sources indicate that the hospital buildings occupied the land on the San Giobbe side of the Canal Regio. The hospital of San Giobbe is presently identifiable only by inscriptions catalogued by Emmanuele Cicogna and in buildings scattered along the Canal Regio. In the eighteenth century, the Contarini stemmi were still in place on a building along the Canal near the lagoon. There is still an inscription which reads “HOSPITALE S. JOB MDXXVI” on the architrave of what might have been the Beccarie entrance, close to the lagoon. (Figure 41)

The description of the part of the hospital closer to the lagoon as “cavo allo squero” in Bragadin’s testament echoes the description in Moro’s testament made about ten years earlier. Moro bequeathed a plot of land in the Cannaregio he had purchased from the owner of the

---

56 Tassini, 467. Corner, 238. Vincenzo Coronelli, Guida de’ Forestieri, Venice, 1724, 237.
57 AOPZC, Busta 226. The part of the hospital closer to the church of San Giobbe, to the east, was called Borghetto, while the portion that lay closer to the lagoon was called the Vecchie, near the slaughterhouse of San Giobbe which opened in 1843. Tassini’s division may have just been an attempt to assign order to the space. Catasto napoleonico: mappa della città di Venezia, Venezia: Marsilio, 1988. The remains of the hospice rooms near the church are mentioned again in a 1737 document drawn up by the da Ponte family, the administrators of the hospital at that time. They mention a series of hospice rooms that abut the church choir behind the main altar is called “Vecchie.” ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 7, c70. “1737, Presento supplica il R.P. Giacomo Lopelli di Venetia Presidente del Serafico Ordine di S. Francesco nel convento di S. Giobbe di questa citta, e seco lui R.R.P.P. Capitolari di d.to convento, come in essa, e che sara qui a piedi registrata a perpetua memoria, al NHS. Ab Lorenzo da Ponte del qm S. Gio: Comiss.ero Cassier del Pio Ospitale, o sia jus patronato della Famiglia da Ponte detto di S. Giobbe...e senz’alchun neppur imaginabile pregiudicio di esso Pio Ospitale per condere ad esso presidente, e suoi Capitolari per essi, e successori tanto terreno vacuo inutile di ragione come detta, assistente nella Carte, sia borghetto detto delle Vecchie dietro il corpo di mezzo delle camere, e contiguo confinante alla capella, e coro di essi PP, quanto basti a formare un Coridoro, o sia Andio capace al Passaggio d’un solo Uomo, e che porti al loro campanile, con permissione d’aprire una porta interiore a detto Andio nel muro del coro sudetto.” G. Romanelli, Venezia Ottocento, Milan: Marsilio, 1977, 221-5.
Arsenale to the hospital for the purpose of constructing sixteen houses for poor elderly sailors.\textsuperscript{58} Marc’Antonio Sabellico said that across the wooden bridge, likely the Ponte Saponella, was a boat landing surrounded by houses for the poor, constructed by “the same prince,” who built the church.\textsuperscript{59} (Figure 42) A rough sketch of a courtyard surrounding sixteen houses and the canal held in the group of documents for the executors of Moro’s will shows that the houses were meant to abut the Canal Grande in a circular fashion. The hospital, then, continually enlarged as new buildings were procured. It also attracted those wishing to contribute services to the poor. At the beginning of the twentieth century, water damage was recorded in the side chapels and the long sacristy. By the sixteenth century, likely due to the boon of Moro’s patronage, San Giobbe had expanded to 120 separate almshouses, a dispensary, a church with two courtyards, and rooms for at least two confraternities.\textsuperscript{60}

That San Giobbe contained a cemetery, a hospice, and a church situated the complex within a multipurpose group of charitable institutions. At Pisa, for example, the enclosed Campo Santo, meant to house burials and constructed over an early Christian cemetery, provided a physical counterpoint to the hospital on the other side of the cathedral complex. At Santa Maria Novella in Florence, a burial ground abutted the church on the side opposite the hospital.\textsuperscript{61} (Figure 43) Within Venice, the location of a cemetery next to a church was unusual; the remote location of San Giobbe likely contributed to the availability of open space for outdoor burial. The hospital complex attached to the church of Santi Giovanni and Paolo, run by Dominicans, was directly

\textsuperscript{58}ASV, Procuratore di San Marco, Busta 2, Fasc. 1, Processo 45, c.143. 27 January 1659. Copy of Moro’s testament, “Laso che sul tereno preso un squero in cavo di chanaregio el qual o comprador dal patro de larsenal sia fato case 16 in 20 chome le pora venire le quali sia date a poveri marinari sian de ani 50...” Sanudo, c27r. “Questi sono i hospedali maggiori in Venexia: Item le case de Christophoro Moro dose a Santo Ioppo, che si danno per l’amor di Dio.”

\textsuperscript{59}Sabellico, 1488, Bk.II. “All’isola seconda all’incontro a cui maurena portico ad uso dei poveri dal medesimo principe fabbricato s’accosta et da piu stanze circondato: addentio e Leuceria.” Piasentini, 1997, 35.

\textsuperscript{60}Pullan, 222.

across the lagoon from the burial grounds on the island of San Michele where there was also a hospital and a church. These core services formed a triangle of piety, recovery, and salvation. Establishment of hospitals to house the poor allowed the Signoria to monitor those who did not have a fixed function in society, and thus maintain control in the city. The Republic depended on the mendicant religious orders, like the Observant Franciscans at San Giobbe to administer these charitable complexes, but the city’s regulation and support of a site like San Giobbe ensured that the local authorities could split the Franciscan friars’ allegiances to the papacy. The friars, though, seem to have remained loyal to the pope throughout their tenure in Venice.

The Friars vs. the Hospital vs. the Confraternity

Since the fissures began to appear between the sects of the Franciscans in the fourteenth century, they engaged in contentious and even violent debates with each other and with other mendicant orders. A distance of at least five hundred meters was required between convents of different orders, likely in order to avoid conflict. The Observant Franciscans complained to the pope that the more lenient Conventual Franciscans were obstructing their path to reform. Pope Martin V assigned three cardinals to oversee a conference between the two sects in Rome in 1429. Though the cardinals concluded that the friars needed to live in concord, the preacher John of Capistrano helped to orchestrate the Constitutiones Martinianae which favored the Observants.

---

64 Duncan Nimmo, Reform and division in the Franciscan order from Saint Francis to the foundation of the Capuchins, Rome: Capuchin Historical Institute, 1987, 607.
It is in this context that in 1434, the Observant Franciscans may have petitioned to demolish the oratory to St. Job and build a larger church. Lucia Contarini, the daughter of the founder of San Giobbe, had just relinquished her *jus patronatus* over the hospital and oratory on 2 January 1434. Lucia opposed the proposed destruction of the oratory on the grounds that it served as the site of her father’s burial. Lucia presented the case for saving the oratory before the pope for the Observant Franciscans claimed obedience to the papacy and fell under its jurisdiction. The papal representatives in charge of the case decided on 7 October 1441 obliged the Franciscan friars to preserve the oratory to honor the memory of Contarini, but also because it would be indecorous to destroy a place in which many cardinals, some of whom became popes and bishops, had celebrated. The ruling was framed in accordance with Francis’ rule that his brothers repair and clean existing churches.

The varied nature of the charitable services offered at San Giobbe contributed to the tension between the hospital administrators and the friars. For such a small area of land, the terms of power were held by several parties with conflicting interests. As San Giobbe expanded, the relationship between the hospital administrators and the friars became fraught. The 1441 decree to maintain the oratory serves as an early example of the persistent tension between the two parties. Contarini’s testamentary directive that the oratory should stay physically separate from

---

65 ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, XLIII, cc. 1r-4r. Contarini wrote that he wished to be commemorated in the oratory.
66 Ibid., 6v-r, for a copy of the papal bull. 18 August 1441 (PD 13): “Breve di Papa Eugenio IV, dato in Fiorenza, ivi portatosi sua Santita con molti Cardinali ad unir la Chiesa Greca con la Latina, nel qual Breve delega S. Lorenzo Giustiniani sopra la causa vertenti tra li Frati, e li Comissarii del Contarini, per la chiesolla di S. Job, e per il jus patronato, che li Frati la volevano demolire...” The pope turned the case over to Lorenzo Giustiniani, bishop of Castellano (1381-1456) and the first patriarch of Venice, Tommaso Tommasini, bishop of Feltrenese, and Fantino Dandolo, who ruled in favor of Lucia Contarini. ASV, Scuole Piccole, 260-1. 7 October 1441 (Processo D 13), “...sentenza diffinitiva del sudetto Santo, che conforme Lucia Contarini, non aveva potesta di donare il Jus patronato alli Frati, così essi non sanno autorita di distruggier la chiesolla di S: Job e la memoria di quel Ven:la Fondatore.”
the hospital may have been a precautionary move. The contentious relationship between the mendicants and the hospice administrators echoed other instances of power share between friars and lay administrators throughout the Italian city-states. For example, the edict of the almshouse set up by Francesco Datini in Prato specified that, "No prelate or clergy was to administer the Casa del Ceppo and no altar, oratory, or chapel would come in to its walls so that it should not come into the ownership of the clergy or evil hands."\(^{68}\) The calls to both separate and exclude friars from administrative duties in charitable organizations suggested that the ecclesiastical and lay branches of power were highly competitive and each party tended to accuse each other of the same corruption.

At San Giobbe, the increasing number of Franciscans and the growth of the hospice must have disturbed the power balance. As the spaces of the hospital began to encroach upon the ecclesiastical space, the friars often raised formal objections. The friars initiated a complaint against the hospital administrators in 1509 to fight the construction of a wall around the cemetery adjacent to San Giobbe.\(^{69}\) In 1516, the governors of the hospital were ordered to pay twenty-five ducats to the friars for building hospital rooms which abutted the campanile of the church.\(^{70}\) In 1569, the friars claimed that they were in grave danger of death from the immanent collapse of the high altar chapel when pressure from a hospital wall created a hole in the side wall of the choir.\(^{71}\) The friars asked the hospital to repair the damage and provide compensation.

---

\(^{68}\) 31 July 1410, Testament of Francesco Datini from Origo, 1992, 186.
\(^{69}\) ASV, Scuole Piccole, Basta 260, 4. "2 May 1509. Chiamor a favor dell'Ospital di S. Job contro i frati, un muro, che sera il campo santo."
\(^{70}\) ASV, San Giobbe, Basta V, xlviiii, 54r. "Siamo avisati quelli del legerano la presente scritura come l'accordo che in essa si contiene essersi fatto dalla a loco nostro di San Job et li comissarii del hospedal. Non esser stato dal canto de moi frati fatto volontariamente ma per non venir a lite li ha cedesto con reservation sempre delle nostre raggion di tanto questo essi comissarii si sono ecomedati per la fabricha fata li apresso il muro della capella grande del 1516 come anco del muro et pilastri del nostro choor del 1586 dentro del sup hospedal li come ognium pol veder patenitibus oculis. Et in feste di questo il fre Ionne Redaldi ha scrita la presente memoriz."
\(^{71}\) ASV, San Giobbe, Basta 5, xlviiii, 15r-16r, 13 December 1569. Appendix 1, Document 2.
There was even disagreement over property boundaries involving the confraternities in residence at the church. At the end of the seventeenth century, the confraternity dedicated to St. Bernardino of Siena brought charges against the Franciscans for trying to acquire legal rights over the little Rio San Giobbe in front of the Campo San Giobbe where their confraternity house was located.\textsuperscript{72} Motions made in 1694 to liquidate the convent in order to pay off its debts give an idea of the state of the convent: in bad repair, subject to haphazard growth, and barely operable.\textsuperscript{73}

Not enough information exists for a clear picture of the friars at San Giobbe, but from these conflicts, the portrait of a consistently restless group emerges. The Franciscans at San Giobbe were under the constant threat of their church’s collapse, and they were often at odds with the hospice administrators and the law of the Republic. When Pope Sixtus IV excommunicated Venice in 1482 for laying siege to Ferrara, the friars refused to say mass in the church of San Giobbe in order to maintain obedience to the pontiff. They were then exiled by the Council of Ten for adhering to the ruling of the papacy.\textsuperscript{74} In 1561, the friars were engaged in a bizarre ruling before the Inquisition when they were accused of burying one of their own alive.\textsuperscript{75} While the charges were dropped, the source of the malignment against the Order is unclear. The friars at San Giobbe were also accused of destroying their bell tower. As the Venetian diarist Marino

\textsuperscript{72} The bickering extended to the friars and the confraternity of San Bernardino as well. In 1694, the scuola filed a complaint against the friars for claiming rights over the Rio in front of the church. ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 8, “L’andera parte, che mette mis. Michiel Bondi gastaldo in questo di 16 Gen. Che il sudetto gastaldo e compagni della scola de mis. S. Bernardin sia concesso il sopradetto loco, e terrea per longhezza dalla nostra scola fino al canton della chiesa, e per larghezza dalla strada fino al Rio da redo, reservando in liberta nostra di lassar fra la scola nostra. Et la sua una calle di larghezza di un passo, che per quella si possi andar al Canal.” ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, L, 15r. 22 September 1694, “Chiamor fatto far dà dom:la della Santa fù nostro guard.o, contro i R.R.P.P. di S. Giob, che di fatto, e propria autorità, hanno mandato à far conzar la nra riva quella in faza la lor chiesa per acquistar Jus, à pregiudicio del fondi, che è della nostra scola.”

\textsuperscript{73} ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 1, 22 December 1694.

\textsuperscript{74} Sanudo, \textit{Vita dei Dogi}, 365. After Pope Sixtus IV excommunicate the Venetians, some friars at San Giobbe in order to obey the pope, did not say masses or offices in the church. “Ma alcuni frati di l’hordine di San Francesco Observanti, stavano ne monasterio di San lob, volendo ubedi il Papa, et non volendo dir messa ni altri officij in chiesa, tenendo tal pazia nel capo lhor, che ‘omnis censura, iusta vel inusta, timenda est,’ unde fommo mandati per il Conseio d’I X in exilio di questa cità, e di terre e luogi nostri.”

\textsuperscript{75} Appendix 1, Document 3.
Sanudo reports the incident, one night in 1515, some friars who found the bell’s relentless mark of time anything but dulcet, destroyed it. The commune ordered the friars to rebuild the campanile, though the extent of damage is unclear. The current campanile is adorned with the family arms of Moro so presumably the reconstruction work was not severe and the principal structure was completed under Moro. The details about the transgressions by the friars at San Giobbe are obscure but they illustrate an insolence that dated back to their reaction to the ruling to preserve the oratory. The friars flouted the 1441 sentence meted out by the committee which decided the fate of the oratory. According to testimonies taken about the site in 1502, the friars waited until after the deaths of Lucia Contarini and the Patriarch of Venice, Lorenzo Giustiniani and they destroyed the oratory. The events surrounding the destruction of the oratory are unclear and the church may have begun after Lucia Contarini’s death in 1447 or even before the friars were ordered to preserve the oratory in 1441.

Plans for Destruction: The Changing Convent of San Giobbe

The layout of the ecclesiastical spaces of San Giobbe during the 1440s is unknown. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the first detailed plan of San Giobbe was produced in order to carry out Napoleon’s suppression of the monasteries. In 1810, the Franciscans who had inhabited the convent since 1428 were evicted. The Order was later replaced by a group of Canossian brothers. A plan of the convent drafted by Cesare Fustinelli before the church was closed on 25 April 1810 reveals that San Giobbe was part of a convent at the beginning of the

---

77 Cicogna, 551.
nineteenth century with service areas near the façade, and two courtyards.\footnote{BMC, PD. C818.29. Plan by Cesare Fustinelli, made for the suppression of the convent.} (Figure 44) The Fustinelli plan highlighted the living quarters and the service areas marked for destruction as the inhabitants of the convent were evicted. Most of the areas destroyed were along the front of the church, including a kitchen and the atrium; a refectory between the courtyards, and the second cloister were also destroyed.\footnote{In addition, the Fustinelli plan shows that the gardens perpendicular to the church, the library over the sacristy, the chapel, and the house of vicar over the sacristy would be demolished.} There is no mention of the second cloister in any extant documentation on San Giobbe outside of the Fustinelli plan, nor is it shown in earlier plans or views of Venice, but here it was marked for destruction. While fragments of the east loggia of the first cloister remain, there is no trace of the second cloister and the area where the cloisters were is now given over to gardens. (Figure 45 & Figure 46)

Despite the changes to the convent, based on the Fustinelli plan, the current church is not remarkably different than it was when the Republic fell to Napoleon in 1797. The church consists of a long aisleless nave, as most early Franciscan churches, with five chapels of varying sizes projecting from its north side. The cloister abutting the south side of the church precluded the construction of side chapels to balance those of the north. A campanile is wedged into the space to the east of the chapels on the north and the high altar chapel. The high altar chapel at the east end of the church is framed by what appears to be a triumphal arch configuration of pietra d'Istria: two small niche-like chapels in the transept frame a larger arched opening onto the high altar chapel, or presbytery. The high altar chapel is covered by a dome and a long choir protrudes from behind the seventeenth-century altar. The entire church is vaulted, though the elevation of the nave is higher than that of the choir. It is punctuated by the dome over the high altar chapel.
Countless renovation campaigns have complicated our understanding of the building history of San Giobbe. The Barbari View shows that already by 1500, the design of the church had undergone modification: the double ogival windows on the south side of the nave had been partially blocked to accommodate both the altarpieces inserted into the walls and the double-storied loggia in the cloister where the friars lived. Significant renovations occurred around the high altar, the first in the late sixteenth century when the walls of the cappella maggiore were in danger of collapsing. The entire exterior of the sacristy was redone in 1689. Renovations took place in the early seventeenth century when the choir and high altar area were enlarged. A surge of activity is also recorded in 1716. In the nineteenth century, repairs were required on the tribune of the church after an errant bomb struck the church during an 1849 attack to quash the Venetian uprising against short-lived Austrian rule.

The most transformative moment in San Giobbe’s history is the most elusive: the point at which it became a church. At some point after the Franciscans took over the church of San Giobbe in 1428, a new church replaced the oratory established by Giovanni Contarini and it is unclear whether it was begun before the clamor to destroy the oratory or after the 1441 ruling to preserve it. Most narratives of San Giobbe, in guidebooks and early compendia of Venetian religious complexes, describe its history as episodic: the Franciscans incorporated, or built the church around the oratory. Many scholars believe that the room extending from the south of the transept behind the courtyard of San Giobbe, labeled “cappella” on the Fustinelli plan, is the oratory founded by Giovanni Contarini in 1380, where the governors of the hospital were to

80 Appendix 1, Document 2.
81 ASV, San Giobbe, 5, LI, 1689. Ffèce restuarare, sue refabricare le camere de luoghi communi dietro la sacrestia con spesa tra tavole, Murali, Pietre, calcina, fattura, et altro in tutto.”
82 ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 8, proc. 80. “1716: Attestiamo noi sottoscriti discreti del coro di San Giobbe di Venezia che essendo rovinosa la Riva nostra verso la chiesa, sie compiacciuto il N.H ilustrimo Ecc.i Sig.i Marchese Marno Saccegniano con atto di generosa carita restaurarla.”
recite daily mass and a special mass on the day of the Annunciation.\textsuperscript{84} A long sacristy protrudes from behind it, parallel to the choir. According to the histories of San Giobbe, the church expanded around the small chapel, as the friars wished, and the hospital governors were appeased that the oratory remained. The documentary history does not fit easily into the account of the building determined by guidebooks and historians.

The orientation of the small room labeled “capela” on the Fustinelli plan has undergone numerous changes, making it difficult to discern its original relationship to the church.\textsuperscript{85} It is believed to be the Oratory of St. Job dedicated by Giovanni Contarini. It has a rectangular plan, consisting of two bays with low, pointed cross vaults and ogival fenestration. The room is accessible from the transept of the church under the monument to three members of the Nani family, the last of whom, Ermolao died in 1633. (Figure 47) The current portal of the small chapel from the church is off axis with both the altar and the two mid sixteenth-century floor slabs leading away from the altar. An exposed column on the wall inside the oratory flush with respect to the slabs shows that the chapel was accessible from the transept of the church at an early stage in design, but shifted to accommodate a design issue in the church at least by the time the seventeenth-century Nani monument was installed directly over the portal.

At one point, the main portal of the room led from the courtyard into the oratory, bypassing a principal entrance from the church. The oratory could be entered from the NE corner of the courtyard of San Giobbe, as distinguished in the courtyard by a larger arch in the loggia. Directly across from the cloister door, a sixteenth-century portal opens into the sacristy, covered by the

\textsuperscript{85} BMC, PD. C818.29.
monument to Cardinal Marc’ Antonio da Mula dating to sometime after his 1566 testament.\(^{86}\)

(Figure 48) On the same wall, a window was blocked up, after the sacristy was added but before the first extant reference to it is in a 1515 testament.\(^{87}\) The windows are bifurcated and end in a point, like the windows in the chapter house next door and those blocked up in the nave suggesting that the room was built at the same time as the main church. (Figure 49)

In the sixteenth century, this small chapel captured the interest of Renaissance patrons searching for appropriate burial spaces. It is presently covered with late sixteenth- and seventeenth-century burial slabs, two of which align axially to the main altar against the southeast wall. There is one altar on the south wall, opposite the entrance from the church, adorned with a 1540 nativity scene by Girolamo Salvado. (Figure 50 & Figure 51) The spate of burials in this room directly follows a repaving campaign in the church in 1578. One of the friars, Giovanni Redaldi made a record of the burials that would be lost to the repaving, but the plan he made is now lost.\(^{88}\) The extant testaments for the burials still in the room reveal an interesting pattern: they ask for burial in the “sacristy.” Francesco Salvieti, whose slab lies close to a wall in the chapel, specified burial in the sacristy.\(^{89}\) Cardinal Marc’ Antonio da Mula had written that he wished to be buried in his native Venice in the sacristy of the church of San Giobbe.\(^{90}\) However, his monument covers the door of the oratory leading into the long room.

\(^{86}\) ASV, Atti Lilliol, 1259, 664. 17 Gennaio 1566.
\(^{87}\) ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 1, VIII, 7 November 1515. Testament of Pietro Oliviero.
\(^{88}\) ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 7, 60, 18 April 1578, “Item carissimo Mis. Pietro Foschari fiol del q sopraddit Mis. Marco deti licenza a fra Bartholamio Veneto procurator del monasterio di San Job del facieses impir de terra la sepulture qual loci l’archa fata farma non si dovesse destar li muro atorno. Et questo per el sua magisa non li panur per alhora volerla finiri ma che forsi a quali tempo la hanbe in tal sepulture e permezo la capelina foschara apresso la capella del testa. Et io fre Ioanne Redaldi ho fato questa pocha di memoria acio di Frati che di tempo in tempo serano sapiamo il loco dove e tal sepulture per esser fat il pavimento della chiesa tudo da quadri.”
\(^{89}\) ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 3, XXIII. Francesco Salvieti left all his goods and property to San Giobbe and a mass a year in perpetuo.
\(^{90}\) ASV, Atti Liliol 1259,664, 17 January 1566, Rome. “Il corpo mio sin portare in Venezia, et sepolto in san job in sacrestia nelle mie arche, senza pompa...fra un mese at San Lorenzo (in Rome),” or the friars at San Lorenzo would have to pay 1000 scudi to San Job.
labeled as the sacristy in the Fustinelli plan. The Nani family also requested burial “in the vault of the sacristy,” and like the testators in the sixteenth century who requested burial in the sacristy, the monument to the Nani family is in the vault of the door of what is called today the oratory, leading in from the church.\(^91\) The unanimous designation of this room as a sacristy during the sixteenth century in extant testaments for those buried in the room calls the accepted history of this room into question. I believe that given its location off the transept, it was the sacristy of the church in the fifteenth century. By the seventeenth century, the long room protruding off this little side oratory was called sacristy as it is in the Fustinelli plan and once again, the function switched.\(^92\)

The room may have always served as the church’s sacristy as it is designated in the sixteenth century. In the section of his treatise on architecture on convents, Francesco di Giorgio proscribed a sacristy for all Franciscan convents. They should all have, “One or two ornate and enclosed sacristies where the vestments and other things used by the church are conserved.\(^93\) This small little chapel may have served as the sacristy before the longer room that is now considered the sacristy as denoted on the nineteenth-century Fustinelli plan was added. The room was clearly added to the church after the small oratory for the two symmetrical doors that abut the oratory cover a door. At some point, tie-vault medallions containing images of San Bernardino of Siena were installed in the small chapel. The intersections of the ribbed cross vaults of the room are joined by images of both a haloed Bernardino and his attribute, the

---

\(^91\) MCV CC 3115, 5. Testamento di Zorzi Nani, 28 agosto 1638, from, ASV, Atti Claudio Paulini Notaio, “Alli quali R. di Padri di san Job ho anco fatto allignatone di altri ducati dieci d’entrata all’anno, perche all’incontro mi hanno concesso il luoco vacuo sopra il volto della sacristia per poter ivi fare il desposito deli doi Procuratori dove fui consigliato.”

\(^92\) ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, LI, 7. 1693 “Fece restuarare, sue refabricare le camere de luoghi communi dietro la sacrestia con spesa tra tavole, Murali, Pietre, calcina, fattura, et altro in tutto. seque l’anno. per haver fatto far la prospetiva di San Giobbe nel chiostru picciolo dietro la Sacrestia ducati 8:10.”

\(^93\) Una o due sacrestie ornate di ricinti armari dove I paramentri e altre cose opportune alla chiesa conservate sieno.
abbreviated name of Jesus, IHS, which he held up for emphasis during his sermons. (Figure 52)

Regardless of the date of the room, these medallions can be dated to after 1450 when Bernardino was sainted. The room may have provided provisional headquarters for the saint’s confraternity at San Giobbe until they received a more permanent confraternity house in 1504.

Failing Memories and Mistaken Histories: Reconstructing the Early Church of San Giobbe

In part, the confusion about the building history of the oratory stems from inconsistencies in the terminology used. At different times in archival material and in subsequent literature about San Giobbe, the small room to the south of the main church of San Giobbe has been referred to as oratory, chapel, sacristy, and anti-sacristy. Throughout the documentary history of San Giobbe, “oratorio,” “chiesolla,” or the “chiesa vecchia” are used interchangeably to denote the oratory of San Giobbe commissioned by Contarini. While Contarini’s will refers to the ecclesiastical arm at San Giobbe as an “oratory,” in Lucia’s 1434 surrender of jus patronatus, San Giobbe is referred to as a “chapel” as it is in papal bulls issued.94 Emmanuele Cicogna recorded hundreds of burial inscriptions at the church from the eighteenth century that are now gone. His designation for various locations in the church differs from the plan made by Cesare Fustinelli—Cicogna’s oratory is Fustinelli’s capella.95 The change in names demonstrates that the functions for rooms were not stable, but the epigrapher was not exacting in his designation of rooms for he often contradicts the testaments. Whereas Cardinal da Mula and the Nani family asked for burial in the sacristy of San Giobbe, Cicogna refers to this space of burial as the oratory. That modern scholars commonly call this room the oratory and have named Giovanni Contarini its founder may be the result of Cicogna’s work.

---

94 ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, xlii, 9r.
95 Cicogna, 581.
The phase “chiesolla, overo Oratorio” is a constant refrain in building documents about San Giobbe and the Memorie, though the phrasing is not limited to San Giobbe or even Venice. A 1451 document for the building of the oratory of San Bernardino in Perugia makes the same reference to a “cappella, overo oratorio.” In one document discussing the renovations to the Tempio Malatestiano in Rimini, the reason for rebuilding the temple, “that is, oratory,” was given as the desire to create a place of burial for Sigismundo Malatesta and his mistress. There were no hard rules for designation of type. Ecclesiastical buildings during the fifteenth century, particularly the smaller ones used primarily for private worship, had fungible descriptive qualities. The ambiguity of terms, chiesolla or oratorio, suggests that the typology of the oratory was not well-defined in the fifteenth century, but that it referred to a small private or semi-private ecclesiastical building.

In the sixteenth century, a religious group called the Oratorians, devoted to the new saint, Filippo Neri, would construct oratories to emphasize the singing of the mass and to hold spiritual exercises, but oratories were codified to some extant before the Oratorians. The term oratory was used, at least since antiquity, to describe buildings in which the celebration of mass or divine offices were intended for a specific group of individuals, often a monastery, confraternity, or guild, in connection with a hospital, burial site, or a larger religious complex. There are examples of oratories constructed for small private mass near burial sites of the saints in antiquity. The oratory of San Giobbe is closest in character to St. Benedict’s description in his Rule. Though the mendicant orders, represented by the Franciscans at San Giobbe were more

---

engaged with society than the monastic Benedictines, several aspects of Benedictine life overlapped with those of the mendicants: the ban of ownership, the taking of vows, a commitment to providing charitable services and the necessities of cloistered life, a dormitory, refectory, kitchen, and chapter-house, and the inclusion of an oratory for private masses. St. Benedict regulated the use of oratories as spaces of devotions for cloistered monks. For Benedict, the oratory derived from its Latin root, orare, to pray, and served as the place of mass for one specific community of monks and individuals within the community. Indeed, most of the testimonials included in the Memorie for San Giobbe specify that the “chiesolla overo oratorio,” served as the location of mass for the hospital officials.

Testimonies called Memorie, given by the hospital administrators, friars, and members of the confraternities at San Giobbe pose the greatest challenges to the established history of the church. In particular, the testimonies suggest that the room believed to be the Contarini oratory was not the first, but superceded an earlier oratory to San Giobbe. The Memorie have been glossed over in histories of the church for they have been collected in pergamene form and only in fragments, but because they were made for the Great Council, the Memorie may have signaled the first of several recorded disputes between the administrators of the hospital of San Giobbe and the friars over land and building rights. There are references in the Memorie to the orientation and number of entranceways and altars in the church, but there are no documents to substantiate the accuracy of neither Memorie nor the contradictions in the testimonies about the physical descriptions of the site. The sense of geography is consistently skewed, for example. In early descriptions of the church, there is a frequent reference to a fondamenta—an embankment


101 San Giobbe, Busta 4, XLI and Busta 5, XLVI.
along a canal—near the church, but the church is almost equidistant from all the canals nearby. The accounts were taken at the very beginning of the sixteenth century and describe a period of building about forty to sixty years earlier. What becomes surprisingly clear in the documentation pertaining to San Giobbe is that the building fabric of the church during its formative years, in the fifteenth century, was ambiguous, even in the sixteenth century.

Many of the Memorie for San Giobbe divide the building history of the church into three phases. The first begins with the foundation of the small oratory by Contarini in 1380. The second begins as the first church, the testimonies claim, falls to ruins, sometime around the 1440s, but this phase clearly lasts through the dogate of Moro for it is mentioned in association with the Doge. Because one testimony states that, “In the location of the present church, there was water and swamp; it was built less than sixty years ago,” the second phase of construction could be set to around the 1440s, after the 1441 ruling to preserve the oratory. 102 (Figure 53)

The third phase commences sometime after Moro’s death and concludes sometime by 1502 when the testimonies are taken.

One of the testimonies tries to lay out a rough chronology. “In the place of the present church there were fragments of a smaller church built in stages. First there was a small church, and the friars brought the stones of the small church as it fell to ruin.” 103 The first phase of building, as

---

102 ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, xlvi, 40r. “Che dove al pres.t e la chiesa predeta de detti frati, era aqua, e Polude et è meno d’anni 60 fo edificada.” ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 6, LX, 29r: “...che dove al presente e construta, et edificarla chiesa nova al presente edificata per li frati li habitanti del ordine observanti de s. Francesco...en avanti l’edification di detta chiesa terrenero poludicio mezano, ne bon ne cio, comanda come el sa de quell haver visto oculati circa fa anni 60 in 70 precise...che al presente se attriva v’era una gesiola picola appo la fondamenta del Canal Regio porta fu la quel certi frati...se celebratera per detti frati... 15 March 1502.”

103 ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, xlvi, 41v: “...e per che son interrogado della fabrica della pres.e Ch.a era acqua, digo tanto saver che dove e la ghiesa presente era parte di membri della chiesa picola e sta fabricada in diversi tempi. P:ma picola; e delle prie della Ch.a vecchia, che i frati le portavan so come le ruinavan, la 2:a edification dalla tribuna in suso la capella s.dta che fece la bona serenis.a del S.mo pren.e sig. Chfto Moro, che fece la capella del Altar sd.ta con oltre capellette sono unite. La 3.a edification comenza dalla capella di Martini verso l’aqua perché la terminava la ch.a quanto tempo e non me ne ricordo specificadam.te., ma sono assai anni, e fu edificata imediate la
described, involved the destruction of the “small church” established by Giovanni Contarini in 1380. The second and third phases of building concerned the present church of San Giobbe. “The second building, from the tribune over the chapel, was made by the good Prince Moro who made the altar chapel together with the smaller side chapel niches (capellette). The third phase begins by the Martini Chapel towards the water. I don’t remember how long it took, but several years.”

The beginning of the second phase likely corresponds to a 1443 testament, which requested burial within the “newly built church of San Giobbe,” just two years after the ruling to preserve the oratory. The “second building” comprises the core of the church from the Martini Chapel, the second protruding chapel on the left from the church’s entrance, to the pietra d’Istria triumphal arch configuration at the eastern end of the nave in front of the high altar chapel. The Moro arms in the upper corners of the arch confirm that this work was commissioned by Doge Moro. (Figure 8) One part of this triumphal arch configuration, the little niche flanking the cappella grande on the right, came to commemorate the death of Francesco Marin, around 1502, suggesting that even if this triumphal arch configuration was not complete by Moro’s death in 1471, it was thirty years later.

The different height extensions of the pilasters of the side chapels on the north side of the nave show that the interior of San Giobbe was built in stages. The pilasters abut at the entrances to the Grimani and Martini chapels, the two closest to the entrance on the north of the nave, but

cusina et refett.o dormitorio vechio et ancora che ananza uno poco d’orterello in la chiesa picola vecchia habitava e celebrava messe et divini offici...”

Ibid.

6 September 1443, “Ego Andrea Gritti. Volo et ordineo corpus meum sepirij in ecclesia Sancti lob noviter fabricate in loco ubi dictis fratribus placuerit...”

ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, 43r: “Frati de San Francesco mai non se aricorda, ne ha aldido dir oratorio; over chiesa del ospedal non ma de s. Job, e li stava drati osservanti vecchi de s. Francesco huomeni religiosi, i qual officiava in detta chiesa vecchia dove al presente e Campo Santo in el qual In parte fu quello in edificata tre capelle, et il campaniel.”
the Martini pilaster capitals are lower than the Grimani pilasters. (Figure 54) The difference in height may have been a competitive gesture if the Grimani chapel was added on to the church after the Martini Chapel had been completed in the 1470s. A heavy cornice made of *pietra d’Istria* encircles the nave and transept right below the windows; it may have been installed before the elevation of the roof, but it serves to tie together the different spaces of the church and to unify the disparate heights of the altar frames. (Figure 55)

The *Memorie* place the “chiesa vecchia” or old church of San Giobbe, which I take to mean Contarini’s oratory, on the *fondamenta* of the Canal Regio and not in the chapel off the transept of the church as has been assumed. One testimony, presumably from a hospital official, given the use of possessive tense, states that, “Our church or oratory was on the side of the *fondamenta*, contiguous to our place and hospital and the door was near the canal where there is presently empty land.” 107 Another testimony specifies that San Giobbe was situated on the recently installed *fondamenta* of the Canal Regio: “The oratory built by Contarini had three altars and two doors, one of which was on the *fondamenta* of Cannaregio where there is now a niche with a Madonna.” 108 There is presently such a niche in the wall along the fondamenta of the Canal Regio. Though there is no documentary evidence for it in the sixteenth century, its rounded arch is similar to one depicted near the façade of San Giobbe in an eighteenth-century engraving. (Figure 56 & Figure 57) In short, the oratory as described lay along a canal and not off the transept of the church.

---

107 Ibid. “*Item che detta nostra chiesa overo oratorio era dalla banda della fondamenta et contigua al nostro loco, et hospedal e la porta era veiro el canal, et ora dove al presente e terren vacuo.*”

108 ASV, Scuole Piccole, Busta 260. “*Contarini fece fabbricar la chiesolla sive oratorio col titolo di S. Iobbe capacce di 3 Altari, 2 la Porta era su la fondamenta di Cannaregio nel sito proprio, che ora vi e un nuchio con una Madonna...*”
The site described by the *Memorie* for the oratory along the fondamenta corresponds to the placement of the building labeled “lob” in the 1500 Barbari View near the crossing of the current Tre Archi Bridge and the Ponte Saponella. *(Figure 38)* Given the distance of the building in the Barbari View from the church complex, the placement of the label seems pointed. There is a small residential building in roughly the same spot today that has a tabernacle on the exterior wall depicting a 1586 Pietà. It is unclear as to when the tabernacle was added, but it was likely inserted into the building at an earlier date, before it was used as a residence, and perhaps when it served a religious function. Later sixteenth and seventeenth views of Venice shift the label of the complex, “San Giobbe” to the main church. In his eighteenth-century map of the parish, Giovanni Battista Paganuzzi labeled a building in the same spot the “oratory of San Giobbe dell’ospedalleto.” *(Figure 58)* But the placement of the label in the Barbari View suggests that this small building was identified as one of the key components of San Giobbe by the artist. Based on the testimonies, it was likely that the fourteenth-century Contarini oratory was in the spot labeled “lob,” and that it was restored to the oratory of the Ospedalleto. Presumably, this is where the hospital administrators conducted their masses at the beginning of the sixteenth century, referred to in the Memorie as the Oratorio Nuovo.

The *Memorie* and a history of the confraternity of St. Bernardino at the church report that the original oratory was destroyed by the friars. A cumulative seventeenth-century history for the *scuola* of St. Bernardino of Siena states that the friars waited until after the deaths of Lucia Contarini in 1447 and the Republic’s Patriarch Lorenzo Giustiniani in 1451—who fought for the preservation of the oratory with the hospital governors—and flouted the 1441 ruling to preserve

---

the oratory of San Giobbe, by destroying it one night in 1456. Several accounts charge the friars with the destruction of the oratory, though the date of demolition frequently changes. One of the testimonies states that in about 1434, the church fell into ruin while another places the church in ruin around the time of the 1441 ruling. A 1516 document from a legal process between the governors of the hospital and the friars regarding the property and confines of the campo or space in front of the church states that in accordance with the wishes of Giovanni Contarini, the governors of the hospital must celebrate a mass in the oratory, “già rovinato,” or destroyed and it describes a new church that went up on the fondamenta. Whether it was destroyed or ruined by decay, one friar remembers taking the bricks from the old church as they fell and reusing them for building in the new church.

Prejudices and memory compromise the testimonies of the Memorie, but there are other indications that the present church was built on a site slightly removed from the older Contarini oratory. One of the testimonies specifies that the old church that was destroyed was in the Campo Santo (cemetery), marked on most plans of Venice between the present church and the Canal Regio. “There was a church on the side of the fondamenta and it had a door on the fondamenta towards the canal and now there is a Campo Santo (burial ground) contiguous to the

---

110 ASV, Scuole Piccole, Busta 260, f4, 1456, “...Fu distrutta la chiesolla o fusse oratorio de S. Job, fondamenta di notte tpo, dai Frati medesimi, riso loco publico, che si entrava in Chiesa nouva di San Bernardino: p Tre Porte cioe. La maggiore prima. La Seconda p il claustro, e la Terza ove ora el’altar di Sant’Antonio da Padova 9 anni doppo morta Lucia Contarini Dollin, et adesso e Campo Santo jus dal magto ecc.mo della Sanità. Che nell’anno 1491 della sua erezione prese possesso di tutti i Cimiterii, e cosi di questo...dopo aver quella di questo Santo sofferente Profetta loro stessi, di notte tempo, distruta del 1456 e reo Campo pubblico, ora camposanto, non avendo ardito, di disfarla, se non doppo la morte di Lucia Contarini Dollin 1447 e di Lorenzo Giustinian 1451 che e non essere benestante, vengono ad essere anco esenti, da dispendii de Lite, da disturb, e dall’odio fratico, che q la troppa loro capidita, e solecitudine delle cose temporali, in apropiarcele come fanno qui soi decadono dalla stima e venerazione dovuta a religiosi.”

111 ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 6, 1501, “Che anni circa 34, che la detta nostra chiesa vene nostra a ruvina overo fo ruinada.... ma visi ben i frati desfava la Chiesa vecchia e in fra la chiesa Vecchia el era un pozzo serado dei frati, e adesso hanno fatto Campo Santo per sepelir morti.”

112 ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, xlix, 16r.
chapel of the big church and there was a well in the center in which the old church was.” The church repeatedly mentioned in the *Memorie* on the *fondamenta* of the Canal Regio took up space near the Campo Santo. (Figure 59 & Figure 60) If it were destroyed as the friars petitioned, then it would free up space for more burials.

One of the memories of the church from 1502 states that, “Zuanne Contarini was buried in the said old church where the Campo Santo stands at present.” In Contarini’s 1407 testament, he took credit for building the oratory near the hospital and “place,” *loco*, of San Giobbe. He was originally buried in the building he founded judging from the slab inscription copied by Cicogna. It reads, Here lies the all holy noble and venerable priest Giovanni Contarini, founder of this church and place, San Giobbe…” (Figure 61) Thus, his slab was located in the oratory of San Giobbe as he requested in his testament. However, in a document from the eighteenth century, Contarini’s burial is specified as “near the gardens, behind the sacristy” of San Giobbe. Contarini’s effaced slab was eventually inserted into the wall of a small chapel along the *fondamenta*, in order to avoid further damage. But if the oratory now in the present church was Contarini’s original site of burial, why would his monument have been removed completely from the oratory and not set into the wall there? The difficult journey of a burial slab from the oratory to another site in the complex seems implausible; in general, slabs are removed from the floor to

---

113 ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, xlvi, 43r. “Che era una chiesa dalla banda della fondamenta, et haveva la porta su la fondamenta verso el canal, et adesso e campo santo contiguo alla capella della chiesa sudetta grande et era uno pozzo al mezo de i frati, nellqual chiesa vecchia habitva…”


a wall for preservation. Based on the following memorial testimony entry from 1502, Contarini’s body was moved to the present church of San Giobbe. We can then infer that at some point, it was moved to its present location which at one point served the confraternity of the Pieta. It was restored and used for mass in the eighteenth century.\footnote{ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, xlvi, 68v. “28 Maggio 1711. Ill.mo et rev.mo Monsignor Patriarca. Essendo stato ristaurato dalla pietà e carità de Fratelli della Vener.a Congregation del Confalone di S. Bernardino vicino alla Chiesa di S. Giobbe dentro il confini di S. Geremia il loro antico Oratorio, non desiderando che l’Opera pia esercitata gli abbia da levare, o interrompere l’antichissimo in cui sono di far celebrare la Santa Messa nel medesimo. Perciò umilmente supplicano essi Fratelli l’innata e sempre grande bonta di il Illustra, erev.ma accio si degni concedere la facoltà per la benedizione solita praticarsi in casi simili a chi meglio a lei parerà senza che s’abbia d’incontrarne spesa di sorte per tale effetto, atesa l’incredibile povertà di detta congregazione. Grazie.”}

What is likely is that the oratory he founded was destroyed and moved to the new church based on the following document:

There was an old church above the Canal Grande (The Canal Regio) which was used by the friars and, with the consent of Brother Marco Querini with other friars they governed the old church. After the death of Lucia Dolphin, they destroyed the old church near the well head where they buried the dead. Doge Cristoforo Moro made a new church with a high altar chapel on the land going towards the dormitory of the friars. In the older smaller church there was a tomb which was placed in the new church, this I remember.\footnote{Ibid., 44r: “...l’era una chiesa vecchia sora el canal grande, la qual chiesa era frati, e de conscenti m. Fra Marco Querini con alcuni frati e governava quella chiesa vecchia, e da poi el fu fatto su uno terren verso el dormitorio de frati, e dopoi la morte de Madonna Lucia Dolphin, el fo geta zoso la chiesa vecchia, e della sponza del Pozzo el fo fatto terrem e sepeli se morti: e m lo dose m christoforo moro fece far la chiesa nova la capella granda sul terren andava al dormitorio de frati, e la chiesa picolla vecchia era un arca, la qual fo messa in la chiesa nova sic he questo me recordo.”}

Another testimony specifically identifies the tomb that was moved as Giovanni Contarini’s.\footnote{ASV, San Giobbe 5, 43r: “Item ...M. Zuane Contarini esser sta sepulto in detta chiesa vecchia dove al presente e campo santo e fatta questa chiesa nova fu porta el so corpo in questa Chiesa Nova, ma ex visu suo dixit non vidisse.”}

Despite the testimonials which placed it along the fondamenta, it is difficult to determine with certainty that the chapel in the church was not the 1389 oratory of San Giobbe. One of the strongest problems with defining the position of the early oratory of San Giobbe lies is the location of Lucia Contarini’s burial. In her 1418 testament, Lucia requested burial in front of the
door of the church of San Giobbe. Her tomb marker does not exist anymore, but the epigrapher Emmanuele Cicogna located the inscription in the cloister of the church, close to the chapel that scholars have called the 1389 oratory. Lucia Contarini died in October 1447 so her burial wishes may have been changed, may not have been honored, or her burial inscription had been placed in the cloister as many inscriptions and fragments presently line the courtyards of several Renaissance churches. Alternatively, she may have been placed where she wished in front of a new church to San Giobbe, but that would seem odd given her fight to protect the oratory established by her father.

Selling the Church: Commemoration at San Giobbe

Even before the 1441 ruling to preserve the oratory of San Giobbe initiated by Giovanni Contarini, there were motions made to expand the church. The 1389 dedication of the St. Job oratory did not signal the end of that phase of building. In 1396, just seven years after the dedication of the oratory of San Giobbe, money was left “for the building of the church of San Giobbe. In 1428, Pope Martin V sanctioned a “future chapel” at San Giobbe. A history of the confraternity of San Bernardino at San Giobbe states that the new church went up in 1435, indicating that when the papal delegates obliged the friars to keep the oratory in 1441, the

---

119 ASV, Canellerie Inferiore, Misc. Test. Notai diversi. Atti Denti Cristoforo, Busta, 24, n, 1441, 17 August 1418. Testament of Lucia Contarini Delfin. “Questo volo che sia el mio testamento ela mia ultima volonta di me. Proma volo chel mio corpo sia sopolito in nanzi la porta di la chiezia di Santo Jopo in volta in una stuora che non di di sia ne per vedi di ne starii sono gli d la chiesia. Di san jopo ne loca nesuna. Sono qual che chandeloto di oper eli che se teoica in la chiezia et laso in largo di lanima ai mie come fazii che non faza la di terza mente.”

120 BMC, Gradenigo Dolfin: 10 ottobre 1445; qui jace la venerabil Donna Madonna Luia Dolfin da San Jopo, e Madonna Cecilia sua figo, requiescant in pace.

121 ASV, Testamenti, Busta 728, Not. Boccasin, Marco, n. 319. 27 June 1396, “Item demitto pro fabrica ecclesie S. Job ducatum unum auri.”
conflict concerned preservation more than growth; expansion had already been planned. At this early date, development was not hindered by the ruling, but it was engendered by the will of the friars who seem to have had an agenda that reached beyond that of the hospital board.

If expansion on the church continued with the offending oratory still in existence, then why would the friars have petitioned for its destruction rather than its preservation? While the pursuit for a larger church at San Giobbe seemingly contradicts the Observants' claims to asceticism, the enlargements would have supplied the church with more spots for burial. Enlargements and renovations to churches were partially pursued due to the growing demand for private chapels and the church's willingness to profit from them. In exchange for a donation, mendicant churches provided burial space for the laity. Formal recognition of lay burial within churches provided one of the most transformative effects on church design. During the Middle Ages, private chantry and burial chapels began to line the naves of churches and radiate out from their apses. Contributions for a burial chapel afforded the donor an environment in which to shape his spiritual and civic identity, as the patron generally assumed responsibility for the chapel construction and the decorative scheme. Private chapels served as miniature mausolea for the family of the donor, who would then acquire burial rights and extend them to descendents. These chapels did not always transform the dimensions of the church; altars were often placed against the wall of the church's nave to provide a point of reference for the direction of prayers, particularly in the large, aisleless halls of the mendicants. By the fifteenth century, there were

---

122 ASV, Scuole Piccole, Busta 260, The history of the scuola is based on documents now lost and was written over 250 years after the events described (P. D.) “...fu principiata, a fabbracar la nuova Chiese, dedicate a S. Bernardino da Siena.”

123 Goldthwaite, 1980, 12 and 98. According to Goldthwaite, most of the city's rebuilding was begun to fulfill a desire for chapels.
more than six hundred privately held chapels in Florentine churches. The mendicants likely contributed to this surge, as they did at the Frari and Santi Giovanni and Paolo in Venice. The Observant Franciscan churches of San Francesco della Vigna and San Giobbe had to compete for worshippers with the Conventual Frari, where burial was sanctioned in 1256, and which attracted more worshippers than the Observant churches.

Scholars have attributed the relaxing of prohibitions against lay burials first to the mendicant orders, but in 1217, the Cistercians began to bury the laity with the permission of their parish priests. The mendicants granted burial rights soon after in exchange for fees. In 1227, the Dominicans received papal authorization to bury the laity. Previously, only saints, popes, and royalty were allowed burial in Dominican churches. The Franciscans won formal approval to bury the laity soon after in 1250.

Given the prominent role of the mendicants in burying the dead since the thirteenth century, it is not surprising that the friars wanted more space at San Giobbe. After the mendicant orders received papal permission to house burials during the thirteenth century and accept payment for them, burial by the mendicants escalated. Testaments asking for burial at San Giobbe, in particular, often specify a sum of about twenty ducats a year to be left to the church in exchange

---

128 In 1253, the Franciscans were allowed to stop paying a fourth of the burial fee to the parish, *Bull. Fran.* 1, 537, 669.
for private masses to be said on the anniversary of death for the salvation of the testators’ soul. Requests for masses allowed a social relationship to extend into the afterlife for it bound the friar to intercede with prayer for the deceased but also ensured a continued sustenance for the convent through payment. With a bigger and sturdier church, more burial space could be made available, more private chapels purchased, and subsequently, more Offices for the Dead sold and stipends provided to hold scheduled masses for the soul of a family’s deceased. Occasionally, private owners ceded rights over masses to a confraternity in order to attract a greater number of worshippers to the masses said at their sepulcher. The act of creating a space which focuses suffrages for the dead—including prayers and masses—enlisted the living in helping the dead reach salvation through prayer.

In 1443, when Andrea Gritti—not the doge—requested burial within the “newly built church of San Giobbe,” he specified that the interment could occur, “in a place which pleases the friars.” He then asked for a stone slab to mark the site at which his body was buried. That this Gritti left the exact location of his burial in the hands of the friars demonstrates their concern with the practice. Burial at San Giobbe attracted several people clearly drawn to the presence of the friars, but donations of land to the hospital from several testators who also donated land and requested burial at the church demonstrates that a church’s proximity to one’s parish often did determine burial location.

---

130 6 September 1443, “Ego Andrea Gritti. Volo et ordineo corpus meum sepriij in ecclesia Sancti Iob noviter fabricate in loco ubi dictis fratribus placeret, et in una capsa lignej inclusum et cohopta panno beretino qui panus remanere debeat dictis fratribus et accipiatur tantum panum quod fierj posit una cappa... et dimitto dicto monasterio pro una palla fienda in dicta ecclesia et antipalla duc.rum triginta aurii pro anima mea ad unum ex altaribus fiendis sub parcu in media ecclesia ad pedem cuius altaris michi gratissimum foret corpus meum cum dicta capsa in terra tumulatum et per meos commisarioos fabricarj facere unum lapidem super unum lapidem super dicto corpore meo.”

131 Muir, “Virgin on the Street Corner,” 32-3. Muir writes that neighborhood parishes were not strong in Venice and that burial often occurred far from home. While this was the case for the larger mendicant churches, San Giobbe did attract several locals for burial.
The influx of private contributions to a religious order meant to represent spiritual impoverishment compromised the Franciscan project. The new burial allowances raised theological and proprietary debates among the Franciscans now formally permitted to conduct interment. Because burial came with the attendant fees the deceased would leave to the order, some friars believed that the practice went against their tenets of usus pauperus. The friars debated the necessity and sanctity of providing burial in their churches throughout their early existence. A 1303 statute decreed that no one is to be buried in a Franciscan church unless deemed by the custodians of the church to be of meritorious dignity or sanctity. It was also decided that the “brothers should not seek burial fees through lawsuits or violence.” There was a rift between mendicant burial practice and the order’s codified prescriptions which defy study of how consciously the friars adhered to defined burial regulations.

One of the first major defenses of burial came from Pierre Jean Olivi (1248-98) who reminded the friars that since they did not own property but that property was managed and legally owned by the order’s lay procurators, they would not be held responsible for financial transactions associated with the burial. He wrote that, “Burying the dead is a work of mercy, spiritual and in no way out of harmony with the evangelical perfection. Having the right to bury is not contrary to the highest poverty,” if it is done without cupidity. The friars should

---

132 This idea has been discussed by several historians of Franciscan policy including David Burr. For more information on how Usus Pauperus relates to patronage: Louise Bourdua, The Franciscans and Art Patronage in Late Medieval Italy, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004, chapter 1.
133 G. Fussenegger, O.F.M., Statuta Provinciae Alemaniae superioris annis 1303, 1309 et 1341 condita, 233; Memoriali, Statuti ed Atti di Capitoli Generali dei Frati Minori inediti dei secoli XIII e XIV, ed. G. Abate, MF 33 (1933), 22. On order of the pope, people should be buried in family burial sites. In Narbonne, at the General Chapter of 1260, it was decided that no one should be buried in Franciscan vestments if it can be avoided and in the 1279 chapter of Assisi, Jerome is reiterated with an amendment that the burial party should reimburse the church. Burial should take place in a family sepulcher and no litigation should occur over bodies.
134 Ibid.
concentrate their burial efforts not on the sticky issues of payment, but the "spiritual right concerning the body." St. Antoninus, the Dominican archbishop of Florence, offered three reasons for burial in "loco sacro:" for the intercession of the saints in whose honor the church was built; for the faithful to offer prayers for the deceased; and because the dead would be assured of rest undisturbed by demons. In reality, however, the friars buried the rich more often than the poor.

The interior of San Giobbe, like several other mendicant churches throughout Renaissance Europe, developed into a portfolio of memorial inscriptions. Many churches even mapped out burial sites and slabs in early plans of the church incorporating the memorials into the layout. In the nineteenth century, Emmanuele Cicogna recorded several inscriptions in the cortile of the church and within the nave that are no longer extant. A contemporary plan of the church by the Soprintendenza per i Beni Architettonici gives an idea of the placement of the surviving burial slabs, but not of the scores of extant testamentary requests for burial in San Giobbe since its inception. (Figure 62) The first definitive signs of lay burial at San Giobbe occurred outside of the church. The burial grounds enveloped the small building at the intersection of the two bridges in the Barbari View that I have identified as the fourteenth-century oratory of San Giobbe. In an eighteenth-century engraving of the fondamenta San Giobbe, along the Canal
Regio, a hint of cypress trees peak out from a fence in the vicinity of the cemetery. (Figure 63)

In the 1846 plan of Venice by Bernardo e Gaetano Combatti, the cemetery is clearly demarcated and spans the entire breadth of land between the church and the Canal Regio.¹⁴² (Figure 64 & Figure 60)

In 1434, the same year in which Lucia Dolfin relinquished control over San Giobbe, the friars received jurisdiction over a cemetery in the vicinity of the hospital and oratory, likely the one demarcated by the visual resources.¹⁴³ Even though burial administration remained in the hands of the friars at San Giobbe, the Magistero della Sanità officially assumed control of the cemetery in 1491. In 1509, the friars unsuccessfully challenged the hospital’s construction of a wall to enclose the cemetery.¹⁴⁴ The enclosure would create a definitive ceiling on how many lay burials the friars could permit on church property and how many donations for Offices of the Dead could be received.

The growing number of confraternities at San Giobbe would have facilitated burial. In Venice, the administration of burial was not relegated solely to the ecclesiasts or the mendicant orders, but the numerous confraternities regulated by the commune.¹⁴⁵ While the confraternities specialized in providing charitable services to the poor, they were also principally concerned with ensuring burial privileges to its paying members and the clientele of the hospital in need. Because it existed since the inception of the hospice in the late fourteenth century, the confraternity to St. Job likely ensured burial at the church for its members before the

¹⁴³ ASV, San Giobbe, XLIII, 12r. 10 January 1434. “...in vestrò territorio possitis facere, et ordinare unum Cimiterium omnibus modis, via, et forma, quibus melius possum de lure vobis concede; ita tamen, quod dictum cimiterium remaneat ditto loco Sancto Job nostril Ordinis Subiectum, et sub fratrum eiusdem omnimodam. Jurisdictionem; dummod in dicto Cimiterio sepellianti quicumque nominandi per dictam do’am Luciam...”
¹⁴⁴ ASV, Scuole Piccole, Busta 260, 2 May 1509, “Chiamor a favor dell’ospital di S. job contro i frati, un muro, che serra il Campo Santo.”
confraternity to Bernardino was initiated in the early 1450s. But extant testimonies requesting burial in San Giobbe suggest that in the second half of the fifteenth century, more burials were requested at the church, presumably after San Giobbe became the focus of devotion to the new saint, Bernardino of Siena, and after the confraternity devoted to Bernardino began. That the confraternity dedicated to San Bernardino at San Giobbe eventually fell under the jurisdiction of the White Penitents or the Arch confraternity of the Gonfalon established in Rome to carry out charitable and burial services for the poor confirms that the confraternity was concerned with burial.\textsuperscript{146}

Requests for burial in the church were frequently made by members of the confraternity, which would ensure that their wishes would be carried out as ordered. Several members of the confraternity were widows, for example, who requested burial in the habit of the Third Order of Franciscans, the Poor Clares.\textsuperscript{147} The proximity of the confraternities to the cemetery of San Giobbe along the fondamenta and the regularity with which they buried members can be deduced from a case of theft in the eighteenth century. While the friars of the confraternity of Santa Maria della Pieta attended a funeral, one of the members made off with a silver candelabrum from the confraternity meeting house, presumably because he could see from a window that the other members were out of sight.\textsuperscript{148}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[146]{ASV, Scuole Piccole, Busta 260, 6 February 1584. The confraternity is called Santa Maria del Gonfalone e di San Bernardino. Sergio Pagano, L'archivio dell'arciconfraternita del Gonfalone: cenni storici e inventario.}
\footnotetext[147]{ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 7, f. 60. "IHS. In nome di dio amen 1464 die 30 luio... Di in vole chel còpo suo sia sepellia i lo logo di Santo Job e Bernardino in Canarexo. In labito di terzo ordine di santo francescho al qual ordine lassa per lo vestir e lor fadiga duox 4 per suoi i comissarioni ordinin e vuole che sia el nobile..." Crouzet Pavan, 793.}
\footnotetext[148]{ASV, Provedittore del Comun, Reg. N. Matricola of the scuola of S. Job, 87 and notes of the scuola of Santa Maria della Pieta in San Giobbe from 1796. A member of the confraternity named Nonzolo Antonio Bianchi stole a candelabrum while the brothers were in the Campo Santo burying a dead confraternity member. He sold the object two days later to the goldsmith on the Rialto.}
\end{footnotes}
Conclusion

The common descriptions of patronage during the Renaissance give a picture of a rising mercantile class searching for ways to display their newfound wealth. Palaces, private chapels, fresco cycles, or renovation projects announced the patron’s legitimate power and persuasion in local, ecclesiastical, or worldly affairs. Just as the patrons wished to convey that they had obtained their wealth honorably, an artistic or architectural commission could demonstrate that they spent it that way as well. By providing sustained relief to an institution like the church patrons demarcated sites of personal authority as a testimony to their wealth.

But spending was imperiled by Christian unease with the initial profit, particularly by the growing mercantile economy. Ancient sources were mined for accepted wisdom about civic values that would provide justification for spending lavish sums on art and architecture. Humanist writers and statesmen accommodated those patrons who reinvigorated the economy, decimated after the Black Death, by justifying expenditure on building as a contribution to communal beautification. The defenses of expenditure resonate with the desire among financiers to avert accusations of cupidity and usury. As A. D. Fraser Jenkins explained in his article on Cosimo de Medici’s patronage, Renaissance writers framed spending in terms of ancient theories of magnificence. In *Della Famiglia*, Alberti writes that, “One can with their riches acquire fame and authority in things great and noble with largesse and magnificence,” echoing similar sentiments on magnificence held by Aristotle. By praising the tenacity of the prosperous,


150 Aristotle, *Nichomachean Ethics*: “For, as the name itself suggests, it is a fitting expenditure involving largeness of scale.... Therefore the result should be worthy of the expense, and the expense should be worthy of the result, or should even exceed it. And the magnificent man will spend such sums for honor’s sake; for this is common to the virtues.” Leon Battista Alberti, *Della Famiglia* The Family in Renaissance Florence, translation by Renée Neu Watkins, Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1969. “On can acquire fame and authority with riches and grow in things great and noble with largesse and magnificence.”
writers such as Leonardo Bruni encouraged improvements to the city by fostering a sense that expenditure was a virtue. Magnificence was not associated with opulence nor could it be stylistically perceived, but it came through in the virtuous act of spending for the res publica.

The fifteenth-century bibliophile Poggio Bracciolini came to a similar conclusion: that economic gain was fine as long as spending was undertaken for the communal good. During the Renaissance, the diatribe against greed was rooted in condemnations of sin, but it also resounded with republican criticisms of activity undertaken for individual material accumulation. In On Avarice, Poggio devises an apocryphal debate on the demerits of avarice against lust. When the discourse ended, Andrew of Constantinople offered a conclusion by paraphrasing Cicero. He said, “Nothing is more indicative of a mean spirit and narrow mind than the love of wealth, nothing more commendable and glorious than to despise money, when one has it not, and, if one has, to spend it bounteously and liberally.” During the fifteenth century, “liberal expenditure” was posited as the opposite of avarice and served as a sign of magnificence.

Donations to the voluntary poor became a popular mode of displaying one’s virtue as a patron and ecclesiasts like Timoteo Maffei often concurred. Maffei was an Augustinian who praised Cosimo di Medici’s spending on the convents of the spiritually poor. Not unlike Doge Moro, Cosimo’s patronage of the Augustinian canons at the Badia at Fiesole, his patronage of

---

151 Leonardo Bruni, The Humanism of Leonardo Bruni: Selected Texts, translated by James Hankins, Binghamton: MRTS, 1987, 275. “What about avarice? Is it not a difficult passion to bridle? There is a virtue called liberality which combats this species of immoderation. It is a certain mean between getting and spending, removed on the one hand from sordid avarice, and equally from thoughtless prodigality.... The liberal man is midway between these two: he understands where, when, and how much to take in and pay out, and by following reason and by practice he soon forms a habit of so acting.”


154 Ibid.

155 Fraser Jenkins, 164.
the Observant Franciscans in the Mugello, and the Dominicans at San Marco in Florence illustrates how expenditure, paradoxically, engendered an aesthetic announcing the ideal of apostolic poverty or spiritual humility.

The countless requests for burial at churches overseen by ascetic religious orders illustrates that as patrons prepared for death, they undertook visual and spatial measures to align themselves with religious orders as they prepared for death. In the case of San Giobbe, testators often requested burial at the church because they resided in the parish or they were members of a confraternity associated with the church, but frequently, testators make reference to the Franciscan Observants as a group with whom they would like to be affiliated by leaving money to all the churches in a city associated with the order.

At San Giobbe, Doge Moro seems to have been partaking in the form of patronage that allowed the religious orders to benefit from a financial investment in building. When Moro was elected doge, congratulatory letters praised his piety, suggesting that in his political career before doge, he had established himself as religious.156 His patronage of the hospice and church of San Giobbe and the Observants would have given public definition to those assessments of Moro. Doge Moro was noted for his piety above all else. His expenditure at San Giobbe helped cultivate that image.

156 BNM.Lat.XIII.90, f.65r. (=4143).
Chapter 3

What did Doge Moro do at San Giobbe?

The Historiography of San Giobbe: The Direction of Past Research

If the original Contarini Oratory was the first phase of building that was described by the Memorie, subsequent stages have served as the point of inquiry for modern scholarship. Pietro Paoletti’s *L’architettura e la Scultura del Rinascimento in Venezia*, provided one of the first studies of San Giobbe.¹ He put forth a chronology for work done at the church throughout the fifteenth century based on Doge Moro’s 1470 testament and land donations. His close examinations of the figural sculpture throughout the church and the vegetal and filigree patterns on the pilasters to determine the authorship of Pietro Lombardo have determined the course of inquiry into the church.

Due to the absence of a named architect or designer for the work at San Giobbe in the documents, save for one passing mention in Moro’s will to a stonecutter named Antonio, the accepted chronology and attribution of the church derive from Paoletti’s division of work at San Giobbe into two phases by different workshops. *(Figure 53)* Paoletti set the first phase—work on the nave, and, according to him, plans for the long retro choir—to around 1450, the time of the first mention of Moro in documents and the occasion of his personal saint protector, Bernardino da Siena’s canonization. The reconstructions of San Giobbe and Doge Moro’s work at the church generally begin with epigraphical fragments. In his 1581 guide to Venice, Francesco Sansovino used an inscription in front of the confraternity house to St. Bernardino of Siena at the church to date Moro’s involvement with San Giobbe to the 1450 canonization of

Bernardino. Bernardino had allegedly predicted Moro’s election as doge, stimulating the invention of a vivid mythology about the sanctification of Moro’s election.²

Paoletti’s division of work roughly corresponds to that put forth in the Memorie about building at the church. Paoletti placed the beginning of the second phase of construction at San Giobbe to the time of Doge Moro’s 1470 will for it left money to continue work on the church. He believed that the decoration of the church was completed in this period: the centralized square chancel with Moro’s burial slab, the triumphal arch between the nave and the chancel consisting of a large central entry arch framed by two smaller archways with altar niches, the Martini Chapel, and the decoration of the entire church.

Paoletti’s chronology and his attribution of San Giobbe to Antonio Gambello after 1450 and then to Pietro Lombardo after the Doge’s death have been taken as authoritative, although the documentary evidence linking the architects to the church is scant. There is no mention of any designer in the documents pertaining to the church. A notarized codicil to Moro’s testament dating to 29 October 1471, stipulates that the chapel should continue according to “orders given,” by Moro to “Maistro Antonio tajapera de S. Zacaria over per quelo de S. Severo.”³ Based on this description, Paoletti attributed the first phase of work at San Giobbe to Antonio Gambello, the architect in charge of the church of San Zaccaria after 1463.⁴ Stylistically, there are few similarities between San Giobbe and San Zaccaria to suggest that the Proto could have been the same. Gambello has also been named by modern historians as the Proto of San Giobbe

---
³ ASV, Testamenti, Busta 1238, nos. 178 and 188, with a copy in ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, XLVI.
⁴ Paoletti, 529. Robert Munman, Venetian Renaissance Tomb Monuments, PhD Dissertation, Harvard University, 1968, 194. Munman dismissed Paoletti’s attributions of the church to Antonio Gambello in favor of Rizzo for he says that Moro fostered Rizzo when he commissioned him to sculpt the three altars at San Marco in 1465 and when he assigned the completion of the Arco Foscari to Rizzo in 1462.
due to the similarities between the large arch which frames the high altar of San Giobbe that which adorned the newly constructed gate at the Arsenale, Venice’s shipbuilding and arms warehouse. Gambello has never been properly placed at the Arsenale.\textsuperscript{5} Several scholars have attributed the Arsenale gate to Gambello based on his post as military consultant to Venice, but there is no other evidence to link him to the Arsenale.

Cesare Bernasconi identified the “maestro Antonio” of Moro’s testament not as Gambello, but the sculptor Antonio Rizzo.\textsuperscript{6} According to Paoletti, Rizzo resided in a house in the parish run by nuns from S. Zaccaria, the location of “Antonio” indicated in Moro’s will. The reference in Moro’s codicil to San Zaccaria is more likely an abode in the parish rather than the church of San Zaccaria where Antonio Gambello was believed to have been the Proto. Recently, Matteo Ceriana also dismissed the previous attributions of the church to Antonio Gambello in favor of Rizzo. He bases the change in attribution of Rizzo’s previous work for Moro. Moro commissioned Rizzo to sculpt the three altars at San Marco in the early 1460s and he assigned the completion of the Arco Foscari to Rizzo in 1462.\textsuperscript{7} Rizzo is mentioned in the 1469 receipt for work on the altars in San Marco as stonecutter, \textit{lapicida}—like the \textit{tajapietra} from Moro’s codicil—from the neighborhood of San Giovanni Novo, near San Zaccaria.\textsuperscript{8}

While determining an author for San Giobbe undermines the importance of the workshop, the attribution of the church has been worked out largely by the style of ornamentation. Floral, vegetative, and urn patterns in the pilasters at San Giobbe and the exterior portal are reminiscent of the designs of the altars by Rizzo for Moro in the transept of San Marco. (\textbf{Figure 34}) These

\textsuperscript{5} Ennio Concina, \textit{L’Arsenale della Repubblica di Venezia: tecniche e istituzioni dal medioevo all’et\'a moderna}, Milan: Electa, 1988, 63
\textsuperscript{6} C. Bernasconi, \textit{Intorno alla Vita e le Opere di Antonio Rizzo}, Venice, 1959, 32. Bernasconi believes that the “Maistro Antonio” of Moro’s will is the sculptor Antonio Rizzo. Anna Schulz, 1983, 119.
\textsuperscript{7} Ceriana, 23.
\textsuperscript{8} Malipiero, 1893, ii, 147. “Ser Antonious Rizo lapicida de confini Sancti Johannes Novi...” After a 1483 fire devastated the Palazzo Ducale, Malipiero writes that “Antonio Rizzo, stonecutter was named supervisor.”
modes of ornamentation were commonly found in ancient sources and were revived in painting and sculpture. With Rizzo, Moro helped introduce a structural and ornamental vocabulary to Venice widely mimicked for its evocations of an antique aedicule. Several patrons of early modern manuscripts employed similar imagery on their title pages as framing devices for their coats-of-arms contemporaneous to the execution of the altars in San Marco. Both Antonio Rizzo and Pietro Lombardo are credited with the introduction of the same tradition into Venice—the floral and vegetative articulating pattern that can be seen on the friezes and pilasters of San Giobbe. The leafy capitals and vegetation of the transept altars, the chancel pilasters, the presbytery arch and frieze, with their vines, calyxes, and urns also became a trademark of the Lombardo family and their workshop. Both artists, Rizzo and Lombardo, followed each others’ careers closely as the most employed sculptors in Venice during the second half of the fifteenth century.

Paoletti identified Pietro Lombardo’s hand at San Giobbe through stylistic evidence, but in equal measure, from a 1485 epistolary reference to the artist. Matteo Collaccio reaped praise on San Giobbe in a letter to Cristoforo and Lorenzo da Lendinara: “You are illustrious, Padova, for your buildings, your citizens, and for your ingeniousness! You are illustrious also for the art of the celebrated sculptor Pietro Lombardo! He brought the marble vaults to life. Yesterday, I admired his sculpture in the church of San Giobbe.” The artist, however, is not cited in

---

10 Peter Humfrey, *Painting in Renaissance Venice*, Yale University Press, c1995, 204. Humfrey claimed Rizzo completed the altar frame of St. Vincenzo Ferrer at Santi Giovanni and Paolo, while it had previously been attributed to Rizzo while employed by the workshop of Pietro Lombardo.
11 Collaccio mentions San Giobbe in a letter to Cristoforo and Lorenzo da Lendinara, Venice, 1486. “Clares, Patavinum urbe, clares civitate, clares et his ingeniis, clares etiam arte statuarii clarissimi, horum affinis, Petri Lombardi. E duct h ic etiam vivos de marmore vultus, cuius statuas in Divi lob aede pridie sum plurimum miratus.” Collaccio’s letter to Cristoforo and Lorenzo da Lendinara was printed in the *Philological Opacula*, Venice 1486. G. Mariacher, “Pietro Lombardo a Venezia.” *A. Ven.* IX (1955): 39. Mariacher believes that the letter suggests that Lombardo completed the chancel. San Giobbe is the first recorded architectural undertaking attributed to the
Because Collaccio declared that Lombardo brought "vaults to life," it would seem he was referring to the figural work at San Giobbe: the putti in the spandrels of the chancel or the figures of Saints Bernardino, Anthony, and Louis, once on the portal, though the sculpture is described as "in" the church. (Figure 65 & Figure 66) The physiognomy of the putti in the presbytery at San Giobbe are remarkably similar to those on Pietro Lombardo's monument to Doge Antonio Roselli in the Santo in Padua begun in 1464 and finished by 8 April 1467. Collaccio likely wrote about the chancel figures, which would offer a 1485 terminus ante quem for its completion. Pietro Lombardo had also executed a slab tomb for Jacopo Pavini in Il Santo in 1467, which has since been removed, but presumably, the Doge would have seen Lombardo's work.

Pietro Lombardo is more often credited with, and in many cases documented as, the designer of churches. He was named as the architect in charge of the building of Santa Maria in Miracoli in 1481, about ten years after Paoletti placed him at San Giobbe. It is likely that both Rizzo and Lombardo worked at San Giobbe, but that each had help from their workshops. Throughout the church, there are slight variations in the ornamentation. Even within the high altar chapel, the front and the rear corner pilasters were obviously worked by different hands. There is an economy of line in the ornamentation placed in the rear pilasters as opposed to the fuller vegetative ornamentation of the front pilasters in the bay which holds the tomb of Moro. The variation in size between the front and rear pilasters indicates a time difference between the installation and therefore different artists as well. The chapel was likely elongated into its current

---

12 Ceriana, 23. Ceriana believes that the tondi held by putti in the pendentives of San Giobbe were copied for a lost fresco of the Oratory of San Sebastian and Mark at Padua before 1481.
square for the faces of the front arch pilasters are equal in width while each side of the rear
presbytery pilasters is different in width and thinner.

San Giobbe has been categorized as one the first examples of the so-called Tuscan
Renaissance styles to appear in Venice based on two parts of the church in particular—the high
altar chapel with Moro’s tomb and the Martini Chapel off the nave of the church. The designs for
these chapels derived from Florence. The heavy arched opening of the high altar chapel into a
symmetrical space framed by fluted pilasters and crowned with tondi of the evangelists is like
the Old Sacristy at San Lorenzo; the Martini Chapel is also symmetrical with fluted pilasters but
it has a terracotta ceiling by Andrea della Robbia, much like that of the Chapel of the Cardinal
of Portugal in San Minato. (Figure 67 & Figure 68) That these are ostensibly the first obvious
appearances of Florentine motifs in Venice has ensconced the analytical work on the church of
San Giobbe in questions of stylistic attribution and authorship.\textsuperscript{13} Significantly, Tuscan artists
such as Antonio Rossellino and Francisco di Simone Ferruci are only believed to have worked in
the Martini Chapel around 1475, while the other artists believed to have contributed to the design
of San Giobbe, Antonio Rizzo from Verona and Pietro Lombardo from Como, came from
Venetian territories within the terraferma.

The design and decorative similarities between San Giobbe and the chapels in Florence has
been noted by scholars like Marvin Trachtenberg, who assessed the stylistic similarities between
several Renaissance chapels, including San Giobbe, and the Old Sacristy, to expose an emerging

\textsuperscript{13} Herbert Dellwing, \textit{Kirchenbaukunst des späten Mittelalters in Venetien}, Worms: Wernersche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1990, 64. Keydel, 1970, 151-62. Lombardo’s first documented work in the Veneto was the tomb of Doge Antonio Rosselli at the Santo in Padua. The arch framing the tomb is similar to that of San Giobbe in that it has the layers of he is not formally documented in Venice until August 1474. Camillo Semenzato, “Pietro e Tullio Lombardo Architetti.” \textit{Bollettino di Studi Andrea Palladio}. (1964). Matteo Ceriana, “Due esercizi di lettura: la cappella Moro in San Giobbe e le fabbriche dei Gussoni a Venezia,” \textit{Annali di architettura} n° 4-5 (1992/93), 23.
type based on taste and political alliances. While I will try to build on some of Trachtenberg’s conclusions about the Old Sacristy in particular to assess how the Medici-funded design was adapted for burials, I avoid the issue of style. Stylistic evaluations have been analyzed in the context of Venetian architecture but they have not aided in mapping out chronology and meaning, nor do they help determine the elusive architectural workshop responsible for San Giobbe. Based on Trachtenberg’s analysis, in order to determine the nature of Doge Moro’s work at San Giobbe, I searched for points of connection between the doge and the Medici in Florence to understand if similarities in patronage extended beyond the similarities in burial arrangements. I also evaluated the relationship between the Doge and his personal saint-protector, Bernardino of Siena, based the numerous references to Bernardino in the testament of Doge Moro.

The Holy Man Claims Venice

During his sermons throughout the city-states, Bernardino did not always remember Rome warmly when he recalled his treatment there during his 1426 trial for heresy. He also berated the Florentines for their spending practices, building lavish chapels to give the veneer of repentance. Throughout the city-states, however, Bernardino conferred particular praise on Venice as an example of good government, one that had avoided the factionalism which the preacher had witnessed in his native Tuscany. He accepted all of its claims of serene

---

17 Origo, 32.
Republicanism and stable stewardship. During a sermon in Siena, where factionalism was rampant, Bernardino extolled the concordance of Venice: "O Venice! How much glory you have! How do you maintain yourself so well? O, my fellow citizens, do you know the principal reason? It is nothing if not the concord between them; everything is for unity." Venice installed a well-functioning system of justice, according to Bernardino. Bernardino lauded Venice for meting out swift justice, remembering that he "saw a sodomite burned in Venice."  

Bernardino’s respect for Venice must have been a factor in the saint’s strong purchase over the city. After Bernardino’s sainthood, city chroniclers emphasized his consanguinity with Venice. All of the Franciscan friars of Venice participated in a procession throughout the city on July 4, 1450 after his canonization. There was a festival in the Piazza San Marco following two double rings from the campanile to mark the event and the procession passed by the major Franciscans churches in Venice. Near San Barnaba, a temporary sacred bridge made of gondolas was erected for the procession. 

Bernardino’s political clout is best understood in the call for his immediate canonization by political leaders throughout the city states. Bernardino’s body lay intact in L’Aquila, the site of his death in 1444. At the time of his canonization, the Sienese were involved in futile diplomatic

---

21 Mormondo, 160. There is no record of Bernardino in Venice before 1422 when he gave the Lenten series of sermons in the city.
22 Sancte Boncor, 34.
negotiations with L’Aquila, where Bernardino died in 1444 to reclaim the body of their native saint who was interred in a church built especially for the reception of Bernardino’s body.\textsuperscript{23}

Soon after the preacher’s death on 20 May 1444, the consistory deliberated about whether to send Filippo Maria Visconti in Milan the eyeglasses of Bernardino and the record of miracles made by him.\textsuperscript{24} The presence of a list of miracles associated with Bernardino immediately after his death, shows that the decision to canonize him began early. Inquiries into the miracles associated with Bernardino began swiftly in 1445, leading to his canonization in 1450.

Without any corporeal relic of Bernardino, the Venetians relied on the memory of his body passing though the city.\textsuperscript{25} Rather than focus on the impossible mission of acquiring part of the mortal remains of Bernardino, hagiographical sources about Bernardino placed the saint in residence at the hospice at San Giobbe, though there is not much hard evidence to confirm his stay at the convent. Pietrangeli di Salimbeni noted having heard Bernardino preach during 1405 in Venice for his testimony in the 1450 canonization process.\textsuperscript{26} Later lives of the saint record a visit to Venice by Bernardino during the reign of Doge Tommaso Mocenigo (1414-23), who allegedly promised to grant any wish Bernardino might have while he was in Venice.\textsuperscript{27}

Bernardino requested support for the Carthusians off the island of Sant’ Andrea al Lido and the donation of a hospital for the plague-stricken on Santa Maria di Nazareth. Though there is no evidence to support the Doge’s promise or Bernardino’s request, in 1423, the Senate deliberated


\textsuperscript{24} It was approved with 142 favorable votes and 22 against. “A margine sono disegnati i occhiavle,” in Archivio di Stato, Siena, Concistoro, 471, c.22.

\textsuperscript{25} Flaminio Corner, \textit{Ecclesiae Venetae Antiquis Monumentis nunc etiam primum editis}, vol. 6, Venice, 1749, 285.

\textsuperscript{26} Piana, 383-435.

\textsuperscript{27} Origo provides an overview of the incident.
construction of a convalescence center on an island in the Santa Maria di Nazareth also known as the Lazaretto.\textsuperscript{28}

Piero Dolfin remembered hearing Bernardino preach in 1423 at S. Polo: “...I, Giorgio Dolfin, knew him and touched his hand and heard many of his pious sermons at various times, and likewise I, Piero Dolfin, the author of these annals, Giorgio’s son, saw the said saint and heard his sermons in the Campo San Polo in Venice.”\textsuperscript{29} The sermons heard by the Dolfin were the result of an invitation extended to Bernardino in 1422 to preach in Venice after a series of sermons heard by Republican officials in Brescia. One other visit in 1429 is confirmed by a letter dated from Venice on the 22 February by Bernardino to Francesco Marchi.\textsuperscript{30} After Bernardino’s death, Bernardo Giustiniani also remembered Bernardino meeting with his father Lorenzo, the first patriarch of Venice.\textsuperscript{31} Giustiniani had received the personal effects belonging to the preacher from one of his friends. As a note of thanks, he praised the preacher, “We shall venerate with deeply devoted hearts this most holy person,” and he made reference to a visit by Bernardino of Siena to Venice in 1443, right before his death.\textsuperscript{32} Residents of the Frari and San Francesco della Vigna claim to have hosted Bernardino on his visits to the city after his death. In one of his earlier visits to Venice, he is believed to have resided at San Francesco del Deserto. The island

\textsuperscript{28} ASV, Senato, Misti, Reg. 54, 140 v. Deliberations dated to 28 August 1423. The senate pitched 2000 ducats to construct San Niccolò on the Lido. Pullan, 208.

\textsuperscript{29} Giorgio and Pietro Dolfin, \textit{Cronica, 1396-1458}, BNM.Cl.Ital.VII. Cod. 307, 418v. “Adi 25 ma(r)zo in la festa di Pasqua di mazo du canonizato San Bernardino da Siena del ordine di san Francesco; lo suo corpo è sepolto ad Aquila furì di piato per Papa Nicholò la sua festa se celebrasse adi 20 mazo el di de la sua morte che morì del 1444. El qual mi Zorzi Dolfin cognosciti et tocchà la man et aldii molte sue devote predication in diversi tempi. Et simili, io piero dolfin scriptor di questi annali, se fiol, vidi el dicto sancto, et udi le sue prediche sul Campo de San Polo in Venexia.”


\textsuperscript{31} Labalme, 1969, 226.

would have held particular resonance for San Bernardino as a site which was purportedly founded by St. Francis in the thirteenth century.  

The recent death of the saint combined with the absence of his bodily relics placed greater emphasis on the saint’s representation. In the six years of beatification before the institution of his feast day as a saint there were attempts to define an iconic representation of the saint. Devotional images of Bernardino began to appear throughout Venice around the time of his canonization. Jacopo Bellini, for example, often paired a contemplative and downward-looking Bernardino based on a real life meeting, with St. Anthony Abbot as the inheritor of spiritual contemplation. (Figure 69) The image shows Bernardino with wisps of hair and a sallow face, but in Bellini’s portrait, he is not as emaciated as he would become in later portraits. Even the abbreviation for Jesus used by Bernardino in his sermons, the IHS symbol, is shown in faint tones above his shoulder. A more active, preaching Bernardino is depicted in the mosaics of the south vault of the basilica of San Marco, though this Bernardino also has the tufts of hair around his ears that would disappear to a skeletal head in later representations. (Figure 70)

Another image of Bernardino in the south vault of San Marco marked a significant passageway used by the doges entering the basilica from the Ducal Palace. The preacher looks down at the doges entering the basilica, pointing out the name of Jesus. In 1453, the Procurators of San Marco determined that this south vault of the basilica required reinforcement. The dates of the renovations to the south transept likely occasioned the new mosaics on the vault completed in 1458 by the mosaicists Silvestro and Antonio based on an inscription in the

---

33 Wadding. BMC, Codice Cicogna, 3233-4. Sanudo wrote that Francis prayed in an oratory located on the island, while Francesco Gonzaga and Luke Wadding similarly wrote Francis into the history of the church, not only as an occupant but as its constructor.

mosaics. San Bernardino is among the four saints depicted along with Saints Paul the Hermit, Antonio Abate, and Vincenzo Ferrer.  

(Figure 71)

The group of mosaics is rarely spoken about given the lack of information on the execution date and the artists, but there is a rather avuncular sentiment underlying the group. Saint Anthony Abbot and his friend Paul both represented the hermetic side of piety. Because Anthony buried Paul, they are often both represented together. Bernardino tended towards the secluded life when he wasn’t preaching, but apparently decided to preach after hearing the Dominican Vincenzo Ferrer preach in 1406. He received the elder preacher’s blessing to evangelize in the city-states. Bernardino and Vincenzo would have been appropriate choices of representation in the dome given the saints’ popularity in Venice in the years following their canonizations in 1450 and 1455 respectively. The inclusion of Bernardino in the mosaic program illustrates that the saint made an impact as a preacher, along with St. Vincenzo, on Venetian life.

Despite Bernardino’s popularity, there was resistance to Bernardino’s ideas and the poverty he represented. Francesco Filelfo dismissed the sincerity of the Franciscans who were assuming administrative duties of the major charitable institutions in Filelfo’s Milan. Many humanists were engaged as scriptors for the papacy, who oversaw the mendicant orders, but were themselves critical of the practices of the Orders. The strongest condemnation of Bernardino and

---

35 Otto Demus, *The Mosaics of San Marco in Venice*, Vol. I, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1984, 6-7. Michelangelo Muraro, “L’Esperienza Veneziana di Paolo Uccello,” *Atti del XVIII Congresso Internazionale di Storia dell’ Arte, Venezia*, 1955, 197. Jacopo Bellini may have had a hand in the design of the mosaics. His name has been put forth as having worked on the mosaics, and his pairing of Bernardino and Antonio Abate for a panel of the triptych, evokes the later depiction of these two saints in proximity at San Marco. Demus has identified the inscription Antonio FCI under the IHS in the mosaic of San Bernardino as the mosaicist Antonio di lacopo, possibly the son of Jacopo Bellini, but other interpretations have suggested that the mosaicist was Paolo Uccello. In this attribution, the image of Bernardino would have originally been Anthony of Padua, altered after the canonization of Bernardino. The idea is that the IHS substituted STO and that “Antonio FCO” may have stood for Franciscan rather than the name of the artist. The idea is not compelling, particularly if the mosaics were new due to the restructuring of the south vault. The attribution to Paolo Uccello is less secure for he has only been loosely affiliated with the basilica. Ettore Merkel, “I Mosaici Rinascimentali di San Marco,” *Arte Veneta*, XL1 (1987): 24-5.

36 Origo; Mormondo, 152.

37 Humfrey, 1988, 403, 410.
the mendicants’ role in preaching poverty came from Poggio Bracciolini who ambiguously invoked Bernardino in his dialogue on the religious orders and greed, *On Avarice.*\(^{38}\) For the antiquarian Poggio, the demands of friars on the rich threatened the monumentality of their cities.\(^{39}\) Poggio stated that, “We should not build our cities with such ghosts of men.” When Poggio accused Bernardino of hypocrisy in his *Contra Hypocritas*, he illuminated the great divide between the morality of the mendicants and the humanists. That Poggio also hurled the insult of hypocrisy at Bernardino, shows that he must have known that St. Francis hated hypocrisy.\(^{40}\) In *On Avarice*, Poggio has one of the participants in the debate on greed say,

> In one respect both Bernardino and other preachers of the same description seem to me to fall into an error. They do not preach with a view of doing good, but for the purpose of displaying their eloquence. They are not so anxious to cure the mental diseases which they profess to heal, as to obtain the favor and applause of the mob. They learn a few phrases by heart, and utter them indiscriminately before audiences of every description. Treating of recondite and obscure matters, they soar beyond the comprehension of the vulgar, and tickle the ears of women and fools, whom they dismiss as ignorant as they found them. Some vices they reprove in such a manner that they seem rather to teach, than to correct them, and in their thirst for gain, they forget the promotion of the cause of religion.\(^{41}\)

---


\(^{39}\) Hans Baron, “Franciscan Poverty and Civic Wealth as Factors in the Rise of Humanistic Thought,” *Speculum*, 13/1, (January 1938): 12-14. As Hans Baron demonstrated, this poverty became a humanistic ideal as well and led to a great paradox between the mendicants and the humanists.


\(^{41}\) Poggio, *On Avarice*, 242-5. Poggio has drawn the following striking picture. “Inflated by the pretended inspiration of the Holy Spirit, they expound the sacred scriptures to the populace with such gross ignorance, that nothing can
Bernardino was not without his detractors at San Giobbe either. One resident of the parish clearly remembers that when the friars went begging under the name of St. Bernardino, their requests were denied and they were greeted with hostility, but when they announced that they were members of the society of St. Job, they fared well.

San Giobbe becomes San Bernardino

Most redactions of the history of San Giobbe propose that after Bernardino of Siena’s 1450 canonization, Doge Moro patronized building at San Giobbe to venerate the saint who had cast him as a future leader of Venice. In his 1571 guide to Venice, Francesco Sansovino attributed the initiation of the church of San Giobbe directly to Doge Cristoforo Moro’s devotion to Bernardino following the preacher’s canonization. In 1448, Moro would be elected to his post as Procurator of San Marco and in 1462, after the reigns of Francesco Foscari and Pasquale Malipiero, and after Bernardino’s canonization, Moro was elected doge. The account of St. Bernardino of Siena’s prediction of Moro’s dogate before he died became synonymous with the Doge’s rule and his involvement at the church of San Giobbe.

As in the rest of Venice, the friars at San Giobbe tried to remember when the future relics of the living Bernardino had passed through the church. One resident of San Giobbe remembered
that at least three Observant Franciscan preachers had stayed at San Giobbe, "...me recordo S. Bernardino vegniva star la, S. Zuanne da Capistrano, S. Giacomo della Marca." Seventeenth-century histories of San Giobbe place the saint here on his last visit to Venice before his death in 1444, citing the care he could receive for his own failing health in 1443. The record of a correspondence exists between Bernardino and the doctor in residence at San Giobbe during 1443, Pietro Tomassi. That the hospice was the central component of San Giobbe might have appealed to Bernardino as the only hospice run by Observant Franciscans in the city at the time. Since his experience as a volunteer caring for the infirm at the hospital of Santa Maria della Scala as a young friar in Siena, Bernardino tended to stay in hospitals during his travels.

Bernardino's body remained whole in L'Aquila, buried in the church dedicated to him. With Bernardino's body guarded by the locals in L'Aquila where he died in 1444, there was no immediate plan to send out corporeal relics to devotees of the saint outside of the Abruzzi. In the seventeenth-century inventories of relics in Venice undertaken by the Procurators of San Marco, there is no mention of non-corporeal relics of Bernardino at the church of San Giobbe. The friars at San Giobbe had to make due with a carved wooden tabernacle bust of San Bernardino by Bartolomeo Bellano which originally stood over the high altar. (Figure 72)

45 ASV, San Giobbe, XLVI, 41v.
46 Chapter 2.
47 Cicogna, 709.
50 ASV, Procurator di San Marco, Busta 84, fasc. 7, 1703. See also the inventory of 1666.
51 ASV, Procurator di San Marco, Busta 84, fasc. 6, 189b
Sansovino was not far off in tying Moro to San Giobbe after Bernardino became a saint in 1450. In 1445, the Council of Ten gave land to the friars at San Giobbe to enlarge the convent, but Moro is not named in conjunction with this donation. Moro was mentioned in a 1451 *inter vivos* donation by Elisabetta Bragadin of eight *passi* (13 meters) of land to San Giobbe behind the church just one year after Bernardino became saint (“Tantum de terreno vacuo dicte Isabette posito post ecclesiam Sancti Job quantum passus octo ipsius terreni vacui ut fratres ipsius Monasterii possint et valeant ipsam ecclesiam elargare et dilatare quantum comprehendit ipsum terrenum per dictus passus octo”). Bragadin’s donation represented the largest recorded individual land donation to San Giobbe after Giovanni Contarini’s. That the donator, Elisabetta, was the daughter of Lucia Contarini indicates that the Contarini family continued to hold land in the area for generations after Giovanni Contarini’s death. The donation was meant “to enlarge the monastery and church of San Giobbe.” The naming of a monastery and dormitory at San Giobbe in the donation implies that the church and cloisters existed at this time.

---

52 ASV, Council of Ten, Deliberazione, Rocca 28, f.23.
53 ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, f.38. “Nobilis domina Isabetta relicta viri nobilis Bartholomei Bragadeno de contrata Sancti Severi dedit tradidit donavit inter vivos in perpetuum loco Monasterio se conventu sancti Job, siue spectabili et generoso domino Christophoro Mauro honorando procuratori S. Marci de Ultra ac vire nobili et egrigio domino Marco Zane condam domini Andrae de contrata Sancti Sephani Confessoris asserentibus se dicti Monasterii et Conventus sindicos et procurators.... Tantum de terreno vacuo dicte Isabette posito post ecclesiam Sancti Job quantum passus octo ipsius terreni vacui ut fratres ipsius Monasterii possint et valeant ipsam ecclesiam elargare et dilatare quantum comprehendit ipsum terrenum per dictus passus octo.” One Venetian *passo* equals 1.74 meters. Eight *passi* then would equal 13.909 meters and the choir is 16 meters. ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, “Haec sunt verba contenta in testamento qu D. IO: Delphino...in cambio del detto Legato missier Rigo fiulo fu del predetto missier Zuanne ha fatto fare Donazione per Madona Isabetta Bragadino sorella sua delle caseste erano dredo la Capella, e terreno va al luogo verso la palude, e lo tenore della Donazione si ponera di sotto, e li fratto sono stati contenti, & hanno renonziaio al soprascritto perpetuale Legato in Luogo de Terreno, overo Oratorio, lo quale in lo anno 1465, e stato alzato, & interato fin al canton ultimo del dormito.”
54 Ibid.
Moro was not yet Doge, but was named in the Bragadin donation as Procurator of San Marco de Ultra, a position he held from 1448 until his election to the dogate in 1462. As a Procurator, Moro oversaw testamentary bequests for the property of the Republic in sestiere that he oversaw, but Cannaregio did not fall under his jurisdiction of responsibility. In the case of the Bragadin donation of land behind the church, Moro is mentioned with the Prior of San Giobbe, Marco Zane, as a lay patron acting on behalf of the religious Order.

In addition to the Bragadin donation, a flurry of papal indulgences offered to those who supported the building and decoration of San Giobbe in the first half of the 1450s, indicate a spell of building activity after the canonization of Bernardino. In 1454, while Moro was Procurator of San Marco, Nicholas V issued a papal bull conferring indulgences on those who donated land or money to the church, or fulfilled their religious duties—through burial, mass, confession, or donation—at San Giobbe or through the confraternity dedicated to St. Bernardino at the church. The indulgences were renewed a year later. In the indulgence of 1454 to San Giobbe, Pope Nicholas V named Moro as an ambassador and as a devotee of the cult of Bernardino. Papal indulgences were not unusual for contributions to churches during building

55 ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, f.38.
56 Reg.Vat. T. 455, f.90-91v; ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5.XLVI, 9r. Reg.vat. vol. 431, f.192v. 1 February 1455, Romae indulgences. "Cupientis igitur, ut domus B Job. Civitatis ven. Ord.io fratris Minoris regularis observe seu illius ecclesia vel capella qua nuper non nulli cives dicte civitatis et inter alios dilectus filius Christoforis mauro nobile eiusdem civi.is Procu. S. Marci ai dilectori filiori dominii Ven.um ad nos Ambasciator existens, et pro huiusmodi gratia obtinenda interieniens a Supplicans ex zello devotionii quem tam ad dictum ordinem quam etiam ad s. Bernardino confessor gerune post canonizacione dicti sancti per nos factam in suis structurii et edificii ampliare ceperunt, ai sub vocabulo, et titulo Beati Bernardino consecrari fecerunt, pro structurii edificii huiusmodi et ad optatum finem deducendi, quae non parvos requirunt expensas, ad quamarum. Supportione Christi fidelium sufragaggia sunt permaxime opportuna mediabili sufragii huiusmodi celerius perficiati, ai christifidelis devotionii causa eo ferventius ad ipsius dominii ecclesiam confluant... milesimo quadringentesimo quinquagesimo quarto. Pridie Kalendas Aprilis Pontifica nostril anno Octavo." in a congratulatory letter when Moro was elected doge, the indulgences were mentioned as a sign of Moro’s piety. BNM, Lat.XII.90, 36a. “Non omittam illud precipium tua munificentia ac religionis specimen tua diligentia et auctoritate tua q maxima impensa templum gloriosissimi divi bernardini non solum faciundum augendumque sed etiam tutissimo vallo fidei christianae et plenissima indulgentia munientid curasti.”
and renovation campaigns but the timing of these indulgences coincided with Moro’s time in Rome as an ambassador to Venice during the drafting of the Peace of Lodi. In the 1455 indulgence to the church, Pope Callixtus cited Moro as Procurator of San Marco. The mention of Moro in connection with the 1455 indulgence illustrates that his drive to promote Bernardino predated his 1462 election to the dogate.

Fighting for St. Bernardino: The Confraternity of St. Bernardino of Siena

There was a brief mêlée among the principal Franciscan strongholds in the city for the exclusive rights to host the confraternity of San Bernardino after his canonization. Records exist for charitable confraternities dedicated to the newly minted saint at all of the principal Franciscan churches in Venice during the 1450s: at the Frari, San Francesco dell Vigna, and San Giobbe. Various confraternities must have existed in numerous churches throughout Venice after his canonization for on 11 September 1450 the Council of Ten passed a law stating that only San Francesco della Vigna could host the confraternity scuole. If we are to believe the convents’ documents, however, scuole dedicated to the saint also existed at the Frari and at San Giobbe.

The confraternity to St. Bernardino began at San Giobbe soon after Pope Nicholas V canonized him in 1450. Most records of San Giobbe state that the scuola piccola was neatly established on the day of Bernardino’s canonization, his feast day, 20 May 1450. The confraternity was likely started later, but the earlier initiation date offers authenticity to the contested scuola. Bernardino was added to the title of San Giobbe in a 1452 Council of Ten

58 ASV, Consiglio di Dieci Misto 14, 3r. 2 September 1450.
59 ASV, Senato, Reg. 15, f. 91, 14 April 1456. The schools of San Francesco and San Bernardino at San Francesco della Vigna united under one name.
60 ASV, Scuole Piccole, Busta 260-1; ASV, San Giobbe Busta, 5, xlvi, f.64
61 ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 4, 2r.A. “E fu comenzado questa benedeta scuola correndo gl’Anni del Sig. 1450. Adi 20 di Maggio in la Giesia de Misier S. Giobbe. In la qual giesia si e fabricando una capella ad honor de M. S. Bernardino confessor nostro special advocato della devotion nostra, la qual capella fece edificar il N. H. missier
document dated to 10 May which allowed the scuola of Santa Maria della Misericordia to celebrate the feast of Bernardino at San Giobbe. In 1453, the Council of Ten again revoked all rights of any church but San Francesco della Vigna to host the confraternity, a conflict which faded out of the recorded documentary history by 1454. Given the presence of confraternities dedicated to Bernardino at both the Frari and San Giobbe and the papal indulgences granted to each confraternity in the late 1450s, the bans were likely revoked. On 10 May 1463, the Council allowed the scuola of the Misericordia to celebrate feast of Bernardino at San Giobbe.

Documents had mentioned Bernardino in the title of the church in the 1450s suggesting the scuola already played a big role at the church.

Though the confraternity was infamously malissimo governate for several years after Moro’s death, it was the most powerful confraternity at the church. Moro left money on his death to all the confraternities of which he was a member and specified that during his funeral, the members of his confraternities were to process through the church with candles, but Moro left the confraternity of Bernardino twenty ducats as opposed to the five or ten ducats he left his other...
confraternities.\textsuperscript{66} That the high altar of the church dedicated to St. Bernardino fell under the jurisdiction of the \textit{scuola} of Bernardino by the end of the fifteenth century illustrates its importance. The members of the \textit{scuola} conducted twelve processions a year, at least since 1587, but the other schools at San Giobbe needed to petition the confraternity of San Bernardino to say high mass in their chapel in the church. That Moro provided more for the \textit{scuola} of San Bernardino than the other confraternities which claimed him as a member explains the special privilege that might have been conferred to the confraternity and it would not be surprising if they were granted their own space in the church off of the transept before the confraternity’s permanent \textit{scuola} was recorded in 1504.

The space of the confraternity is unaccounted for from the time it was established in 1450 until in 1504, when it began renting a dilapidated tenant house from the Gonella family on what is now the Campo San Giobbe in front of the façade of the church for two ducats a year.\textsuperscript{67} Before the confraternity moved to the Gonella property in 1504, they may have inhabited the small room off the transept. The medallions binding together the vaults, and the use of the term oratory to describe the space in the documents makes this idea plausible. Though the documents associated with San Giobbe do not mention an oratory for San Bernardino, as the cult of St. Bernardino developed after 1450, newly established confraternities to the saint referred to their religious edifices and meeting houses as oratories. The most prominent oratories to Bernardino are attached to basilicas dedicated to San Francesco and include the oratory in Assisi from 1480, the

\textsuperscript{66} ASV, Testamenti, Not. Tomei Tomas 2394. “Lasso a le schole in le qual io son s. Iopo s. Francesco ducati 5 per una de 5, Antonio da Padua xe ai fine menori...S. Marie de Valverde, s. Chrostofallo, ducati 10, e per s. Bernardino ducati 20.”

\textsuperscript{67} Pagamuzzi, 1821. The map of the parish shows that the scuole of the Barcajuoli da Mestre of the Varrotteri, or leatherworkers was also located in the campo, perpendicularly situated in relation to the façade. In 1462, the operators of the traghetto between Mestre and Venice requested permission from the Council of Ten to establish a scuola at St. Job in Cannaregio, presumably at the church, which would have been the first stop on the island for their boats. Consiglio di Dieci Misto, Reg. 16, f. 55v
oratory in Perugia with its portal depicting San Bernardino’s rise to glory, and that in Siena near
the church of San Francesco.\footnote{Robert L. Mode, “San Bernardino in Glory,” The Art Bulletin, Vol. 55, No. 1. (Mar. 1973), 62.} There is no record of a special liturgy said for Bernardino that
would have engendered a special need for an oratory, but because oratories were smaller than
most churches, they afforded confraternities dedicated to the saint more privacy. When he was a
novice in Siena, Bernardino was a member of the confraternity to the Virgin, believed to have
flagellation at San Giobbe, but it is likely that the confraternity dedicated to Bernardino at San
Giobbe would have elements of ritualistic mortification. Even as such practices faded out of
written existence the type of small private room used by the confraternities may have persisted as
convention.

Members of the Gonella family sold a house in ruins, stables, and a garden between the
convent and the Rio San Giobbe to Doge Moro for the use of the confraternity for 470 ducats.\footnote{ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, 26 July 1465. Moro buys from Zuanne Gonella and Regina Gonella, “Una domus a saxentibus affitarsi ad pedem planum et in solario com sua cortile sive spongia et puteo in ea posito....con so terra vacua messa in el confin de San Geremia, chel ditto ha da ser Vettor Zappa murer, che son quell ache avè dal capitolo e dai preti de S. Jeremia appresso la chiesa de S. Job e de S. Bernardino.”}  
At the beginning of 1504, the scuola of San Bernardino conceded some of their land in front of
the church to the scuola of San Job for the construction of their school in exchange for an annual
rent.\footnote{The land was first owned by the Gonella family and transferred to Moro before he donated it to the church. ASV, Scuole Piccole, Busta 261. 1438 (PD 33) “Fu fatto il primo dormitorio, nel primo claustro dalla parte della Sagrestia, il Refettorio, e la Cusina, che sin la se estindeva il loro confin avanti che il Dose Moro falsefar il s.do claustro sopra il rio di q. Vettor Gonella oggi detto di S. Job.” ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 8, “Suplica della schola di S. Job 16 January 1504. Essendo comparisi in questo zorno d’avanti mis. Michiel Bondi Gastaldo, & suoi compagni della scola di mis. D. Bernardin mis. Zaccaria, Alcoti, & compagni della Scola di mis. S iopo, richiedendo, che li dobbiamo concider tango terren del nostro scomenzado dalla nostra Scola a retto tramitto, fino per mezo il canton della Giesia di San Iopo, che sono circa, passa 5, sopra el qual a tutte sue spese i possino fabricar una scuola per mis. S. Iopo, 7 quello s’intenda a Livello, pagando Ducati 2 ogn’anno di livello alla Scola nostra di mis. S. Bernardino, per il qual
Canal Regio and possibly faced the church.\textsuperscript{72} In a document from November 1507, the 
\textit{fondamenta} in front of the church is below the confraternity and is near the boat landing of seven 
steps, as the one off the Rio San Giobbe.\textsuperscript{73} (\textbf{Figure 73}) Very likely, the disposition of the 
confraternity was like the arrangement of the Scuola of the Annunciation which stood across 
from the destroyed church of Santa Maria dei Servi and faced the façade of the church. (\textbf{Figure} 
\textbf{74} & \textbf{Figure 75})

In the histories for the confraternity of St. Bernardino of Siena, there is a note that reads,

“This blessed \textit{scuola} began in the year of our Lord 20 May 1450 in the church of San Giobbe. In 
that church, a chapel in honor of S. Bernardino our special confessor and advocate of devotion 
was built. The chapel was made by Christoforo Moro Procurator of San Marco and devotee of 
San Bernardino.”\textsuperscript{74} The high altar chapel was clearly devoted to San Bernardino according to the 
orders of Christoforo Moro. If the histories of the confraternity of St. Bernardino are to be

\footnotesize

\begin{quote}
livello ne assegheranno tanti pro alla camara, che ogn’anno scoderanno i detti d. 2 non comenzando di pagare, ne 
livellar il sito fino detta scola non sia messa a coverso...”
\end{quote}

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{72} The site of the Gonella donation is described in detail in ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, xlvi, 32r, 1708. “Nostro 
terreno Vergine Vacuo longo piedi 53 in circa, e largo cioe da un capo pied 40,2 dall’altro piedie 35: in circa, che 
forma Campo d’avanti la chiesa, e Convento delli reverendi Padri Minori Osservanti Francescani. Detti di San 
Giobbe in Contrada di San Gieremia, con la nostra Riva derimpetto a detta chiesa, larga piedi et onze otto elonga 
piedi nel primo scalin della quale li vede in circa l’inscrittione seguente cioe Riva e Dondi della Scola di San 
Bernardino da Siena e dalle due parti lateriali deva medesima cuie scolpito in marmo Il nome di Giesu, come pure 
dov’e il Lavo della Croce dato poner l’anno 1693; a linea retta del Canton della Facciada di detta Chiesa da essi 
reverendi Padri di notte tempo, ...detto serene inscritto pur d’una fondamenta di Poera viva longa piedi 122 in circa 
sopra il Rio di San Giobbe contigua da’un latto alla sopradetta Riva, ed all’altro termina al muro della nostra scuola 
fate fare l’anno 1588: a proprie spese della sueda nostra scola , alla quale costarevo d 153:- in circa sotto il 
Guardianato del M. Sebastian d’Avanzo.” ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, 44v, 29 April 1463. “El era tre case: una in 
sole de Moro, e una de Pare la qual fo de una dona Maria del Moro, e la terza casa era de m. Zuanne Gonella, e del 
1454: steti dentro con mia Mare. Et....tutte queste tre case haveva orto longo per fina arente la Chiesa nova e dapoi 
M. Cristoforo Moro dose de Veneti compro la casa de m zuanne Gonella e un terren che se tegniva cane susp, e 
fece de parte del terren uno rie per andar alla chiesa... L’anderà parte che mette ditto vardian di far far la 
fondamenta, che seguita la fondamenta delle nostre case di pietra viva fin alla riva, e per mezzo la gesia di San 

\textsuperscript{73} ASV, Provedditore di Comun, Reg. O. 136.

\textsuperscript{74} ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 4, 2r. “E fu comenzado questa benedeta scuola correndo gl’Anni del Sig. 1450. Adi 20 
di Maggio in la Giesia de Misier S. Giobbe. In la qual giesia si e fabricando una capella ad honor de M. S. 
Bernardino confessor nostro special advocato della devotion nostra, la qual capella fece edificarc il N. H. missier 
Christoforo Moro Procu. De M. S. Marco devoto del Beato San Bernardino.”
trusted, one of the Doge’s first acts was to begin the process of dedicating the high altar of San Giobbe to St. Bernardino of Siena. According to the confraternity of St. Bernardino, “The Altarpiece of St. Job placed by the friars on our altar [to S. Bernardino] was removed by the Doge in 1463.”

During Moro’s dogate, the importance of the titular Job diminished at the church, while Bernardino was elevated to positions of liturgical importance principally through the consecration of the high altar to the Sienese saint and its subsequent control by the Doge’s confraternity of St. Bernardino. The high altar at San Giobbe dedicated to Bernardino has been replaced at least twice since its 1493 consecration but it is located behind the tomb slab, as the Doge requested. The dedication of the altar to St. Bernardino in 1493 marked the height of a rite of veneration for the saint in Venice. Just one year earlier, an altar dedicated to Bernardino was consecrated in the Frari, the Conventual Franciscan church.

Doge Moro’s Testament

Moro’s testament offers the greatest proof of his commitment to St. Bernardino and his power over San Giobbe. Twenty years after Moro’s first documented association with San Giobbe in the 1451 donation of land by Isabetta Bragadin, the Doge drew up his testament and committed the enormous sum of 10,000 ducats for “completing the work begun on the church of San Bernardino, in elongating it, and making the chapels according to need, finishing the

---

75 ASV, Scuole Piccole, Busta 260 (P. D.35) “...pala di S. job messa dai frati al nostro altar fatta levarvia(levarsia) dal doge 1463.”
76 ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 4, n.XLI. f.24-25, 1505. ASV, San Giobbe Busta 5, fasc. xlvi, 3v. In 1587, the altar was reconsecrated. The altar was gilded in 1607. “Casa al incontro die haver tanti contadi alli frati per refar l’altare come nello apar: ducati 30.” It was also redone in 1664: “Però fu posta parte nella capitola senate di detta Scola dal mag.io Sig. Francesco Covreloti Guardian magior di essa confraternita, che sia promesto alli d.ti R.R.P.P. di poter rinovar, e rifabricar d.o Altar maggiore dedicato al nome di San Bernardino.”
cloistered dormitory, and ornamenting the said church and monastery.”\(^7^7\) Thus, by 1470, the layout of the church had begun and was in need of amplification. The testament reveals that Moro had commissioned the chapels of the church, including his own in the high altar. The chapels to which Moro refers are likely the chancel and the altar niches flanking the presbytery in the transept. Moro secured and specified burial “in the church of Saints Bernardino and Job in a tomb in front of the high altar of the said Bernardino in the sepulcher he made.” Given the Doge’s demand that his burial spot never be changed under any circumstances, he is buried where he specified, in the high altar chapel before the altar to Bernardino.\(^7^8\) Moro ordered funerary masses said and candles made on the anniversary of his death in his 1470 testament.

Venetian identity was based on the translation of St. Mark from Alexandria to Venice in the ninth century. Moro’s sponsorship of the cult of St. Bernardino refers to this foundational act and must be seen in political terms. The spatial alignment of Moro’s monument with Bernardino’s altar comprised part of an effort to secure a more favorable place in the history of city than his otherwise flawed doge’ship would have allowed. Moro used San Marco as a model in enlisting the church of San Giobbe as the focal point of his campaign to honor San Bernardino. As the ducal basilica of San Marco promoted the entrenched rhetoric of Venice’s providential formation, the arrival of Mark’s body to the lagoon, and the authority of the doge, Moro tried to effect similar associations at San Giobbe, but through his burial, the worship and imagery of Bernardino, and his individual tenure as doge.

\(^7^7\) ASV, Notatorio Tomei, Busta 27, 2394. ASV, Testamenti, B. 1238, nos. 178 and 188, with a copy in S. Giobbe, Busta 5, fasc XLIV. “Vojo chel mio corpo sia posto in la giezia de mess. S. Bernardin e S. Jop in larcha mo facta fare davantij laltar del ditto S. Bernardino...Compito l’opera comenzada de la giezia de s. Bernardino in longarla e far la capele segundo el bixogno e per quelo, manchase al giostror dormitorio che se lavora tutu sia compito con ogno altro lavoro li hohorese far in hornamento de la dita giezia e monestier.”

\(^7^8\) ASV, Archivio Notarile, Testamenti, Atti Tomei 1238. “Voemo chel corpo nostro sia tumulato di sepulto cioe nelarcha dove e sepulto el corpo del nostro dilecto consortie missier christopalo Moro.”
This move to align the city’s history with his own is adumbrated in Moro’s *Promissione*. The illumination by Leonardo Bellini at the beginning of the text shows Moro kneeling before the Madonna and Child flanked by Saints Mark and Bernardino.79 *(Figure 17)* The saints depicted in the illumination connected Moro’s dogate to Venetian history. The Madonna was believed to have offered the Venetians protection since the founding of the Republic. In Venice, the coincidence of the date of the Republic’s mythical foundation on the feast of the Annunciation in 421 made the Cult of the Virgin quite popular.80 Kneeling at the Virgin’s feet in front of his personal saint protector, Bernardino, and the Venetian saint protector, Mark, Moro showed himself to be a loyal follower. Moro repeated the network of saints involved in the supplication when he commissioned a representation of Bernardino on the altar of St. Clemente in San Marco, the ducal basilica. In Vincenzo Coronelli’s eighteenth-century guide to the paintings in the churches of Venice, he noted a now-lost picture in San Giobbe in which Bernardino shows Moro the doge’s ceremonial cap, the *corno*.81 It reads “Ecce Coronaberis,” “Here is the Crown,” reminding the viewer of Christ’s Crown of Thorns and Bernardino’s halo. The painting gives visual definition to Bernardino’s prediction about Moro’s election as doge.

Many doges promoted connections to their personal saint-protectors and Mark as they promoted their own rules. Doge Giovanni Mocenigo was often portrayed alongside his name saint, St John the Baptist and St. Mark while his successor, Doge Agostino Barbarigo was presented to Mark by his name saint, Augustine. The juxtapositions implied that each doge had a divine justification for election. Moro’s relationship to Bernardino was different for it factored human contact and a prediction of the dogate into the alliance. The connection was not merely a

79 Moro’s *Promissione*, 5r.
visual assertion of divine will overseeing one's dogate, but divine will effecting one's dogate. Hagiography about Bernardino could be written to give weight to Bernardino's prediction of Moro's election. The prediction transcended the mere foretelling of a future event. But the idea that a prophesy was directed towards Venice was itself an honor that bolstered the republic during a period of intense threat. The very notion of a prophesy reinforced the myths of Venetian state building for it resonated with the prediction that St. Mark would be buried in Venice. In Venice, events were driven by god and were not left to chance.

Bernardino's importance in Venice waned after Moro's death, but was revived by Doge Andrea Gritti (reg 1523-1538), who was elected to the dogate on May 20, the Feast day of St. Bernardino in 1527. Doge Gritti funded the enlargements and renovations to his neighborhood church, San Francesco della Vigna, run by Observant Franciscans. A recorded 1527 visit by Doge Gritti to San Giobbe on the saint's feast day commemorated the Doge's election and included a mass said at the high altar dedicated to the saint. In the Sala di Collegio of the Palazzo Ducale, Tintoretto depicted Bernardino between Sts. Mark and Louis presenting Doge Gritti to the Virgin enthroned after a 1531 destroyed version of the painting by Titian. Gritti added a base to the altar with an image of himself praying before his name saint, Andrew, and St. Mark. (Figure 76) Like Moro, Doge Andrea Gritti donated a thousand ducats and requested burial before the high altar of San Francesco della Vigna in his will of 12 March 1539. His burial wish was not carried out for his death is marked not with a floor slab before the altar as had been

---

83 Sanudo, Diarii, LV col. 19, 6 October 1531. Sanudo describes the votive painting above the door of the anti-Collegio.
84 ASV, Archivio Notarile, Testamenti, Atti Marsilio, busta 1208, c. 265. Doge Andrea Gritti's testament.
requested, but there is a plaque commemorating his life as a just doge on the right wall of the high altar chancel. 85

**Doge Moro and the Friars: Jus patronatus and usus pauperus**

For twenty years after the 1451 Bragadin donation, Moro solicited funds and land for the friars of San Giobbe and in effect, oversaw the enlargement of their convent and the construction of the new church. The donation solidified Moro’s *jus patronatus* at San Giobbe. Moro is named as the holder of *jus patronatus* of San Giobbe even after his death. 86 The issue of *jus patronatus* and Moro’s subsequent interest in the building of San Giobbe illustrates the problematic issue of ownership and the administration of mendicant churches as summarized by the *usus pauperus* debate. 87

As discussed previously, one of the distinctive characteristics of the Franciscan Order was its commitment to poverty. As the voluntary poor, the Order’s fullest expression of poverty was the prohibition of ownership among its members. From books to buildings, the friars were not allowed to own property or deal with money. 88 The Minori were to beg and were to lodge as

---


86 ASV, San Giobbe, 5, XLVI, 26v: “…di far comodare il colmo di detta Capella, et altare non mai stato vostro; ma sempre riservatto al *Jus patronato* di detto Ser.mo doge, e suoi, legitiimi, e perpetui rappresentati fra quali la d.a Unda: Scola di S. Bernardino da Siena, che fu dallo stesso doge sino dalla prima eretione d’essa scola, unicam.te assegnato alla medesima per officiarlo. 1712.” Likewise, Giovanni Contarini held *jus patronatus* of the hospital and then transferred it, *in perpetuum*, to the hospital administrators right before his death in 1407.

87 Bourdau, 2004. Bourdau offers a discussion of how the relationship between friar and patron played out in the Veneto. She concludes that while the layman certainly held power, the Franciscans often played a role in determining artistic program.

pilgrims. The belongings of the order could be owned by others but used by the friars, referred to as *usus pauperus*. The Order ceded ownership rights and claimed obedience to the pope, a submission which likely fueled the quick and early success of the Franciscans soon after Francis’ death in 1226.

Because the Franciscans themselves were not allowed to own property, the emerging Renaissance patron could supply funds and supplies to the necessary operations of Franciscan convents without compromising the friars. The friars were admonished that, “As foreigners in this age, in poverty and in lowliness be a servant of the Lord be a servant. Accept sureties on behalf of alms boldly.” In the Order’s early years, the friars tended to stay in makeshift accommodations during preaching expeditions, but as membership in the Observant Franciscan order swelled across Europe, the friars became less peripatetic. The need for more permanent accommodations arose, but settlements in agricultural centers or on the outskirts of cities tested St. Francis’ original rule of 1221. The life of retreat was not a strong pursuit of the Observants, but engaging with society through ministry and preaching were. They aimed to alleviate suffering of the urban poor. But in establishing convents, they ran into potential conflict with St. Francis’ original rule of 1221, which forbade ownership of property and envisioned Holy Poverty as an end. One of the original Franciscan edicts on building declared, “Let the friars appropriate nothing for themselves not a house, a place nor anything.” As the orders were dependent on charity, they generally settled on donated land.

---

89 Pope Gregory, *Quo Elongati*, published on 4 October 1230: Ownership would lay with the papacy, but use with the Franciscans. Wadding, *Annales*, 1244. Though the Franciscans were one of the mendicant, or begging orders, it was not universally accepted as practice. Luke Wadding said that Haymo of Faversham was against begging.  
90 Thomas of Celano, *Life of St. Francis*, 300.
Possession of property was forbidden as a violation of Holy Poverty, but the Order skirted the issue by placing its property under papal ownership. Pope Nicholas III passed an order declaring that the pope, cardinal, or a donor should appoint a syndic, nominated by the brothers, to oversee their funds. Thus, the policy of ceding property rights enabled a wealthy Venetian like Moro to take control over the patronage of one of their churches at a point when the friars at San Giobbe were in need of funds.

An example of how the system of Franciscan ownership was carried out is documented near San Giobbe at San Francesco della Vigna. In Venice, Marco Ziani’s thirteenth-century donation of land for a convent to six Franciscans at what is now San Francesco della Vigna was litigated for clarification on the rule. Ziani asked for perpetual masses said on the anniversary of his death in exchange for the land. The Franciscan provincial ministry decided that the six friars could not accept the land because permanent annuities violated the Franciscan rule. But when the will was disputed in court, Pope Innocent IV allowed the bequest.

The Franciscans came to San Giobbe only in 1428 well after it was dedicated to Job, but Job’s declaration that, “The lord giveth and the lord taketh away,” squared nicely with the order’s Rules against owning property. The Franciscan friars present at the hospice after 1428 to offer medicinal and spiritual healing likely turned to Job to remind the inhabitants of the hospice of the efficacy of suffering for an eventual redemption. St. Francis’ follower and biographer, Thomas of Celano, cited the Book of Job in giving shape to Francis choice to renounce his

---

91 As outlined in the papal bull, Quo Elongati issued by Gregory IX in 1230, the papacy allowed the Franciscans to use and not to own property. John Moorman, A History of the Franciscan Order from its Origins to the Year 1517, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968, 50; Kajetan Esser, Origins of the Franciscan Order, Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1970, 164. Most likely, the tension that was beginning to arise between the necessities of preaching and the itinerant life and Francis’ belief in poverty provoked Francis to write the rules. The Rules were consistently amended by the popes, which concerned the Observants. Nicholas III’s amendments were codified in Exiit qui seminat.

92 Flaminio Cornaro, Notizie storiche delle chiese e monasteri di Venezia, e di Torcello, 1758.
wealth.\textsuperscript{93} The ownership of property was transferred out of the hands of Job, just as the Franciscans relinquished their ownership of property to the Pope. Moro's request to wear the Franciscan shroud in burial likely meant that he was a member of the lay tertiaries of the Franciscan Order. In this capacity, he could marry and serve as the order's lay procurator, securing donations, overseeing property, and managing the affairs of the clerical friars. The friars became residents and users of religious spaces under the guardianship of an assigned Procurator who ultimately answered to the Pope.\textsuperscript{94}

Moro symbolically transferred the privileges and rights once afforded the doge at San Marco to San Giobbe. The doges held \textit{jus patronatus} over the basilica of San Marco, as evidenced by the possessive "cappella nostra" in documents regarding San Marco.\textsuperscript{95} However, ducal \textit{jus patronatus} over San Marco declined dramatically when the Signoria restricted individual burial rights and personal display at the church in the fourteenth-century to curb what was seen as excessive aggrandizing and ostentation.\textsuperscript{96} The limitations placed on the doges' use of the basilica of San Marco revealed the waning authority of the dogate. In many ways, Moro turned San Giobbe into a satellite of San Marco, where he could hold \textit{jus patronatus} as the doges had originally at San Marco and where his place of burial would be considered a site of ducal importance.

Moro was apparently engaged in the quotidian operations of the convent. He knew the prior of San Giobbe, Francesco Trevisan, and singled him out for special praise in his testament. He

\textsuperscript{93} Thomas of Celano, 332, cites Job 29.16.
\textsuperscript{94} Trexler, 1980, 268.
\textsuperscript{95} Pincus, 36. Pincus compares the \textit{jus patronatus} of the doge to medieval \textit{eigenkirche}, in which a particular patron holds ownership. Demus, 1962, 45. Landau, 1975.
clearly had a special relationship to the Franciscans that was known at the time of his rule. In an illumination from a copy of the letter from Pius II exhorting Moro to join the Crusade, a friar kneels at the feet of the Doge embodying the relationship of owner and poor user, or *jus patronatus* and *usus pauperus*. (Figure 77)

Not only do the Moro *stemma* fill the corners above the central arch, announcing the Doge’s ownership over the space, but the numerous copies of the Doge’s will in the documents pertaining to the church of San Giobbe suggest that his wishes were taken seriously and were preserved. 97 (Figure 8) Though they are not often specified in his testament, he makes two allusions to “orders given” which implies that more specific plans were discussed. Moro also had strong control over the disposition of his funerary monument and its arrangement with respect to the altar, evident in the date of the epitaph, September 1470, which corresponds to the date of Moro’s will and not his death in October 1471. Moro likely had the slab engraved while he was still alive, a point to which Moro alludes in his will. 98 Like most doges, Moro assigned an attentive commissary to oversee the execution of his wishes. Several studies on the San Giobbe Altarpiece have claimed that attempts were made after Moro’s death to downplay his hand in the church’s development, but the documents about San Giobbe show that members of his commission carried out his wishes and drew on funds he left to improve and monumentalize the area around San Giobbe into the eighteenth century. 99

---

97 Appendix 1, Document 4.
98 BNM, Ital.VII.519 (=8438), f.62. *Cronaca Trevisan*. Doge Sebastiano Ziani also had his sepulcher installed before his death at “S. Giorgio e nel ingiostro del ditto monestier un uno sepulcro de marmoro che in vita el se preparo degnamente el fo meso.” Completing one’s sepulcher before death was a common practice. Francesco Datini, the merchant from Prato, had his tomb slab carved before he died in 1410. Much has been written about the tomb slabs of Balduccio Parghia and Lorenzo Trenta in the Cathedral of Lucca. Each of the slabs was carved by the workshop of Jacopo della Quercia well before they died. James H. Beck, *Jacopo della Quercia*, New York: Columbia University Press, c1991 and Doralynn Schlossman Pines, “The Tomb Slabs of Santa Croce: A New ‘Sepoltuario,’” Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1985.
99 Goffen, 1986, 87. But ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, LXVI is full of orders to the executors of the doge’s will.
Moro held posthumous rights at San Giobbe strongly implying that his wishes were carried out at the church. The Doge’s testamentary directive to the executioners of his will to replace themselves as his advocates *in perpetuam* offers an idea of how Moro continued to hold sway well into the eighteenth century over the church and high altar chapel which housed his burial monument. In 1585, the friars of San Giobbe gave permission to Daniel Priuli, the patriarch of Venice, to construct his sepulcher and burial monument in the high chapel on one of the side walls. His numerous testamentary references to the tomb of Doge Gritti at san Francesco della Vigna suggest an affinity with the Observant Franciscans. However, the Priuli had a house on the *fondamenta* of San Giobbe and a few members of the family were buried in San Giobbe which may have endeared the church to Daniel, but also, his father, Angelo Maria had plans for burial at San Giobbe. One of the three slabs directly behind the high altar belongs to Angelo Maria Priuli who died in 1589. Furthermore, the Priuli were related by marriage to Cardinal Marc’ Antonio da Mula buried in the chapel near the transept.

The Priuli requested to bury Daniel in a wall tomb that would cover the entire side wall of the presbytery. In order to accommodate Daniel Priuli’s tomb in what was called alternatively the choir or the high altar chapel, the friars agreed to replace the existing altar with a thinner one. Priuli clearly modeled his own burial after the one given to the Doge Andrea Gritti at San Francesco della Vigna. He even insisted that the new altar follow the proportions of that at San Francesco della Vigna.

---

100 MCV, CC 3115/12. “Item voio et ordeno che caduauno de mie commessieri post ala sua morte substituir uno commissiar e per el simel I substituir de di tempo in tempo imperpetuo possi substituir.”

101 ASV, Proveddito del Comun, Reg. O, 131v. Sestiere di Cannaregio, Matricola della scola di S. Bernardino in San Giob. Priuli asks for a spot on the side of the altar, “usque ad limella sepulcrum Chori per longitudinem , et per latitudinem ovir ut ipse loco reperitur includendo dictum altare maius...et debeat faricar facere unam Archam pro suo deposito, et quoram declarabit, et debeat fabricar facere altare maius prefactum in loco ipso conforme Altare sancti francesci vinea proportione iuxta exigientiam ipsius loci sede cum tabernaculo in medio Sanctissimi Sacramenti, et duabes figuris una ab utuoque latere di San Bernardino, et S Iob, et transportare facere palum, que de presenti reperitur in choro, et amuoverer ianum, que facit transitum in ipso choro...”

Francesco della Vigna.\textsuperscript{103} The sixteenth-century executors of Moro’s will, named by earlier executors, intervened to halt the potential alteration of Moro’s burial space and to protect his original burial wishes. The executing committee acting on Moro’s behalf obliged the friars to withdraw the offer, citing possible detraction from the prestige and honor of the doge’s memorial. The convent sought 175 ducats in reparations for the decision.

**Bridge over Troubled Waters: Monumentalizing San Giobbe**

After Doge Moro’s work at San Giobbe, the overtures of ducal power instilled at the church continued to resonate as the executors of his will drew on funds from his account at the, “Monte vecchio in sestier de san polo” to pay for improvements to the church and proposed a new bridge.\textsuperscript{104} Moro envisioned San Giobbe as the focal point of an urban renewal program. His family owned property near the church and funded the abbey of Santa Maria della Misericordia, in what was the parish of San Geremiah also in the Cannaregio.\textsuperscript{105} As Moro supported projects in the Cannaregio throughout his life and was buried at San Giobbe, he also monumentalized the space in the vicinity of the hospital and the church. Moro asked for several offices of the dead said at his burial site directly after his death and every year on the anniversary of his death with all the Observant friars in the city present. In part, the space would need to accommodate the friars and have a dignified character for the annual funerary mass of a doge.

Moro not only oversaw the construction of San Giobbe, but he initiated the ambitious construction of a more permanent bridge across the Canal Regio leading to San Giobbe. Pietro Barozzini wrote of Moro on his death that he, “created easier access to the hospital, to the convent,
and to the church of San Giobbe, all for the love of St. Bernardino of Siena. That the bridge over the canal Regio was important to Moro is evident in the naming of his close nephew, Lorenzo as the Commissioner of Bridges. Moro’s projects to monumentalize San Giobbe were surely meant to rectify the problems of access to the site and the presumably shabby character that marked its origins. The entrance to the church of San Giobbe was not on the Canal Regio, the main artery of the neighborhood, but the smaller Rio San Giobbe. After San Giobbe was incorporated into the Procession for the Nativity of the Virgin undertaken by the scuola grande of San Giovanni Evangelista, the mariegola of the scuola reminds members of the confraternity to take shallow water boats when they visit San Giobbe as a stop during the procession, likely because they disembarked for the church on the shallower Rio San Giobbe façade front and not the deeper Canal Regio.

In 1475, Moro’s executors proposed a more “sumptuous” stone bridge over the Canal Regio based on the wishes and “memory” of Moro. The notes for the proposal indicate that the bridge would create easier access to the site, insinuating that the wooden bridge was more dilapidated. What evolved into the current Tre Archi Bridge completed in 1688 was initiated by Moro. (Figure 78 & Figure 79) In 1445, signaling heightened activity round San Giobbe, a

---

107 BMC, Codice Cicogna 3115.
108 Crouzet-Pavan, 1992, 119-120. The procession for the Nativity of the Virgin took place on 8 August. It made stops at San Giovanni Evangelista, the Frari, and San Giobbe.
wooden draw bridge was erected over the Canal Regio where the stone bridge now stands.\textsuperscript{111} Judging from its depiction in the 1500 view of Venice by Jacopo de Barbari and a sketch of the area from around the same time, it likely looked a lot like the wooden drawbridge over the Rialto at the turn of the century as depicted by Vettore Carpaccio in the Miracle of the Cross Panel of his St. Ursula Cycle. \textit{(Figure 39 \& Figure 80)}

In his testament, Christoforo Moro’s nephew Lorenzo refers to himself as the Procurator of Bridges, a position to which he may have been assigned in order to help his uncle the Doge improve the infrastructure, but the exact nature of the office is unclear. Moro’s close association with the political theorist, Domenico Morosini the executor of his will who wrote the treatise on governmental theory discussed in Chapter 1, \textit{De Bene Institutiones} in 1497, provides context for the improvements at San Giobbe. Domenico Morosini was one of the five signatory attendees on the plans to create the bridge. Ten years after Moro’s executors proposed a new bridge, on 22 May 1486 the superintendents of the commune proposed a campaign to improve the city’s infrastructure by systematizing the streets and bridges in Venice that they judged were still needy of work. On 26 November 1503, the stone Ponte Tre Archi that spans the Canal Regio at San Giobbe was finally erected, but it was replaced in 1688 with its present version.\textsuperscript{112} The bridge gave the church and the recently renovated Rio San Giobbe a more monumental entryway, from the vantage point of those ceremoniously traversing the arch over the bridge.

\textsuperscript{111} Appendix 1, Document 6.
\textsuperscript{112} ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, XLVI, 73v. “Di Ordini degli’Illustris: et Ecc: Sigg: Savii, et Essecutori alle Acque, si comette a Voi D. Marco Zuliani Guardian della Veneranda Scola di S. Bernardino a S. Giobbe di lasciar far un Casotto sul Terren di San Bernardino per servirsì di rifabricar il Ponte di San Giobbe. 13 August 1688. The Scuola of San Bernardino was ordered to give land to erect the deposit of the works “...pre far fabricar di Per il ponte grande ditto di San job, di piera, e disfatto quel di legno.” Susanna Biadene, “Progetti per il ponte di San Giobbe a Cannaregio,” \textit{Le Venezie possibili: da Palladio a Le Corbusier}, edited by Lionello Puppi and Giandomenico Romanelli, Milano: Electa, 1985, 116. ASV, SEA, Busta 399. In June 1688, the bridge was in terrible condition according to the Proto Domenico Margutti. On 10 September 1688 work is still not begun and Margutti proposes to the Savi the possible conditions of the contract for the “murer” that “dovera restaurar tutto detto ponte disfacendo prima il volto piccolo di cotta dalla parte di Ca’ Valier.”
The monumentalization of San Giobbe in Moro’s name extended from his plan to beautify and fix the infrastructure of Venice. At the beginning of his dogate in 1463, Moro ordered an excavation of the Grand Canal, presumably to clean the water along the main artery of civic spectacle in the city. In addition, by adding the second storey to the Arco Foscari, he gave the covered passageway that cut through the courtyard of the ducal basilica a greater vertical, and thus visual, exposition by adding a second storey to the work begin by Francesco Foscari. These projects fit within Renaissance concepts of urban renewal which equated a well-governed city with an orderly appearance.

Moro’s desire to reconstruct the bridge at San Giobbe may be in homage of Doge Sebastiano Ziani who was responsible for planning the Rialto Bridge. Doge Sebastiano Ziani constructed what we now know as the piazza and the piazzetta of San Marco. In constructing the basic plan of the Palazzo Ducale as it stands today, Ziani filled in the lagoon surrounding the palace: the piazzetta of San Marco between the Library and the Palazzo Ducale. On that new infill, Ziani erected the granite columns dedicated to St. Theodore and St. Mark at the Molo to recognize the two saint protectors of the Republic. Because Ziani is credited with dividing the neighborhoods of Venice into six *sestieri*, he organized and assigned the procurators to their property charge. He placed new prestige on the office of the Procurators by enlarging their offices in the Piazza San Marco.113 Through his family, Ziani held property in the Castello neighborhood. What is now the Arsenale stands on property he donated to the State and his family donated most of the land that is now the Observant church of San Francesco della Vigna. Doge Moro’s own patronage of the

113 The three offices of the Procurazie included the Procuratori de Supra, responsible for property around the piazza San Marco, the Procuratori de Citra, and the Procuratori de Ultra responsible for real estate on the Grand Canale. The buildings of the Procurazie bordered the north and south sides of the piazza, with a typically Venetian colonnade on the first floor and offices and apartments on the second. During the reign of Doge Ziani, plans were begin on the Piazzetta as well by reclaiming the moat next to the Palazzo Ducale and filling it in to landlock the basilica and the piazza.
Observant Franciscans may have been informed by the Ziani family’s donations to the religious order. But the construction of the bridge at San Giobbe may have been an attempt to imbue Moro with an urban renewal project that could evoke those undertaken by Doge Ziani.

**Breaking Rules: Franciscan Building Practices**

Moro’s patronage of San Giobbe seems to have fit into the Franciscan Order’s Rules for ownership, but the degree to which the church of San Giobbe reflected an emerging type of Franciscan ecclesiastical structure is more debatable and exposes the problems with definitions of building typology undertaken by several Europeans. Several scholars have explained the prevalence of the aisleless nave in many Franciscan churches, including San Giobbe, as a way of offering the worshippers an unobstructed space for hearing and seeing sermons, thus replicating the public experience of preaching.\(^{114}\) While the explanation seems logical enough the typology is difficult to sustain. Throughout the fifteenth century, the Franciscans dispatched popular preachers to give long sermons in the vulgate, promoting the ideas of St. Francis and just as often condemning usurers, Jews, Muslims, and sexual deviants. The friars had to establish themselves in cities for extended periods of time to meet the Order’s commitment to preaching. Periods of penitence in the Christian calendar proved especially popular for public preaching engagements. The friars typically preached in public spaces, famously illustrated by Sano di Pietro in his paintings of Bernardino of Siena preaching from a makeshift wooden pulpit in the Piazza del Campo in Siena during his Lenten cycle of sermons in 1427. (Figure 81) The most accessible spaces were outdoors. In a woodcut from the didactic guide *Confesison* by Girolamo da Padova,

---

In discussing Franciscan buildings, the common approach is to see how the rules for building, as devised by the Franciscans, apply case by case. In 1260, at the general chapter meeting of the Franciscan Order in Narbonne, the most detailed regulations for Franciscan building were drafted. Subsequent regulations tended to reiterate the rules put forth at Narbonne. They call for sobriety in decoration to reflect the Franciscan commitment to poverty and they ascribe a morality to decoration in the call for modesty that evokes Vitruvius' diatribe against irrational decoration.

Ornateness and excess are directly opposed to poverty; we therefore decree that in buildings all
ornateness of painting, paneling, windows, pillars and other such things be studiously avoided, and likewise, all excess in length, breadth, and height, taking due account of the conditions of each place. Churches must under no circumstances be vaulted, except for the apse, without permission from the minister general. The belfry must henceforth not be built in the form of a tower. Nor should there henceforth be painting or stained glass windows telling stories in pictures, except the main window of the apse behind the high altar, in which there may be put pictures only of Christ crucified, the Blessed Virgin, St. John, St. Francis, and St. Anthony.


A. Carlini, “Constitutions generales Ordinis Fratrum Minorum anno 1316 Assisii conditae,” *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 4 (1911): 276-302, 508-526. “Ecclesias autem et quaecumque alia edificia que, considerato fratrum habitantium numero, excessiva merito debeant reputari, fieri de cetero firmiter prohibemus. Sintque fratres deinceps et ubique edificijis temperatis et humilibus contenti secundum decentiam sui status, in quibus curiositas in picturis, celaturis, columnis, fenestris et hulismodi, ac superfluitas in longitudine, latitudine et altitudine, secundum loci conditionem et morem patrie, artius evitentur. Nullumque notabile edificium de cetero constructur vel destruatur sine licentia et dispositione ministri. Et qui contrarium fecerit vel consuluerit, de loco irrevoçabiliter expellatur, et alijs penis gravibus puniatur.” These rules are very similar to those drafted almost sixty years later:
The terms of the Franciscan Rules overlap with the Dominican Order’s proscriptions for building drafted about thirty years earlier, but they are not as detailed. The Dominicans also called for modesty and the minimal decoration, but they placed limits on the dimensions of their churches. In the recorded history of the Franciscan Order, the Rules for building are not that specific. Diversions from the modesty called for in the rules are permitted with the consent of the Provincial Minister, but the call for modestly left room for interpretation.

In the thirteenth century, William of Nottingham insisted on crude building materials. He had the stone walls of the friars’ dormitory at Shrewsbury pulled down and replaced with mud. William of Nottingham’s radical humility contrasts with the huge basilica begun by the religious order in Francis’ hometown of Assisi right after he was canonized in 1228. The lower church of the basilica was almost complete by the time of the 1260 Chapter at Narbonne in which the Rules for building were drafted. The basilica at Assisi was devised by one of Francis’ most ardent followers, Brother Elias, the former provincial minister of the Order in Syria. (Figure 83)

That the basilica was covered by ribbed vaults and frescoes in the lower chapel arguably places the seat of the Franciscans in violation of their own calls for modesty. Because the Rules for building were so vague, most Franciscan convents violated the standards in some way. At San Giobbe, for example, there is a tower for the belfry, there are vaults, and the church was adorned by several fifteenth-century paintings that had subject matter outside of the parameters prescribed.

117 G. Villetti, Francesco d’Assisi: chiese e conventi, Electa, 1982, 97. In 1228, the Dominicans devised the following law for buildings, “Mediocres domos et humiles habeat frater nostri ita quod murus domorum sine solario non excedat in altitudine mensuram XII pedum, et cum solario XX, ecclesia XXX, et non fiat lapidibus testudinata nisi forte super chorum et sacratam. Si quis de cetero contra fecit pene gravioris culpe subiacebit.”
119 Little, 23. Ironically, the stone was taken down at great expense.
While studies of Franciscan Rules for building provide records of how the Franciscans wished to project their identity, the disjuncture between Franciscan buildings and the written Rules for building suggests that the Rules were often disregarded. In part, the transgressions against the Rule must have been structural: St. Francis believed that buildings should not be constructed specially for his followers, but rather, the friars should use abandoned buildings and repair them, as he was told to do in one of his first divine visions at the church of San Damiano near Assisi. Directly after the Observant Franciscans were given official papal recognition at the Council of Constance in 1415, the friars took over private residences to establish churches. If the friars were taking over preexisting foundations and buildings for their own churches and convents, the conditions for use were set.

The repetitive motifs in the design of Franciscan churches, such as the aisleless naves and timber roofs, do not religiously adhere to the Chapter rules, but they accommodate the Franciscan preaching activities and liturgical principles. The hierarchy in the liturgy would be somewhat mitigated by the absence of aisles for the view of the high altar would be more accessible. However, there are other explanations for the predominance of large aisleless naves in mendicant churches that have not been adequately explored. That the Franciscans provided indulgences for those who celebrated mass at the high altar likely helped focus attention on the liturgical center of the church.

In the mid-thirteenth century, the Franciscan Haymo of Faversham made changes to the missal used by the friars and later by the whole church. The emphasis on chanting and the high
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120 Esser, 165. Moorman, 63.
121 Amonoci, 19. After the official split between the Franciscans in 1517, and the stricter *Minores Strictpris Observantiae* are published, Franciscan building is more often channelled into a typology.
122 Van Dijk, 51.
123 Ibid. The gradual amended by Haymo was issued in 1251 and the antiphon soon after.
mass would have made visibility and the elimination of sound barriers more important. The preachers also taught *laude spirituali*, songs consisting of simple refrains that were not recited in Latin but in the local vernacular.\textsuperscript{124}

Throughout the fifteenth century, mendicant churches typically had timber truss roofs. The façade of San Giobbe in the Barbari View indicates that it was either dismantled or the roofline was raised at some point after 1500. The profile of the back of the façade in the View is a trilobed projection that is higher than the nave and differs greatly from the façade that exists today in which the tympanum is level with the nave roof.\textsuperscript{125} (Figure 38 & Figure 84) Before it was vaulted as it is today, the fifteenth-century truss roof of San Giobbe probably covered a wood beam ceiling, as most Franciscan churches.\textsuperscript{126} The conversion in roofing systems likely occurred after the fifteenth-century ogival windows were blocked from the cloister, for the buttresses on the exterior of the nave terminate at what is the cornice level inside and pointed vaults begin right above the cornice. (Figure 85 & Figure 86) Each vault frames a square window which neither aligns with the altars along the south end of the nave nor with the long double ogival windows blocked up behind the altars.

In the sixteenth-century redesigns for the Observant church of San Francesco della Vigna in Venice, drawn up by the friar Francesco Zorzi in the 1530s, sound quality motivated the addition of stone vaults.\textsuperscript{127} (Figure 87) Zorzi recommended having, “All the chapels and choir vaulted, because the word or song of the minister echoes better from the vault than it would from the


\textsuperscript{125} McAndrew, 141.

\textsuperscript{126} Villetti, 1982.

rafters.\textsuperscript{128} The song would reverberate better in an open space.\textsuperscript{129} San Giobbe did have an organ in the sixteenth century so the stone vaults may have been installed in the choir for the purpose of improving sound. But these stone vaults were prevalent. King Sigismund settled the Observant Franciscans in Visegrad in Hungary and, at some point before its sixteenth-century destruction, it had stone vaults and a single nave.

That the addition of stone vaults contradicts the earlier Franciscan rule prohibiting them suggests that the Rules for building were not high on the agenda of the Observants, the friars were not familiar with them, and that more localized convention dictated form. Many scholars turn to the rules for Franciscan building to relate to the typology of the churches but tying the construction for a building to vague precepts often hundreds of years old, yields discrepancies for the most part.

Without relying too much on the Franciscan Rules for building, Deborah Howard has identified an emerging Observant Franciscan typology at the end of the fifteenth century at the end of Francesco di Giorgio’s life.\textsuperscript{130} She saw the churches of the order typically built with a double-storied single nave without aisles and a protruding choir behind the altar. She believed that the redesign for San Salvatore in Florence in the 1490s by Il Cronaca was one of the first Observant churches to put these motifs to use, though it maintained its timber roof.\textsuperscript{131} (Figure 88) The other examples she cites, such as San Francesco della Vigna, did not.

\textsuperscript{128} Sanudo \textit{Diarii}, 24, 321. Wittkower, 102. Zorzi represented the Observants at the Franciscan assembly in 1517. in his prescriptions for building written in 1535, the year after the pouring of the foundation at San Francesco della Vigna, Francesco Zorzi recommended the revision of Sansovino’s plan, relating all the dimensions of the church to a ratio of 1:3 in the hopes of achieving a harmonic space.
\textsuperscript{129} Josef Laszlovsky, “The Friary of Visegrad,” 27, 28.
\textsuperscript{131} Howard, 113. Linda Pellecchia Najemy, “The First Observant Church of San Salvatore al Monte in Florence,” \textit{Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz}, 23/3 (1979) 273-275. Luca della Tosa gave the Observants the land, a palace and gardens, near San Miniato in a document dated 20 February 1418. A hospital was recorded
I believe that Il Cronaca’s design, like the others that followed him derived from Francesco di Giorgio. Since the Franciscans did not own their churches and the construction or redesign generally fell under the auspices of a patron, the Renaissance architectural treatises dedicated to the financial supporters of the convents may reveal more about how designs for mendicant building came about. Francesco di Giorgio, for example, provided a section on convent design in his architectural treatise.132 While other religious orders inhabited the outskirts, Francesco di Giorgio placed the convents of the Franciscan Observants in cities. For his Franciscan churches, Francesco di Giorgio’s plans were highly symmetrical and did not have aisles. He proscribed belfries, cloisters for burials, separate chapels, a choir in the center for the recitation of divine offices, sacristies, and separate spaces for the lay friars and those who had taken vows. His plans for the convents of the religious orders fulfill distinct functions for preaching, hearing confession, sermons, and the recitation of the mass, but they were devised by an architect and not the Franciscans. (Figure 89) While the churches were massed as hierarchical spaces, they were meant to accommodate several visitors and often called for the doubling of service areas, such as the sacristy.

Francesco di Giorgio was responsible for building several mendicant churches at the end of the fifteenth century. Larger Franciscan convents that he redesigned, such as Bernardino’s home convent, the Osservanza in Siena, became prototypes for other contemporaneous churches due to Francesco di Giorgio and later, Fra Zorzi at San Francesco della Vigna. di Giorgio’s church of San Bernardino in Urbino has a long retrochoir, domes, and no aisles like San Giobbe. Where the Venetian church has a heavy cornice that wraps around the church to tie it together, Francesco di
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Giorgio uses a heavy inscription praising St. Bernardino and the Observants as preachers. 

(Figure 90)

The monastery of St. Bernardino, the Osservanza outside of Siena on the Capriola Hill had a long choir and an aisleless nave with chapels as the church at San Giobbe, but it is unknown whether this scheme was devised when Bernardino had the Siena Osservanza rebuilt in 1423, or in the 1470s when Francesco di Giorgio added a domed chancel. Francesco di Giorgio’s emphasis in his built and written work on choirs and domes suggests that they were becoming an important part of church design. For the reconstruction of one of Bernardino’s first residences as a Franciscan, the church of the L’Osservanza in Siena in 1474, the Franciscans were to maintain their modest decorum in the construction of the dome. (Figure 91)

For more security and the protection of the said building, the vault which covers the choir, in the fashion of a round cupola, it should be higher than the other vaults of the church and made in an honest way, in such a mode that it will not offend the conscious nor will it result in any notable transgression of our rules and constitution or our Order and family in Italy. 

The Osservanza dome penetrates the ridgeline for it is elevated on a drum, but it is encased in a brick cylindrical covering on the exterior. The call for security and decorum at the Observant Franciscan church which once hosted St. Bernardino may have informed the covered dome at San Giobbe. The San Giobbe dome does not have a drum and does not even penetrate the roof line; it is not visible from the bridge of the Tre Archi to the south, but it is covered by a truss roof

---

133 Martino Bertagna, L’Osservanza di Siena : la Basilica e i suoi codici miniati, Milano: Electa, 1984, III, 1964, 8-9. “Per piu securita et fortezza di decto edificio, la volta la quale sa affare sopra il coro si faccia, a modo d’duna cupola ritonda, la quale habbi ad essere piu alta de l’altre volte della chiesa et faccisi in modo honesto, in tal modo che non si habbi ad offendere la coscienza e non habbi a resultare o soffrire notabile transgression de la regola nostra e de le costituzioni del’ordine nostro et de la famiglia nostra d’Italia. Imperocche in la sopradecta scritta si dice che la chiesa si facci largha braccia sedici, vedendo che non harebbe il suo sexton e che con grandissima difficolt et senza alcuna ragione si adapterebbero le volte, agionsero et deliberaro e sopradecti padri che si facci larga dal choro in giu braccia diciasepte.”
system. (Figure 92) From the inside, four of the eight windows are blocked due to the truss covering which conceals the dome on the exterior elevation.

The Lowly Dome

An explicit reference to a dome is not made in the documents at San Giobbe until a 1691 note about the cupola of the high altar chapel in severe danger of falling.\(^\text{134}\) The problem lies in the absence of visual representations of the dome. The view of San Giobbe in the Barbari View published in 1500, two years before the *Memorie* does not show a dome, but an apse. There may have been a dome that did break through the ridgeline of the church. The dome on pendentives which covers the chancel of San Giobbe is not visible in the Barbari map and no definitive evidence exists for its installation. Given that the domes of other churches are shown in the Barbari View, if the dome was visible, it would have been depicted.\(^\text{135}\)

This issue has dominated histories of San Giobbe and may account for the stagnation in the history of the church. Later views of Venice do not diverge much in detail from the 1500 Barbari View. The similarity in the depictions of the site in successive iterations of Venetian views suggests that San Giobbe was not easily observed from the vantage point that the cartographers and surveyors used or that depictions of this area of Venice were generally copied from previous views. Because Barbari’s View was likely completed over a period of time, the changes that occurred at the church by the time the View was published in 1500 may not have been recorded. Juergen Schultz believes that the Merlo View of 1660 was an exception to those who copied Barbari’s View for it looked at the city afresh, accounted for new building, and corrected the

\(^{134}\) ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, xlvi, 52v. 1699. Di Comun per far comodar l’Arco della capella del Altar di chiesa. ASV, Scuola Piccola, Busta 260, 1691 28 Ott. “Giulio Cassina Testor fu nostro Guardano mando Parte, di non far conzar il Colmo della Capella ducal del Dose Moro; et in caso che li Frati volessero far Lite, si è fatto ballotar f 5—per spinderli contro la Giusridizione, che la scola nostra, in detta capella, et Altare di S. Bernardino.”

\(^{135}\) Ibid., 141.
omissions of his predecessors.  

(Figure 93) However, the Merlo view depicts the church of San Giobbe just as Barbari depicted it 160 years earlier, without the dome. Only thirty years later, in 1691, the cupola of the church was in dire need of repair which suggests that it was in place by 1660 when the Merlo View was published, but the 1797 view by Giampiccoli does not show the dome.  

(Figure 94)

In the fifteenth-century schematic drawing of the neighborhood of San Giobbe, what appears to be a small domed structure stands behind the nave of San Giobbe. (Figure 39) The drawing is not representational; it shows only the faintest outlines of major property delineations in the neighborhood, and it combines elements of plan and elevation, but the inclusion of this small structure topped by a cross, may be significant. Otherwise, there are no depictions of San Giobbe's dome before the nineteenth-century renovations following its damage by an Austrian bomb. (Figure 95) Those renovations to the dome were likely based on its previous appearance.

The domed high altar chapel of San Giobbe has been the subject of numerous renovation campaigns which partly accounts for the problems in its chronology. Documentation of the nineteenth-century reconstruction of the dome describes the replacement of the triangular covering. One of the two archived drawings of the reconstructed dome from 1861 describes it as a representation of the "new dome (nuova cupola) in section and in plan with an octagonal tambour, or drum covering relative to the presbytery of S. Giobbe." The other drawing represents the scaffolding that covered the "renovations" to the dome. (Figure 96) This drawing of the

---


scaffolding stops right below the roof covering over the dome, concentrating the north side of the presbytery and the structure of the pendentives and the cupola. With so little focus on the roof of the church in the drawings, it was probably already in place. If the dome had been exposed on the exterior elevation before the damage, with nineteenth-century reinforcements, it likely would have been exposed again.\textsuperscript{138}

If the dome was initiated before the dome of San Michele in Isola in 1486, it would have been the first low hemispherical dome on pendentives in Venice after San Marco. The date of the dome would determine Moro's commitment to recreating San Marco. There are certain similarities the dome shares with the domes at San Marco that make the covering of the dome seem deliberate regardless of when the cupola was installed. The dome is a low hemispherical dome on pendentives as the domes at San Marco. Eight windows pierce the base of the dome of San Giobbe, the same deep windows that encircle the domes at San Marco. (Figure 97 & Figure 98) By drawing on the domes of San Marco, Moro would have co-opted an architectural and iconographical vocabulary which held the collective identity of Venice. Moro was motivated in his support of San Giobbe by the connection he could forge to symbols of ducal power and divine legitimacy to the dogeship.

While the notice for a covered dome at L'Osservanza gives the idea of Franciscan propriety, ideas which may have already influenced the way the dome was built at San Giobbe. However, the covered dome at San Giobbe has precedent in the dome that covered the transept of San Lorenzo in Florence and to some degree the dome of San Lorenzo in Milan.\textsuperscript{139} (Figure 99, Figure 100, & Figure 101) The exterior pyramidal brick work at San Lorenzo conceals the

\textsuperscript{138} Ceriana, 24-7. Archivio Soprintendenza per I Beni Arti ed Architettura di Venezia, Busta 36.
\textsuperscript{139} Saalman, 207. Manetti claimed that the tower-like cover over the cupola of San Lorenzo was not a part of Brunelleschi's overall scheme.
dome and its support system. The dome over the transept crossing at San Lorenzo was closed in 1456 and was the subject of a critique by Giovanni da Guaiole a year later.\textsuperscript{140} According to Brunelleschi’s biographer, Antonio Manetti, the dome of San Lorenzo, “differed in all respects both inside and outside from Filippo’s intentions.”\textsuperscript{141} While the project may have diverged from Brunelleschi’s original designs, Cosimo de’ Medici stood behind the project and was actively engaged in its engineering. The spot under the dome of San Lorenzo would be the site of Cosimo’s slab marker. (Figure 102) Howard Saalman believes that the dome at San Lorenzo might not have been designed to pierce the ridgeline and that it was covered by a superstructure, as San Giobbe.\textsuperscript{142} The mention of a tribune combined with the fact that the dome is currently invisible from the exterior of the church suggests that the tribune referred to a cupola or special vaulting over the high altar chapel which set it off from the nave.\textsuperscript{143}

The dome of San Giobbe closely followed the San Lorenzo dome in that it is covered and its apex reached almost double the diameter of the base of the four piers which supported it. The covering may have reduced weight from the dome by drawing the pressure outwards, but the reasons for why the structures of these domes are often concealed from the exterior is elusive. As we will see, Doge Moro looked to Medici patronage for his own architectural patronage and burial plans so borrowing the dome configuration would not have been unusual in the context of Moro building.

A chronology of work put forth at San Giobbe in the \textit{Memorie}, taken in 1502, says that the high altar chapel was covered by a tribune in the second phase of work, “Made by the Serene Doge Cristoforo Moro, who made the high altar chapel unified with the other smaller

\textsuperscript{140} Saalman, 179. Manetti, 148.  
\textsuperscript{141} Manetti, 1272-80.  
\textsuperscript{142} Saalman, 1989, 121.  
\textsuperscript{143} McAndrew, 140.
chapels.”¹⁴⁴ In contemporaneous documents about San Lorenzo, the dome is referred to as the tribune.¹⁴⁵ The mention of a tribune over the chapel in the Memorie may have also referred to a dome over the high altar chapel. The term at least means that it must have been vaulted in such a way to give emphasis to the high altar below. The high altar chapel of the church was likely done by the time of San Giobbe’s consecration on 14 April 1493, though the consecration of the Frari a year later might have hastened the consecration.¹⁴⁶

When did the Friars Start to Sing?: The Date of the Choir

While the date of the dome poses the greatest problem to understanding how Moro envisioned his burial chapel, the choir at San Giobbe is one of the biggest challenges to the building’s architectural history. If the retrochoir was completed in the fifteenth century, it would have been the first of its kind in Venice.¹⁴⁷ In the 1500 view of Venice by Jacopo de’ Barbari, the nave of the church terminates in an apse rather than the thirteen-meter retrochoir protruding from the high altar as it does today. The choir is still not depicted in Merlo’s 1660 view of Venice but the choir which is big enough for General Chapter meetings at San Giobbe is recorded in building histories of the church. By 1779, a map of Venice by Belluno shows the long choir of San Giobbe, but the retrochoir is rarely depicted before the eighteenth century despite early seventeenth-century references to it. (Figure 38)

The presence of long or deep choirs behind the altar did not become common in Venice until the sixteenth century. The Palladian churches in Venice at San Giorgio Maggiore and San Francesco della Vigna were among the first in the city to install long retrochoirs protruding from

¹⁴⁴ ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, xlv, 41v. “2:a edification dalla tribuna in suso la capella suddeta che fece la bona serenis.a del S.mo pren.e sig. Chfto Moro, che fece la capella del Altar sd.ta con oltre capellette sono unite.”
¹⁴⁵ Saalman, 1989, 121.
¹⁴⁶ McAndrew, 134.
¹⁴⁷ McAndrew, 254.
behind their altars. The long retrochoir removed clerics from the visual field of the laity, thus affording the clergy more privacy and separation from the laity in the celebration of the mass, and allowing the worshippers a greater view of the celebrant.\textsuperscript{148} At San Giobbe, the presence of a space behind the altar that could accommodate the friars of San Giobbe increased the visibility of the activity at the altar for all participants.

At San Giobbe, two shallow steps in the nave lead up to the high altar chapel. A large rounded arch of Istrian stone spans the opening of the high altar chapel, flanked by two smaller altar niches in the transept to form the triumphal arch configuration that separates the nave from the twenty-five meter liturgical east that encompasses the high altar chapel and the choir. The smaller niches contain inscriptions bearing reference to their patrons, the Corner in 1506 and the Marin in 1502, providing a \textit{terminus ante quem} for the arch division. This liturgical east is divided into three principle spaces: the first is directly behind the arch, covered by the dome above Moro’s tomb slab. (Figure 53 \& Figure 62) The second space contains the altar, while the third is the choir, screened off by the altar and the organ. (Figure 103 \& Figure 104)

The space divides differently in plan than in elevation. In plan, the chancel of San Giobbe consists of two overlapping squares—one with the slab and one with the altar broken by a single step at the edge of the tomb that leads up to the altar. (Figure 3) The beginning of the arch to the step equals just over seven meters square in plan. However, the square that the worshiper registers is different. It begins at the back of the arch and extends to a pilaster just behind the step.

\textsuperscript{148} James Ackerman, “The Gesu in Light of Contemporary Church Design,” \textit{Distance Points}, Cambridge: The MIT Press, 425. Howard, 128-30, 186-88. San Giorgio’s retrochoir was almost contemporaneous following the Tridentine abolishment of the recitation of the divine office. Howard believed the addition of these long choirs behind the high altars and removed from the sight of the laity, meant that the high altar would now serve as a rood screen offering the friars and monks privacy and a permanent place to sit even if the doge visited during a mass and needed to sit in the high altar chapel. Jaqueline E. Jung, “Beyond the Barrier: The Unifying Role of the Choir Screen in Gothic Churches,” \textit{The Art Bulletin}, (Dec. 2000). Marcia Hall, “The Ponte in S. Maria Novella: The Problem of the Rood Screen in Italy,” \textit{Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes} 37 (1974), 157-73.
and slab. The step forms the beginning of another seven meter square ending at the back end of
the altar. These two overlapping squares equal about fourteen meters, just a fraction over eight
Venetian passi. The space from triumphal arch to altar roughly corresponds to the eight passi of
land donated by Isabetta Bragadin in 1451, meant “to enlarge the church of the monastery.” 149
Most scholars believe that this donation formed the long choir behind the altar because the
measurements are almost exact. The altar divides the space bounded by the triumphal arch
configuration and the back of the choir almost into two liturgical spaces that each equal about 14
meters. Thus, because the two spaces that picot around the altar are nearly exact in length, it is
also possible that the Bragadin land was used in the twenty years after it was donated to form the
liturgical heart of the church the high altar chapel and not the retrochoir.

In fifteenth-century Venice, the choir typically stood in the transept crossing, or occasionally
extended into the nave, as the choir stalls in the Frari in 1468. The similarities between the arch
opening into the high altar chapel at San Giobbe and the arched choir screen at the Frari suggests
that at San Giobbe, the arch screened off the choir area as well. (Figure 105) As a design issue, it
is difficult to determine how deep the space behind the high altar arch at San Giobbe extended
during the fifteenth century due to its absence from the Barbari View and the lack of information
on the early church. In the Barbari View, the campanile is located in the middle of the church as
it is now, but the campanile is now just to the north of the presbytery, while in the 1500 View it
stands in the middle of the nave, which is depicted with four windows as can be seen today.
(Figure 38) In 1516, the friars destroyed the campanile, but it is likely that they restored it on its
original foundations. The view of the Barbari surveyors was likely distorted and the campanile

149 Venetian Passo = 1.7387 meters.
was pushed towards the west in the depiction.\textsuperscript{150} If the choir extended behind the altar, the engravers did not yet understand where the presbytery was in the plan.

The most recent scholarship on San Giobbe posits that the Barbari View is correct in its portrayal of an apse and that the long retrochoir behind the altar is a product of the seventeenth century. Matteo Ceriana believes that the choir was not built until 1607 based on a brief note published by Emmanuele Cicogna for payment to “renovate our church altar on the occasion that they have installed a new choir (fatto il coro da novo).”\textsuperscript{151} Ceriana’s later dating of the choir is supported by the record of a 1605 meeting in which the friars and the confraternities resolved to provide the church with a choir in which all the friars could pray together.\textsuperscript{152}

Despite the note published by Ceriana, the possibility that the long space behind the altar predated the seventeenth century is also strong. James Ackerman conjectured that the nave and


\textsuperscript{151} ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, XLVII, 19-23, 49. 9 Ott. 1607. “Andrea Spinelli, che dette la supplica fatta dalli PP al NH Zorzi querini al cap.o del per poter rinovar l’altar di chiesa in occassione del coro fatto da novo.” Ceriana, 25. Ceriana cites the fragment above noted by Cicogna.

\textsuperscript{152} In 1607, there were several motions about the choir passed. One enforcing the recitation of prayers there. ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 7, LXXV, “...Per cavedal de ducati dusento in virt~i d’un’Instrumento pregati nelli atti di rifabricio Beatiano not.ri di veneti sotto a di 26 novembre 1607... essi r. vi padri essi, et successori promettino, et si obbligno di celebrar, et che da loro successori ser an celebrate messe vi al mese nella sudetta coro che da in perpetuo intendentiosi esser cominciate a celebrate dette messe nel giorno premo dell’istante, et successive, et ciò in remedio dell’anema di esso mag.to sig.ri effano così vicendo come dopo la sua morte et de suoi defunti.” In 1607, a dispute broke out between the \textit{scuola} of San Bernardino and the friars about who would make payment for the renovation of the altar. “Li ritrova nella chiesa deli molto Reverendi Padri di San Giob l’altar maggior dedicato e fabricato al honor di San Bernardin, qual e sempre stato usato et reseguato dalla scola indirizzata al’honor di detto santo in detta chiesa. Il qual altar maggiore desideranno li detti molto Reverendi Padri rifabricar, e rinovar in honor di detto Santo et a maggior ornamento, et abbelimento di d.a Chiesa, alla quale honorata et devota opera intendono anco concorrere li fratelli della detta benedetta scola di San bernardino. Però essendo stati ricercati dalli detti reverendi padri di poter rinovar, et infabricar detto Altar, e che debbano detti fratelli contribuire, e concorere alla detta spesa e pareando a detti fratelli detta richiesta esser giusta, et honesta, et doversi abraciare. Però fu posta parte nella capitola senate di detta Scola dal mag.lio Sig. Francesco Covreloti Guardian magior di essa confraternita, che sia promesto alli d.ti R.R.P.P. di poter rinovar, et rifabricar d.o Altar maggiore dedicato al nome di San Bernardino p.o per abbelimento e ornamento di d.a Chiesa, alla construtura della quale opera siano datti delli dinnari di d.a scola. P 30 da 1664. per p:to il qual altare rifabricato, che sia resti come era p. Avanti restaurato alla detta scola ne possino essi R. Di Padri in Alcun topo concederlo ad altri, ne appropriarlo ad altre scole, o confraternita. Drizzate, o che si instimessero in detta chiesa, e cosi saranno dechiaratione li detti reverendi Padri d:esser così contenti. The choir was big enough at this point to accommodate the two doves that joined the friars in mass. 20 May 1696. “Giacomo Millesi, detto Biscotello, non solo pagò le sudette à 59:12; mà cresèe la posta di dare Z 2:10 all’Organista, 2 Lire quattro per 2 para di Colombini alli Frati che cantero in Coro.”
the choir are probably contemporaneous since the vaults are similar.\textsuperscript{153} While Ceriana believes
the note refers to the renovation of the entire choir space, Deborah Howard believes that note
may only be speaking of the installation of new choir stalls or to the revaulting of the choir.\textsuperscript{154}
Howard has given a fifteenth-century date for the entire twenty-eight meters behind the high altar
chapel screen arch because the exterior brick masonry is consistent with the rest of the church.

(Figure 106) The vaults on the inside of the choir have a point and a curve typical of the
seventeenth century, though the choir ceiling may have been redone in conjunction with the
vaulting in the ceiling of the nave in the rest of the church. (Figure 107) The Gothic arches on
the exterior of the choir are stylistically closer to the late Gothic exterior of the Frari rather than
the seventeenth-century Gothic revival. If the seventeenth-century renovations to the church took
place on the interior, the spaces would have shifted a bit, but the foundations would have
remained the same. Given the three sixteenth-century slabs behind the high altar from the
sixteenth century, at least, the choir was located behind the altar, though the burial request does
not specify how deep the area was.

At San Marco, there were two choirs, one for the doge, and the other for the clergy of the
church. The choir for the church clergy was located behind that of the doge. At San Giobbe, the
high altar chapel, containing the tomb of the Doge was likely where Moro sat when he attended
mass at the church since he owned the rights over the high altar chapel. It would seem that even
if the choir was not finished by the time of Moro’s death, it would have been planned. In 1473,
the Great Council records two hundred friars at the church. To accommodate even a portion of

\textsuperscript{153} Howard, 2002, 129. Ackerman, 1979, 289. Ackerman believed that the presbytery punctured the long corridor in
the fifteenth century, giving definition to the two spaces, the nave and the choir. Heydenreich and Lotz, \textit{Architecture
in Italy, 1400-1600}, Harmondsworth, 1974, 87. Lotz thinks that in the 1460s, the large chancel was added to the
center of the nave and choir.

\textsuperscript{154} Matteo Ceriana reviewed the documents on the church published by the nineteenth-century epigrapher
Emmanuele Cicogna in an attempt to understand how the dome and the choir relate to the building’s history.
the friars for a mass, a large choir would be necessary. At least by the late sixteenth century, the friars were obliged to make processions by the *cappelle grande* to venerate the holy relic and the added space around the altar would have granted the privilege to more friars.

In Venice, several of the liturgical concerns that would involve the choir arose before the Counter Reformation, when these retrochoirs became more fashionable. The bishop, Lorenzo Giustiniani (1381-1456) regulated the musical requirements of the liturgy when he became the first patriarch of Venice in 1451. Giustiniani was a follower of St. Bernardino and celebrated mass at San Giobbe. Based on his preference for the chanted mass, the retrochoir may have been installed early on. As a composer, the preacher and follower of St. Bernardino of Siena, St. Giovanni da Capistrano, may have made an impact on the movement of the choir to behind the altar. In 1453, for example, the Observant Franciscan church of San Bernardino of Verona which has a choir behind the altar was consecrated by Giovanni da Capistrano. He also wrote the antiphon which was sung after the vespers in the long retrochoir at San Bernardino in Urbino.

---

155 Cicogna, 535. 5 Aprilis "Vadit pars quod iisdem fratibus Sancti Job in quorum monasterio hoc anno celebraturi sunt eorum Capitolum ad quod concurrunt fraters ad num. 200, et sint pauperrimi quia vivunt de eleemosinis, solvi debeat per quibuscumque pecunii nostris pretium stariorum viginti farinarum, et liberarum septingentarum cranium quando celebrabunt Capitolium predictum, sicut alias factum fuit ut hac piissima eleemosina ferventiores flant in corum orationibus."

156 ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 7, 14. "Molto mag.li signori osservanti. Doveando neccesariamente provever d'un choro, conforme à questa vostra e nostra chiesa di S. Giobbe, ove giorno e notte, unitamente hanno a convenire tutti li Padri à lodare il Sig.re et à pregare per la conservatione, et prosperità delle Magnificentie vostre ne ritrovandosi il povero Monasterio. Facoltà di poterlo fare con l'eleemosine ordinarie, ricercandosi in ciò grosissima spesa. vengono supplichevolmente, tutti questi Padri à pregarle, volere per le pietosissime visere della Misericordia con estraordinaria eleemosina congiutarti in così bisignosa, et honorata opera, che di ciò oltre gli obblighi ordinarii, di nuovo s'offeriscono tutti per se stessi, et per i loro successori di pregar H.S. Dno, per la felice lor conservatione. Quod Deus dignetur concedere, in gratia Amen."

157 Labalme, 1969.
The vespers provided the inscription praising Bernardino which wrapped around the church. Giovanni da Capistrano is reported to have stayed at San Giobbe at least once and he may have had an affect on the extension of the long choir behind the altar.

The best explanation for the long choir space is that it was built in stages. In the Barbari View of Venice, there are two faint lines extending from the retaining wall behind San Giobbe, perhaps the foundations for the longer choir. The area around the interior presbytery of San Giobbe shows signs of elongation in stages. Close examination of the interior brickwork of the church reveals registers that are approximately equal on either side of the chancel but which began to differ after each pilaster towards the choir, suggesting that the bricks were laid at different times.

Moreover, the step that cuts through the chapel and abuts Moro’s tomb, leading up to the altar divides the square presbytery in a location that is not symmetrical, but it is 5.95 meters from the arch screen and 1.5 meters from the far back pilasters. If the plan of this high altar chapel was conceived as a square, the step may have been installed to ensure that the altar would stand a few inches higher than the slab or the step was a preexisting design constraint. Lastly, the pilasters marking each stage of the presbytery and choir are different in style and width and are at different states of completion. The bays between the pilasters of the high altar chapel evenly spaced. The area from the arch to the first pilaster is 7.45 meters exactly, followed by a 2.07 meter gap to the next pilaster. From this penultimate pilaster there is 2.26 meter span to the pilaster that demarcates the back of the altar. Beyond that extends the 13.35 meter choir.

\[158\] It reads: “O splendor pudicitiae, zelator paupertatis, amator innocentiae, cultor virginitatis, lustrator sapientae, protector veritatis: ante thronum fulgidum aeternae maiestatis, para nobis adyrum divinae pietatis. Implora nobis gratiam, beate Bernardini.”
During the 1450s, when San Giobbe was in its initial stages, Pope Nicholas V planned renovations around St. Peter's and the Borgo in Rome, a project that Moro would have seen while he was in Rome as an Ambassador for Venice in 1454 working out the details of the Peace of Lodi. Building at San Giobbe was certainly on Moro's mind while he was in Rome, for the papal indulgences granted to those who committed to building at San Giobbe in 1454 and 1455 were made in the Moro's name. According to Nicholas V's biographer, Giannozzo Manetti, a low dome on pendentives was planned for the crossing of St. Peter's under Pope Nicholas as was a long choir. While St. Peter's and San Giobbe differ in general plans, the idea for the elements of St. Peter's may have appealed to Moro as he began to rebuild San Giobbe. The long choir at St. Peter's, which was later destroyed to accommodate Bramante's plan, was continued under Pope Paul II. With an extended choir behind the altar at San Giobbe, Moro emulated the designs of an emerging liturgical space rather than the overall plan for St. Peter's.

Several scholars believe that the choir of San Giobbe was designed with the high altar chapel and they have associated the placement of choirs behind the altar as a response to changes in Counter-Reformation liturgical requirements. The notion that the position of the worshipper in relation to the celebrant hinged on sight lines may derive from an interpretation of the liturgy filtered through reforms undertaken by the Vatican. Because the Council of Trent called for greater participation in the liturgy by the laity, it was been assumed that the proliferation of

161 Reforms which called for greater participation from the laity such as Council of Trent and Vatican II.
retrochoirs moved the clergy to behind the altar, allowing the laity greater visual access to the Elevation of the Host.\textsuperscript{162}

This call for increased lay participation has been interpreted as a response to previous conditions, as though before the Council of Trent, the hierarchy of the church closed off the visual celebration of the mass and the Council of Trent opened it. While the heavy choir screens in certain churches throughout Europe did seem to obstruct the view of the laity, throughout the history of the church, many church reformers sought to facilitate the visual participation of the masses and at the same time, control the crowding of the laity around the Host.\textsuperscript{163} The laity often has access to the Host visually or through proximity even before the Council of Trent. Rather than prescribing a radical change, the Council of Trent’s instructions for greater lay participation may have been a response to a growing trend of choirs behind the altars. By leaving the rules for choirs vague, but codifying the root cause, the worshipper, the Church could assert control over the design of its churches.

Two Torsos and a Head: The Relics of St. Luke the Evangelist

While the choir was likely elongated according to Moro’s wishes in his testament based on land left for the church in 1451, I believe that the dome at San Giobbe was at least planned under Moro to emulate the form of a reliquary. Just one year after Bessarion brought the head of St. Andrew to Rome in 1462, as described in Chapter 1, Moro welcomed the head of St. George to Venice; it was cared for by the Benedictine monks on the island of San Giorgio in their pre-


A year later, Doge Moro staged a grand attempt to acquire the relics of Saint Luke the Evangelist. The presence of Luke’s relics in Venice would have added another evangelist to the Republic with Mark. The body would have rounded out the objects associated with him in Venice. During the Fourth Crusade in 1204, the Venetians returned home with an icon of the Virgin and Child, a Hodegetria image, believed to have been painted by St. Luke and in 1204, after the Venetians looted Constantinople, the relics of St. Luke, along with those of Andrew and Timothy, disappeared from the Church of the Holy Apostles in the former capital city where they had been venerated by the Eastern Church. The presence of Andrew and Luke in Italy now was not only a declaration of power of the Eastern Church, but helped to prove that the Latin church would bear the responsibility of guarding the property of all of Christianity.

In August 1463, Moro arranged for a group of Franciscans to import a body believed to be St. Luke the Evangelist from Bosnia—currently invaded by the Ottoman Turks—to Venice. The relic was ceremoniously transported from its initial point of entry in the Venetian lagoon on the Lido to its ultimate place of rest, the small church of San Giobbe in the western periphery of the city. However, the Benedictine monks of Santa Giustinia in Padua had been venerating a body without a head as St. Luke the Evangelist, found in a leaden coffin and ceremoniously deposited in the church. They launched a determined challenge to the authenticity of the Venetians’ claim to the torso of St. Luke the Evangelist. They pleaded their case for authenticity to the papacy.

---

164 Kenneth M. Setton, “Saint George’s Head,” Speculum, Vol. 48, No. 1. (Jan., 1973), 9. In August, 1462, the head of St. George was noted on the island of Aegina, the Senate directed all sea captains to secure the relic and bring it back to Venice. On 13 December 1462, the Benedictines at San Giorgio received the relic. Acta sanctorum, Aprilis, Tom. III, 133. Vettore Capello, buried at the church of St. Elena was responsible for securing St. George’s relic.

165 BMC, PDD, 727 Vol. 1, 104. Barozzi writes that a solemn procession marked the arrival of the relics from the Spalatro galley to the nave of San Niccolò of Lido, then to San Giobbe, where the relics now rest in the sacristy.

The emissary of Pope Pius II in the decision, Doge Moro’s friend, Cardinal Bessarion, served on the committee that decided on the veracity of the relics of Luke and sided with Venice over the identification of the relic as St. Luke the Evangelist. However, when Pope Paul II came to power, the papacy realized that the ruling in favor of Venice negated the identity of the attribution of a head in the Vatican to Luke the Evangelist which was believed to have formed a perfect fit with the body in Padua. Despite his Venetian pedigree, Paul II reversed Bessarion’s decision and soon after the relic at San Giobbe was identified as belonging to St. Luke of Stiris. The news did not go over well at San Giobbe; into the seventeenth century, inventory records still listed the body of St. Luke the Evangelist as a relic of the church.

The notion that relics were vulnerable in non-Christian lands would have held particular significance for Venice. The story of Moro’s acquisition of St. Luke in 1463 is not only reminiscent of the translation of St. Andrew to Rome a year earlier, but evokes the theft of St. Mark the Evangelist. When the contested Luke arrived in Venice in 1463, the Italian city-states projected an image of their enemy, Sultan Mehmet II, as imperiling the sources of ancient learning and holy relics. Tensions reminiscent of those felt in the ninth century when Mark was brought to Venice rattled the Republic in the fifteenth century. Moro’s solemn removal of property from the East fit into the rhetoric that was informing the Crusade and the Venetian understanding of its own history and its survival as a Christian Republic. The presence of yet another evangelist in Venice, Luke, would help propagate the idea that the city was an ideal

---

167 Archivio di Stato, Padua, Corporazione Soppresse, Monasteri Padovani, S. Giustinia. N. 233, (f. 27r, n. 19). The material contains Bessarion’s ruling in favor of San Giobbe in 1463.
168 ASV, PSM 84, Proc 189a, Fasc. 5. The 1634 inventory of San Giobbe notes that the church contains St. Luke the Evangelist’s body minus the right arm. Subsequent inventories also place the relics of St. Luke the Evangelist at San Giobbe. ASV, Procuratore di San Marco, B. 84, Fasc. 6, Proc 189b, c128a; ASV, Procuratore di San Marco, Busta 84, Fasc. 7, process no 189b, 13 May 1666 and 27 June 1703. Sanudo, *De origine*, 48-9. Contains a list of relics in Venice.
resting place for the authors of the gospels as the Turks encroached on Christian-held land. The relics helped Venetians claim that the accoutrements and bodies of saints chose to rest in Venice. Whether or not the relics had at one time belonged to the saints was moot; Bessarion and Moro reinforced the destiny of Italy as a safe haven for the relics of Christianity.

The early date for the design of the dome at San Giobbe gathers its strongest support from Moro’s translation of what he believed were the relics of St. Luke the Evangelist to Venice from an area in Bosnia in 1463. Moro’s interest in placing the relics of St. Luke the Evangelist in San Giobbe expresses a desire to turn the church into the second reliquary of an evangelist in Venice after the first evangelist’s reliquary at San Marco. St. Mark was ceremoniously transported to Venice and helped give focus to the subsequent history of Venice. The projection of Venice as a “mythical” and idealized Republic divinely ordained and protected by St. Mark the Evangelist became assimilated into the real history of Venice. The translatio gained popularity as Venice struggled for independence from both Aquileia, which also claimed St. Mark as its patron saint, and the Byzantine Empire. The theft served as the basis for Venetian identity for the next eight hundred years until the fall of the Republic in 1797.

---

170 Barozzi writes that a solemn procession marked the arrival of the relics from the Spalatro galley to the nave of San Niccolò of Lido, to San Giobbe, where the relics now rest in the sacristy.
171 Patrick Geary, *Thefts of the Relics in the Central Middle Ages*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978, 9-15; Otto Demus, *The Mosaics of San Marco*, Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library, 1960, 45. The story of the translatio has been passed on through an eleventh-century document that was probably based on somewhat factual material, such as the building of the basilica. The translatio is depicted in the mosaics of the Chapel of San Clemente in San Marco. In addition, Luke and Mark were the two evangelists who were not apostles and who were acquaintances.
The interest in bringing pilgrims to San Giobbe likely contributed to the church's reluctance to cede that it did not own the body of St. Luke.\textsuperscript{173} The Venetian churches which hosted the burials of the doges, the Frari and Santi Giovanni e Paolo, attracted several visitors due to their large supply of relics and ducal tombs San Giobbe likely wanted to present itself as a tourist church.\textsuperscript{174} There were images of St. Christopher, the patron saint of travelers and pilgrims, on the altar of the confraternity of the gondoliers at San Giobbe. It likely received the prayers of the \textit{traghetti} operators on their way to Mestre from the western part of the Cannaregio where San Giobbe was, but it may have also received the prayers of the pilgrims who were in Venice on their way to the Holy Land.

Several pilgrims passing through Venice while they made arrangements to sail East offered vivid descriptions in their diaries of the saint's bodies that would see in various churches. The pilgrim from Delft, Arent Willemsz who was in Venice in 1525 en route to the Holy Land had gone to San Giobbe, where he was shown "the entire body of St. Luke the Evangelist."\textsuperscript{175} The bodies or objects associated with a saint were believed to hold spiritual powers and pilgrims flocked to benefit from the intercession of the saints through proximity to their material remains.\textsuperscript{176} The visitor to San Giobbe venerating the relics of Luke would see his own mortality reflected in Luke's torso, but would understand that they could help bring about his salvation. "Relics were the most important feature in the religious landscape. In them, the power of the unseen world was more accessible than anywhere else....relics alone were both visible and full of beneficent intelligence."\textsuperscript{177}

\textsuperscript{174} Brown, 244: St. Denis in the 13\textsuperscript{th} c. was acknowledged as a tourist destination to visit the royal tombs.
\textsuperscript{176} Belting, 77, 184.
\textsuperscript{177} R. W. Southern, \textit{Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages}, London, 1990, 30-1.
Erasing the Enemy: The Church of the Holy Apostles

The timing of the Doge’s translation of relics to the West is significant: the translations occurred between the 1453 seizure of Constantinople by Sultan Mehmet II and Pope Pius II’s plans for Crusade in the early 1460s. One development in 1463 should not be overlooked within the parameters of these two major events. In 1463, construction was underway on the Fatih Mosque in Istanbul by Mehmet II. An ambassador of the Sultan’s, Tursun Beg, described how Mehmet, “Built a mosque in the best site of the city which encompassed the Hagia Sophia and surpassed it in beauty.”178 The Florentine architect, Filarete, ensconced in the Sforza court in Milan and in contact with the Venetians, is believed to have traveled to Istanbul to give council to Mehmet on construction. Filarete’s drawings of the Ospedale Maggiore in his architectural treatise resemble the plans for Mehmet’s mosque.179

The site of the mosque must have made Eastern Orthodox scholars exiled in the West wince: the Church of the Holy Apostles begun by Emperor Constantine in Constantinople during the fourth century and rebuilt in 550. (Figure 109) The year after Moro was elected Doge, the Sultan Mehmet began to build the mosque over the Church of the Holy Apostles. (Figure 110) He did not convert the Aposteleion, but razed it, likely as an act of victory over his foes in the West. With its cruciform plan and five domes, the Aposteleion has been identified as one of the strongest prototypes for San Marco in Venice.180 (Figure 111) According to Juergen Schultz, not only did San Marco copy the plan and skyline of the Church of the Holy Apostles, but he saw the

---

Fora of Constantinople replicated in the Piazza San Marco.\(^{181}\) The entire ducal complex would have pointed to Roman imperial and Christian authority in the former Constantinople at a time when Venice was subject to the rule of Byzantium.

The destruction of the church in Constantinople would have cast a dark shadow on its sister church, San Marco in Venice. Thus, at San Giobbe, the creation of a low dome on pendentives pierced with windows similar to those at San Marco would have been both an homage and an act of defiance. As Mehmet began the process of covering the Church of the Apostles as an emblem of a Byzantine past, Moro began to embrace that past as a Venetian doge, most forcefully in the design of his burial chapel and church. In covering his church with a dome that evoked Byzantium, Moro reclaimed a piece of the Aposteleion.

Obtaining the relics of both Andrew and Luke in close proximity may have been more than coincidence on the part of the allies Pius II and Doge Moro. When Emperor Constantine founded the Church of the Holy Apostles, he planned on acquiring the relics of all the apostles. By the time the church was destroyed, the Church of the Holy Apostles held the relics of several saints, but Andrew was the only Apostle whose relics were at the church, and St. Luke the Evangelist’s relics were also on display at the church. The importance of the Apostles for Venice is evident in the images of the twelve apostles in the large under arch at the entrance of the high altar chapel of San Giobbe, where Moro is buried. Moro did see the need to protect the representations of the earliest followers of Christ.

In 1463, the pope and the doge ceremoniously imported apostles’ relics to the Italian city-states, namely those who were at the Aposteleion likely in an effort to stir enthusiasm for a Crusade. Andrew was brought to Rome and Moro tried to bring Luke to Venice. They would

---

protect Christianity and help promote the need for a Crusade to halt the root cause of the threat. The city-states were converted into Constantinople to aid in the program of renewal and Christian perseverance. More relics were waiting for liberation and of Venice saved them, they combined power of the objects would help protect Venice and attract visitors. Sacred thefts, as Patrick Geary calls them, were justified throughout Venetian history as deed for Christianity.¹⁸²

The Imperious Republican

Most scholars believe that the combination of the low dome on pendentives that became popular in Venice during the fifteenth century had, in part, derived from the Church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople and its most notable copy in Italy, San Marco.¹⁸³ The Church of the Holy Apostles served as the burial site of several Byzantine emperors, as described in several Early Christian accounts of holy places throughout the East, including Eusebius’ *Vita Constantini* and his *Ecclesiastiae Vitae* of 337.¹⁸⁴ The church’s founder, Emperor Constantine, was temporarily buried in the center of the church, but was then moved to the center of a permanent mausoleum adjacent to the Aposteleion. Emperor Constantine placed domes over both his mausoleum and the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, which he built over the site of Christ’s burial and Resurrection.¹⁸⁵ (Figure 112) The dome of the Holy Sepulcher covered a  


centrally planned, circular space attached to a longer basilica in Jerusalem, but the centrally planned structure that emphasized a dominant X and Y axis in plan and a vertical axis was more often reproduced than the circular rotunda that encircles Christ’s tomb. Byzantine emperors portrayed themselves as divine rulers, holding qualities of Christ on Earth, thus, they were often buried in the center of a mausoleum under a dome. The emperor was marking these as Imperial sites but also giving importance to sites that represented his adopted religion of Christianity.

In part, the Church of the Holy Apostles redounded to an imperial tradition that appealed to elite Renaissance patrons. Borrowing or copying elements of the design reinforced dynastic claims for rulers throughout the city-states. The Church of the Holy Apostles, however, not only represented imperial power to the Renaissance patron; it was one of the earliest structures of Early Christianity. After its destruction, it was reconstituted in the Latin West in parts as an index of the Early Church to counter its erasure. The quincunx plan of the Church of the Holy Apostles that was taken up at San Marco was reproduced on a small scale at a few churches in Venice, but was largely reduced in most private chapels to a centrally planned space. The pendentive and dome combination traveled through the East to the Veneto via trade, most prominently through the ducal basilica of San Marco at Venice and in 1405, through the Padua Baptistery, which housed the burial of the city’s autocratic ruler Francesco da Carrara. In his

---

186 Saalman, 1993, 109; Patrons may have also seen the coins of Constantine’s tomb to get an idea of what it looked like in devising their own burials. Although the Holy Sepulcher was destroyed by the fifteenth century, a plan had been preserved and descriptions of the site existed in ekphrastic form by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastiae Vitae


188 Heinrich Klotz, Filippo Brunelleschi: The Early Works and the Medieval Tradition, New York: Rizzoli, 1990, 153. Howard Saalman, Filippo Brunelleschi: The Buildings, University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993, 109; Howard Saalman, “Carrara Burials in the Baptistery of Padua,” Art Bulletin (September 1987): 377. Historians have often assumed that Francesco was buried in 1378 under the baptismal font and removed in 1405 when the family lost power in the city, while his wife occupied the adjacent wall tomb in the interior wall of the entrance. However, Howard Saalman believes that the lack of evidence for a burial under the font could just as
architectural treatise from the mid-fifteenth century, *De Re Aedificatoria*, Alberti calls for the design of burial chapels to resemble miniature temples, symmetrical and centrally planned—as Moro’s burial space at San Giobbe—to evoke their ancient funerary function. Though burial in a centralized chapel under a dome was becoming more common among patricians in the city-states, this emerging typology contained several overtones of imperial and saintly burial, contradicting the mores of the Republic over which Moro ruled. While the forms may not have been emulated religiously, the perceived ideology was. The dome typically signified the celestial sphere, but the increasing deployment of centrally planned rooms for burial covered by a dome on pendentives was, in itself, an expression of power.

If the destruction of the Church of the Holy Apostles whittled away physical remnants of an early Christian and Imperial past, the sites of relevance in Palestine must have felt similarly remote. Pilgrimage to the Holy Land was difficult in the fifteenth century, and pilgrim reports detailed lengthy negotiations with Muslim locals that translated into danger for the Christian reader. Since Jerusalem fell out of Christian control, the now inaccessible sites generated a nostalgia that manifested itself in copies throughout the city-states. Contemporary art historians search for the point of exact copy between chapels in the west and their eastern prototypes, but

easily indicate that the tomb was freestanding between the baptismal font and his wife’s wall tomb rather than in the center of the Baptistery.


190 Giovanni Rucellai, purportedly an acquaintance of Doge Moro’s, supposedly asked for the measurements of the Holy Sepulcher to use in his own burial square tomb at San Pancrazio in Florence. In addition, the Old Sacristy contained a lantern which was purportedly a replica of the *tholos* that covered the tomb of Christ. Moro may have derived the general plan for his tomb from the Holy Sepulcher from these earlier burial monuments, but the Holy Sepulcher was under the care of the Franciscans, which emphasizes its importance as a prototype for Moro.

the methods of translating the designs from the Holy Land to the city states was not always exact. It could be effected through symbols or even descriptions.

Renaissance patrons who seem to have been most entranced by the dominating vertical axis of these centrally planned spaces in Constantinople and Jerusalem, which culminated in a dome, looked to ally themselves with the political structures represented by the dome. In Europe, the dominant vertical axis that linked tomb to dome in a centrally planned structure was first taken up in earnest in the Old Sacristy designed by Brunelleschi for San Lorenzo in Florence. It housed the freestanding tomb of Cosimo de Medici’s father, Giovanni di Averardo de’ Medici (1360-1429), called Giovanni di Bicci, and his wife Piccarda in the middle of the room under a table. The Old Sacristy is twenty braccia square (11.9 meters) in plan and almost the same length in height at 11.6 meters, with a smaller square apse on the southern wall; domes on pendentives cover both spaces. (Figure 113 & Figure 114) It is a highly symmetrical space with a smaller square apse on the southern wall; domes on pendentives cover both spaces. Corinthian half pilasters, the type of capital associated with a funerary monument, made of pietra serena appear embedded in the fabric of the wall and frame the corners of the room.

As a manuscript collector, Cosimo was equipped to oversee many of the designs and iconographical programs of the family’s commissions. Furthermore, his travels to the Veneto to oversee Medici banking interests there may have fostered his interest in Eastern imperial burial traditions. Franciscans produced written and figurative descriptions of sites considered holy in Jerusalem once they assumed custody of the Holy Land in 1434. Both Moro and the Medici would have been able to receive descriptions of Jerusalem in manuscripts but also from Franciscan friars journeying between east and west who came through the churches they patronized, Moro at San Giobbe and the Medici at Mugello al Bosco.
As a funerary chapel, the Old Sacristy provided an appropriate model for Moro’s burial in the high altar chapel of San Giobbe. The ratio of wall length to height from pavement to dome in the Venetian chancel is approximately 1:2 as it is at Florence. The altar wall of the Old Sacristy is divided into three bays providing a loose prototype for the arch of *pietra d’Istria* in San Giobbe at the entrance to the high altar chapel. At San Giobbe, *tondi* of each of the evangelists decorate the four spandrels of the pendentives of the dome and the corner pilasters bend around the wall, a motif used in the Old Sacristy. There are differences in the design of San Giobbe and the Old Sacristy; the decorative elements of Moro’s burial chapel had been in circulation in Florence for over thirty years by the time Moro became doge. The dome of San Giobbe is a hemisphere, not a melon like the Old Sacristy dome, but the San Giobbe main chapel is closely related to the Brunelleschi prototype at San Lorenzo in its dimensions, volume, and its decoration.

Other notable chapels based on the Old Sacristy include Pigello Portinari’s chapel at Sant’Eustorgio in Milan, the chapel of the Cardinal of Portugal at San Miniato al Monte in Florence, and the Pazzi Chapel at Santa Croce also in Florence. Doge Moro’s burial chapel as well as the Martini Chapel in San Giobbe contains motifs from the Old Sacristy. For this reason, these chapels have been identified as heralding a Tuscan Renaissance in Venice, but for Doge Moro, the burial in the Old Sacristy as much as the design must have held appeal. The Old Sacristy was still new enough by the time San Giobbe was constructed for the type to be considered part of an avant-garde with which Moro wanted to associate himself. Moro left funds in his testament for the entire church, but the centralized, square high altar chapel would be his burial chamber. That

---

192 The dimensions of the San Giobbe chancel are 7.55 meters x 13.40 meters. The Old Sacristy is roughly 11.9 meters x 23 meters.

Moro’s burial fits into an emerging burial convention based on the Old Sacristy strongly suggests that the dome on pendentives at San Giobbe was built or at least planned under Moro. As the representatives of two republics within the city-states, Moro might have looked to the Medici for burial cues.

In 1468, when he donated his library to Venice, Cardinal Bessarion referred to Venice as “another Byzantium,” suggesting that the rich cultural heritage of the East that he describes in his Letter of Donation is lost. Cardinal Bessarion’s declaration that Moro presided over “almost a second Byzantium” illustrates the trope of summoning the idealized version of time and place in history to project the idealized version of one’s own, but it also shows the importance of Byzantine culture in Venice under Moro. The Byzantine Empire was idealized in Venice, particularly after the Fall of Constantinople in 1451, when Venice felt vulnerable. The Empire evoked the height of Venetian powers when the doge was titled, “Lord of a Quarter and a Half a Quarter of the Byzantine Empire.” The myths of a serene and functioning republic during the height of Venetian powers in the thirteenth century emphasized the symbiosis of the monarch-like ruler and republican values which were derived from Byzantium. The reaches of power which were believed to have accompanied the Byzantine emperors made more poignant by the dwindling powers of the doge in the fifteenth century. The Council of Ten held more power than the doge and began to institute legislation limiting his powers in the fifteenth century. Moro’s testing of the restrictions placed on the office of the doge suggests a desire to reassert the importance of his status as the doge’s were increasingly barred from personal expression in San

---

194 Bessarion’s 1468 Letter of Donation to Moro.
195 Debra Pincus, “Hard Times and Ducal Radiance,” Venice Reconsidered, Martin and Romano, 95. Pietro Ziani was the first doge to assume this title, in the thirteenth century. Pincus also emphasized the pairing of the doge with Christ after the Byzantine model.
Marco. Doge Moro may have constructed his burial chapel at San Giobbe to actualize Cardinal Bessarion’s image of Venice.

Conclusion

The appearance of San Giobbe during the Renaissance is problematic. Descriptions of the site from 1502 challenge the assumption that Giovanni Contarini’s oratory is attached to the church in the form of a small vaulted chapel to the side of the transept from 1380. Discrepancies between the 1500 Barbari View, later visual representations of the area of San Giobbe, and the present appearance of the church pose the largest problems to understanding the nature of Moro’s work there. The date of the dome has been problematized in the literature on the church, for it is not visible in the Barbari View but it seems never to have been visible from the outside. That there is reference to a tribune over the high altar chapel in 1502 suggests that it was at least vaulted to stand apart from the rest of the church, but given Moro’s strong control over the high altar chapel at San Giobbe, the enormous sum of 10,000 ducats he left to the church, and outcries about the dome’s immanent collapse in 1691, Moro likely planned the dome if it was not yet installed by the time of his death in 1471.

Moving past questions of design chronology, the church of San Giobbe represents Doge Moro’s commitment to St. Bernardino of Siena. The records that have been preserved about Moro’s work at San Giobbe are most explicit in announcing the Doge’s financial contributions to the church, but he ensured that the high altar was dedicated to his patron-saint well before his death. Moro rose to power in Venice in 1448 when he was elected to the position of Procurator of San Marco and when clamoring to canonize Bernardino was at a fever pitch. In the immediate aftermath of his death, Bernardino underwent the transformation from preacher to prophet and miracle worker. Moro latched onto the trajectory of Bernardino’s sanctity to give shape to his
own rule. His relationship to Bernardino assumed the contours of the relationship forged between St. Mark from Alexandria and the office of the doge. On his arrival in Venice during the eighth century, Mark’s body was consigned to the doge who built a chapel in order to carry out Mark’s alleged wishes of burial in Venice. Mark immediately replaced St. Theodore as the patron saint of the city in the mind of the Venetians. Overseeing the sacred theft of Mark legitimized the rule of the doge as the republic struggled for freedom from Byzantium and Aquileia. Moro’s promotion of Bernardino coincided with his promotion to Procurator of San Marco. He was now one of the unofficial nine candidates for the dogate. Furthermore, Moro venerated Bernardino at a church dedicated to an Old Testament saint with an abstract pre-Christian pedigree. Diminishing the importance of Job at the church to accommodate a recent saint with ties to Venice might not have been too difficult.

Moro was the first doge since to add a saint-protector to Venice in the form of Bernardino since St. Mark became the city’s saint patron saint. Thus, connections that Moro may have tried to forge between San Marco and San Giobbe may not have been unusual. There are no relics of Bernardino recorded at the church of San Giobbe. His body was guarded in L’Aquila and Moro turned his attention to saving relics in the Eas from the Turks. Instead, Moro imported the relics of another evangelist to Venice, St. Luke.

By the fifteenth century, relics were needed to preserve the state. As Patrick Geary has shown, the relics of St. Mark did not only give focus to veneration, but they were called upon to represent Venetian ideas about its own sovereignty and power whenever those ideals were in danger of crumbling. In many ways, the relics of the saints stolen by Venice in order to fulfill the call of manifest destiny influenced the writing of Venetian history. After all, the Venetians

---

were merely the conveyers of the relics to Venice. As divine bodies, the relics contained the agency in the decision about where they would ultimately rest. The cult of relics could paradoxically eradicate the fact of death for the saint was meant to remind the person venerating of the promise of Resurrection. But the relics needed to be present in the city for the myth to work. The meaning of these relics for the Venetians in the fifteenth century cannot be transferred whole to other cultures for in Venice; the history of relics is rigorously intertwined with Venetian civic identity.

---

Chapter 4

Tombe Terragne: Moro’s Burial Arrangement at San Giobbe

Il se désagrège et s’efface.—Les Travailleurs de la Mer, Victor Hugo.¹

Death of the Doge

There are several accounts of the ceremonies that accompanied the death of a doge.² After the public announcement of the doge’s death, twenty members of the Great Council led the body in a procession to the Sala del Piovego, the Hall presided over by the justices of the courts which oversaw financial transactions and property management, on the loggia floor of the lagoon wing of the Palazzo Ducale. For three days, the deceased doge lay in state in the Sala in a catafalque with four torches beneath the canopy. First, he would have been embalmed and dressed for display in his crimson mantle with an ermine collar and a gold ducal corno placed on his head. The body was displayed in the ducal apartment by candlelight for a day. The doge’s authoritative garb became a canvas onto which the office of the doge was represented. A short sword was placed in the deceased doge’s hands, held against his chest, upside down with the blade touching the face. The doge’s gold spurs were also worn upside down, towards his feet.³ The signs of secular power the doge held were overturned, symbolizing the definitive end of his command.

¹ Victor Hugo, Les Travailleurs de la Mer, XII, 269.
³ Geraldine A. Johnson, “Activating the Effigy: Donatello’s Pecci Tomb in Siena Cathedral,” The Art Bulletin, Vol. 77, No. 3. (Sep. 1995), 450 Johnson believes that when a high-ranking government or church official was left uncovered for a public viewing during the funerary rites, the garments played an important role in the vicing of the body. That the ducal robes played such an important role in the death of the doge, suggests that the doge was also left uncovered for public viewing.
As a Republic, Venice was intensely anti-dynastic and tried to preserve the honesty of the election system, yet the ceremony surrounding the death of the doge had monarchical overtones due to the prolonged process of mourning. The death of the doge had been subsumed into the rigors of Venetian ceremony, but the ceremonial hyperbole was underscored by the fear of claims to dynastic power by the doge’s survivors. The ceremonial rejection of the doge’s power, and his family, helped to deter the potential tension from a period of interregnum. As the natural body of the ruler decayed and was consigned to the family for burial, the political body was preserved by the Venetian government. The integrity of the Republic could be sustained despite the death of the leader.⁴

Dressed in ceremonial scarlet, several members of government stood vigil with the deceased doge, which, according to Sanudo, signified that the individual doge had died, but that the Republic lived.⁵ To demonstrate that the power gap following a death would not affect the Republic, six High Counselors of the Senate installed themselves in the Ducal Palace until the new doge was chosen. The eldest member of the group assumed the interim responsibility of the dogate.⁶ With the body guarded, any claims to power by the family were suppressed by emblematic insults. The Council of Ten broke the ducal letter seals and the symbolic gold ring emblazoned with imagery of the Republic given to the doge after his election as a sign of his authority. The fragments were then given to the family as a sign of their broken power. The family of the doge was also obliged to assume the great expense of the funeral.

⁵ Sanudo, I Diarii, Vol. XXX, 19 June 1521, c. 380; Kantorowicz, 427. Barozzi, f133. In Bishop Barozzi’s funerary oration for Moro, Barozzi says that, “the whole republic is one, it culminates in the unity of the doge.”
Before the funeral took place at the ducal basilica of San Marco, there was a grand procession led by the confraternities of Venice, with the places of greatest honor given to doge’s scuole. A funeral elegy would be read at San Marco or at the church of burial said over a large temporary catafalque at the church to receive the body of the doge.\(^7\) The procession ended at the church of burial—San Giobbe in the case of Doge Moro—with a requiem mass if the funerary dirge had been pronounced already. Most ducal burials took place at the large Conventual churches which had the capacity to hold large crowds. The number of dignitaries in the final part of Moro’s funeral procession to San Giobbe was likely amended after the death of Moro due to the small size of the church.

The records of Doge Moro’s death state that he died on 9 November 1471, that Andrea Donado, a Venetian ambassador to Pope Paul II gave the Doge’s funerary oration at San Marco, and that after his body had laid in state at the Palazzo Ducale, he was ceremoniously transported to San Giobbe.\(^8\) In his testament, Moro requested a vigil held over his body for one night at San Giobbe before burial. He wanted to be buried wearing only the simple shroud of the Franciscan friars at San Giobbe and without pomp, without “alguno honore.”\(^9\) Unlike other contemporary doges who stipulated burial in large wall tombs, Moro was buried under a simple floor slab in the habit of the Franciscan order, not in his ducal garb. Moro wanted the friars of San Giobbe to assemble with the other Observant Franciscans in Venice from the churches of San Francesco del Deserto and San Francesco della Vigna to perform the masses and to pray for the soul of the

\(^8\) ASV, Council of Ten, Deliberazione, Regina 23, f. 97r, records the death of Moro on 13 November 1471 rather than 9 November.
\(^9\) ASV, ASV, Notatorio Tomei, Busta 27, 2394.
doge in perpetuam. He left money for the recitation of one thousand death masses to be recited with candles.10

After the burial of a doge, the Great Council assembled to choose five correctors who examine the life and actions of the recently deceased doge.11 The investigators searched for the previous doge’s transgressions against Venetian law and his oath of office. They meted out the necessary penalties to the doge’s survivors and drew up new oaths for the next ducal Promissione to stop those contraventions from legally occurring again.12 According to Malipiero, Moro’s estate was charged 300 ducats, and though it is unclear why, it seems that a certain risk in penalties went with accepting the dogate.13

Moro’s wife, Cristina, drew up her will in December 1471, and asked for prayers said for her and her family at the church of San Salvadore near the Rialto, but she requested burial in the sepulcher where her husband is buried in San Giobbe.14 The deaths of the Doge and Dogaressa were marked with a large slab in the center of the main chapel of the church and in front of the high altar, as requested. The tomb slab was one of the largest in Venice; it is 390 x 270 cm including the border, accounting for just over twenty percent of the floor space of the high altar chapel. The slab is located under the dome though the slab does not line up with the lantern of the dome. Moro’s slab is in front of the high altar, flush with a step that changes the gradation of

10 “For Damascene (Serm.: De his qui in fide dormierunt) quotes Athanasius as saying: “Even though he who has departed in godliness be taken up to heaven, do not hesitate to call upon God and to burn oil and wax at his tomb; for such things are pleasing to God and receive a great reward from Him.” “Reply to Objection 1: By bringing oil and candles to the tombs of the dead we profit them indirectly, either as offering them to the Church and as giving them to the poor, or as doing this in reverence of God. Hence, after the words quoted we read: “For oil and candles are a holocaust.” Aquinas lauds the burning of candles at graves because the wax “is pleasing to god.”
11 Muir, 1981, 277. During the sixteenth century, three inquisitors were added to the committee.
12 The election process is described in the manuscript compiled by Leonardo Sanudo on the occasional of Moro’s election to the dogate. BNM, (=4143), 3r-4v.
13 Ibid. Malipiero, 660. The penalty falls to the heirs as the Loredans were fined 1500 crowns after Doge Leonardo Loredan was accused of not upholding the dignity of the office.
14 Appendix 1, Document 7.
the chancel floor by about six inches. Thus, the slab is situated on a lower plane than the altar to St. Bernardino of Siena. (Figure 3) This may have been a hierarchical choice or a pre-existing design constraint. Because the step does not bisect the center of the chapel and Moro’s slab is not on axis with the center of the dome, the chapel may have been altered.

The high altar chapel is separated from the nave by two shallow steps and a central arch made of pietra d’istria flanked by two smaller niches. The three rounded arches at the entrance to the high altar chapel at San Giobbe were modeled after the Arch of Constantine in the Roman Forum. (Figure 115 & Figure 116) As a symbol of Constantine’s victory over Emperor Maxentius in 313, the Arch was erected in the Forum to mark a point along the route of his second ceremonial procession into Rome in 326. Several of the Roman emperors before Constantine had arches erected throughout the Empire to commemorate a particular military triumph, but the Arch of Constantine provides one of the only instances in Antiquity in which an arch is designated as a triumphal arch, Arcum Triumphis in its inscription.

Commentaries on Vitruvius, military, and architectural treatises that circulated during the Renaissance canonized the arch as a motif that announced the builder’s knowledge of construction motifs in antiquity. Political, military and funerary rituals in ancient Rome played out against the frame of the arch, and its potential as a ritual threshold captured the imagination of builders and patrons in the Renaissance. In Venice, at the Arsenale, the seat of Venetian military power, the façade was retrofitted with an Arch—not unlike the single arch in the high altar Chapel of San Giobbe—and Doges Francesco Foscari and Moro both built arches in the courtyard of the Ducal Palace to give a more monumental demeanor to the political ceremonies.

15 Wendy Stedman Sheard, “Tullio Lombardo in Rome? The Arch of Constantine, the Vendramin Tomb, and the Reinvention of Monumental Classicizing Relief,” Artibus et Historiae. Vol. 18, No. 35. (1997): 160-4. Sheard believes that the tomb of Andrea Vendramin, originally in Santa Maria dei Servi, was also based on the Arch of Constantine.
that took place there. (Figure 117 & Figure 135) Alberti promoted the arch and used it in his own built work. The facade of the church of San Francesco at Rimini which Alberti built around 1450 has a facade that emulated the Arch of Titus, erected in 81 AD. At San Francesco, Alberti received help on the interior decoration from Roberto Valturio who promoted the arch as a way to announce military strength in his 1466 De Re Militari. He also intervened at the Arco Foscari in the ducal Palace, adding an arch to the second storey, adorned with an image of himself genuflecting before the lion. Because his family coat-of-arms decorated the spandrel of the arch in the high altar chapel of San Giobbe, he was likely responsible for it.

In addition to its use as a backdrop for political theatrics, the arch was also subsumed into a Christian matrix. By the Middle Ages, the arch gave spatial definition to Christian notions of progress towards salvation. It was a threshold that signified an upwards spiritual evolution. The triumphal arch configuration at the entrance to the high altar chapel of San Giobbe framed the burial slab of Moro before the high altar, suggesting the triumph of salvation in death, a popular theme in the Renaissance. If the arch at San Giobbe was in place by the time of Moro’s death in 1471, it would have given focus to the funeral ceremony after the body of Doge Moro arrived at San Giobbe from San Marco. Even if it was not yet complete, the placement of Moro’s coat of arms in the spandrel where, in ancient Rome, personifications of triumphs were generally placed, reinforced the notion of a personal salvation. The entire chapel became Moro’s burial chamber and monument, not just the slab. There are several other examples of burial under an arch during

the Renaissance. For example, Castello Quaratesi, the patron of San Salvatore al Monte in Florence, was buried under the arch of the high altar chapel of the church in 1465. The burial sepulchers of Sigismundo Malatesta and his wife Isotta were likely meant to be in the façade of San Francesco a Rimini under the arch.19

As a threshold, meant to be traversed, the arch suited the needs of funerary ritual which assisted in consigning the soul of the deceased to heaven. One Psalm typically recited during funerary processions read, “Open to me the gate of justice.”20 The antiphon typically read during funerary rites, *In Paradisum* made the entering of Paradise into a ritual, replete with guiding angels who would lead the dead to paradise where they would meet the saints who had gone before them.21 Angels in the spandrel of the arch and palms in low relief on the pilasters before the high altar not only give visual representation to the prayer, but they evoke Christ’s entrance into Jerusalem as described by the gospel of St. Matthew 2, in which angels meet Christ at the gate for his final entry into the city. The heavenly Paradise was often associated with its terrestrial manifestation, Jerusalem, “the sacred city” where Christ is buried.

Moro may have tried to place himself into a continuum of Imperial burial deriving from Constantinople by situating his tomb slab under a dome, but he also created a visual connection to Jerusalem. The experience of Jerusalem was often emulated or recreated in some measure in private chapels. Twelve panels of the apostles decorate the intrados of the central arch of Moro’s burial chapel at San Giobbe divided at the apex by a panel depicting the Agnus Dei. The decoration of the intrados not only references the Apostles from the destroyed Aposteleion, but

---

20 Sicard, 225. Sicard cites Werse 19, Psalm 118.
21 *In Paradisum*: “May angels lead you into Paradise; may the martyrs receive you at your coming and lead you to the holy city of Jerusalem. May a choir of angels receive you, and with Lazarus, who once was poor, may you have eternal rest.”
summons the presence of the twelve gates of Jerusalem.\(^{22}\) (Figure 8) According to St. John the Evangelist, there is no temple building in the New Jerusalem, for "The Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the city's temple." The lamb under the arch at San Giobbe then converts the space into a representation of Jerusalem, an earthly paradise where Moro is buried. Because Venice was on the route to Jerusalem for pilgrims coming from the west and the north, the urban space of Venice could seen as a continuum of the Holy Land. After Christians lost control of Jerusalem, New Jerusalems were proclaimed in several cities, alluding to the loss or inaccessible nature of the city, but the declaration of a site as a New Jerusalem also served as a point of easy reference. In his *Summa Theologica*, Thomas Aquinas believed that the dead, "Wished to be buried in the land of promise," to create a greater resemblance to the burial site of Christ.

Through Aquinas' interpretive lens, approximation to the burial conditions of Christ would help to ensure a personal Resurrection.\(^{23}\) Thus, burial under a dome would evoke Christ's burial "in the land of promise."

In many ways the arch screen at the entrance of the San Giobbe chancel was the most salient part of Moro's monument for it was the most visible. The effect of Moro's tomb played out in the entire chapel, which became his mausoleum. Only by entering the high chapel at San Giobbe, could the slab of Moro be seen. Moro's floor slab is located in the chancel of San Giobbe before the church's high altar.\(^{24}\) (Figure 3 & Figure 4) It bears the inscription, "Cristophorus Maurus

---

\(^{22}\) *Revelation* 21, 14. "Where the wall of the Heavenly Jerusalem contains twelve foundations each marked with the name of one of the apostles."

\(^{23}\) Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae: questions on God*, edited by Brian Davies and Brian Leftow, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. "Reply to Objection 2: The fathers of old arranged for the burial of their bodies, so as to show that 'the bodies of the dead' are the object of Divine providence, not that there is any feeling in a dead body, but in order to confirm the belief in the Resurrection, as Augustine says (*De Civ. Dei* i, 13). Hence, also, they wished to be buried in the land of promise, where they believed Christ's birth and death would take place, Whose Resurrection is the cause of our rising again."

\(^{24}\) ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 4, XLI. f.24-25, 1505. ASV, San Giobbe Busta 5, fasc. xlvi, 3v. The altar was gilded in 1607. "Casa al incontro die haver tanti contadi alli frati per refor l’altare come nello apar: ducati 30." It was also
princeps MCCCLXX mensis septembris,” the date not of Moro’s death but of his testament in which his specifications for burial appear. Punch holes in the Doge’s inscription suggest that bronze letters once filled in the inscription. A decorative border with a floral motif similar to the pattern of the pilasters lies around the periphery of the tomb. The Moro family arms—three bunches of black grapes suspended over azure and white diagonal stripes—and the ducal crown appear in each angle. Though it was not visually prominent at eyelevel, the tomb slab was one of the largest in Venice at the time.

On most ducal tombs, the doge was depicted in a recumbent pose on a funerary bier, head propped by a pillow, frozen at the point of the funerary rites. Unlike the effigies on most ducal tombs which demarcated the time of death in an architectural space, there was no effigy of Moro to give the viewer a visual cue with which to remember him. Rather, he was inscribed in the church pavement as a ruler, a prince. The use of the term “prince” to describe the head of Venice was acceptable by Republican standards. The Venetians interchanged the term “prince” with “dux” but were careful to keep his powers in check. But in using Princeps rather than Dux, Moro likely referred back to the title of the head of the Roman Senate, princeps senatus, conferred on Augustus. Because Augustus was one of the last Roman Republicans and the heralded the beginning of the Roman Empire, the term had ambiguous meaning: Augustus was the prince over a senate that was increasingly governing only in name. In Moro’s case, the opposite held


25 ASV, Testamenti, Atti Tomei 1240.
true. His use of the term “princeps” on his burial monument was a reassertion of the power of the dogate.\textsuperscript{27}

Moro’s simple burial slab underscores the outward piety associated with Doge Moro. Pilgrims passing through Venice during Moro’s reign noted his piety. Chroniclers of Venice, including Moro’s great-nephew Marino Sanudo, had harsher words for the Doge. His acts of patronage throughout Venice tell yet a different story. However, his last gesture of humility in creating a slab that could not be easily seen can only be taken seriously. The signs of death brought about a certain devoutness to which Moro was not immune.

In Chapter 2, I discussed the way in which lay tombs and private burial chapels may have influenced the decision to enlarge the church at San Giobbe, but here, I will focus specifically on Doge Moro’s tomb slab, its relation to the high altar, and the liturgical implications for a slab and its placement in the church. I ask if the experience of memory is shaped or changed by the way a monument of commemoration demands the interaction of the worshipper. Does the position of the viewer who must look up or down to see a monument in a church change the meaning of a monument? And was there a conscious effort among determined users of a floor slab, in the Christian context, to affect a stance of humility? By looking at Moro’s burial scheme in detail, I try to see if death opened up a new set of spectatorial practices rooted in metaphor, by extending to the performance of prayer for salvation.

Crowding the Altar

Wealthier patrons and rulers often requested burial within the church, in close proximity to a privately endowed altar. They provided stipends to hold masses for the soul of the deceased at

\textsuperscript{27} Moro did use the title “doge” on the altars he dedicated in the basilica of San Marco and later doges, such as Marc’ Antonio Trevisan, used “princeps.”
the altars they dedicated, either weekly or on annual feast days. Occasionally, testators specified
the type of religious groups they wished to perform the mass in order to ensure a particular kind
of liturgy and a critical mass of participants. Private owners could also cede rights over masses to
a confraternity, as Moro did, in order to attract a greater number of worshippers to the masses
said at their sepulcher. Purchasing popularity on earth would ignite appeals for the salvation of
the deceased. The act of creating a space which focused suffrages for the dead—including
prayers and masses—enlisted the living in helping the dead reach salvation through prayer.

Tombs like Doge Moro’s proclaim their role as commemorative apparata primarily through
spatial means. This is not to say that the location of more visual wall monuments do not have
significance, but wall tombs often have sculptural or more outwardly representational cues for
the viewer or worshipper in the church. Doge Moro’s tomb, instead, laid emphasis on the
privilege of site rather than sight. Worshippers must have known of Moro’s burial at San Giobbe,
at least on the anniversary of his death presumably through the candles he donated in perpetuam
to masses recited, but from the nave, the worshippers would not have been able to see the tomb.
Depending on the material and the location of the floor slab, it becomes part of the fabric of the
church, made holy by the nature of the prayers. The architectural space of the church had always
been one that was shaped by liturgical practice and the worshipper. The slab of Moro does not
merely adorn a church wall, but it is an active agent in the liturgy.

There are countless examples of high ranking officials and ecclesiasts requesting burial under
a slab before an altar but a few in Venice must have particularly appealed to Moro as he thought
of his own interment.28 Francesco Sansovino described the burial of the Procurator of San
Marco, Giacomo Moro, Cristoforo’s grandfather, before the high altar of Santa Maria della

Misericordia. The tomb has now been removed and the church has been under heavy restoration for years, but Moro may have emulated his grandfather’s burial in some way to remind visitors to both tombs of his political heritage. The use of the simple tomb slab also alludes to the reports that after Doge Enrico Dandolo’s death in Constantinople during the 1204 Crusade, he was buried in the center of the Hagia Sophia with a floor slab. An inscription at Hagia Sophia commemorates Dandolo on a bronze plate, so presumably the tomb was nearby.

Moro is one of the only leaders of Venice who was buried under a slab before the high altar, but his burial scheme informed the burial plans of a later devotee of the cult of San Bernardino of Siena, Doge Andrea Gritti, who was elected on Bernardino’s feast day. At the Observant Franciscan church of San Francesco della Vigna, Gritti could venerate St. Bernardino, the former Vicar-General of the order, but the Doge also owned property in the area. In his 1535 testament, Gritti requested burial in the pavement in front of the high altar of San Francesco della Vigna. Instead, Gritti was placed in the wall of the presbytery with a plaque commemorating his burial there. While the final Gritti burial program illustrates potential signs of compromise between the Doge’s request and his burial in a chancel wall, there is a burial at San Francesco della Vigna which approximates Moro’s. Doge Marc’ Antonio Trevisan, who ruled for less than a year in 1553, is buried under a large slab about as big as Moro’s in the crossing of San Francesco della Vigna with an inscription that relates only his name and title, but his burial wishes are not on record. (Figure 119) (Figure 120)

29 ASV, Archivio Notarile, Testamenti, Atti Marsilio, Busta 1208, 265. “Volemo et ordinino che il corpo nostro se nato il solito modo de le vergini ne li principi de Venetia sia sepulto in la chiesia de li frati de san Francesco de la Vigna in una archa da offre facta in el pavimento di quella in la capella granda avanti lo altare grado laqual da nono e fundata et se fabricata, secondo il modo facta et ordino qual debe arcucimo per investimento....” ASV, San Francesco della Vigna, Busta 4, 236-43. 25 July 1536 “Sarcofagum autem in pavimento capelle predicte maioris.” 30 Clearfield, 1981, 29. In late medieval France, kings were often buried in front of the high altar, including Henry VII at Notre Dame. Also, Cosimo would have known of Pope Martin V’s bronze effigy by Donatello at San Giovanni in Laterno in front of the high altar. Here, the canons choir was moved to the back of the apse. Robert
The orientation of these burial slabs in relation to the altar is relevant. Slabs are often huddled around the high altar and subservient chapel altars throughout the church to mark a burial site in the crypt of a church below the church pavement in order to receive the blessings that were believed to have come from proximity to saints. While the placement of the slabs within a church is often haphazard, there is just as often axiality between the slabs in relation to the altar. In Malta, the slabs of the knights form an orderly and regularized grid of marble floor rectangles which cover the cathedrals in Mdina and Valletta. (Figure 5) Closer to San Giobbe in location and date, at Santa Maria dei Miracoli in Venice, fifteenth century slabs line the nave on axis with the main altar as they do at Santi Giovanni and Paolo. (Figure 121)

I believe that burial under a slab in approximation to an altar evoked early Christian elite burial practice.\(^{31}\) The high altar was described by several theologians, from St. Ambrose to St. Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, as the most worthy place in the church. Ambrose thought of burial in spatial terms: he believed that proximity to the altar would entail the intervention of the altar’s titular saint in divine negotiations for the salvation of the soul.\(^{32}\) St. Ambrose lobbied for martyr burials beneath altars in order that the beatified could bond with the host. He wrote, “Let him be above the altar who suffered for all; let them be beneath the altar who were redeemed by his suffering.”\(^{33}\) Though the law was eventually relaxed, canon law required the insertion of a relic of the titular saint into the table of the high altar of every church as suggested in Revelation

---


\(^{32}\) Saint Ambrose, *On the Sacraments*, edited by Henry Chadwick, London: A.R. Mowbray, c1960, IV.XII. Ambrose equated the altar with the body of Christ for the five crosses generally engraved on them at the time of consecration signify the five wounds. When Ambrose died, he was laid under the high altar of the church he founded in Milan dedicated to the saints Gervasius and Protasius.

6.9. "I saw under the altars the souls of them that had been slain for the word of god and for the witness they had borne."34

Directly following the legitimization of Christianity by Constantine, the hierarchy between mere mortals and saintly bodies was not as established. St. Ambrose invited the deceased to increase their chances of intervention by partaking of the body of the saint to whom they consigned themselves by claiming proximity to the altar. But with the Doctrine of Transubstantiation passed in 1215, the liturgy was reshaped.35 After the bread and the wine of the liturgy were placed on the altar, they were "substantially changed" into the body and blood of Christ. (Figure 122) The officiate of the mass would raise the Host over the altar and the body of Christ would be present in the sacrament.36 The altar would be the site not only of the saint it represented but it would be consecrated by Christ.

But with this new change in liturgical theology, burial near the altar became contested. William Durandus wrote in the thirteenth century,

No body, therefore ought to be buried in the church near an altar, where the body and blood of our lord are made, except the body of holy fathers, who be called patrons, that is defenders, who defended the whole country with their merits...37

In 1494, Savonarola would lambaste the rash of burials in approximation to or under altars.38 Despite the theological complaints, the practice continued, but the objections about burial before the altar suggest that it was understood to have been controversial.

35 James F. McCue, "The Doctrine of Transubstantiation from Berengar through Trent: The Point at Issue," *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 61, No. 3. (Jul., 1968), 385-430. Ambrose was a big proponent of the idea of transubstantiation. From John, "For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed."
Allies and Axes: Doge Moro, Bernardino, and the Host at the Altar

Doge Moro’s tomb relies on the function of the church as a stage for the mass. During the mass, particularly during the Elevation of the Host, the celebrant at San Giobbe and the laymen would have fixed their attention on the space surrounding the tomb. The tomb would have been the recipient of every public mass said at the high altar in addition to the masses said by the confraternity of San Bernardino. As Richard Trexler said, “The political has no soul like the body natural.” As a mortal, the Doge had to attain salvation through the prayers of others. The tomb serves not only to memorialize, but to reintegrate the doge back into society through its location which forced worshipping Venetians to intercede for the Doge through prayer.

For the church theologian William Durandus, the worshipper and the deceased needed a relationship that was mediated by sight or touch. Thus, burial would need to be configured in spatial terms. The burial marker would allow for both experiences. Anthropologists like Victor Turner have emphasized the sensory experience inherent in ritual but in studies of Renaissance funerary practices in the West, such concerns are often omitted. Seeing the host was officially a privilege as evident from the calls for crowd control around the sacrament of the Eucharist. But so was tasting the Sacrament: One did need to be full of grace and clean from sin to take communion. If seeing the Host was a privilege, did the privilege extend to spatial proximity? The area around the altar was usually reserved for ecclesiasts or high-ranking officials, a position Moro reclaimed in death. But wall tombs tended to be at a ninety degree angle to the altar.

42 Duffy, 101.
The placement of the Moro’s tomb in front of the high altar of San Giobbe undercuts the humility that is inherent in a tomb that is not visible from the nave, for the slab is positioned in the most liturgically significant space in the room. The prominent position of Moro’s tomb marker in the centralized chancel, almost directly under the dome, and directly in front of the high altar compensates in its spatial position for what it lacks in visibility. During the mass the celebrant elevated the host to effect transubstantiation on line with the tomb of Moro in the public liturgical services and during the funerary masses Moro requested at the church on the anniversary of his death. At Moro’s tomb, the Host, and thus, the body of Christ, would have been consecrated. Regardless of the orientation of the celebrant, the worshippers would face the tomb, directing their prayers towards the Doge. The axis defining the relationship of St Bernardino at the altar and the Doge in the tomb would be reformed by the host. The spatial emphasis on Moro’s tomb by its approximate axial arrangement—in the middle of the centralized chancel, and almost directly under the dome—reinforces its alignment with Bernardino, the titular saint of the altar. Likely, Moro wanted to affect the continued intervention of his patron saint in death. (Figure 53)

Theological propositions about the Resurrection were played out in the high altar chapel. By situating the tomb under the dome, Moro capitalizes on the elongated vertical axis and its possible liturgical significance. In other words, the comprehension of the slab under the dome would have hinged on a semiotic process by which the viewer would understand Moro’s figurative redemption and rebirth as they worked through the axial hierarchy legitimized by the four evangelists in the tondi. The implied salvation is articulated in space through the vertical movement away from the physical tomb to the heavenly sphere represented by the dome.

43 ASV, Testamenti, B. 1238, nos. 178 and 188.
Liturgically, the architectural ambient of Moro's burial chapel illuminates Early Christian and Eastern conceptions of the physical church as a divine microcosm. The way in which the church was designed through a set of spatial hierarchies meant to transform the viewer's experience from one profane to one that was increasingly spiritual spoke to a Byzantine aesthetic that derived from the tradition of ekphrasis, or representing a visual impression through words.\(^44\) When describing the church of the Holy Apostles around 1200, Nicholas Mesarites wrote, "At the threshold of the Holy Apostles, the point of transition, he explains that the eyes of the senses must be supplemented by the eyes of the mind in a progression, not just from the exterior to the interior of the church, but from the evidence of the senses to the final mysteries and secret places."\(^45\)

The Byzantine theologian, Germanus wrote that, "The church is heaven on earth, where the god of heaven dwells and moves. It images forth the crucifixion and burial and Resurrection of Christ..."\(^46\) Nicholas Andida also felt that the Elevation of the Host by the celebrant "images forth" the events of the Passion. This Byzantine idea that both the setting of the church and the activity conducted in it served to activate a connection to the Passion and salvation plays out in the high altar chapel at San Giobbe as it does at the Old Sacristy. Moro's tomb not only stands in

---


\(^{45}\) Durandus, *Rationale divinorum officiorum*, edited by A. Davril and T.M. Thibodeau, Turnholti: Brepols, 1995-2000, Chapter 1: 31. “The chancel, that is, the head of the church, being lower than its body, signifieth how great humility there should be in the clergy or in prelates, according to that saying, And the More thou art exalted, humble thyself in all things. The rail by which the altar is divided from the choir, teacheth the separation of things celestial, from things terrestrial.”

\(^{46}\) C. Mango, *Art of the Byzantine Empire*, 57-60. Karl Lehmann, “The Dome of Heaven.” *Art Bulletin* XXVII, 2. Robert F. Taft, “Liturgy of the Great Church,” *Liturgy in Byzantium and Beyond*, Brookfield, VT: Variorum, 1995. Early theologians discussed the way the worshipper claims an understanding of the Trinity based on the *logos* in the Byzantine liturgy. Taft cites Saint Maximus' (580-662) discussion of the temple as a microcosm in the *Mystagogia* (1-5, 91). Germanus, Book 1/1. In Book 4/3, Germanus writes, “The holy altar stands for the place where Christ was laid in the grave....It is also the throne of god on which the incarnate god reposes....and like the table at which He was in the midst of His disciples at His mystical supper...prefigured in the table of the Old Law where the manna was, which is Christ, come down from heaven.” André Grabar, 1972, 2:39.
the direct line of the altar of his adopted patron saint, but it completes the iconographic program of the cupola and reinforces the theme of Resurrection. The *tondo* of God-the-Father in the San Giobbe dome offers divine acknowledgment of the deceased below. (Figure 98) The four roundels of the evangelists in the pendentives occupy the intermediary space between the tomb and the dome, ostensibly to serve as intercessors for the worshipper’s salvation, as saints often do in altarpieces.47 The privilege of easy sight may be suppressed, laying emphasis instead on the privilege of site.

**Moro Mimics the Medici: Comparing Cosimo’s Tomb Marker to Doge Moro’s**

The spatial arrangement of Moro’s tomb fit into an emerging type of elite burial which positioned the burial slab before the altar. Some tombs, like Moro’s floor slab, are situated outside of the areas of major foot traffic, often close to the high altar. There are no organizing principles determining the placement of slabs from church to church. In some cases, the positions of slabs in churches have been altered or they have been removed to the wall for the purpose of preservation. The degree to which the slab obliged one to negotiate a path through the church became problematic. In the late Middle Ages, when the practice of church burial escalated as discussed in Chapter 3, and it was legally sanctioned for the laity, burial slabs became an integral part of church floors. Several markers from antiquity were turned over and reused for more contemporary burial. As the burial of laity in the church and around the cloister became common after the twelfth century, the General Chapter of the Cistercians ruled in 1191 that floor slabs

47 S. Sinding-Larsen, *Iconography and Ritual: A Study on Analytical Perspective*, Oslo, 1984, 27. In most liturgical situations, the martyr represents the suffering church, or Purgatory, the step to salvation between the Churches Militant and Triumphant.
should be level with the ground “in order not to offend the feet of the passerby.”

By the time of the Council of Trent, the burial slabs were regarded as a genre. Carlo Borromeo believed that no tomb should rise above the pavement level (non excedens pavimentum).

If Moro was interested in the designs for St. Peter’s, there was a prominent example of a burial before the altar by a pope. The Liber Pontificalis states that Pope John VII was buried in front of the altar of the now destroyed Oratory he erected at Old St. Peter’s, an oratory that was still in existence when Moro was in Rome.

Donatello designed Pope Martin V’s bronze effigy slab at San Giovanni in Laterano in front of the high altar ciborium of Sts. Peter and Paul which contained an engraved effigy of the portly pope. As Martin V helped revitalize Rome after the Papal Schism, his burial in a church founded by Constantine before the apostles who represented the earthly church would have appealed to Moro as he worked out his own burial scheme.

When Robert of Anjou died in 1343, he was laid to rest in the middle of the choir in Santa Chiara in Naples immortalized in a double portrait with his wife in repose. In her study of the burial practices of the medieval kings of France at Saint-Denis, Elizabeth Brown notes that several requested burial under a simple slab but they were almost always strategically placed near an altar. Louis VI requested buried with a simple marker between the two altars of the Trinity and the Holy Martyrs.

---

49 Aries, 239. Palladio, Book IV. In the early church, the altar was accessible by the nave and the choir. Palladio discusses this arrangement in early basilicas.
Burial before the high altar was generally reserved for ecclesiasts and monarchs, but there were also precedents for lay burial marked by a slab in front of a high altar, like Cosimo de Medici. Doge Moro’s burial scheme most closely approximates that of Cosimo de Medici. Cosimo de’ Medici’s floor slab, attributed to Andrea del Verrocchio, is in the transept crossing of San Lorenzo in Florence above the pier in the crypt in which he is buried. (Figure 7) It was completed sometime after Cosimo’s death on 1 August 1464. Before Cosimo’s death in 1464, he expressed his desire for a constrained burial despite the fact that he died the richest man in Florence. He told his son Piero that he “wanted his body placed in the ground and not in a thing of noteworthiness or height.” The request provides a precursor for Moro’s testamentary request for burial in the ground, “without pomp.” A small government-appointed council of Medici allies, with Cosimo’s son Piero de’ Medici, commissioned a floor slab, based on Cosimo’s directions. He turned his monument into something that can not be easily seen, but could be stepped on. The Prior of San Lorenzo, Pietro Bonichi, gives the earliest description of the tomb of Cosimo de’ Medici in the Sepoltuario of 1482, with emphasis on its location in the pavement before the high altar.

For Cosimo, we have a clear idea from several biographies that he tried to temper his outward power in Florentine politics and the Medici tried to ingratiate themselves with the popolani. Vespasiano di Bisticci wrote that Cosimo, “acted privately and with the greatest discretion…and whenever he sought to obtain an object, he let it appear that the matter had been...”

---

54 BMC, Codice Cicigna 2115. Moro writes in his testament, “Metendo loro el’ mio corpo sotto e senza alguno honore.” The crypt is now flooded
set in motion by someone other than himself and thus he escaped envy and unpopularity.”

Thus, the level of his tomb slab was humble, while the position and the materials used told a different story. Cosimo’s slab consists of a large circle of white marble cutting through four symmetrical sections of porphyry, inscribed within a square, marked at each corner by bronze shields with the Medici palle.

Cosimo’s request for a humble burial fit into a type of self-commemoration that gave the outward impression of humility. In his second will of 1297, the cleric Hugues Aycelin asked for burial in a copper tomb at the foot of the high altar at Santa Sabina in Rome level with the pavement, “So that the brothers seeing it will remember us in their prayers.” In several testaments of the late Middle Ages, requests were made for burial depressum et humile, in the ground and humble. Cardinals Seguin and Leonardo Patrasso, for example, stipulated burial in the ground. King Henry IV wrote in his will dated 20 June 1475 that he wished to be buried “lowe in the grounde, and upon the same a stone to bee laied and wrought with the figure of Dethe with scochyns of oure Armses and writings convenient aboute the bordures of the same remembering the day and yere of oure decease.” St. Augustine’s meditation on his mother Monica’s burial prefigures many of these requests for modesty in burial. He wrote,

She had no care whether her body was to be buried in a specific monument...All she wanted was that we should remember her at your altar...she will not answer that she has no debt to pay for fear that her conning accuser should prove her wrong.” Monica was not interested in the image she would

56 Vespasiano, 214.
57 Friedman, 1970, 109. Filippo Strozzi was buried behind an altar in the family’s chapel at Santa Maria Novella sometime after 1491. The position of the altar in relation to the tomb was also noted in Strozzi’s 1491 testament.
leave to the living of this world; she was only interested in receiving prayers at the altar for the salvation of her soul.61

An idea of the burial effect Moro aimed for may be gleaned from the testament of King Louis VII. He asked to be interred not at St-Denis, as his predecessors, but at Barbeaux, the Cistercian monastery he founded in order to receive the prayers of the entire Cistercian order.62 His widow Adèle de Champagne commissioned a tomb for him before the main altar of gold, silver, and precious stones with effigy but his epitaph revealed the nature of his burial request. Louis VII chose to lie “in poverty in this poor company” and “to be impoverished in this poor house, so that the poorest will remember me, poor as I am.”63 The subtext of the request for a lowly or humble burial in death was that it would lead to exaltation in the afterlife. Moro also requested a burial, “without honor,” but in a language that was less explicitly demeaning towards his corpse.

But how Cosimo de’ Medici came to own his burial spot belies the humility claimed. After the death of his brother, Lorenzo, Cosimo purchased new memorial offices at San Lorenzo in his brother’s memory and he pledged full support for the completion of the basilica, which had languished since the beginning of the 1430s.64 In exchange for shouldering the financial burden of San Lorenzo, in 1442 Cosimo acquired parts of the church over which the chapter had hitherto demanded control—the cappella maggiore, the aisles, and the nave of the basilica. Moro’s

---

61 Le Goff, Birth of Purgatory, 64.
donation of 10,000 ducats to San Giobbe and his requirement that no one tamper with his burial requests strongly suggests a similar ownership over the liturgical center of the church.

A 1500 plan of the basilica of San Lorenzo discovered in Venice by Howard Burns shows the choir placed in the apse and the altar placed at the edge of the chancel, facing the congregation and Cosimo’s tomb, similar to the arrangement at San Giobbe.65 (Figure 123) Giannozzo Manetti noted the unusualness of the move of the choir to behind the altar and believes Cosimo ordered the choir moved when he decided on his burial site.66 A century later, Charles Borromeo instructed clergymen to build churches with the choir in the cappella maggiore, as at San Giobbe, and in Borromeo’s churches, the altar was placed at the entrance to the choir chapel. Like Cosimo de’ Medici, Moro was concerned with the orientation of the altar in relation to his tomb about a century before the Council of Trent put forth suggestions for the disposition of the altar. The rules put forth for the altar to stand before the worshippers and in front of the choir by Borromeo were likely based on the fact that the practice had been established already at churches like San Lorenzo in Florence and San Giobbe.

In the fifteenth century as San Lorenzo underwent rigorous reconstruction, it was believed that the church was founded by St. Ambrose.67 As an antiquarian and a humanist, Cosimo must have made a conscious effort to revive the earlier orientation of the altar under the early Church. At Mugello al Bosco, a Franciscan Observant convent also patronized by Cosimo de’ Medici, the altar turns to face the nave as well.68 That the arrangement of the altar was still not common in

---

66 Volker Herzner, however, suggests that the move was Piero’s decision. Several other choirs were also placed behind the altar at around the same time. In the 1450s, Santa Annunziata in Florence and Santa Giustinia in Padova had the same arrangement.
the mid-fifteenth century suggests that Moro and the Medici may have been following an
Ambrosian tradition in turning the altar *versus populum*.

The similarities between the placement of Moro's tomb and Cosimo’s tomb strongly suggests that both altars would have been oriented towards the worshippers in the nave and not against the back wall of the apse. The disposition of Cosimo’s monument—under a dome and in front of an altar, like Moro’s—overrides the pretensions to humility inherent in a floor slab. The location of Moro’s slab in an elevated presbytery meant that the monument would not be subject to the same foot traffic as those markers near church portals or scattered throughout the naves of churches. The qualification of a death marked not only by a slab but positioned in a strategic way in relation to the altar, however, changes the parameters of humility.

That Moro specified burial before the high altar dedicated to St. Bernardino of Siena and specified that his tomb was not to be moved suggests that the celebrant of the mass at San Giobbe faced the nave during the celebration of the mass. The cumbersome high altar currently installed in San Giobbe was likely completed in the seventeenth century. It was meant to be adorned with figures of Job and Bernardino on either side. Three sixteenth-century tomb slabs are located directly behind the high altar including Guarino de Angeli, who requested burial “behind the high altar” under the pavement “to the right of the door to the sacristy in the choir.”

Thus, the current location of the altar seems to have been in the general location Moro

---

69 ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 7, fasc. LXXIV, 8. Angelo Maria Priuli was buried behind the altar and Pandolfo Maurocino was also behind the altar from 1450. “Guariscus q. Antonii di Angelis … Assignaverut et assignarit atque concederut et concedat per fazo di guarischo ibidem ponti et stipulati per se et heredique ac successoris sui sepulturam in per faza ecclesia s. Job scilicet locum terrenu in pavimento cori eiusdem ecclesie post altare maius altare sinistro prope portam per quam itur di sachristia ad dictâ corâ in quo loco dictus D. Guariscius suis propriis summptisque et ad sui beneplacitum possit et valeat fieri facere una arcam solo aquatam cum suis cohoptortio arma et epitaphio quibus et fut ipsi di guarisco solacerit et visâ fuerit. Cum plenissima potepate qualemus indicta archa per fatus d guariscus et sui heredes possit et collocare el poni facere cadaver siyra ossa tam ipsius D. Guarisci que. Allorum suorum defuntorum quodque dicta arca sit remeneat et remanere debeat pro sepultura eiusdem D. guarisci et suorum heredam et successorum in perpetuum… et se obligaverut celebriare et celebrari favere duas missas singula
chose, despite its replacement at least once in the sixteenth century and again a century later. The altar that is now at the church forces the celebrant to face east, away from the worshippers, but during the fifteenth century, when San Giobbe, was an infant Franciscan church serving a hospice for the poor, the altar was likely simpler. When the high altar was reconsecrated in 1583, it was moved from "place to place" suggesting that it was smaller and more portable. By the seventeenth century, the altar had been replaced at least twice.

Moro’s request for burial before the high altar suggests that the tomb stood between the altar and the nave, as it does today. But there is a good chance that the celebrant faced the apse when the Host was elevated for the high altar is in the east. Moro deliberately broke with conventions of liturgical orientation to return to an Early Christian Ambrosian tradition of the celebrant facing the people that played out at St. Peter’s, and at San Lorenzo in Florence where Cosimo de’ Medici is buried. St. Ambrose after all invited the living up to the altar in death.

Early church doctors and theologians advocated an arrangement in which the officiate of the mass would turn versus populum towards the people at the altar, inscribing the visual cycle of the liturgy within a set of borders. After the sixth century, however, the practice of facing the congregation during the liturgy was largely abandoned and the altars and the celebrant turned from the worshippers towards the wall. There are several conflicting reasons given for the change in the orientation of the altar and the mass. In part, it derives from the categorization of

---

71 Duffy, 101. The practice was advocated in the fourth century by St. Ambrose.
72 Ibid. McCue, 385-430.
the Middle Ages as unenlightened, in which a cut off occurred between the clergy and laity socially and visually. The orientation of the altar in relation to the worshippers did become a debated theological issue at some point. Frequent calls to respect the Host suggest that access was not totally forbidden regardless of where the celebrant stood or which direction he faced. But the celebrant did not likely stay fixed in one position during the liturgy. When Thomas Aquinas posed the question of, “Whether the actions performed in celebrating this sacrament are becoming?” he answered, “It seems ridiculous for the priest to turn round frequently towards the people, and often to greet the people. Consequently, such things ought not to be done in the celebration of this sacrament.” The orientation of the liturgy was important and it may be the case that the priest turned from the altar versus populum frequently during the mass, but at the Elevation of the Host, it may have been key for the celebrant to face Jerusalem in the East.

Art historians most often cite the visual disconnect of the clergy from the laity as a way to give focus to the Elevation of the Host. When discussing the mass in the thirteenth century, Albertus Magnus believed that elevating the host, allowed it “to be seen and adored by the people” proving that even before the Council of Trent, thus the celebrant was just a medium for the host; it would be seen regardless of which direction he faced. The Elevation of the Host at the altar is often depicted with the celebrant facing a wall, away from the open space of the congregants. In a 1317 fresco by Simone Martini in the Lower Basilica of St. Francis of Assisi, St. Martin celebrates the mass facing the back of the altar or the wall of a church. That he carefully elevates the Host, (Figure 124) with a follower peering over his shoulder, suggests that

73 Aquinas, *Summa*, Question 83.
Martin was following rules that governed gesture and orientation and did not require separation from the laity. St. Ambrose also called for the inclusion of the congregants in the visual circle of the liturgy, but if the celebrant faced the east, and that happened to be the wall, the participants would all be facing in the liturgically prescribed direction.

Changes in orientation are illuminated by Pope Gregory the Great’s sixth-century repositioning of the altar. At St. Peter’s in Rome, because the church was oriented to the west, Pope Gregory the Great moved the altar away from the apse wall of the basilica. The altar was moved very close to the crossing of the transept, likely in an effort to create a more exacting vertical axis with the alleged tomb of St. Peter below. (Figure 125) In order to face east, the celebrant stood between the apse wall and the altar facing the entrance of the basilica, and the worshippers, versus populum. Thus, the visual connect between the celebrant and the worshipper may not have been a major consideration, but orientation would now be correct. The worshippers may have also turned towards the door to face east when the host was elevated.

**Pride and Purgatory**

Throughout his journey through purgatory in the *Divine Comedy*, Dante carefully considers the spatial position of the souls as they undergo their punishments. Souls who suffer from the vice of avarice are made to lie face-down on the floor: the ground and stone help shape the representation of the deceased. The prostrate position is invoked to suggest penitence like those souls bent down with weight of their sins, symbolized by the large stone slabs they have to

---


77 Ibid.

78 The translation is based on those of W. S. Merwin (2000), Allan Mandelbaum (1984) and my own reading of the passage.
carry on their backs. In the Middle Ages, the sin of pride was considered one of the most serious venial sins.

Early on in his journey through purgatory, in Canto 12, Dante encounters mythical and biblical figures condemned to purgatory by cause of pride and hubris. Most of the souls that Dante meets throughout the *Divine Comedy* offer verbal accounts of their sins, but in Canto 12, Dante transfers the authority of communication to images. In one instance, Dante looks upon on the incised image of Arachne crouching in defeat after challenging the goddess Diana to a weaving contest. Dante counterbalances pride with humility, a dichotomy inherited from earlier theologians. However, in Dante’s conception of the afterworld, pride is not an obdurate sin punishable by hell, but it is negotiable, pending a cathartic turn through purgatory.

As Dante approaches the carved images set into the ground, Virgil exhorts him to,

“Look downward, for the way will offer you some solace if you pay attention to the pavement at your feet.” As, on the lids of pavement tombs (*tombe terragne*), there are stone effigies of what the buried were before, so that the dead may be remembered; and there, when memory-inciting only the pious—has renewed their mourning, men are often led to shed their tears again; so did I see, but carved more skillfully, with greater sense of likeness, effigies on all the path protruding from the mountain. 79

Virgil’s command for Dante to gaze downwards is an initial gesture of humility. It allows Dante to see representations engraved into the ground under his feet, which he compares to pavement tombs, *tombe terragne*, in churches.

Through a glance, the tread of his feet, and the shedding of tears, Dante recreates the sensual act of reciting prayers for the dead in churches to mobilize the departed soul for improvement. The clear cut definitions of heaven and hell, increasingly nuanced by theologians, were made more permeable with the expansion of rituals for the exoneration of sin after death in purgatory.

79 Ibid.
The souls in purgatory were not condemned to eternal suffering in hell, but they were also not pure enough for salvation. A soul endured cleansing after death through fire. Suffrages helped bring about the end of the trials by fire by quenching water—here, in the form of tears—and signaled a progress towards heaven. Though Dante is not explicitly praying, his meditation on the memory of the deceased brought about by the images in the ground, like burial slabs, embodies the mutual profiteering from which both the living and the dead benefit as described in religious theology from at least the time of St. Augustine. With the increase in favors the living could do for the dead, death was manipulated into a parallel existence to civic life. The sociability of death was essential in fashioning an upwards inflection towards salvation.

The dialectic of pride and humility was one formulated by the early church doctors. Augustine wrote that, “The measure of humility is apportioned to each one according to his rank. It is imperiled by pride, for the greater a man is the more liable is he to be entrapped.” Humility was as an important theme for the Franciscans as poverty. In a fresco from the lower church of the basilica of St. Francis and in the vaults of Santa Croce in Florence by Taddeo Gaddi, humility is displayed with hope and charity. In both cases, humility is shown as an allegory, not unlike Dante’s embodiment of humility.

Thomas Aquinas accumulated beliefs on humility from the Bible and the early church doctors. He stressed the importance of affecting a stance of humility, “For divine grace is conferred on the humble.” After St. Augustine, he asked, “Are you thinking of raising the great
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81 St. Augustine, *De sancta virginitate*, translated by P.G. Walsh, New York: Oxford University Press, 2001, XXXI. Then St. Bonaventure speaks about humility: “The fruits of humility are manifold. First, it calms the anger of God, while moving him to suspend judgment due to guilt.” The second fruit of humility: “it finds grace.” Third, “it brings righteousness.”
82 1 Peter 5:5, Prov. 3:34, James, 4:6: “But he giveth greater grace. Wherefore he saith: God resisteth the proud and giveth grace to the humble.”
fabric of spirituality? Attend first of all to the foundation of humility (*spiritualis aedificii fundamentum*).” The configuration of humility as the foundation for the other virtues was reconfigured throughout the Middle Ages and into the Renaissance as a self-imposed lowliness. Through Isadore of Seville, Aquinas traced the etymology of humility, from the root humus, which he declared, is the earth beneath us. In early Christian burials, the root of the word meant to bury in the ground. For example, in Reims, the body of St. Remy was moved to the side of the church of St. Christopher at some point, but its new burial marker held evocations of its past. “This body of Beato Remigii was first buried in the center of the church of St. Christopher.” These earthly connotations of humility were propagated in graphic representation as well. Several representations of the Tree of Virtues in manuscript illuminations place humility at the base of the Tree, as the root of the other virtues. (Figure 126)

Spiritual humility is almost always expressed paradoxically and in spatial terms, overturning mortal abasement with heavenly exaltation or mundane pride with eternal punishment. For example, a passage in Luke 14 ensures the salvation of the humble: “For whosoever exalts himself shall be abased; and he that humbles himself shall be exalted.” One particular genre of Madonna and Child seated not on a throne but on the ground echoes the association of humility with lowliness. These images are identified as the Madonna of the Humility because she relinquished her throne in her maternal role of nurturer. (Figure 127) One particular image is accompanied by a quote from the Virgin, “Because he has been mindful of the humble state of
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83 Coluccio Salutati, *De Saeculo et religione*, Chapter 14L *De Humilitate*: “Humilitata enim subit cum miseriuam nostrum agnoscinus nosque peccati deformatit correptus contemptibiles iudicamus.”


85 Psalm 13: depositum potentes de fede & exaltatuit humiles.” “Custodiens parvulos Dominus: humiliates sum, liberavit me.”
his servant, from now on all generations will call me blessed.” Humility as a sign of inferiority played a large role in the liturgy as well. Early eleventh century clamors often began “in spiritu humilitatis,” exhorting the worshipper to lie before the altar.

Death was treated as the ultimate manifestation of humility. Thomas Aquinas does not insist on burial of the body as a prerequisite to Resurrection, but burial is a courtesy of the living to shield the odor and mortification of the corpse. The marker or monument at the burial site is meant to stand in as a substitution for the corpse. Even in Northern Europe where the putrification of the body in death was more often represented, there were laws regulating the display of the corpse. For most lay burials in the Italian city-states, the corpse was not to be displayed during public ceremony, but was to be shrouded. Slabs emulate, to some degree the body as it was laid out on the lapita, a stone place on the floor or a funerary bier right after death. They freeze the funerary moment to demonstrate that the deceased is in eternal rest.

Quite often pride was muted in commemoration practices by displaying the rotting corpse or the effigy with the cadaver about decomposition and its inevitability. The burial inscription often combines the related ideas of humility and purgation. The relationship is spelled out more clearly in the tomb of Giovanni da Montopoli in the Roman church of Santa Prassede. The inscription
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86 Luke 1.46-48. “Et ait Maria magnificat anima mea Dominum et exultavit spiritus meus in Deo salutari meo quia respexit humilitatem ancillae suae ecce enim ex hoc bestam me dicent omnes generationes
87 Patrick Geary, “Humiliation of Saints” in Saints and their Cults, edited by Stephen Wilson. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983. The clamor involved a ritual humiliation of relics, which were then placed on the ground.
88 Philippe Ariès, Western attitudes toward death: from the Middle Ages to the present, translated by Patricia M. Ranum, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974, Panofsky, 89, 91.
89 Strocchia, 1981, 171-72, 174-75. Strocchia discusses Florentine regulations against displaying corpses during public funerary rites from the 13th to the 15th century. Aquinas, Summa. “Reply to Objection 3: Since flesh is a part of man’s nature, man has a natural affection for his flesh, according to Eph. 5:29, ‘No man ever hated his own flesh.’ Hence in accordance with this natural affection a man has during life a certain solicitude for what will become of his body after death: and he would grieve if he had a presentiment that something untoward would happen to his body....”
reads, “This is the tomb of Giovanni da Montopoli, spicier (spetiarus). What you are, I was. What I am, you will be. Pray for me. Sinner, do penance.” (Figure 128) The first person pronoun individualizes the deceased, I am, “sono” suggesting a continual existence into the afterlife, but it also universalizes the experience of death to show that as the verb tenses shift from living to departed, the “I” will still be. The inscription reintegrates the deceased into society seamlessly. With a visual cue of death, the inscription warns the living to repent and begin the labor towards salvation.

Not everyone subscribed to the emphasis on humility in death given that in many tombs, few traces of humility can be found. Many ducal tombs in Venice “recall to memory” the life of the deceased or the glory of the afterlife rather than the reality of death. But how one consigned themselves to popular memory at the time of death is ultimately difficult to understand. For example, Filippo Decio, a professor of law at Pisa, in the 16th century, boasts of his salary of 1500 ducats a year on his tomb, a choice of inscription that is difficult to grasp today when we think of the Renaissance as populated by priests, prelates, and friars patrolling for greed and usury.

While the body of the deceased would remind the viewer of his own pending death, the clean monument, like Moro’s represents the two states of living and afterlife rather than the decay of the natural body. As a monument, it “calls to mind” another thing. Regardless of how the deceased was represented on the slab in text or image, asleep peacefully or fodder for worms,
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91 Aquinas, Summa, “I answer that, We have recourse to burial for the sake of both the living and the dead. For the sake of the living, lest their eyes be revolted by the disfigurement of the corpse, and their bodies be infected by the stench, and this as regards the body. But it profits the living also spiritually inasmuch as our belief in the Resurrection is confirmed thereby. It profits the dead in so far as one bears the dead in mind and prays for them through looking on their burial place, wherefore a “monument” takes its name from remembrance, for a monument is something that recalls the mind [monens mentem], as Augustine observes (De Civ. Dei i; De Cura pro Mort. iv). It was, however, a pagan error that burial was profitable to the dead by procuring rest for his soul: for they believed that the soul could not be at rest until the body was buried, which is altogether ridiculous and absurd.”
burial slabs forced the living into a gesture of humility by looking down. They would be looking at the dead, staring at their own assured fate. The slab is an acceptance by the deceased of the humility of mortality which they projected back to the living world. The acceptance of humility it would seem would in itself lead to the expiation of sin.

Momens Mentem: The Death of the Burial Monument

Dante offers a model for how to think about humility and representation, in death. Because Dante’s allegory offers a summation of the theological principles of the afterlife and informed later conceptions, his understanding of pride through the graven images inscribed in the earth, like _tombe terragne_, evokes several ideas about the commemoration of death in the late Middle Ages and Early Renaissance. I believe that burial slabs, marking the corpse in they crypt below or in a separate part of the church, were remnants of a theological and commemorative past developed during the Middle Ages, which evoked penitence in memorial and the final mortal steps of purgation.

Dante’s thirty year period for purgatory is echoed in a testament dated to 1645 in which Orlando Soderini leaves money for one mass a week recited by the friars of St. Job for souls in purgatory, for thirty years.⁹² Dante’s determination of a time limit for purgation likely derived from theological doctrine. The medieval theologians pioneering a doctrine for purgatory turned to biblical and ancient sources to justify their development of a liminal space to test preparedness for salvation. The evidence for Purgatory in the bible was scant. The bible does not offer a clear indication that a space, abstract or physical, exists for a soul to ready itself for salvation after death, but it does suggest that supplication on behalf of the dead by the living could help the
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⁹² ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, LIII, 59r. Testament of Orlandi Sonderinih 27 April 1645. “Item voglio, che sii no dati ducati dodeci all’anno per trent’anni continua a’i fratti di S. Gioppo perle habbino carico (canico) di cellebrar una messa alla settimana all’altar privileggiato per l’anime del Purgatorio secondo la mia intentione.”
deceased negotiate their fate. Biblical passages informed later formulations of the doctrine: "For if he had not hoped that they that were slain should have risen again, it had been superfluous and vain to pray for the dead... Whereupon he made reconciliation for the dead that they might be delivered from sin."93

Virgil's command for Dante to gaze downwards is an initial gesture of humility, but it is also a pedagogical directive for Dante to recognize pride as one of the principle factors for residence in purgatory. Was burial in the ground an acknowledgement of purgatory? As a monument that demands the interaction of the living body, did it continually activate the memory of the deceased?94 Did Moro's burial perpetuate his memory more effectively because it was integrated into the liturgy? Dante's intimacy with the images on the ground, through a glance down and through physical contact, embodies the mutual profiteering from which both the living and the dead benefit.

Purgatory has recently begun to capture the imagination of scholars, particularly after Jacques Le Goff traced its conception. Purgatory, he believes, was inserted into the fixed and intransient spaces of heaven and hell during the thirteenth century. It was often depicted as a middle space, porous on its border with heaven for the ascension of souls after their trials. The Franciscan, St. Bonaventure also took part in the debates on purgatory. "The place of purgatory is probably according to common law, below, but it is in the middle according to the divine economy."95 Because purgatory was not passed as official doctrine, its location was always unclear. Dante places purgatory on a mountain, while in later manuscript, the cavalier, Louis of France, tired from battle wanted to purge his war sins and penetrated the soil of purgatory in

---

93 2 Macc. 44-5
94 Young, 2000, 90-105.
95 Le Goff, Birth of Purgatory, 252-3.
September of 1361. Dante positions those souls in purgatory against the ground either represented or burdened by stone. His allegory for purgatory centers around the recurring motifs of material and medium, stone and tomb, suggesting that purgatory requires a burial of the body close to the ground. Through his burial monument, I believe Moro expiated for his personal sins—which have not been made known to us—and his political sins.

Those souls in purgatory because they were avaricious when they lived are forced to lie face down on the ground burdened with heavy monoliths. The image is one of a burial in the ground, with a soul, “Stuck to the pavement, Adhaesit pavimento anima mea.” Again, “The work of avarice is here proclaimed in the purging of the down-turned souls,...Just as we failed to lift our eyes on high, because they were fixed on earthly things, so justice here has turned them to the earth.” burial in the ground was an acknowledgement of what had been described by Dante as penance for avarice and pride. That Dante employs these trials as catharsis suggests that purgatory was associated with lowliness and the ground.

The sociability of death was essential in fashioning an upwards inflection towards salvation. In Purgatory, Dante contemplates and walks over the graven images of the departed, like tomb slabs; they interact. Thomas Aquinas credits the living with more power in the world of the dead. Even pre-Christian philosophy identified bonds between mortality and death. In the Nicomachaen Ethics, Aristotle hinted of the possibility that the fortunes of the living affect the dead, but he was not specific about the nature of the relationship. Of the living, St. Augustine does “not see what helps they be to the dead,” but believes that they should preserve the “memory of the place in which the deceased are buried.”
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96 Le Goff, Birth of Purgatory, 215. BMC, PD 1508. cl. 1. 384. The illustrated manuscript documents the travel of Louis of France to purgatory of St. Patrick.
97 Aristotle, Nicomachean ethics, translated by C.C.W. Taylor, New York: Oxford University Press, 2006, I, X. Aristotle asks if the dead could be affected by the living?
Most often it was assumed that souls were in that indeterminate and transitional space of purgatory, not condemned, but not pure enough for salvation. A soul endured cleansing after death through the help of suffrages. Reciting prayers for the dead implies that the departed soul could be improved. The very celebration of funerary rites must confer something to the living or the dead or those rites would not be undertaken.\textsuperscript{98} Prayer over the dead, “profits the living also spiritually in as much as our belief in the Resurrection is confirmed thereby. It profits the dead in so far as one bears the dead in mind and prays or them through looking on their burial place, wherefore a monument takes its name from remembrances, for a monument is something that recalls the mind, as Augustine observes.” A Franciscan Laude which draws on James 5:16 urges worshippers to, “Pray for the other, so that you shall be saved, because the prayers of the just have great value.”\textsuperscript{99}

The more masses ordered in testamentary bequests on behalf of the dead required payment to the church. The faithful were lead to believe that their fates could be improved if they began the process of repentance on earth. Thus, affecting a stance of humility before death would be a good investment in future salvation. The contrasting spaces of judgment after death were made grayer when the idea of purgatory became church doctrine. When death seemed more immanent, one could begin the process of purging sins by purchasing prayers and the promises of funds to a church to save their souls. Donations to charitable institutions and the purchasing of indulgences serve as examples of a few of the mortal actions one could undertake. While the idea of

\textsuperscript{98} Aquinas, \textit{Summa}. “Further, according to Augustine (\textit{De Cura pro mort. iii}), ‘In olden times the funerals of just men were cared for with dutiful piety, their obsequies celebrated, their graves provided, and themselves while living charged their children touching the burial or even the translation of their bodies.’ But they would not have done this unless the tomb and things of this kind conferred something on the dead. Therefore the like profit the dead somewhat.”

\textsuperscript{99} BNM, Ital.IX. 145 (=7554) Francisnan Laude ca. 1430-40.
purgatory was supported by the religious orders, the economic side effects of its implementation countered the ideas of reform associated with the Orders.

The papal councils marshaled ideas about the trial of a soul in purgatory before salvation into church doctrine. Two Councils in particular—Lyons in 1274 and Florence in 1438—debated the issue of purgatory in order to oblige the Orthodox Church to accept the idea. The principal issue in both Councils was unification of the two Latin and Greek churches as a political and military front, but it seemed that the more practical unification of the churches was bound to theological like-mindedness. Michael VIII Palaeologus accepted the Doctrines of the Latin Church in 1274, but the idea of purgatory was largely ignored in Byzantium. During the 1438 Council in particular, the two churches tried to come to a mutual agreement on several issues which had been theologically divisive including the doctrine of purgatory and the *filioque*, or the nature of the transference of the Holy Spirit.

For the representatives of the Latin Church, the Greek position on Purgatory was unclear. There seems to have been disagreement going into the Council on the nature of the trial to determine where one would wait after death for assignment. The exact confusion came about over the uses of fire as an effect used to cleanse sin. However, the efforts to clarify the matter were hampered by the opacity of the Greek position according to representatives of the Latin Church. In the papal Bull produced by the Council of Florence, the issue of purgatory was addressed succinctly: “If truly penitent people die in the love of God before they have made satisfaction for acts and omissions by worthy fruits of repentance, their souls are cleansed after death by cleansing pains; and the suffrages of the living faithful avail them in giving relief from such pains, that is, sacrifices of masses, prayers, almsgiving, and other acts of devotion which
have been customarily performed by some of the faithful for others of the faithful in accordance with the church's ordinances."¹⁰⁰

After these two Councils, the idea of Purgatory was fresh in the minds of those laymen and ecclesiastics who participated in or who contributed financially to the meetings. The very discussion of purgatory in the 1438 Council may have been largely informed by the beliefs of Bernardino of Siena's on the subject. Bernardino does not speak of purgatory in terms of judgment but focuses on souls who need further cleansing. He says, "One of the joys of purgatory is knowing that it is transient. The quality of the life lived and the suffrages one receives after death influence time spent in purgatory."¹⁰¹

But even before 1438, the language of death is entrenched in an understanding of purgatory, even if the term "purgatory" was rarely invoked in testaments as the cause for prayers.¹⁰² Masses tied into the idea that the ultimate destination of a soul after death was not always absolute and could be swayed by the living. Within the intransient spaces of heaven and hell, prayers for the dead would serve no purpose, but if the soul was situated in a temporary space to be cleansed of excusable sins for admittance to heaven, then the prayers of the righteous living would help expedite the process. At S. Giacomo in Florence, the burial slabs contain images of the living praying over the bodies of the deceased. The slabs are didactic in that they embody the act of purgation showing the worshipper standing over the slab what to do.

They also govern the position of the worshipper. Commonly, if a slab has an effigy, the sleeping figures are framed by architectural niches engraved to suggest depth, thus combining

---


¹⁰² Duffy, 300-303.
horizontal and vertical elements in the space of the same plane. The tomb of Carlo Crivelli from Santa Maria in Aracoeli in Rome, now removed to the wall, shows the scholar asleep, lying horizontally, in an architectural space that would be oriented at a ninety degree angle to the worshipper. (Figure 129) Other tomb slabs contained inscriptions that wrapped around the periphery forcing the viewer to walk around the marker. (Figure 130) The general effect is one of movement and positioning to prepare the worshipper for prayer.

That Moro’s slab is inscribed in the center with the date of his testament suggests that it was not intended to contain an effigy. In order to take in the full view of his tomb, due to its size, the worshipper would have to stand about a foot away from the tomb. Combined with its frame, its size forced the footsteps of the worshipper away. At Santa Croce in Florence, one tomb accommodates the worshipper by constructing a perspectival space that narrows at the feet of the etched figure, but for most tombs the ideal vantage point was difficult—the view from above. Both Moro and Cosimo de’ Medici create an elevated view for the celebrants in the high altar chapel. Moro’s celebrant would be a step above the tomb, while more explicitly, the elevation of the high altar chapel would have given the celebrant a clear view of Cosimo’s slab marker.

Effacing the Stone: Damnatio Memoriae

Because several tomb slabs have been placed in the walls of churches to avoid further erosion, the original placement of several slabs in areas of churches prone to heavy footsteps, such as the nave, suggests that the testators either knew or accepted that their burial markers would be exposed to foot traffic and worn. As the carving of a slab became more worn from walking, the memory of the testator would be expiated. The body represented by the slab would be in a position to receive the prayers, but the memory of the deceased represented by the engravings on the slab would, depending on location and placement, begin to be effaced. The
Dominican friar buried in the middle of the nave of Santa Sabina in Rome on axis with the high altar would receive the benefits of the celebrant, but would also be gathered around the worshipper, right under foot while the prayed. That the slab is now cordoned off to stave off further erosion, has in some sense, deactivated the tomb. (Figure 131)

The slab provided a marker for prayers, but was its prolonged existence as a memorial a mark of pride? Occasionally, slabs are placed right in the entranceways to a church, welcoming the stampede of worshippers as at the church of Santa Maria dei Miracoli in Venice. This gesture of humility is clear. The tomb would be effaced and the markings which individualized the memorial would soon disappear. Eventually, the information contained on the slab, if any, would be worn away. Those burial slabs placed in areas of the church not normally prone to procession, and the slabs made of more durable material without level variations, like the marble slabs of the Knights of Malta, would not be effaced as easily. (Figure 5) Was giving the appearance of seeking effacement of the mortal trappings of the deceased, including the memorial and inscription, a way of expiating one’s mortal sins?

One of the key points of Dante’s experience of the relief carvings is his movement over them, as he studies the cases of pride set in stone. That memory ties into some sense of pride is indicated by a few testaments. For example, the penitent Lewis Clifford temporarily converted to Protestantism, but reacclimated himself to Catholicism before his death. The very language of his testament implies the latter’s concern with the process of purgation. He asked that, “My stinking careyne be neyther leyd clothe of gold ne of silke, but a black clothe... ne stone ne other thinge, whereby eny man may witte where my stinking careyne liggeth.”103 The mortification

103 Ariès, 323. In 1684, Elisabeth d’Orleans wrote that she didn’t want her grave to be seen. M. de La Curne de Sainte-Palaye, Dictionnaire historique de l’ancien langage français, ou Glossaire de la langue française depuis son origine jusqu’au siècle de Louis XIV, par La Curne de Sainte-Palaye, Vol. 9 Niort: L. Favre, 1875-82, 171. under
which peppered the language of the will did not translate to the desire for eternal condemnation. The scramble for eleventh hour humility was directed at the living body, but the effacement of the slab could have been a form of self punishment and purgation of memory and pride to prepare oneself for redemption. The floor slab, the representation of the deceased in death, is incorporated in the fabric of the church. The continual effacement of the monument’s function as “calling to mind” works in dialectic with salvation. The body will eventually disintegrate into an indistinguishable skeletal figure and the slab would eventually wear down.

This act of self-abnegation evokes the ancient Roman practice of damnatio memoriae in which an image of a ruler was obliterated or disfigured after they had died to stain their memory. The practice of Damnatio memoriae was codified by the Roman Senate and used to dishonor those whom, the senate had decided dishonored the Empire. Portraits were mutilated and occasionally, the offenders name was struck from all public records. The practice tended to focus on the animating or sensory features of a statue; the nose, the mouth, eyes, or ears and though they were being deactivated. The intention of the decree was to erase all traces of a person’s association with Rome posthumously and legally.

The practice was well known in the fifteenth century. After Doge Marino Faliero’s (1354-1355) conviction for involvement in a conspiracy to overthrow the Venetian Republic, he was sentenced to decapitation and the republic legislated to deface all images associated with his memory. In the frieze of doges by Domenico Tintoretto under the cornice in Great Council hall at the Palazzo Ducal in Venice, the spot which should contain the image of Faliero was covered
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the defileion of “representation,” an excerpt from the Duc de Berry’s 1415 testament appears: “Item je vueil et ordonne que, oudit habit (des religieux Celestins), je soye mis sur une cloye à la pure terre, sanz aucune chose mettre sur laditte cloye, aiant mon visage et mes mains descouvers. Touts voies, se mon corps ne se povoit garder sans trop puer, si en soit faite seulement representation.” Duc de Berry.

by a shroud. Images of St. Thomas Beckett were savagely scratched away in Norfolk following 1588 orders to destroy his image after it was decided that he had shown too much rebellion towards the monarchy.\textsuperscript{105} (Figure 132)

Cosimo de’ Medici was also a victim of \textit{damnatio memoriae}. After his death in 1464, Cosimo’s partisans and his son Piero petitioned to have the name \textit{pater patriae} written around the north side of the floor slab that marked his tomb. The epithet \textit{pater patriae} originated with Julius Caesar when he took the title after a war triumph and subsequent emperors adapted it, to illustrate their care for the well being of its “family” or \textit{res publica}.\textsuperscript{106} The name was officially assigned to Cosimo only after his death on 1 August 1464, but though historians believe that his allies called him \textit{pater patriae} while he was alive.\textsuperscript{107} As Cosimo was a Humanist, the title may have been a literary conceit, but there is no evidence that the name \textit{pater patriae} was ascribed to Cosimo before it appeared on the tomb, and the imperial significance of the name surely overrode any other meaning it might have had. The inscription implies the rebirth of the body politic as Cosimo.

When he came to power, Girolamo Savonarola (1452-98) proselytized on the state of burial. He said, “How many great masters and gentlemen are in Hell even though they left beautifully adorned tombs behind them! These rich men desired and loved riches in life and in death, possessing them in life and wanting to be buried in rich tombs in death. They did not even want to rot unless in a luxurious place.”\textsuperscript{108} When Lorenzo’s son Piero was expelled from Florence in

\textsuperscript{105} Duffy, 412.
\textsuperscript{108} Cohn, 1988, 61, 97. Girolamo Savonarola: “...Oh rich gentlemen and lords of the world who have wanted so much pomp and luxury in this world, the saints and servants of Christ did not want your riches and your vanities.
1494 and Savonarola began to refer to the Medici as tyrants, insurgents removed the inscription, "Cosmos Mediceus Hic Sitvs est Decreto Pvblico Pater Patriae," ("Here is the site of Cosimo de' Medici, by public decree father of the country") with its imperial overtones from Cosimo's tomb. In 1494, November Savonarola declared that only saints should be allowed burial in churches, others are heretics. In March 1496, the preacher denounced the presence of coats-of-arms in churches.

I believe that several elite burials like Moro deliberately avoided effacement through placement. The bronze that once emphasized Moro's tomb may have been removed for safekeeping, or may have been melted for cannon, but its absence, the failure, and the general decay of the tomb are a form of historical effacements. Moro's tomb ultimately represents his death, megalomania, expenditure, Resurrection, and personal failure. Death is an absolute; it provided the Renaissance patron and the historian with a fixed turning point for the social persona. Knowing about death gave the patron an opportunity to do something about it. Moro's burial with a large slab, like an anti-monument was a final act of piety.

Conclusion

During the Middle Ages and Renaissance, dying was incorporated into the social process of life and the burial monument was meant to engage that process. Many historians today stress the "packaged" effects of monuments that neatly heroicize or easily summarize an event. At the risk of an anachronistic reading, the tombs of the Venetian doges, for the most part, operate in a
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Where are the trials and poverty and martyrdom and the grievances and the passions of the saints? All of these have passed and they enjoy for eternity the greatest peace and glory; while you are perpetually damned and in the flames of hell.

109 Florence, Archivio di Stato, Repubblica, Deliberazioni dei Signori, Ordinaria Autorita, fol. 118v. 22 November 1495. ASF, Medici Archive Project, 148, no. 129.
110 Young, 93
similar fashion, glorifying the life of the doge without complication, almost assisting in the
deification of his memory. They merge the institutional history of the dogate with the mortal
flesh of the doge. Because the office of the doge had been neatly bound to the divine mandate of
Venice’s existence as a Republic, the doges entwined the imagery of Venice’s sure salvation
with their own. With his tomb slab low in the ground, Doge Moro preemptively acknowledges
that his mortal or natural body, as an entity that is separate from the dogate, required a humble
burial. Moro does not discard the trappings of the dogate. He adorns his slab with the ducal
crown and his title, princeps, and his slab was likely one of the largest in Venice at the time.
However, the monument was less about presenting a consummate version of Moro’s own
history, and more about a process of expiation.

The Doctrine of Purgatory was not an official church doctrine when Moro prepared for death.
Though ritual humility in Renaissance burial practices is difficult to gauge, the extant testaments
and inscriptions which refer to their church pavement burials as humble suggest that other burial
slabs with less explicit production notes also meant to project a sense of humility in death. Burial
slabs were often placed in the pavement of the church to make a deliberate statement about the
deceased’s preparedness for the expiation of sin, regardless of social class. That Moro had the
inscription put on his slab when he was still alive was a part of the process of preparing for death
which extended from the drafting of a testament. St. Francis’ biographer, Thomas of Celano
describes the saint writing out a testament that prescribed a set of rules for his followers then
lying down naked in wait for his own death, or rebirth.\footnote{Ariès, 27-52.} The body which underwent a
protracted period of preparation for death, like Francis, had a better chance of Resurrection.
Chapter 5

"The Resurrected Job: Giovanni Bellini’s San Giobbe Altarpiece Reconsidered"

“The greedy deeds of Venetian history were over when her art-history began.”—Mary McCarthy, Venice Observed.¹

The San Giobbe Altarpiece in San Giobbe

In his 1488 Description of Venetian Sites, Marc’ Antonio Sabellico mentions a “distinguished” painting from the early career of Giovanni Bellini located on the side wall of the church of San Giobbe.² (Figure 62 & Figure 133) Sabellico’s description of the painting corresponded to the location of Bellini’s San Giobbe Altarpiece—on the second altar from the entrance on the right side of nave—until it was removed to the Academia in Venice 1815.³ The Altarpiece depicts the Madonna and Child enthroned, surrounded by Sts. Francis, John the Baptist, and Job on the left and Sts. Dominic, Sebastian, and Louis of Toulouse on the right with young musicians gathered at the Madonna’s feet.⁴ The figures stand under a large green umbrella that hangs from a coffered barrel vault over a niche covered in marble and mosaic. Giovanni Bellini’s signature can be found on a plaque at the base of the throne of the Madonna and Child, but the Altarpiece does not include a date. In the process of dislodging the painting from its frame for preservation, two of the thirteen horizontal planks of poplar at the top were destroyed, but the Altarpiece does not include a date. In the process of dislodging the painting from its frame for preservation, two of the thirteen horizontal planks of poplar at the top were destroyed, ¹ Mary McCarthy, Venice Observed, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1963, 147.
² Marci Antonii Sabellici, De Venetae Urbis Situ, Antonium de Strata cremonese Anno Domini, 1488, third region.
which reduced the height of the painting by about a half a meter, but when it was created in the second half of the fifteenth century, at 5.26 meters, the image under discussion was one of the largest altarpieces in Venice.\(^5\)

By 1488, when Marc-Antonio Sabellico dated the painting by Bellini in San Giobbe to the artist’s early career, Bellini was already cherished as a Venetian artist, but early writers did not offer much concrete information about the history of the painting. When he attended the consecration of the church of San Giobbe in 1493, the Venetian chronicler Marino Sanudo noted that the Altarpiece was Bellini’s best work, but he did not mention that the altar to Job was likely consecrated then as well.\(^6\) Vasari believed the work was beautiful, and in his 1581 guide to Venice, Francesco Sansovino offered the source of its estimation as Bellini’s first foray into the use of oil paints, though restorers have found traces of oil paints in Bellini’s earlier paintings.\(^7\)

Despite the lacunae in documentary evidence to secure a patron or a date for the San Giobbe Altarpiece, the painting has generated a long bibliography.\(^8\) Beginning with Marco Boschini in the seventeenth century, several discussions of the Altarpiece have focused on how the space of the church is absorbed into the pictorial space through the painted depiction of the pilasters with

---


6 BMC, Codice Cicogna 1920, c.25. “A santo ioppo uno altar di zuan belin che dele belle cosse habbi fatto.”


dolphin capitals from the real altar frame. The repetition of the sculpted elements in paint creates a continuum of space beyond the impenetrable surfaces of the church. Rona Goffen has provided the most extensive analysis of the painting’s meaning; she identified the Immaculate Conception and the plague as pertinent themes addressed in the Altarpiece based on the inscription in the lunette of the niche and the presence of Sebastian and Job as saints meant to help ward of the plague. These analyses have been put to the service of assigning a 1478 date for the Altarpiece: two years after the Feast of the Immaculate Conception was officially instituted in 1476, and a particularly bad plague year in Venice, according to the chronicler Niccolò Trevisan.

My study of the San Giobbe Altarpiece draws on the iconographical and symbolic analyses of previous scholars, but shifts the emphasis of the inquiry from iconography to issues of representation and gesture through the figure of Job. Most representations of Job from the late Middle Ages or early Renaissance portray the Old Testament figure as gaunt or emaciated, covered with wounds or prostrate on a dung heap. These images illustrate Job in his worst moments as narrated in the Book of Job: they show the prophet after he has lost all of his possessions and his family. However, Bellini’s Job in the San Giobbe Altarpiece is unusually robust. He has a gray beard to suggest his age, but his body is muscular and heavy. He takes up a

9 Boschini, La Carta del Navegar Pitoresco, 1660, 28-9.
privileged position in the foreground of the painting to the Virgin’s right. I explore Bellini’s radically reconfigured Job to understand how this change in physicality compares with other representations of Job in Venice and beyond. I believe that the full-figured representation of Job is essential to understanding the role of salvation not only of the worshippers at the altar of San Giobbe, but of the entire Venetian Republic. That Job is shown canonized and full-bodied suggests a shift in the attitudes towards death as the Black Death continued to ravage Italy, but also in the Republic’s conception of itself.

I will also analyze Bellini’s San Giobbe Altarpiece as a work of art made specifically for the church of San Giobbe. The San Giobbe Altarpiece has been photographically reinstalled to see how the architectural elements in the painting correspond to the actual architecture of the frame, but the church has not been studied very often in conjunction with the famous Altarpiece painted by Bellini. (Figure 134) By the early sixteenth century, San Giobbe was adorned with three large altarpieces that were all mentioned in Francesco Sansovino’s 1581 guide to Venice: Vettore Carpaccio’s Presentation in the Temple (1510), Bellini’s San Giobbe Altarpiece, and Marco Basaiti’s Agony in the Garden (1516). That the figures in each of the altarpieces are enframed within a painted niche suggests that the patrons devised a cohesive program. But the removal of these works to the Accademia in 1815 for protection has meant that until recently, the works of art have not been seen as part of a whole monument and San Giobbe has not received the same historical attention it might otherwise have had if the paintings been left in situ.

I would like to see how the Altarpiece was used as a ritual object in the church. I will evaluate the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century records outlining the bylaws of the confraternity

---

of S. Job in the Provveditore del Comun, which consist principally of major liturgical obligations of the confraternity members at their altar since the fifteenth century. The significance of the Altarpiece likely evolved by the time the regulations were compiled, but assessing the painting with the cumulative obligations of the confraternity illustrates ideas that were in circulation about the Altarpiece closer to the time of its production. Relying mostly on visual evidence, I will discuss how the Altarpiece fuses the competing histories of the church of San Giobbe: as a site of ducal patronage, a burial site, a hospice, and a Franciscan church.

San Giobbe Altarpiece in Contemporary Venetian Painting

The San Giobbe Altarpiece may very well have been painted in 1478 as Goffen has suggested—and no conclusive evidence exists to put it earlier—but the dating has divorced the conception of the painting from Doge Cristoforo Moro, who held control over the church throughout the 1460s. In many ways, the Doge’s power persisted posthumously through the executioners of Moro’s will who ensured that the Doge’s interests at the church were not ignored or undermined. There are no documents to link Moro directly to the Altarpiece, but the cumulative circumstantial evidence suggests that Moro’s period of rule in Venice was addressed in the program of the Altarpiece and its position over an altar overseen by the confraternity of St. Job. The date of the San Giobbe Altarpiece has been defined by its meaning and subject matter, but also by how it conforms to narratives of fifteenth-century Venetian painting.

The reluctance to date the San Giobbe Altarpiece earlier than 1478 likely derives from what is seen as a stylistic and compositional progression in Bellini’s work. The San Giobbe Altarpiece is hermetic; it encloses the saints in an unventilated and symmetrical devotional space.

---

Altarpiece hinges on a central vertical axis marked by the laurel, the umbrella under the vault, the cross, the patera-like tondo on the throne of the Madonna, the Madonna herself, the sound hole of the guitar and the plaque at the base of the throne announcing Bellini’s authorship in an inscription. The orthogonal lines which form the coffers in the vault converge on the inscription in the center of the base of the Altarpiece. Bellini embedded symmetry into the creation of the painting and obliged the saints to interact within this set framework. The saints cluster in groups of three around the throne, which is placed in the exact center of the marble panels. The Cross at the top of the throne and the flower in the center of the tondo below it both serve as pivots for equilateral lines descending down towards the stigmata of Francis and the arrow which pierces Sebastian’s stomach. Even the marble panels behind the saints, meant to emulate sliced marble revetment juxtaposed again at the seam and the five stylized seraphim fall into the lines of symmetry.

The rigid symmetry served as a guide for the plotting of single point perspective in the painting and suggests that the painting was, as Sabellico claims, made early in Bellini’s career. Giovanni Bellini’s deployment of single point perspective in the San Giobbe Altarpiece was shaped by Leon Battista Alberti’s codified prescriptions on proportion, geometrically constructed perspective, and architectural ornamentation culled from his treatise On Painting written in 1435 and his architectural treatise, De Re Aedificatoria, written about ten years later. For example, in his architectural treatise, Alberti advocated the use of coffering for vaults in the Renaissance as an appropriate way to decorate an arch and he employed the coffer motif in his built works.¹⁴

¹⁴ The symmetry extends to the microcosmic unit of the body. In his 1435 treatise, On Painting, Alberti provided a formula for drawing the human body: “I have noticed as common in all men that the foot is as long as from the chin to the crown of the head.” Bellini turns out one foot of each Francis and Sebastian parallel to the picture plane as if to offer the viewer a unit of measurement. The length from the crown of the heads of both saints to their chins almost exactly measures the length of their feet.
The coffered barrel vault was an ancient form of decoration but it also gave artists seduced by Alberti’s codification of perspective a straightedge with which to show their understanding of a geometric construction of space. In the San Giobbe Altarpiece, the lines dividing the coffers all converge at the plaque on the throne near the base of the frame to establish the horizon line.\textsuperscript{15}

The fidelity to the emerging rules for painting spelled out by Alberti in 1435, and others including guides by Giovanni Bellini’s father Jacopo, have been used to assign a late date to the San Giobbe Altarpiece, but Bellini’s close adherence to the systems proposed by Alberti would suggest that he was in the process of learning the rudiments of painting when he created the Altarpiece at San Giobbe.\textsuperscript{16} The numerous drawings from the sketchbook of Giovanni’s father, Jacopo Bellini, which experiment with perspective, also informed the San Giobbe Altarpiece. Jacopo depicted large proscenium-like arches with exaggerated perspectives opening up to scenes from the Bible or the Passion. (Figure 135) The accumulation of sketches demonstrates that Jacopo was concerned with theoretical underpinnings of perspective. The Venetian born Giovanni da Fontana dedicated his lost treatise on perspective, written before 1444, to Jacopo Bellini. This suggests that the Bellini patriarch did not just sketch out his ideas, but partook in an intellectual discourse about them.\textsuperscript{17} On the death of Jacopo’s wife, Anna Rinversi, in the mid-1470s, the sketchbooks were left to Giovanni’s older brother, Gentile, but by this point, the notebooks were likely mementos more than pedagogic tools for the siblings.\textsuperscript{18} As a result of the dating scheme, most scholars assume Bellini’s San Giobbe painting followed Piero della Francesca’s \textit{Brera Altarpiece}, dated to 1472, for the latter worked out a sophisticated

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid.
understanding of perspective in his mathematical treatise, written in the last part of his life, but as I believe, Bellini knew the rudiments of perspective well before Piero employed them.\textsuperscript{19} (Figure 136) Bellini’s use of perspective would not have required Piero’s more sophisticated study.\textsuperscript{20}

The technical aspects of the San Giobbe Altarpiece are made clearer in comparison with Bellini’s triptych painted for the sacristy of Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari—signed and dated to 1488. Art historians try to narrow the gap in years between the San Giobbe Altarpiece and Bellini’s Frari triptych for the—because both paintings depict saints gathered around an enthroned Madonna and Child with a mosaic backdrop and an inscription.\textsuperscript{21} (Figure 137) The central arched panel of the Frari frame portrays the Madonna and Child flanked by two rectangular panels of saints Nicholas and Peter on the left and Saints Mark and Benedict on the right. Though the frame divides the saints into distinct groups in the Frari panel, they inhabit the same space behind the frame, a conceit that diverges considerably from most late medieval and early Renaissance triptychs which position saints in discreet and unrelated spaces.\textsuperscript{22} Bellini relied more on the guidelines of coffers in the vault to effect recession of space in the San Giobbe Altarpiece, while the Frari Altarpiece is a full three-dimensional object modeled by light


\textsuperscript{20} Marilyn Aronberg Lavin, “Piero della Francesca’s Montefeltro Altarpiece: A Pledge of Fidelity, The Art Bulletin, Vol. 51, No. 4. (Dec.1969), 367; Millard Meiss, “A Documented Altarpiece by Piero della Francesca,” The Art Bulletin, Vol. 23, No. 1. (Mar. 1941), 64-5. Deborah Howard, Bellini and Architecture,” Cambridge Companion to Giovanni Bellini, edited by Peter Humfrey, Cambridge University Press, 2003, 153. The Madonna and Child is the centerpiece for a large assembly of saints with the ducal patron kneeling in front. The scene takes place under a coffered vault, like the San Giobbe Altarpiece, but with a lower slope and in a deeper space. The similarities between the two altarpieces—including the paneled apse, the hanging objects over the enthroned Madonna and Child and the emphasis on the presenting the body of the Christ Child—have been interpreted as an artistic exchange between the two artists when Bellini was in Pesaro near Urbino to paint the Pesaro Altarpiece in the early 1470s.

\textsuperscript{21} Goffen, 1989, 161.

\textsuperscript{22} In the Renaissance artists copied the painted decorative elements of the ancient Romans as framing devices. Andrea Mantegna’s San Zeno Altarpiece frames each figure in space through the use of painted columns and receding pilasters But Mantegna’s figures inhabit the same space. The composition recalls the long painted friezes in ancient Rome which were divided into discreet episodes by painted columns of pilasters. Many other artists in the Renaissance also turned the wall into a window or tableau framed by architectural elements.
and shade, strongly suggesting that the Frari Altarpiece was painted later than the San Giobbe Altarpiece.

The San Giobbe Altarpiece has also been defined by how it relates to the San Cassiano Altarpiece by Antonello da Messina and the St. Catherine of Siena Altarpiece by Bellini, but these works are either fragmented or lost. (Figure 138 & Figure 139) Historians tend to assign a pivotal role to the arrival of the Sicilian painter Antonello da Messina to the Venetian lagoon in the mid-1470s.\(^2^3\) Vasari credited Antonello with pioneering the use of oils in Venice with his Altarpiece painted around 1475 for the church of San Cassiano.\(^2^4\) Antonello has been credited with informing Bellini’s unified architectural spaces, for the gathering of saints in the San Giobbe Altarpiece is similar to the assembly of four saints around a Madonna and Child enthroned in the San Cassiano Altarpiece. But due to its fragmented state, the architectural setting in the Antonello panel can only be conjectured. Because the Madonna and Child are enthroned and flanked by four saints, many scholars believe that there is an arch in the background due to Bellini’s use of the arch in his paintings of the enthroned Madonna and Child with saints. However, there is no indication of the arch.

Bellini’s own destroyed painting for the St. Catherine of Siena altar—which is recorded only in a watercolor—at the church of Santi Giovanni and Paolo in Venice which has been dated to 1472 is much denser than the San Giobbe Altarpiece.\(^2^5\) The watercolor of the St. Catherine


Altarpiece portrays a group of saints and angels crowded around the Enthroned Mary and Child. They are framed by a painted arch, but in an architectural setting that is open to the air. Bellini picked out elements from the frame, such as the dolphins on the capitals and the ornate pilasters, and brought them into the picture, as he did at San Giobbe. There are at least eleven adult figures depicted in the watercolor of the Madonna with an architectural throne shielding a cloudy sky. It is unclear as to why the St. Catherine Altarpiece is given a date that is earlier than the San Giobbe Altarpiece.

Bellini and Antonello da Messina may have had a more equal relationship than that which has traditionally had Giovanni absorbing the migrant Antonello’s practice. Giovanni Bellini used oils before Antonello’s documented work at San Cassiano, most notably in his 1474 portrait of Jörg Fugger.²⁶ (Figure 140) Francesco Sansovino’s claim that the San Giobbe Altarpiece was Bellini’s first use of oils, taken with Sabellico’s claim that the Altarpiece was completed during Bellini’s earliest training suggests that the Altarpiece was completed before 1478.²⁷ If Sansovino’s claim that the San Giobbe Altarpiece was Bellini’s first use of oils were to be correct, then the San Giobbe Altarpiece would have been painted before the Fugger portrait of 1474 and thus, it would have been painted around the same time as the San Cassiano Altarpiece.

**Specchio Religioso: The San Giobbe Altarpiece as a Devotional Space**

Bellini’s architectural setting establishes him within a discourse that was played out in tempera and later oil paints throughout the fifteenth-century regarding the representation of a devotional space. The San Giobbe Altarpiece depicts a setting that is similar to Masaccio’s 1425

---

²⁶ Sansovino, 57
²⁷ Sabellico, *de Venetae Urbis Situ*, 1488, Book II.
painting of the *Trinity* on the side wall of the nave of Santa Maria Novella in Florence. 28 *(Figure 141)* In the fresco, Christ stands crucified in a barrel vaulted and coffered chapel below God-the-Father, with a dove representing the Holy Spirit. St. John the Evangelist and the Virgin Mary introduce the scene to the donors standing in the liminal space of the fictive columns framing the scene. 29 Below the altar on which Christ is presented lays a tomb with a skeleton and an inscription, which reads, "I was once what you are now, and I am that which you will soon be." 30 The skeleton is believed to represent Adam, as Christ’s crucifixion took place above the tomb of the first man. Masses were presumably held for the Lenzi and “suorum,” in front of the fresco according to records. The *Trinity* is a mirror of death with a focus on how Resurrection plays out spatially for holy and mortal bodies.

Like the San Giobbe Altarpiece, the *Trinity* depicted an architectural space painted to give a sense of depth to the flat wall surface through perspective. Masaccio’s coffered barrel vault recedes to a point that would be level in the distance with the base of the altar, though he painted the *Trinity* before Alberti codified the rules for perspective. The false chapel of the *Trinity* has been interpreted as the fulfillment of a spatial need. 31 Occasionally, puncturing a wall proved too costly or pre-existing site conditions prohibited the outward expansion of a private chapel from the nave. A cloister abuts the nave on which both the *Trinity* and the San Giobbe Altarpiece

---

28 Rosand, 29-32.
30 Leonetto Tintori, “Note sulla Trinità Affrescata da Masaccio nella chiesa di Santa Maria Novella in Firenze, II. La Scomparsa e il ritorno,” in *Le Piture Murali: Tecnico problemi, conservazione*, edited by Cristina Danti, Mauro Mateini and Arcangolo Moles, Florence, 1990, 261-8. Tintori uncovered the skeleton which had been blocked by Vasari during conservation of the fresco.
stand precluding the capacity for a chapel. Members of the Lenzi family, presumably the donors portrayed by Masaccio in front of the columns, were buried in proximity to the painted altar.\textsuperscript{32} There may have been burials in front of the altar of St. Job in Venice, but the confraternity dedicated to the saint prayed in front of the altar and brought the bodies of the recently deceased in front of the altar to receive prayers before burial.\textsuperscript{33} It is not known if there was an altar in front of the \textit{Trinity} beyond the fictive one covering the decomposed body in the bottom register of the painting.

With the conscious application of a sense of perspective to the fictive chapel on the side wall, Masaccio tried to transfer the visual experience of those consigned to pray in a side altar to the eastern end of the church’s nave. The barrel-vaulted naves that populated images like the \textit{Trinity} over the altars recall the Chapel of the Crucifix at the end of the nave of San Miniato al Monte in Florence, attributed to Michelozzo or Bernardo Rossellino in 1448.\textsuperscript{34} (Figure 142) The baldachin stands in the center of the long, dark nave framed by the stairway to the elevated choir. It has an elongated coffered barrel vault with a terra cotta ceiling by Luca della Robbia and terminates with fourteenth-century panels by Agnolo Gaddi depicting the life of St. Minias and the Passion. While earlier tabernacles of the time resembled small gothic towers, the San Miniato ciborium employs the coffers suggested by Alberti deliberately emulating an ancient space. Like the devotional spaces depicted by Bellini, Piero, and Masaccio for their altarpieces, the tabernacle in San Miniato gives focus to the sacraments of the liturgy, literally directing the vision of the

\textsuperscript{33} ASV, Proveditore del Comun, Reg. O, f. 224.
viewer down the nave. All of these spaces describe, in some degree, the type of liturgical focus that gave form to abstract ideas about devotion.

As an enclosed space given volume by Bellini, the Altarpiece extends the space of the church of San Giobbe and provides a focal point for liturgical activity. If the setting of the Altarpiece is architectural, then it functions like a mirror, displaying the nature of the space to the worshipper in which he or she prays. The inscription provides a didactic analog to direct prayer towards the purity of the Virgin at the Annunciation taken from a homily of the Annunciation. The Altarpiece projects an idealized experience for the worshipping body.

In the San Giobbe Altarpiece, the particular depiction of space was noted at least by the seventeenth century. Marco Boschini’s 1660 *La carta del navegar pitoresco*, given in the form of a dialogue, offered one of the longest expositions on the painting after its creation.35 Boschini had never seen an image that “emanated such devotion” and believed, like his predecessors, that it merited the highest admiration. He called the painting a “specchio religioso,” a religious mirror, implying that it fit into the genre of didactic art which reflected an ideal mode of comportment for the worshipper.

As he goes onto describe each individual saint in the Altarpiece, it is clear that the meaning of Boschini’s specchio religioso is not unlike the term *sacra conversazione* adapted by nineteenth-century art historians to describe similar gatherings of Madonna and Child with saints. As Rona Goffen has shown, the designation *sacra conversazione* derives from St. Paul’s letter to the Phillipians and implies that the saints inhabit a heavenly world.36 The reflective aspect of the painting observed by Boschini is strengthened by Bellini’s use of fictive

architecture. Boschini does not explicitly tie his designation of the painting as a specchio religioso to the way in which Bellini drew elements of the frame which adorned the Altarpiece into the picture plane, but this stylistic flourish intersects with the meaning of the work as conceptualized by Boschini. Bellini pilfered architectural information from the real space of a church for the paintings that would later decorate its walls. The Madonna and Child are framed by pilasters with low relief floral decorative patterns and dolphins surmounted by Corinthian capitals, emulating those in the painting’s real altar frame made of pietra viva. The intrados of the arch frame contains the coffered barrel vaults which likely extended to the top of the frame before the painting’s removal. The cornice below the mosaic apse lunette advances upwards in a dramatic slope opening into the space of the church not unlike the heavy cornice which encircles the entire church of San Giobbe. David Rosand believes that the illusionistic space of Bellini’s Altarpiece was not meant to create a trompe l’oeil and delude the viewer, but was meant to denote an idealized space for ritual.  

37 Rosand, 1982, 36. Keith Christiansen, “Giovanni Bellini and the Practice of Devotional Painting,” Giovanni Bellini and the art of devotion, edited by Ronda Kasl, Indianapolis: Indianapolis Museum of Art, 2004, 23. In On Painting, Alberti gave painting an edge over architecture, claiming that architects appropriated their decorative elements from painters. “Therefore, painting contains within itself this virtue that any master painter who sees his works adored will feel himself considered another god. Who can doubt that painting is the master art or at least not a small ornament of things? The architect, if I am not mistaken, takes from the painter architraves, bases, capitals, columns, façades and other similar things. All the smiths, sculptors, shops and guilds are governed by the rules and art of the painter.” Alberti’s claim that three-dimensional ornamentation generally associated with classical architecture was formulated by painters, plays into emerging debates that privilege painting over the other arts. The increasing interplay between painting and architecture in visual illusions by other Renaissance artists such as Bernardino Pinturicchio is an assertion of the primacy of painting. In the Renaissance artists copied the painted decorative elements of the ancient Romans as framing devices. Andrea Mantegna’s San Zeno Altarpiece frames each figure in space through the use of painted columns and receding pilasters but Mantegna’s figures inhabit the same space. The composition recalls the long painted friezes in ancient Rome which were divided into discreet episodes by painted columns of pilasters. Many other artists in the Renaissance also turned the wall into a window or tableaux framed by architectural elements. The painted architectural elements in the San Giobbe Altarpiece are similar to the architectural elements painted by contemporaneous artists such as Bernardino Pinturicchio to frame episodes from the life of St. Bernardino in the Bufalini Chapel at Santa Maria in Aracoeli. Filippino Lippi also integrated the actual frame into his painting of the Annunciation with St. Thomas Aquinas Presenting Cardinal Carafa to the Virgin framed by marble within a large scene of the Assumption of the Virgin at the Carafa Chapel in Santa Maria Sopra Minerva in Rome. The paintings hide the wall but conform to the decorative style of the church.
San Giobbe Altarpiece is not about illusion but re-creation. The painter has the ability not only to represent a chapel, but position the patron within that chapel as Masaccio does in the *Trinity*.

The Altarpiece represents a disembodied space, one which is constructed by the mind, but here, the usual interpretations of these spaces as representing an “otherworldly” or “heavenly realm” are mixed quite explicitly with the breakdown of time. Boschini’s focus on each of Bellini’s saints illustrates that at least by the seventeenth century, the meaning brought to bear on the Altarpiece by the saints was one of its most salient characteristics. The saints collapse the narrative into individual disjointed episodes all related to the announcement of the birth of Christ, Christ’s suffering, and his eventual redemption.  

Boschini understood that every Altarpiece in the Renaissance was created as an act of biblical exegesis. Different bodies were depicted together to tell the story of the Passion and the different bodies it represents at the altar: the wounded, the immaterial, and the resurrected.

The iconic image of the Madonna and Child initiates a microcosm of the entire Passion: The introverted figure of Dominic is deeply engaged in his reading. As Boschini says, “With his mind, Dominic sees and meditates.” Bellini shows Dominic as he is described in the “Eighth Mode” of the medieval *De Modo Orandi*, or the Way of Prayer, which describes Dominic as having divine visions of the crucifixion based on his readings. While Dominic is portrayed as the visionary, St. Francis, revealing his stigmata, experiences the scene only through the proleptic lens of the suffering Christ endured on the cross through his stigmata. Both of the

---

Lippi was known to have been in Venice shortly after he received the commission to decorate the burial chapel of Neapolitan Cardinal Oliviero Carafa where he may have seen the San Giobbe Altarpiece.


39 Boschini, 29.


41 Dominic and Francis are portrayed together in part due to the vision of Dominic in which he and Francis are charged by the Virgin Mary to proselytize and save the poor.
enthroned figures acknowledge Francis’ stigmata when Christ’s right hand aligns with Francis’ feet and the Virgin’s hand with Francis’ hand. Christ clutches his chest—adumbrating the lance wound John the Evangelist would write about—at the same point at which Francis shows the lance wound he received after praying for the experience of Christ’s pain at La Verna. Francis reveals the stigmata on his hand to represent the suffering of Christ, but both the stigmata and Sebastian’s arrows are paths to redemption. Job, as a surrogate Christ, is not identified by his suffering, but only the restoration of his health. This muscular Job has already reaped the benefit of passing the test of his faith by god and the marks that once adorned his flesh have been transferred, as will be discussed below. The Altarpiece “images forth” other events from the passion in each figure depicted. As a Republic that aligned the episodes of its historical narrative with major feast days, Venice thrived on the imagery of analogy.

San Giobbe becomes San Marco

Giovanni Bellini may have adapted several ideas about the depiction of space from Florentines, but his Altarpiece depicts a distinctly Venetian space. The evocation of a devotional space is made through the presence of the Madonna, Child, and saints; the sense of place is established through solid materials found in Venice. Earlier Venetian paintings portrayed Venice’s golden mosaic apses, such as the 1345 Pala Ferialle by Paolo Veneziano, but the San Giobbe Altarpiece provided one of the earliest extant depictions of a particularly Venetian architectural setting for a communal gathering of saints. (Figure 143 & Figure 144) Bellini captures the shimmering tesserae of the gilded mosaics which cover the interior surface of the basilica of San Marco through the apsidal decoration behind the Madonna and Child in the San Giobbe Altarpiece. (Figure 145) The streaked rose marble panels behind the throne of the Madonna and Child evoke the panels of iassene marble revetment in the basilica’s fifteenth-
century Mascoli Chapel. (Figure 146) Five stylized seraphim, or angels, which can be seen in the pendentives of one of the northwest tribunes of San Marco, as Goffen pointed out, line the bottom of the mosaic lunette in the Altarpiece, bearing the inscription “Ave Gratia Plena.”

(Figure 147)

Like most of the ornamentation of San Marco, including the columns, the porphyry, the sculpture, and the four bronze horses which once adorned the façade, most of the marbles in the basilica were spoglia taken from the East during the Fourth Crusade of 1204 when Venice violently loosened the reigns of its former colonizer, Constantinople, the capital of the Byzantine Empire in the East. By emulating parts of San Marco in the Altarpiece, it promoted Venice’s Byzantine past as Constantinople was overtaken by the Sultan Mehmet II in 1453. Well after their own Sack of Constantinople during the fourth Crusade in 1204, the Venetians were still promoting their “greedy deeds” in painting to maintain the simulation of a seamless trajectory of triumph for Venetian history.

The transfer of San Marco’s three-dimensional ornamentation to Bellini’s painted surface is also given definition by a distinctly fifteenth-century addition to both San Marco and San Giobbe: the pilasters in the Altarpiece adorned with vines, urns, flora, and vegetal motifs which emulate the decorative patterns of the two transept altars to Sts. Paul and James in San Marco commissioned by Doge Moro during the late 1460s. (Figure 34) The pietra d’Istria decorative

---

43 Giorgio and Pietro Dolfin, Cronica, 1396-1458, BNMI.It.7. Cod. 307. Zorzi Dolfin claims that Doge Domenico Selvo (1071-1084) had “lavorava de adornarla de le piu magnifiche colonne che potassero trovar et mandono a cerchar per tutto el mondo.” Bartolomeo Cecchetti, Documenti per la storia dell’augusta ducale Basilica di San Marco in Venezia, 2 Vols., Venice: Ongania, Ferdinando, 1886, i: 7, no. 60.
44 McCarthy, 1963, 147.
45 Pietro Selvatico, Sulla architettura e sulla scultura in Venezia dal medio evo sino al nostri Giorni, Venezia: P. R. Carpano, 1847. Cesare Bernasconi, Vita ed Opere di Antonio Rizzo, Verona, Vicentini, 1859, 29, 57. Pietro Selvatico attributed the altars to Pietro Lombardo, but Cesare Bernasconi reattributed them to Antonio Rizzo, the author of the sculpture commissioned by Moro on the Arco Foscari. Anna Markham Schulz, Antonio Rizzo: Sculptor
pilasters similar to those depicted in the Altarpiece can also be seen in the church of San Giobbe around the high altar and the St. Job altar frame. They were installed in the church by Moro.\

The basilica of San Marco, built by Doge Justinianus Participacio during the ninth century and rebuilt twice before the twelfth century, was founded to accommodate the relics of St. Mark the Evangelist. When Mark’s body reached the shores of the lagoon at what is presently known as the piazzetta near the basilica of San Marco, he was received by the bishop of Venice with unprecedented fanfare. The Bishop led the relics in a staged procession to San Teodoro, the private chapel of the Doge, who vowed to build a reliquary church for St. Mark nearby. To emphasize the reception of relics, San Marco was loosely modeled after a reliquary in Constantinople, the destroyed church of the Holy Apostles, which was also based on a cruciform plan, capped with five domes, and decorated with the mosaic that came to define representations of the Byzantine Empire. Venice struggled for independence from the Byzantine Empire, but to build San Marco, the doge still turned to architectural and decorative motifs established in Byzantium. As the translatio gained popularity, the basilica became the doge’s private chapel over which he held legal rights or jus patronatus, overshadowing the official church of the Venetian patriarch, San Pietro di Castello.

The shaping of Venetian history began with the narrative of the translatio of St. Mark’s relics from Alexandria, based on the growing Venetian belief that Mark was destined for burial within the city. As a newly formed Republic at the time of the theft, claims to the relics of one of the gospel’s authors offered Venice credibility as divinely ordained, worthy of its prosperity. A

---


46 At other points in the dissertation, I address the altars in San Marco as commissions of Moro.

panel in the sequence of mosaics depicting the translation of St. Mark from Alexandria in the
doge’s chapel of St. Clemente in San Marco illustrates the announcement by an angel to St. Mark
the Evangelist that he would be buried in Venice. The arrival of Mark’s relics in the lagoon
provides the setting for the ideological genesis of the Venetian Republic. To turn the sacred
announcement into a fact of Venetian history, the revelation of the relics—first stolen from
Alexandria, then lost in San Marco, and ceremoniously found again in the basilica—was
inscribed in a narrative on the church wall thus facilitating its assimilation into the real history of
Venice that would come to inform Venetian civic identity for the next 800 years until the Fall of
the Republic in 1797. Given the sequence of Mark’s path to San Marco, the relics had agency
over their appearance, assuring the protection of the Republic by the saint. By portraying San
Marco, the San Giobbe Altarpiece absorbs the associations of the space with the constructed
history of the city.

Bellini’s San Giobbe Altarpiece provided the means by which the aura of San Marco could
be translated to another part of the city. San Giobbe—as a church administered by Franciscans to
serve as the ecclesiastical arm of a hospice for the poor and ill—did not have the resources to
swath its walls in gold leaf, enamel, and marble to effect a connection to San Marco, the locus of
Venetian ducal power. Through a painted backdrop, San Marco could be reproduced cheaply,
establishing a visual connection to the ducal basilica. As the Venetian governing body, the
Council of Ten began to limit the power of the doge and constrict his patronage rights over San
Marco in the mid-fourteenth century, the doges returned to the images of power inscribed in the

48 Demus, 19.
49 Muir, 1981, 13ff. Muir offers a comprehensive historiographical treatment of how the myth of Venice as a serene
republic was shaped and how historians have tried to parse reality from the idealized portrait of the city. Rosand,
mosaics at San Marco more vigorously and creatively. San Giobbe—as a church administered by Franciscans to serve as the ecclesiastical arm of a hospice for the poor and ill—did not have the resources to swath its walls in gold leaf, enamel, and marble to show its connection to San Marco, the locus of Venetian ducal power. As discussed in the previous chapter, the hospice and church of San Giobbe were located in one of the more distant parts of the city, far removed from the economic and political center of Venice, San Marco. San Giobbe primarily served as a hospice for the poor and pilgrims. Poverty was the calling of the establishment, founded the hospital to provide shelter for the destitute in Cannaregio. Through painting, however, the illuminating effect of the ducal basilica could be emulated cheaply by a patron wishing to reinforce a connection to the ducal basilica of San Marco. But what patron bestowed the Altarpiece to one of the poorest confraternities in Venice in one of the poorest churches in the Republic? And how did that patron convince a religious order devoted to asceticism to display it in their church?

Who Paid for the Gold Leaf?: The Patron of the San Giobbe Altarpiece

The quest for an identification of the San Giobbe Altarpiece’s patron has driven scholarship on the painting, but the history of the Altarpiece’s conception, financing, and program remain inconclusive. Only one document has been named in association with the painting so far. Goffen found a reference to “an altarpiece with its saints” in a 1753 inventory of the confraternity of St. Job. It is assumed that the altar which the San Giobbe Altarpiece adorned had been controlled by the confraternity of St. Job due to the nature of image and its description.

50 Chapter 3.
51 ASV, Scuola piccole e suffragi, busta 375, Libro di avensari della scolla di San Giobbe l’anno 1753. 25 April 1753. “Un palla con suoi santi.”
Based on the description of the painting, Goffen determined that the inventory item referred to the San Giobbe Altarpiece. Goffen not only assigned ownership of the San Giobbe Altarpiece to the confraternity, or scuola, dedicated to the Old Testament figure, but patronage. There is no other known painting that would fit the inventory description.\(^5\) Bellini’s so-called *Sacred Allegory* (Figure 148) comes close for it shows the confraternity’s name saint, Job, surrounded by saints. The *Sacred Allegory* portrays a seated Madonna in profile in an outdoor landscape surrounded by female saints, putti playing around an orange tree, and Saints Sebastian and Job. If the inventory refers to this painting, it would more securely link it to the church, though it would not have been on the altar to St. Job in the nave. The painting was in Vienna just forty years after the inventory was taken, in 1793, about to be transferred to the Uffizi in Florence.

For the most part, the confraternity of St. Job assisted in funerary exequies and helped to pay for the burials of patients at the hospice who could not pay for their own burials and it held mass for the deceased.\(^5\) The confraternity to Job was particularly suited to funerary rites as the Office of the Dead contains lines from the *Book of Job* about the maintenance of faith during trial and

---

\(^5\) Fritz Heinemann, *Giovanni Bellini e i Belliniani*, Venezia: Neri Pozza, 1962. Susan J. Delaney, “The Iconography of Giovanni Bellini’s Sacred Allegory,” *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 59, No. 3. (Sep. 1977), 331; Goffen, 1989, 114-6. Bellini’s so-called *Sacred Allegory* comes close for it portrays the confraternity’s name saint, Job, surrounded by saints. The *Sacred Allegory* defies explanation; it portrays an enthroned Madonna in prayer under a baldachin in profile in an elaborate outdoor setting. She is surrounded by female saints in an enclosed platform with pavement emulating that of a church floor. Children play around an orange tree in front of her framed on the other side by Sts. Sebastian and Job behind. Two male saints lean over the balustrade. The *Sacred Allegory* was likely not painted for the side altar for it is quite small and the orientation differs dramatically from the altar frame of the Job altar and the horizontal orientation likely meant that it was meant to be seen obliquely. The painting was in Vienna just forty years after the inventory was taken, in 1793, about to be transferred to the Uffizi in Florence.

the Resurrection of one's mortal flesh. The members of the confraternity were required to come before the altar and recite a mass with the body present after a member or a patient in the hospice died. The body was generally laid out before the altar. Membership fees contributed to burial expenses for the poorer members of the confraternity.

Carpaccio’s *Death of St. Jerome* offers an idea of what a funerary scene for the confraternity must have looked like. (Figure 149) Jerome’s body is laid out on a *lapita*, a stone the size of the body with his feet at the base of an altar and his head is propped up on a stone pillow as most figures inscribed in a floor slab. The ritual derives from the Byzantine tradition of epitaphios, showing Christ’s body laid out on a stone slab for anointment. Jerome is surrounded by his followers dressed in black, holding candles. Jerome’s funerary mass is depicted in a private ecclesiastical space, large enough to accommodate the sixteen figures and the lion gathered around. The rituals that accompany death help protect the living from the impurities of the body and they often had to be accomplished immediately after death.

---


55 Not much information exists on the confraternity to St. Job, but it is mentioned in 1504, when the bylaws for the *scuola* of St. Bernardino record that they were paid two ducats a year by the *scuola* of St. Job to rent land in front of the church near their own *scuola*. ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 8. Supplica della schola di S. Job 16 January 1504.

L’andera parte, che mette mis. Michiel Bondi gastaldo in questo di 16 zner. Che il sudetto gastaldo e compagni della scola de mis. S. Bernardino sia concesso il sopradetto loco, e terrea per longhezza dalla nostra scola fino al canton della chiesa, e per larghezza dalla strada fino al Rio da redo, resservadndo in liberta nostra di lassar fra la scola nostra. Et la sua una calle di larghezza di un passo, che per quella si possi andar al Canal.”

Few images painted for the *scuole piccole* during the Renaissance have been reunited with individual benefactors leading several historians to conclude that in Venice, private signs of patronage were often sublimated in favor of showcasing the corporate ownership of a confraternity.\(^{57}\) However, given the size of Bellini’s Altarpiece for the confraternity of St. Job, most historians believe an individual family was responsible for the initial down payment of the painting before it became the property of the confraternity of St. Job. The Dolfin family is the most seductive possibility as the initial donors of the Altarpiece due to the dolphins under the pier capitals in Bellini’s painting and altar frame. The family *stemma* included three dolphins as a play on their name. The idea is not without merit; members of the Dolfin family were prominent patrons of the hospital of San Giobbe. Giovanni Dolfin, the grandson of the founder of the hospice, became involved in the administration of the hospital, and in his testament, he donated land and houses to the hospital, though he makes no reference to the church of San Giobbe.\(^{58}\) Rather, he requested burial in the church of Santi Giovanni e Paolo. In November 1467, his relative Sopradamor Dolfin requested burial in the church dressed in the habit of a Franciscan.\(^{59}\) Thus, the dolphins may have been used to honor the Dolfin as patrons of the hospital, the church, and possibly of the Altarpiece.

Both Humfrey and Goffen summarily dismissed the possibility that the dolphins in the altar frame could signify the patronage by the Dolfin family. Goffen identified the dolphin as a common decorative conceit of Pietro Lombardo, to whom the construction of San Giobbe is attributed after 1470.\(^{60}\) Debra Pincus, on the other hand, has said that dolphins are not common

---

\(^{57}\) Humfrey, 1988, 401.


\(^{59}\) ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 1, VIII, 35. 6 Nov. 1467 Testament of Sopradamor Delphyno. “...et volglio esser sepulta a s. Job in l’archa, che fo posto mi S. in lo habito de Sancto Francesco...”

decorative motifs in Renaissance Venice as they were in antiquity.\(^61\) To this end, in an inventory of objects in the sacristy of San Giobbe from 1527, twenty-one choir seats are listed each with the Moro arms and dolphins.\(^62\) Dolphins were used to adorn the Colleoni Chapel in Bergamo and Raphael provides a sketch of a dolphin in his notebooks, but in Venetian painting, the dolphins had only been used once before the San Giobbe Altarpiece as a decorative device—in the frame for the now lost altarpiece depicting St. Catherine of Siena over the second altar from the right of the entrance in the church of Santi Giovanni e Paolo also by Bellini.\(^63\)

Rather, Goffen claims that the small shields depicting a rearing horse in the bottom corners of the frame must be stemma, unidentifiable to date. Jennifer Fletcher has suggested that the horses look like the stemma for the Cavalli family, based on their stemme in the church of Sts. Giovanni and Paolo, though the resemblance is weak.\(^64\) Decorative shields on altars tend to represent the Republic or the church in general and not particular families. As these stemme attached to the largest altarpiece in Venice have not yielded an identifiable private patron, they may represent one of the many signs of the Republic. (Figure 134)

The Martini Chapel

The San Giobbe Altarpiece is located across the nave from a chapel built in the mid-1470s by a Tuscan silk merchant, Giovanni Martini. (Figure 62 & Figure 150) The Tuscan Martini family may have constructed their chapel across from the Altarpiece which reflected an emerging


\(^{62}\) ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 8. The inventory was taken by Bartolomeo da Venetia, Procurator del Monasterio de San Giobbe. “1588 adi 3 gennaio. Inventario...de s. Job et bernardino del 1527...sacrestia...Item banchali cum la arma maura vouvo vintiuno cum li dolphin.”

\(^{63}\) Vasari, Vol. III, 155. Vasari says that the St. Catherine Altarpiece was the first painting by Bellini after the portraits. It was destroyed in 1867. Goffen, 1989, 121. Goffen dates the St. Catherine Altarpiece to 1475.

depiction of devotional space painted by Bellini that had its origins in Florence.\textsuperscript{65} Due to the historical continuum into which the Bellini Altarpiece fits, the well-traveled patron would have recognized Bellini’s precedents. For the Martini, the architectural citations for their private chapel were likely filtered through the chapel of the Cardinal of Portugal which projected off the nave of the Florentine church of San Miniato al Monte, designed in the 1460s with a ceiling by Luca della Robbia. (\textbf{Figure 67}) The Martini Chapel is adorned with a terracotta glazed ceiling of the four evangelists by Andrea della Robbia and fluted pilasters which bend into the corners, a conceit in heavy circulation since one of its first appearance at the Old Sacristy at San Lorenzo in Florence in 1428. The Martini Chapel Altarpiece depicted Franciscan saints adorning a central panel that has been removed, but due to the similarity in dimensions and material, it is believed to be an image of the Virgin and Child now at the Fogg.\textsuperscript{66}

In his 1475 testament, Giovanni Martini asked for burial in the chapter house of San Giobbe, where his daughter was already buried, but when the chapel he was constructing was done, he wished for his remains to be transferred there along with those of his daughter and nephew.\textsuperscript{67} Giovanni’s wife Cornelia Salvieti was in charge of overseeing the construction of the chapel after his death. The Martini Chapel was described by the Venetian chronicler Sanudo as the first upon entering the church and earlier testimonies corroborate that it was the first chapel one saw on entering the church before the present façade was extended a bay in the later fifteenth

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{65} Lorenzo Finocchi Ghersi, \textit{Il rinascimento veneziano di Giovanni Bellini}, Venezia: Marsilio, 2004, 85. Ghersi puts the date of the painting close to that of the Frari, painted in 1488, but that would contradict Sabellico’s claim made in 1488 that the San Giobbe Altarpiece was an early work of Bellini.


\textsuperscript{67} Eric Charles Apfelstadt, \textit{The Later Sculpture of Antonio Rossellino}, Thesis (Ph. D.) Princeton University, 1987, 264, 243-4. ASV, Cancelleria Inferiore, Misc. Test. 27 no. 2513. Several records and fragments of burial in the chapter house and the cloister were sold in 1774 by the monastery, making it difficult to determine the original disposition of certain burial monuments.
\end{flushright}
century. 68 (Figure 53) Sanudo also claimed that the chapel housed the tombs of some of the Martini suggesting that the bodies were moved from the chapter house and accommodated in the new Martini Chapel as Giovanni wished.

During the fifteenth century, the side chapels at San Giobbe were not built in spatial sequence but they projected off the nave at different points. (Figure 151) One of the chapels to the left of the Martini Chapel, closer to the high altar, was only constructed in the sixteenth century by the Testa family about fifty years after the Martini began their chapel. 69 Thus, the Martini likely built their chapel based on the presence of the altar frame and possibly the large altarpiece across the nave. Other than the likely presence of a Madonna and Child at the altar with a statue of St. John the Baptist, there were no architectural or figural similarities between the Martini Chapel or Bellini’s painting, but the altars of the Martini and Job are nearly aligned, while the other altars on the side of the nave are not on axis with the altars in the chapels across from them. (Figure 62) The alignment of the altars and the location of the Martini Chapel at the furthest point available from the liturgical east end of the church would suggest that the altar of St. Job held importance for the family. I believe the altar was in place when the Martini Chapel was under construction in 1475.

The Martini Chapel may have been placed across from the altar of Job to attain proximity to their professional patron saint. Job was believed to have been the patron saint of silk merchants. 70 Job may have become attached to silk and luxury trades from the East for his cult...
was stronger across the Adriatic. There are no known lists of members of the confraternity of St. Job, but if the confraternity to Job, oddly enough, attracted dealers in a luxury trade, then the spatial juxtaposition at St. Job would be strengthened.

The Bellini Family

The Bellini family was associated with the silk trade, as well. Anna Rinversi, Jacopo Bellini’s wife and Giovanni Bellini’s mother depending on his legitimacy status, was from a Lucchese silk merchant’s family and Jacopo Bellini apparently designed silks. The Bellini then could have received a commission to paint the Altarpiece or they may have played a role in devising the program. The role of the Bellini as patrons of the arts should not be underestimated. Artists were generally admitted to a scuola as members after they completed work for the scuola, but the Bellini had commissioned works for other confraternities in Venice. While there is no mention of the Bellini as members of the confraternity of St. Job, in the larger scuole for which they produced work—at San Marco and St. Giovanni Evangelista—they were members. In the mid-1460s the two brothers, Gentile and Giovanni, helped their father, Jacopo, complete the cycle of paintings he began for the scuola of San Marco, solidifying their careers as painters. After his diplomatic trip of 1478 to paint in the court of the Sultan Mehmet II, Gentile Bellini

71 Alessandro Manzoni, I Promessi Sposi, Chapter 38. “But it might be said that the plague had undertaken to amend all Renzo’s errors. That scourge had carried off the owner of another silk - mill, situated almost at the gates of Bergamo…” Manzoni portrays Milanese silk merchants are particularly vulnerable to the infection from rats transported with their goods, a conceit that might have derived from fifteenth-century reality.


was often named as the patron of several of the altarpieces, including the procession cycles he began at the end of the fifteenth century for the *scuola* of San Giovanni Evangelista.  

There is a reference to the Scuola of S. Giovanni Evangelista in the San Giobbe Altarpiece. The crosier held by St. Louis of Toulouse is elaborate in comparison to others painted by Bellini and his contemporaries which tend to terminate in a circle. Rather, the crosier held by St. Louis wraps around the staff with two small horizontal bands at the staff, much like the crosier representing the confraternity of St. Giovanni Evangelista.  

(Figure 152) The confraternity did have ties to the altar of St. Job. At least since 1504 when the ritual was recorded, they came to the altar of St. Job to celebrate a mass. Every year on “The eighth day of September, the Scuola of St. Giovanni Evangelista, according to a fixed ritual, meets at the little stone bridge and comes to our Madonna to offer a ducat.”  

That the records mention a fixed ritual suggests that the *scuola* came to the altar of St. Job before 1504. The members of the *scuola* of San Giovanni Evangelista went to San Giobbe and were met by the members the confraternity of St. Job with long candles. The confraternity of San Giobbe then gave the Guardian of San Giovanni Evangelista a wooden Virgin Mary. The depiction of the crosier in the Altarpiece may have been an attempt to acknowledge the *scuola* of St. Giovanni Evangelista. I believe that because the Altarpiece was painted by Giovanni Bellini, the crosier may be self-referential and a sign of the artist’s patronage of his own painting. The thin lips, aquiline nose, and wide watery eyes of Bellini’s name saint, John the Baptist in the San Giobbe Altarpiece resemble the facial features.

---

74 Sohm, 240.
76 The *scuola* of St. Giovanni Evangelista had been coming for years to San Giobbe to celebrate the Feast Day of the Nativity. Jonathan Emmanuel Glixon, *Music at the Venetian Scuole Grandi, 1440-1540*, Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1986, 66. ASV, Scuola San Giovanni Evangelista 16. From the libro Vardian da Mattin, “8 settembre la scuola di San Giovanni Evangelista secondo un rituale fissa l’incontro al ponteselo de piera, vien a tuor la Madonna offrendo 1 ducato...La causa de questa ceromonia altramente non si sano.” The ceremony was at least going on since 1421 when the *scuola* of San Giovanni Evangelista went to the Frari, then San Giobbe.
of Bellini in his portrait medal by Giovanni’s student, Vittore Belliniano, and in a self-portrait.  

(Figure 153)

There is no confirmation for Bellini family membership in the confraternity to St. Job, but they are recorded in a confraternity with Doge Moro and the Martini, the *scuola* dedicated to Moro’s name saint, Cristoforo, at Santa Maria dell’Orto. 77 The confraternity of St. Christopher was formed by members associated with the luxury trades who sought the help of the traveling saint, Christopher, but it also attracted several artists including Jacopo Bellini, and his sons, Alvise Vivarini, the architect Bartolomeo Bon, and Gentile da Fabriano. Other members in the *scuola* of St. Christopher were Doge Moro, the former Gabriel Condulmer, later Pope Eugenius IV, and the Martini family who had the chapel across from the Altarpiece. 78 Thus, the Bellini must have been acquaintances of Doge Moro at least as confraternity brothers. During the last ten years of Jacopo Bellini’s life, when he had secured status as an artist throughout Venice and beyond, Moro was the doge. Jacopo’s older son, Gentile, also painted Moro’s portrait against the same dark ground and in profile as he did Sultan Mehmet II in 1479. (Figure 154)

**Moro’s Altar**

In a 1471 funerary eulogy for Doge Moro given by the Bishop of Belluno, Pietro Barozzi, claimed that the doge constructed an altar to seek council from Job. 79 Barozzi mentions this fact while he discusses Moro’s special relationship with St. Bernardino and the prediction of his dogate by the Franciscan preacher. Either Barozzi did not know that the high altar was dedicated to Bernardino by the time the Doge died and his comment refers to the high altar, or Barozzi was

---

77 Cicogna, 709.
78 Ibid.
speaking about the altar on the side of the church. Moro likely patronized both the high altar and the altar in the nave dedicated to St. Job. Much has been made of Doge Moro’s promotion of St. Bernardino at San Giobbe, but he was an active member of the confraternity dedicated to St. Job, as cited in his testament. The *scuola* of St. Bernardino was privileged at the church: Moro left only ten ducats to the confraternity of Job as opposed to the twenty he left that of Bernardino. The *scuola* of St. Job also had to ask the confraternity of St. Bernardino for permission to say mass at the high altar, but it was also obliged to say mass at the altar dedicated to Job in the church. Moro also called on the members of both confraternities to participate in his funeral exequies and he left money to all the confraternities at the church, including that of Job. Moreover, at the altar, the celebration of the feast day of Moro’s patron saint, Bernardino of Siena, on May 20 was celebrated. The altar to Job was consecrated on the same day as the high altar to Bernardino, where Moro was buried, on 14 April 1493.

According to the records for the confraternity of St. Bernardino, “The Altarpiece of St. Job placed by the friars on our altar [to S. Bernardino] was removed by the Doge in 1463.” At this point, the Doge likely shifted the Job’s altar to its current location on the north side of the nave and began to construct the altar to St. Bernardino in the high altar chapel. The note does not provide a clear idea of when the painting was completed but as a member of the confraternity of St. Job, Doge Moro likely helped devise a new scheme for the side altar. Due to Moro’s control over the rest of the church, Moro’s control over the altar and its decoration is completely plausible. There is no indication that Moro contracted Giovanni Bellini to paint the Altarpiece,

---

80 MCV, Codice Cicogna, 3115/12, 728-732c, 1 September 1470.
81 ASV, Testamenti, Atti Tomei Tomas, 2394.
82 For a list of the liturgical requirements at the altar of St. Job: ASV, Provveditore del Comun, Reg. O, 124-155.
83 The proclamation of consecration is contained in ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 8.
84 ASV, Scuole Piccole, Busta 260 (F. D.35) “...pala di S. job messa dai frati al nostro altar fatta levarvia(levarsia) dal doge 1463.”
but the two may have been acquaintances through their membership in the confraternity of St. Cristoforo. Moro died in 1471 and to be sure, there is no particular reference to him in the San Giobbe Altarpiece. However, given Barozzi’s claim that Moro controlled the altar of St. Job, the program of the Altarpiece was likely defined based on the rule of the Doge and his patronage of San Giobbe.

The Doge and his supporters would have had an interest in forging a relationship to signs of ducal power in the Altarpiece, namely in the invocation of San Marco in the San Giobbe Altarpiece, where the legal rights of the Doge had been slowly deteriorating since 1354 when the Council prohibited ducal burials. The Doge transferred his authority and remnants of Venetian history to San Giobbe. With the infusion of elements from San Marco into the Altarpiece, the repository of Venetian history now also served as the backdrop for the Madonna and Child with saints.

The Signs of Ducal Diplomacy: The Umbrella as Baldacchino

The green umbrella along the vertical central axis of the Altarpiece has been identified by Rona Goffen as a sign of the dogate. Hanging fixtures decorate several holy gatherings during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. These central fixtures were signs that have vexed modern art historians as bearers of symbolic meaning. The 1500 Presentation in the Temple by Marco Marziale also portrays a gathering of saints in a mosaic-covered setting that resembles San

---

85 Emmanuele Cicogna, Delle Inscrizioni Veneziane, Venice, 1824, Vol. 6, 709.
86 Rona Goffen believed that the Altarpiece was meant to protest the ducal patron of the church, Doge Moro, who had fallen into a state of disrepute after his death. Goffen believed that through its great size and stylistic innovations, the San Giobbe Altarpiece compensated for the displacement of Job from the dedication of the main altar, dedicated to Bernardino of Siena by Moro; the San Giobbe Altarpiece was intended to upstage the high altar dedicated to St. Bernardino and the doge who was buried before it. Goffen’s theory insinuates a complex and contradictory spatial alliance. Why would ducal power—and Moro was the only doge associated with San Giobbe—be referenced by the parasol while personally chagrined? Any attempt to undermine Moro at the church would have likely extended to his burial chapel where the high altar was.
87 Goffen, 1986, 64.
Marco, as the San Giobbe Altarpiece. (Figure 155) Marziale’s holy gathering is not covered by an umbrella as the enthroned Madonna in the San Giobbe Altarpiece, but a light fixture with an ostrich egg hangs over the scene, as in the Brera Altarpiece and the St. Catherine Altarpiece. In the early sixteenth-century Pala Pitti, a round green disk covers a gathering of saints around a Madonna and Child.

If the presence of the ostrich egg was closer to the norm, then the umbrella was pointed. The symbolic significance of the umbrella could be dated to the twelfth century when the Venetians sheltered and defended Pope Alexander III from the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa during the near twenty-year Alexandrine Schism. In 1177, the Doge, Sebastiano Ziani accompanied both the Emperor and the Pope to Ancona to forge a peace. According to both the official and fictionalized histories of the Republic, Pope Alexander III recommended that the Doge be given a ceremonial baldachin to guard against the sun, as both the Emperor and the Doge had been offered. (Figure 32 & Figure 33) Regardless of the authenticity of the parasol gift, the umbrella became a major prop in representations meant to show ducal glory and Venetian diplomacy. in the image of Venice from the 1572 Braun and Hogenberg map series, Civitates Orbis Terrarum, the doge is depicted in a cartouche in the bottom of the panel, sheltered by an attendant with an umbrella Venetia. (Figure 156) That there is also an umbrella covering the Madonna enthroned in Bellini’s Sacred Allegory (Figure 148) suggests that it was meant to emulate a tabernacle, but that it also had a distinctly Venetian tinge.

---

89 As recounted in Chapter 2.
90 Hamann-Maclean, 1983, 150-1. Hamann-Maclean discusses eight-sided light fixtures as tabernacles for the important tombs of royalty in the German and French burial traditions of the Middle Ages.
Despite acknowledging that the umbrella in the center of the Altarpiece represented ducal power, Rona Goffen believed that the Altarpiece was in some way meant to protest the ducal patron of the church, Doge Cristoforo Moro. Goffen believed that through its great size and stylistic innovations, the San Giobbe Altarpiece compensated for the displacement of Job from the dedication of the main altar; it was intended to upstage the high altar dedicated to St. Bernardino and the doge who was buried before it. Goffen’s theory insinuates a complex and contradictory spatial alliance. Why would Moro’s power be referenced by the parasol if the intent of the Altarpiece was to undermine his rule? Such double messages were emitted in monuments throughout the Renaissance; however, it seems unlikely in this case, specifically because Barozzi publicly named Doge Moro as a curator of the altar, and moreover, as Goffen says, the side altar was not necessarily a place less honorable than the high altar. Given the position of the altar near the entrance of the church, activity at the altar including regular masses, feast day masses, or Offices of the Dead recited for a deceased member of the confraternity would have been noticed immediately. Goffen believed that the San Giobbe Altarpiece was meant to arrest the gaze of the visitor as they entered the church, trumping the activity at the main altar. I believe that the San Giobbe Altarpiece became the effigy of Doge Moro and that the Altarpiece was meant to complement the activity at the high altar.

As the San Giobbe Altarpiece resided in Moro’s church, it seems likely that the baldacchino represented the memory of Moro’s meeting with Pope Pius II in Ancona in 1464 as they prepared to initiate a Crusade to the East. Through the umbrella the Doge pushes his connection to the formative act of ducal diplomacy conducted by Sebastiano Ziani between the pope and emperor in Ancona during the twelfth century. In Moro’s funerary elegy, Pietro Barozzi

91 Goffen, 1986, 64.
identified Moro with Doge Sebastiano Ziani strengthening the associations we have seen between Moro and Ziani in descriptions of destroyed cycles. Furthermore, Moro’s epitaph, “Cristoforo Moro Princeps” is close in structure to Ziani’s which read, “Sebastiano Ziani Dux.” That St. Sebastian occupies a prominent role in the Altarpiece may be a reference to Doge Ziani. By appropriating his imagery, Moro could forge a triumphal rule like that for which Doge Ziani was remembered.

Doge Moro and his wife, Cristina were the last recorded patrons of the site with ducal credentials. The Dogaressa Dea Morosina Tron, the wife of Moro’s successor Niccolò Tron was buried in the cloister of San Giobbe after she resided as a widow at the hospital, but there is no indication that she made any substantial donations to the church. Moro’s patronage projects at San Giobbe and around the ducal palace and basilica show that he was assiduous in promoting his rule. Documents about the church of San Giobbe from the executor’s of Moro’s will, the money continually drawn on his bank accounts after his death in 1471, and the improvements to the church initiated in his name show that he exerted an influence which reached well beyond his death. Even if the Altarpiece was finished after Moro’s 1471 death and even if the program evolved considerably, it was likely initiated to glorify Moro.

“And I shall be clothed again with my skin:” The Story of Job

San Giobbe likely appealed to Moro as site of patronage for it was a church inhabited by Bernardino of Siena’s order, the Observant Franciscans. However, there were other Observant Franciscan churches in Venice; the story of Job in particular, the titular of the church, must have resonated with Christoforo Moro when he was Procurator of San Marco and he turned his

attention to San Giobbe. Giovanni Contarini’s dedication of the oratory near his hospice to St. Job, sufferer of boils and extreme loss, not only illustrates the impact of poverty and sickness on Contarini’s enterprise. San Giobbe must have appealed to Moro, who presented himself as both the patron and the impoverished.\footnote{The cult of Job had been flourishing for almost a thousand years before Contarini dedicated the oratory of his hospice in Venice to the Old Testament figure Leopold Kretzenbacher, Hiobs-Erinnerungen zwischen Donau und Adria : Kulträume, Patronate, Sondermotive der Volksüberlieferungen um Job und sein biblisches und apokryphes Schicksal in den Südost- Alpenländern, München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: In Konnmission bei C.H. Beck, 1987, 83-90; Nina Gockerell, Kirchen mit altestamitarischen betrozinien in Venedig: Materialien zu Geschichte und Ikonographie der Kirchen S. Giobbe, S. Geremia, S. Moisé, S. Samuele, S. Simeone und S. Zaccaria, Venezia: Centro Tedesco di Studi Veneziani, 1978. Acta sanctorum, 9\textsuperscript{th} edition, edited by Joanne Carnandet, Brussels: Culture et Civilisation, 1965-1970, Vol. 22, June 10, 260.} The \textit{Book of Job} tells the story of a wealthy king or patriarch who loses his home, his wealth, then his seven sons and three daughters; he endures derision by friends who believe that his change in fortune had to have been the result of a concealed moral lapse, and he is physically afflicted—with boils and wound-dwelling worms.\footnote{\textit{Book of Job}, 19:26.} In the darkest days of Job’s contemplation on his loss, he debates with old friends about his lot. He asks, “Did not I weep for him whose day was hard? Was not my soul grieved for the poor?”\footnote{Ibid. 30:25} Due to his steadfast conviction in God through his years of abjection, his wealth was restored tenfold and he was furnished with a new family. Job was a model of charitable living: he once opened his house to the poor, then was poor himself, and for his suffering regained his riches. Moro must have understood he could draw on the vapors of faith and endurance exuded by the popular persona of Job, a charitable monarch, by patronizing a church dedicated to him.

Not very much was known about Job. St. John Chrysostom discusses a cult of Job making pilgrimages to his spot of burial near modern day Syria. That “Saint Job’s tomb,” as she called it, served as a destination along the pilgrimage route of Egeria in her fourth or fifth century.
pilgrimage journal suggests the existence of an active cult of Job. Because of its proximity to
the saint’s alleged bodily relics, the cult of Old Testament figures flourished in the Eastern
Church, but devotion to these pre-Christian saints was rarer in Europe and appeared only
sporadically throughout the Italian city-states. In Venice, the proliferation of churches dedicated
to a figure from the Old Testament is one of the strongest testaments of its ties to Byzantium.
San Giobbe was one of seven churches in Venice dedicated to pre-Christian figures. Prophets, as
they were called, or Old Testament figures subsumed into the canon of saints, may not have
made attractive saints in the West as time and distance dimmed the hope for corporeal relics. In
Venice, secondary relics were often available. The church of San Moisè, for example, claimed
the rod with which Moses turned into a serpent before the Pharaoh. There are no records of Job’s
relics at the church of San Giobbe in Venice, but Job may have emerged as the most popular of
the Old Testament saints for his body was rumored to have been in Rome after landing in Pavia
and the possibility of his arrival kept his cult vivid.

The search for the physical evidence of Job derived from the popularity of his story. The
narrative associated with Job in the late Middle Ages provided a didactic allegory for the poor
clientele of the hospice attached to the church of San Giobbe. His patience in waiting out the

97 Leopold Kretzenbacher, Hiobs-Erinnerungen zwischen Donau und Adria : Kulträume, Patronate, Sondermotive
der Volksüberlieferungen um Job und sein biblisches und apokryphes Schicksal in den Südost- Alpenländern,
Nina Gockerell, Kirchen mit altestamitarischen betozinien in Venedig: Materialien zu Geschichte und
Ikonographie der Kirchen S. Giobbe, S. Geremia, S. Moisè, S. Samuele, S. Simeone und S. Zaccaria, Venezia:
visitur hospitale Confraternitatis S. Iobi in via Purgatorii: & in ecclesia illi sacra sunt Indulgentiae plenariae a
Gregorio XIII concessae. Praeterea in ecclesia S. Mariae Mendicantium, prope portam S. Vitalis, est S. Jobo dicatum
altaré, & ejus ibidem festum celebratur. Est in diecisi Antverpiensi parochia S. Jobi, ad quam magnus hoc die fit
peregrinantium concursus. Vt & Westmaliæ, illustri territorii Lovaniensi Baronatu, quo magna pars urbis
Lovaniensi & vicinorum locorum, [peregrinationes,] ut suæ erga S. Jobum devotioni satisfaciat, solet peregrinari.
98 Acta sanctorum quotquot toto orbe coluntur, vel a catholicis scriptoribus celebrantur quae ex latinis et graecis,
aliarumque gentium antiquis monumentis / collegit, digessit, notis illustrauit Joannes Bollandus; operam et studium
test of his faith sanctioned by god was invoked as a moral example by theologians such as Tertullian, St. Jerome, and Gregory the Great throughout the Middle Ages. In his fourth-century letter to St. Jerome praising his translation and commentary on the Book of Job, St. Augustine posited Job as an exemplar of patience in a meditation on how the saintly self-comport when they suffered. In the fifteenth century, popular preachers such as St. Bernardino and Savonarola solidified the association of Job with divine patience. By 1521, when the Flemish artist, Bernard van Orley, turned to Job as an allegorical figure for his Triptych of the Virtue of Patience for the Governor Margaret of Austria, Job had become synonymous with fortitude against adversity. As a hospice for the poor, Contarini dedicated the oratory to the Old Testament figure, Job, who never relinquished his faith despite his persistent bodily suffering and his loss of property.

The descriptions of bodily suffering in the Book of Job—"My skin turns black and falls from me, and my bones burn with heat"—contributed to evocations of Job to cure or ward off diseases with endocrinal manifestations. Victims of disease, particularly in port cities like Venice, subject to the import of sicknesses from traveling merchants, found an empathetic figure in Job’s vividly described flesh wounds. On seeing Job covered in abscesses, his friends said, “Behold, we have come here and brought the physicians of three kings, and if you wish, you may be cured by them.” But Job responded: “My cure and my restoration cometh from God, the Maker of
Despite his rejection of medicine, Job's endurance of both physical pain and loss made him a perfect patron saint for hospitals which provided care for the poor and sick. With the proliferation of depictions of Job's hurt flesh, sufferers of skin ailments, sexual diseases, and bubo-ridden plague victims appealed to the interventive powers of Job. In Bologna, syphilis patients availed themselves of a hospital attached to the fourteenth-century church dedicated to Job near the Mercanzia. The degradation of Job's body was subsumed into the rubric of larger bodily disease. In the seventeenth-century Acta Sanctorum, Job is listed as the patron saint of leprosy, elephantitus, and grave infections.

Representations of Job seized on the imagery of his total loss, when he was left to contemplate the erosion of his body. Byzantine illuminated manuscripts of the Book of Job show the Old Testament figure gaunt and prostrate on a dung heap, standing alone against his friends who challenge his faith. His misery was described and illustrated in dramatic detail in the thirteenth-century On the misery of Job. In one image, Job is surrounded by saints as he floats on his dung heap replacing the mandorla which tends to encircle Christ to signify his sanctity. The near-naked and emaciated Job can also be seen in Pisa in 1367 and San Gimignano. Depictions of Job seem to have been more popular in Northern Europe where moralizing prints utilized the character of Job to show how one should self-comport in the face of adversity. These prints tended to emphasize the baser characteristics of Job's tribulations. German editions of Gregory's Moralia in Job emphasized his earthly suffering. They show a spotted Job calmly sitting on a dung heap confronted by his erstwhile friends. Job's body becomes the text onto which his

---

103 Ibid., 8.25-6.
suffering is inscribed. Seeing the scars of his suffering would activate the understanding in the viewer that suffering is a part of mortal life and that it leads to salvation.

A 1228 fresco at San Benedetto in Subiaco alludes both to Job’s putrification and his poverty. (Figure 157) It shows Job pocked with sores, boils, and scars and a look of abjection. The author of the image of the leprotic Job emphasizes the role of property loss as much as sickness. Job holds a scroll declaring the line from the Book of Job: “Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither. The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord.” Job accepts the loss of property with which he has been afflicted when he says he was born with nothing and will die with nothing.

The Old Testament Job was resigned to his mortal misery, as the will of God, but Job was restored to health and died of very old age. The early church doctors integrated Job’s recovery into a Christian framework. When St. Gregory the Great wrote his Moralia in Job, which promoted Job as a precursor to Christ, Gregory seized on the salvation Job predicted for himself and the return of his mortal flesh. Gregory’s Job says,

My bones cleave to my skin and to my flesh, and I have escaped by the skin of my teeth. …But I know that my Redeemer liveth, and in the last day I shall rise out of the earth... And I shall be clothed again with my skin, and in my flesh I shall see my God.106

For Jerome and other early Christian writers, the redemptive vision of Job anticipated the Resurrection. Gregory’s interpretation of the passage gives the greatest proof of how the early church doctors superimposed the New Testament over the Old Testament. In the Hebrew, Job’s prophesy is not as triumphant. It reads, “...and after my skin has been thus destroyed, then without my flesh, I shall see god.”

Even before the translation of the *Book of Job* was manipulated by early church interpretations into a New Testament reading that trumped up Job’s self prophesy, the composition of the flesh was often invoked in theological discussions about the nature of Resurrection. In his expository on St. Luke, St. Ambrose wrote about, “Flesh that would eventually be restored to its full integrity at the Resurrection.”107 But Tertullian’s belief that Job represented “Patience in the spirit of flesh,” gives an idea of how flesh was one of the rewards of patience.

Because of Job’s insistence on a full-bodied Resurrection, during the Middle Ages, images of Job appeared in manuscript illuminations accompanying the Office of the Dead throughout Europe. Passages from the *Book of Job* about Job rising up to meet his redeemer found their way into the recitation of Offices for the Dead for their evocation of the Resurrection.108 The prayers played a large role in the liturgy at San Giobbe. When a member of the confraternity died, Offices of the Dead were to be recited at the altar in the church with the body present.109

**Job’s Venetian Rebirth: Bellini’s Job**

Medieval treatments of Job portrayed him as a tested innocent subjected to torments but they identify him with the promise fulfilled by the suffering Christ he prefigured; in this understanding, his suffering was a necessary forerunner of his redemption just as Christ’s crucifixion led to his Resurrection. Unlike artists in Northern Europe, who depicted Job’s skin as a parchment of pain, Venetian artists tended to emphasize the prophetic passage as it had been rendered by early theologians. Vittore Carpaccio’s *Meditation on the Dead Christ*, (Figure 158)
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painted for the confraternity house of St. Job in the sixteenth century, portrays Job as an old near-naked man who along with St. Jerome ponders the enthroned dead Christ in the aftermath of the earthquake that occurred right after Christ died. Here, Job’s dung heap is replaced by Christ’s graveyard and the contemplation of his loss and emaciation becomes a meditation on the Passion. Christ’s Resurrection is promised by the Hebrew inscription behind Christ which cites Job’s prophesy about his own Resurrection.

The association of Job with rebirth made him an appropriate figure for the decoration of the Baptistery at San Marco. Job punctures scenes from the life of St. John the Baptist in the Baptistery, explicating the theological purpose of Job as a surrogate Christ meant to symbolize the Resurrection. In the image of Job from the mosaics of the Baptistery of San Marco completed by Doge Andrea Dandolo in 1350, an angel presents a cloth to Job. The depiction in the baptistery was appropriate for Job whose suffering in the vocabulary of the New Testament gave way to his Resurrection. Though somewhat concealed in the San Giobbe Altarpiece, St. John the Baptist is right next to Job, as if to present him to the Madonna and Child. St. John’s presence acknowledges the teleological end of the Child’s life, his rebirth, and likewise the self-prophesied renewal of Job.

In Venice, the moral worth of suffering was not emphasized, but only the effect was shown. The particle recreation of the body as described by theologians explaining the Resurrection is captured by Bellini in the San Giobbe Altarpiece. In the painting, Job is the telos for all the signs of the Passion depicted and represents Christ’s Resurrection. Bellini does not depict Job’s agony, tirelessly described in the Book of Job, nor does he depict Job in the period of time between the

111 הָעַיִן, גְּדֵרָה, כְּלָלְתָּא (הָאַתּוּלְת), כְּלָלְתָּא (יָנוּכַ), קָבֶּי מַקְעֵר, שָׁמָּה מַכָּה, קָבֶּי מַכָּה, קָבֶּי מַכָּה.
restoration of his health and his death—rather, he focuses solely on the interpretation of Job’s prophesy for his redemption. In fact, Job had a much more modest restoration—he was not canonized but he reclaimed his earthly property. Job’s meditation on rising to meet his redeemer in his flesh was interpreted as a prophesy of the Resurrection, but one of the key debates on the Resurrection involved the nature of the resurrected body: it would be substantially the same as it was during life—strong and muscular. Even the wounded Francis and Sebastian are serene, exposing their wounds merely as symbols of a past event. Their haloes signify that they have been healed by Resurrection. While flesh could become wounded then putrid, gracefully accepting one’s lot would yield an idealized version of the self.

Frederick Hartt drew a comparison between the stooped and sunken Job of Bellini’s Sacred Allegory dated to 1488 and the Job of the San Giobbe Altarpiece, but the Job at San Giobbe is weightier.112 Not only is the body devoid of flesh wounds, but for someone who was said to be pushing 150 when his suffering concluded, the body of Bellini’s Job from the neck down is youthful and muscular.113 It could be argued that in its pre-Michelangelesque form, Bellini evokes the heroic nude, in triumph this full-bodied Job differs from almost all other images of the Old Testament figure. The Altarpiece seizes on the renewal of Job, not his suffering, which needed to be obscured by the Christian camouflage of a perfectly resurrected body. Bellini’s Job represented a shift in representation that can not be divorced from its ducal context at San Giobbe.

113 Job is like Lazarus, his counterpart from the New Testament, Job reminded the members of the hospice of San Giobbe of the efficacy of suffering for eventual redemption. Like Job, Lazarus fell into poverty, but was restored to wealth before he died. Bellini’s reconstituted Job is not unlike Jacopo Tintoretto’s 1556 The Raising of Lazarus in which Lazarus, with rippling muscles in contrast to the boil-covered beggar described in Luke 16, is carried off by angels. At this point the suffering once endured by the saints is suppressed to show the worshippers instead the effects of suffering.
Given both the ducal context for the San Giobbe Altarpiece and its emphasis on Venetian conceptions of its history, Job’s restored body reclaims the authority that was lost with its destruction. Bellini’s Job exploits the analogy of the human body and the social body. Most commonly, ancient political theory put forth political and social structures as organisms that operated in much the same way as a human body. Since antiquity, the complete functioning body was evoked as a powerful metaphor. For Christine de Pisan, corporeal integrity signaled an intact political structure. Thus, the insalubrious body served as a metaphor for an unhealthy government. It would instead be in the government’s interest to present itself as a unified organism working together to make Venice vigorous. The government consistently praised the lack of internal strife. The San Giobbe Altarpiece both produced and reflected a communal identity which configured the healthy resurrected body as the Venetian one.

While the painting focuses on restoration and sanctity, Doge Moro ruled during a time of adversity in Venice: since the takeover of Constantinople in 1453 by the Turks, Venice imposed heavy taxes to strengthen its military resources and rethink trade routes to the East. The Ottoman Turks powerfully led by the Sultan Mehmet II, stripped the Republic of its key ports along the
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Adriatic. Venice experienced at least two major outbreaks of the plague during Moro’s reign. During Moro’s rule, in 1464 and 1468, the Council of Ten recorded a public health crisis. Doge Moro established the hospital of the Lazaretto Nuovo to care for plague sufferers near the island of St. Erasmus in response to a terrible outbreak of the plague in 1468. Most historians date the Altarpiece to 1478, in part due to Niccolò Trevisan’s description of 1478 as a fatal plague year in Venice. The 1460s and the 1470s saw relentless bouts of pestilence spread throughout Venice. In the meantime, the governing body in Venice, the Council of Ten, constantly restricted the powers of the doge. Moro compensated for the stripping away of his power and the failure of foreign policy by enriching his program of ceremony. Job’s body as the Venetian body was reconfigured to stave off failure in representational form. Job’s full body not only offered the promise of salvation, but its place over the altar would signify that salvation had already been realized.

The Body of Job as the Body of Christ: The Corpus Christi

The idealized bodies—Job’s and the Venetian—portrayed in the Altarpiece were fused by the activity that took place at the altar. According to the records of the confraternity submitted to the commissioner of the Commune, the governing body which oversaw the activity of the scuole piccole, the confraternity of Job had to recite mass at their altar every other Sunday, but also on several feast days: the Annunciation, Christmas, Easter, Corpus Christi, and the feast days of

116 Goffen, 1986, 57. For an argument against the pivotal role the fourteenth-century Black Death may have played in the creation of institutions and art dealing with services and themes related to death see Joseph Polzer, “Aspects of the fourteenth-century iconography of death and the plague,” The Black Death: the impact of the fourteenth-century plague: papers of the Eleventh Annual Conference of the Center for Medieval & Early Renaissance Studies, Binghamton: Center for Medieval & Early Renaissance Studies, 1982, 107-130. The causes of the disease were unknown, but its symptoms often manifested in blotchy buboes and swelling.
117 Venezia e la Peste: 1348-1797.
saints Dominic, Francis, Bernardino, and Job. The Provveditore records were compiled in the seventeenth-century based on policies that dated from the end of the fifteenth century. Many of the written regulations postdated the Altarpiece, but the later obligations were likely defined based on both the needs of the confraternity and the visual content of the Altarpiece.

We can glean from the celebration of Christmas, Easter, and Corpus Christi at the altar to Job that the confraternity of St. Job cloaked their liturgical celebrations with optimism. The confraternity cared for the poorest citizens of the Republic and helped cover their burial costs. At the hospice which cared for the sick and the poor in one of the poorest sestiere in Venice, the death rate was likely high. Each time a funerary rite was exercised at the church, the sacrament of the Eucharist was offered at the altar. The feast days that were celebrated at the altar were somewhat interrelated. The focus on birth and Resurrection envelop death in the Christian context of the afterlife; both feast days come together in the feast day of the Corpus Christi. Celebration of the Corpus Christi occurs sixty days after Easter as a celebration of the Eucharist, the bodying forth of Christ by in the sacramental sign of bread. It celebrates the sacrifice of Christ’s body for the sins of humanity.

The church of San Giobbe was probably an important center for the festival of the Corpus Christi. Paintings that allegedly adorned the high altar chapel of San Giobbe by Sebastiano Mazzoni (1611-1678) are The Story of the Manna and The Multiplication of Bread and Fish. The themes conjoin the Old and the New Testaments, a fusion which permeated the entire church. Manna was the Old Testament equivalent of the body of Christ, the Eucharist celebrated

120 Ceriana, 24.
in the feast of the Corpus Domini. In the San Giobbe Altarpiece the rite of the Eucharist was given expression through the display of the body of the Christ Child, or in this case his surrogate, Job, and the feast day of the Corpus Domini was a required celebration at the altar to commemorate the institution of the Eucharist. On the feast day of the Corpus Domini, the members of the *scuola* were obliged to process before the altar with candles in hand as a part of the mass.

On the feast day of Corpus Christi, city-wide processions attended by all of the confraternities in Venice were held. Two of the biggest confraternities in Venice, the confraternity of the Misericordia and the confraternity of St. Mark, also understood the San Giobbe Altarpiece as an effective display of the meaning of the Corpus Christi, for they came to the altar of St. Job to recite a mass on the feast day. Notably, the inclusion of San Giobbe in the procession was codified for the school of St. Mark under its vicar, Gentile Bellini in 1504. That Gentile could justify his confraternity’s visit to the Altarpiece is clearly defined by the spectacle of Job’s resurrected flesh simulating the Resurrection of the body of Christ.

The Altarpiece celebrates the city’s spiritual past under the divine guardianship of the Virgin as its most salient characteristic. Job’s veneration of the Madonna and Child in the Altarpiece reflects the way in which Venice appealed to Marian imagery. On the Feast day of St. Job, May 10, the brothers and sisters of the confraternity were obliged to sing the Ave Maria before the altar, but the worship of Mary drove the imagery of the hospital and confraternity of Job from the hospital’s beginnings. The founder of San Giobbe, Giovanni Contarini, obliged the governors of
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121 Grabar, 1972. 2:39. In Book 4/3, Germanus writes, “The holy altar stands for the place where Christ was laid in the grave....It is also the throne of god on which the incarnate god reposes....and like the table at which He was in the midst of His disciples at His mystical supper...prefigured in the table of the Old Law where the manna was, which is Christ, come down from heaven.”

122 Celebration of the Corpus Christi was officially recognized in 1264. Little, 52.
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the hospital to celebrate a mass on the Feast day of the Annunciation.\textsuperscript{125} The seventeenth-century laws of the confraternity show that the feast day maintained its importance at the church as one of only eight feast days celebrated by obligation at the altar.

In Venice, Job seems to have been associated with the Corpus Christi. Carpaccio’s \textit{Meditation on the Dead Christ} depicts Job contemplating the mortal flesh of Christ as he is laid out on the burial slab. The church of San Giobbe promoted the Incarnation in its Agnus Dei decoration. On the underside of the San Giobbe arch which spans the entrance to the main chapel, there are twelve carved panels of the apostles with the Agnus Dei at the apex. The scriptural precedent for the Agnus Dei comes from John 1:29 “Behold the Lamb of God which takes away the sins of the world,” in references to the baptism of Christ by St. John. The phrase is often uttered at the point in the mass when the priest raises the consecrated host and refers to the consecrated sacrament as the body of Christ.\textsuperscript{126} In enlarging and decorating the church under Moro, the importance of the Corpus Christi for the church was emphasized.

Embedded within the Altarpiece’s promotion of the cult of Mary is a reference to Venetian civic identity. Early historians of Venice promoted the belief that the founders of the Republic chose to break the ribbon in 421 on the feast day of the Annunciation. Sabellico noted that, “On that day, the Son of God was conceived in the womb of the Virgin.”\textsuperscript{127} Mary is often depicted with her left hand held up during scenes of the Annunciation, when the Archangel Gabriel informed her of her pregnancy as she does in the San Giobbe Altarpiece.\textsuperscript{128} The baby Christ is moved to the side a bit by the Madonna so that the central axis of the painting cuts through her

\begin{footnotes}
\item[125] Ibid, 1r. For the metaphor of Venice as the Virgin, see Giovanni Botero, \textit{La ragion di Stato}, Roma: Donzelli, 1997, 6v-7r.
\item[126] John 1:29, “Ecce Agnus Dei. Ecce qui tollit peccata mundi.”
\item[128] Pincus, 2003, 135. Pincus believes the Virgin affects an Orant pose, but several scenes of the Annunciation show the Virgin with her hand held out to receive a message.
\end{footnotes}
stomach or her womb reminiscent of the clean announcement of the Annunciation. The depiction of a Madonna in the gesture associated with the Annunciation places emphasis on the importance of the event for Venetian identity. The Incarnation—the actual act of god revealing himself through man—was enacted through the Eucharist and made manifest in the Altarpiece through the body of the Christ Child and Job. The celebration of the Corpus Domini may have been infused with polysemous meanings about the nature of the body of Christ, but it gave definite form to the Venetian social body. The founders of Venice chose to let the Republic begin propitiously on the day of the Annunciation and tried to extend the metaphor that posited the Virgin as Venice and the Christ Incarnate as the Republic to reality.\textsuperscript{129}

\textit{Hortus Conclusus: Debating Mary’s Maculacy}

If Venice were founded on the day of the Annunciation, those who shaped its identity would have an interest in applying the metaphor of the Immaculate Conception to the Republic. The inscription cutting across the top of the apse lunette in the San Giobbe Altarpiece, AVE VIRGINEI FLOS INTEMERATE PUDORIS (Hail Virgin, undefiled flower of grace), has been connected to a debate between the Franciscans and the Dominicans about the legitimacy of the Doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.\textsuperscript{130} The Immaculate Conception refers not to Christ’s chaste beginning in the womb of Mary—portrayed by the Annunciation—but her own immunity to Original Sin. The inscription derives from the first homily of the Annunciation written by St.

\textsuperscript{129} Muir, “The Virgin on the Street Corner,” 25-42.

Gregory Thaumaturgus, in which he sings of the Virgin’s exemption from Original Sin by emphasizing her grace and purity. “Mary, you are the garden enclosed, in which the white lily of virginity grows without fading, the inviolable violet of humility spreads its perfume, and the rose of tireless love glows red.” The enclosed garden, the *hortus conclusus*, was used to represent Mary’s Immaculate Conception, but it was also the setting for numerous representations of the Annunciation. The pervasive floral decoration in the San Giobbe Altarpiece—the rosettes on the throne and along the central vertical axis, in the tondo above the Virgin’s head and in the laurel above the umbrella—give visual reference to the undefiled flower of the description. In Christ’s doubly undefiled lineage, through the inscription about the Immaculate Conception and the body as represented by Job, the mortal body and the future Resurrection could be reconciled.

In 1476, two years before the projected date of the San Giobbe Altarpiece, Pope Sixtus IV issued a papal bull offering indulgences to all those who celebrated the feast of the Immaculate Conception. That the issue became a fraught theological debate is evident from a bull published by Pope Sixtus IV in 1483 excommunicating all those who invoked charges of heresy against their opponents in the disagreement. The ratification of the bull suggests that upholding Mary’s purity was assuming brutish contours. The Immaculacy of the Virgin became an object of avuncular pride for the Franciscans who believed that Mary’s conception was also immaculate. The Dominicans were eager to point out that though a Virgin, she was carnalized like any other...
woman.\textsuperscript{134} The Dominicans claimed to have differentiated Christ from Mary, accusing the Franciscans of heresy for equating her with Christ. With tensions elevated among the mendicant religious orders over the abstract notion of Mary’s spotlessness from sin, the San Giobbe Altarpiece, in an Observant Franciscan church, championed the Franciscans, who celebrated Mary as a woman uncorrupted by Original Sin in her own conception.\textsuperscript{135}

Historians stress 1476 as the key victory year for the Franciscans in the debate on the Immaculate Conception with the passing of Sixtus IV’s bull instituting the feast of the Immaculate Conception, but images of Mary Immaculate were in circulation well before 1476.\textsuperscript{136} The future saint Bernardino was already preaching the Franciscan party line during his outdoor sermons across the city-states in 1427, proclaiming that the Virgin was without concupiscence and Immaculate.\textsuperscript{137} During the 1439 Council of Basel, the Mary’s Immaculateness was proclaimed by the members. Before 1450, as Patriarch of Venice, Lorenzo Giustiniani championed the Immaculate Conception, referred to in the processes of his canonization.\textsuperscript{138} In 1472, Sixtus IV referred to Mary as the Immaculata Virgo and on December 8 of that year, the Feast day of the Immaculate Conception, the Pope listened to a sermon on the subject at the

\textsuperscript{134} Heinrich Denzinger, \textit{Enchiridion symbolorum: definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum}, Herder, 1976, no 1400. Reprints Sixtus IV’s Decree of 28 February, 1476

\textsuperscript{135} In 1476, Pope Sixtus IV issued a papal bull offering indulgences to all those who celebrated the feast of the Immaculate Conception. The ratification of a papal bull in 1483 excommunicating all those who invoked charges of heresy against their opponents in the disagreement on the immaculacy of Mary suggests that the theological debate upholding Mary’s purity was assuming brutish contours. Her immaculacy became an object of avuncular pride for the Franciscans. The Dominicans believed that though a Virgin, Mary was capable of sin. They accused the Franciscans of heresy for equating her with Christ by celebrating her as a woman uncorrupted by Original Sin in her own conception. Because the Altarpiece is in a Franciscan church, the inscription has been taken to indicate a pro-Immaculate Conception sentiment. Heinrich Denzinger, \textit{Enchiridion symbolorum: definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum}, Herder, 1976, no 1400. Denzinger reprints Sixtus IV’s Decree of 28 February, 1476 regarding the Immaculate Conception.


Thus, the Altarpiece was not necessarily a response to the 1476 Bull and may have been earlier. The appearance of seraphim in the Altarpiece may have solidified the Franciscan content for Francis' biographer, St. Bonaventure, believed that seraphim conveyed the stigmata to Francis. In the west nave of the lower basilica of St. Francis of Assisi, a winged seraph floats above Mount Averna with arms extended bearing its own stigmata, presumably in the act of delivering the wounds to Francis. In the Altarpiece, each of the five seraphim bears the inscription AVE GRATIA PLENA, “Hail thee full of grace,” announced by the Archangel Gabriel to Mary when she learned of her pregnancy. The Franciscan theologian Duns Scotus defined Grace as something entirely supernatural, given only by God. The logic here would follow that because Mary was full of grace she was Immaculate.

The immaculacy of the Virgin tied into the Franciscan conception of the liturgy. In De Corpore Christi, St. Bonaventure, a follower of Francis, describes an image of receiving the Eucharist from the Virgin’s own hands. In order to accept or offer communion, one would have to be free of sin, in a state of grace. The inscription related not only to Marian purity but to the purity which was meant to attend the worshipper. In the Liturgy of the Eucharist during Mass, the ideal state of the recipient of the Eucharist would be a “state of grace.” At the time of communion, the worshipper would ideally be free from sin.


140 Levi D’Ancona, 1957, 35. The fracture constructed between the two mendicant orders, the Franciscans and the Dominicans may be overwrought in the literature that defines the Altarpiece. The two saints, Dominic and Francis, were often paired together as founders of two of the largest mendicant orders. The scene also relates to a religious allegory in circulation about a vision Dominic had of God pierced with arrows, symbolizing sin. The Virgin consoled god by saying she has two devoted servants who would stop the world from sin, Francis and Dominic.


A Cure for the Plague: The San Giobbe Altarpiece

In the context of plague-ridden Venice, an Immaculate Madonna, liberated from the tarnish of Original Sin translated to a deliverance from the more literal manifestation of tuber-like buboes and swelling caused by the plague. Regardless of whether the Altarpiece was created for appeals against the plague in 1478 or earlier, the confluence of anti-plague meaning in the Altarpiece was clear. An image of the Madonna and Child stolen by the Venetians during the 1204 Crusade, referred to as the Virgin Nikopaeia, was processed at least twice in 1575 when the Commission for the church of the Redentore was made to end the plague and again in the 1630 after the announcement was made at San Marco that the Santa Maria della Salute would be erected as a plea for an end to pestilence. The Virgin Nikopaeia was allegedly painted by St. Luke the evangelist and her alleged powers of protection were transferred from Constantinople to Venice after the image was stolen. The imagery of the rehabilitated Job and two wounded saints, Francis and Sebastian, before a Madonna provided the key imagery for the metaphor of a healthy Republic in the Altarpiece.

In the records of the confraternities collected by the Commissioner of the Comun, the confraternity of St. Job is obligated to conduct their rituals at the "Madonna Sanità." The Madonna and not Job, seems to have been the descriptive referent for the Altarpiece. The designation is also made in several contemporary testaments. In a seventeenth century testament,
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143 Goffen, 1986, 64. For an argument against the pivotal role the fourteenth-century Black Death may have played in the creation of institutions and art dealing with services and themes related to death see Joseph Polzer, “Aspects of the fourteenth-century iconography of death and the plague,” The Black Death: the impact of the fourteenth-century plague: papers of the Eleventh Annual Conference of the Center for Medieval & Early Renaissance Studies, Binghamton: Center for Medieval & Early Renaissance Studies, 1982, 107-130. By the sixteenth century, the members of the confraternity were obliged to recite mass on the feast Day of St. Dominic, but not on the feast day of the Immaculate Conception. It is likely that the celebrated feast days were defined based on the painting by the time of the seventeenth century when the currency of the debate about the Immaculate Conception had worn off.

144 Hopkins, 3.

145 Bellini and the East, 48.
Giovanni Comin left ten ducats to the “padri di S. Gioppo” in order that many masses would be recited at the “privileged altar of the Madonna’ in the church. In the Provveditore records, the Altarpiece was called the Madonna Sanità likely because the two half-naked saints in the painting, Job and Sebastian, are associated with sickness. Sebastian and Job in the consortium of saints identified this Madonna as the principal enabler to end the plague, but even on her own she was believed to stave off the deadly pestilence. Madonna Sanità may have been a modern designation, decided on after the doge called for the dedication of a church to Madonna della Salute in 1630 to appeal for an end to the plague.

At least since Boccaccio wrote The Decameron, the plague was regarded as the consequence of Original Sin. Giovanni Bartolus wrote that the moral degradation of man brought about the plague. Immaculacy in all of its meanings: theological, medical, and metaphorical was summoned for if it were painted and placed on the wall of a church, the appearance of a healthy Republic under the doge would be maintained. The creation of an altarpiece could vaccinate the city against the plague as effectively as medication given what was known of the disease. When the plague struck the Italian city-states first in 1348, most local governing bodies did not have systems in place to deal the new health crisis nor were there developed theories of contagion with which to deal with containment of the disease. The causes of the disease were unknown, but its symptoms often manifested in blotchy buboes and swelling, signaling imminent death.

146 ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 1, No. V, 55r v. “Zuanne Comin detto Bressarin 1656. Item Lasio che siano contatto ducti dieci alli Padri di S. Gioppo accio mi dichano tante messe all’altar privileggiato della Madona in detta chiesa per l’anima mia.”
The symptoms were identified as obvious signs of suffering and death, but at the time, the cause of the plague was still unknown. For Giovanni Boccaccio, his conception of Florentine religious and civic society was radically changed after the Black Death struck Florence in 1348. In the *Decameron*, Boccaccio’s social body coped with the deterioration of the individual body by the pestilence through willful decadence, while Bellini lionized the Venetian body.

When contemporary medicine proved erratic, hagiographical texts were mined for possible saints to whom freedom from pestilence could be prayed. Often, the saints were local, as in the case of Rose of Viterbo invoked to stave off sickness in her native city during a 1450 eruption of the plague. Worshippers seized upon the flesh wounds and corporeal sufferings of saints as a salve, refracting the harm incurred as though a divine antibody. In 1478, the year given for the creation of the San Giobbe Altarpiece, the *scuola* of St. Roch was formed in Venice. The French saint, Roch, like Rose, lived in the thirteenth century, just about one hundred years before pestilence was perceived as a crisis in the Italian city-states. St. Roch often showed his own buboes on his inner thigh. The most common form of plague was the bubonic plague in which buboes would form all over the skin. These saints played into the system of pollution. The imperfect body meant disease and if there was a saint already sullied with the marks of distress,

---

150 Ibid, 178. The *nobile brigata* that flees the city follow doctor’s orders. They avoid “The depressing affects of seeing and hearing nothing except what betokens death.”
151 Ibid. 1 Chronicles 21: 2, Samuel 24. God became angry by David’s census-taking for it implied that his subjects were his possession. As a result, he decided to punish King David, but allowed the monarch to choose the punishment. David chose the plague. For an argument against the pivotal role the fourteenth-century Black Death may have played in the creation of institutions and art dealing with services and themes related to death see Joseph Polzer, “Aspects of the fourteenth-century iconography of death and the plague,” *The Black Death: the impact of the fourteenth-century plague: papers of the Eleventh Annual Conference of the Center for Medieval & Early Renaissance Studies*, Binghamton: Center for Medieval & Early Renaissance Studies, 1982, 107-130. Terpstra, 1994, 104.
that saint could absorb the potential pollutants that comprised the unknown basis of the plague.\textsuperscript{153}

The Altarpiece depicts very real flesh wounds inflicted on the body and the overcoming of those wounds on the path to blessedness. St. Francis embodies the dual state of the saints. The wounds were not a test of faith like St. Sebastian’s arrows. St. Francis’ wounds were inflicted from above to emulate Christ’s and more explicitly, to demonstrate the way in which the saintly endure physical suffering so that the faithful need not. He has the stigmata, but the sear of the flesh-generated ecstasy rather than pain. The impurity that they have endured on their flesh is trumped by the purity of their sacredness.\textsuperscript{154}

St. Sebastian’s presence in the San Giobbe Altarpiece provides the greatest evidence of the anti-plague sentiment it holds. During the fifteenth century, worshippers commonly appealed to St. Sebastian for protection against the pestilence. Images of Sebastian’s body pierced with arrows appear in several panels meant to ask for divine protection from the carbuncles and buboes which marked the bodies of plague victims. St. Sebastian was a soldier in the Roman army, who was pierced with arrows for turning his back on paganism to become a follower of Christ.\textsuperscript{155} Several scholars have noted that the imagery of St. Sebastian’s arrow plays on the control over pestilence held by Apollo who shot his arrows at will either to cure or attack the

\textsuperscript{153} Douglas, 44.
\textsuperscript{155} Several scholars have noted that the imagery of Sebastian’s arrow plays on the control over pestilence held by Apollo who shot his arrows at will either to cure or attack the pestilence. Homer, \textit{Iliad}, translated by M.S. Silk, 2\textsuperscript{nd} edition, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004, Book I. Louise Marshall, “Manipulating the Sacred: Image and Plague in Renaissance Italy,” \textit{Renaissance Quarterly}, 47/3 (Autumn 1994): 489, 493. (Book of Job, 6:4) van Os, 1994, 28, On images of Sebastian and prayers beseeching the saint for deliverance from the plague.
pestilence. It seems likely that the pre-Christian association with the arrow came to bear on later interpretations of Sebastian as a curer of the plague.

St. Sebastian was actually cured of his arrow wounds only to be beheaded for again refusing to renounce Christ. Like Job, restoration plays into the idea of Sebastian’s salvation narrative for he retained his faith following bodily anguish. The look of tranquility on Sebastian’s face reveals someone at peace with their tortures; the arrows signify a cure or an apotropaic for the plague and not the infection. It is a sign of Sebastian’s martyrdom that he has overcome and now, like Apollo, he has the power to subvert the harm caused by arrows.

It seems likely that the pre-Christian association with the arrow came to bear on later interpretations of Sebastian as a curer of the plague. But in The Book of Job, Job also summons the poisoning effect of arrows in acknowledging that he has been the target of divine poison when he claims, “I was at ease, and he broke me asunder; he seized me by the neck and dashed me to pieces; he set me up as his target, his archers surround me.” Job again invokes the metaphor of projectile injection when he says, “The arrows of the Almighty are in me; my spirit drinks their poison; the terrors of God are arrayed against me.” In the tales of loss, humiliation, and restoration that comprise Boccaccio’s Decameron The nobile brigata—the seven men and three women who each recount ten stories—evoke the seven sons and three daughters of Job.

But the degree to which Job was considered a plague saint may be tied into his poverty. As Ann Carmichael has shown, the association between poverty and pestilence was expressed

157 Book of Job, 6:4.
during the fifteenth century in the form of anti-plague legislation. The loose association between the epidemic and economic hardship persisted into the eighteenth century. In his *A Journal of the Plague Year*, Daniel Defoe written in 1722, Defoe produced in vivid documentary detail an account of the way in which the plague spread and the coping mechanisms in place to deal with it: “But we perceived the infection kept chiefly in the out-parishes, which being very populous, and fuller also of poor, the distemper found more to prey upon than in the city, as I shall observe afterwards.” Clearly, the abject living conditions of the impoverished contributed to the spread of the disease, but the two conditions of Job: sickness and loss reinforced the social impression of the plague and poverty as a vicious circle.

**The Altarpiece about the Plague without its Victims**

Despite the references to the plague contained within the Altarpiece, there is no mention of sufferers of the plague at the convent or hospice of San Giobbe. The confraternity’s liturgical obligations at the altar of St. Job do not contain any prayers for plague victims. While the exclusion of the plague-ridden from the extant documents does not preclude their residence at San Giobbe, widows, pilgrims, and the poor are recorded in residence there which would have made the insertion of a unit for convalescence from the plague a bad idea. Most likely, the majority of plague sufferers went to the Lazaretto Nuovo established by Moro for convalescence.

The Lazaretto had an elaborate quarantine system to ensure containment of the disease. If the hospice of San Giobbe treated those afflicted with the plague, it would seem that the widows or

---

160 William Langland, *Piers Plowman*, edited by Elizabeth Robertson and Stephen H.A. Shepherd, New York: W.W. Norton, 2006. Even in the fourteenth century economic collapse was blamed solely on the spread of the plague. *Piers Plowman* describes a London in which, “Parsons and parish priests complained to the bishop that their parishes were poor since the pestilence time.”
pilgrims who sought refuge at the hospice would have gone elsewhere. The requirement to lay out the body made in the Provveditore records of the confraternity would not have been permitted for plague victims, for the body was to be buried immediately after death.

Rather sinners and the impoverished are most often invoked as the recipients of charity in testaments and prayers recited by the confraternity of Job at its altar. The Madonna Sanità was named as the advocator for the sinners who recite mass at the altar on the day of the Annunciation and exhortations to the members of the confraternity to participate in mass were made in the name of the Madonna Sanità.161 Bellini’s Altarpiece illustrates the divide between history and art history and the negotiation required to fuse the conflicting set of visual and written data. If there was a plague referent in the Altarpiece, why wouldn’t it have been mentioned in the records of the confraternity?

In his 1533 will, Marino Sanudo wrote,

I bequeath to the church of Messir San Sebastiano a very venerable relic, a bone of the saint which belonged to my aunt Sanudo Moro, and which she had religiously preserved by way of a charm against the plague.162

Could Sanudo’s aunt, the Dogaressa Cristina Moro buried in the high chapel with her husband Doge Moro have played a role in the commission? In general, a family tended to use the space in front of an altar over which they held legal rights for burial, but if there was an earlier burial in front of the altar of San Giobbe, it has been replaced with an eighteenth-century slab. Moro died in 1471 and to be sure, there is no particular reference to him in the San Giobbe Altarpiece. But the image of St. Sebastian in the Altarpiece gave form to his wife’s relic, and after Moro died she

161 ASV, Prov. Di Commun, Reg. O 128, Capitolo 22. On the day of the Annunciation, the Madonna Sanità is the “Avvocato per i peccatori.”
might have taken over patronage of the altar to Job. The Altarpiece would have been a “charm against the plague.”

In her 1471 testament written two years before she died, Cristina Sanudo makes reference to her parents and relatives buried at San Giobbe. The family also owned property near the hospice of St. Job, as identified in the anonymous fifteenth-century sketch of the site displaying property boundaries. The presence of their altar in the church patronized by their son-in-law doge points to a political relationship forged by marital ties. There is no record of where Cristina’s parents were buried, but at some point the Sanudo commissioned the altar next to that to St. Job. Carpaccio’s *Presentation of Christ in the Temple* was painted for the Sanudo altar. Though Carpaccio painted the altarpiece in 1516, he clearly looked to the San Giobbe Altarpiece to the right of the Sanudo altar for compositional guidance. The figures in each painting are framed by a large arch and a mosaic-clad niche and the youthful musicians at the base of the throne in the San Giobbe Altarpiece reappear in Carpaccio’s. At one point, the arms of the family adorned the frame and the inscription found in the mosaic of the Altarpiece, AVE VIRGINEI FLOS INTEMERATE PUDORIS, was written across the Sanudo altar. Given the written and painted similarities between the two adjacent altars, it would seem that the Sanudo were promoting an alliance to the earlier altarpiece, likely because it related to the dogate of Moro, Cristina’s husband.

---

163 ASV, Archivio Notarile, Testamenti, Atti Tomei 1238
164 At 4.21 meters, Carpaccio’s *Presentation in the Temple* is about a meter shorter than the San Giobbe Altarpiece. Humfrey, 1993, 124.
165 Cicogna, 651.
"The Cut Faces of Marble:" Job Inscribed in San Marco

The figure of Job, as depicted in the Altarpiece was exceptionally similar to a description given by the architect Filarete in his treatise on architecture written in the 1460s.

One may see an example in Venice in the church of San Marco where there are many slabs in which there are various things made by nature. If you ever go there, look at the entrance to a chapel of the doge and there you will see an actual figure that you will say is painted and in the form of a hermit with a beard, standing with his hands in such a way that he seems to be praying; exactly how this is made I do not know, but it was created by nature; and at the time those two slabs were sawn, and when the two slabs were set together later they showed this figure; look at it well and you will see that I am telling you the truth. And so I have understood that there are many similar images in Hagia Sophia in Constantinople...

That Filarete perfectly describes Bellini’s figure of Job standing against the marble revetment suggests that Bellini deploys another device which affirms a connection to San Marco meant to take place in the San Giobbe Altarpiece. In his depiction of San Marco, he draws on Filarete’s ekphrasis of San Marco. Like Filarete’s chance hermit, Bellini’s Job is a curly haired bearded figure stooped in prayer, crowned with halo standing in what is meant to be San Marco in the seam of two marble panels.

Bellini takes the written description of Filarete’s visual impression, pulls it out of the cut marble, and paints it. Filarete likely based his description of the figure in the marble at San Marco on similar descriptions in circulation about identifiable form in marble or stone, “accidental images.” For example, Albertus Magnus described seeing the head of John the

Baptist in the split marbles of the Hagia Sophia. As Pliny describes them, these Rorschach-like images are “rendered not by art but by nature, through the pattern of the spots.” Leon Battista Alberti wrote of a similar phenomenon in his treatise, *On Painting*. “Nature herself seems to delight in painting, for in the cut faces of marble she often paints centaurs and faces of bearded and curly headed kings…” Descriptions of these images revealed in the marble patterns, however, were often colored in tones of divine vision, particularly when these unintended images were linked to specific religious buildings. Marbles become the repositories for holy impressions and their manifestation in devotional spaces literally set the function of the space in stone.

Like an alchemist, Bellini read and rewrote nature as the privileged artist whose eye is honed to capture the divine image and to reconstitute it through painting for the worshiper to see. Bellini’s representation of San Marco transfers the visual experience of the worshipper at this side altar in San Giobbe to San Marco and not only provides a geographical reference for the painting, but places it in the particular realm of Venetian history, a fusion of events and sacrality. The very act of veneration in an Altarpiece is didactic, but here Job engages the worshiper by assuming his stance. The figure creates a sense of empathy tied to the notion of personal sacrifice through both the subject matter of the Altarpiece and the Eucharist.

Bellini’s figure of Job assumes the countenance of Filarete’s “hermit with a beard,” in the “chapel of the doge” flanked by saints. Bellini’s Job assumes a liminal position in the Altarpiece as both a saint and worshipper; he is haloed, receptive to the prayers of the worshipper, but in veneration of the Madonna and Child. Saints are commonly shown gathering around the Virgin,

---


Alberti, *On Painting*, Bk. II.
but a hierarchy in which they stand in veneration is rare. Job appeals to the Madonna on behalf of the Republic, both for deliverance from political, salutary, and economic misfortune and in gratitude for its assured recovery based on Venice’s infallible image of itself.

Job’s gesture of prayer before the Madonna and Child enthroned in the San Giobbe Altarpiece is one that can be seen in representations of the doges throughout the fifteenth century. Doge Agostino Barbarigo is presented in prayer to the Madonna and Child by St. Mark in a panel now in St. Peter Martyr on Murano and Andrea Vendramin stands in veneration of the Madonna in a sculpture group from his tomb. (Figure 159) In a portrait of Doge Giovanni Mocenigo (1485-92) painted by Carpaccio, he kneels before the Virgin and Child with Saints Christopher and John the Baptist. The Doge is also depicted in prayer much earlier as well. In the twelfth-century mosaic depicting the veneration of St. Mark’s rediscovered relics at the basilica in the Chapel of San Clemente, the doge is clearly labeled, “DUX.” (Figure 160) Along with the patriarch and other government officials, the bearded doge venerates the relics.171 Moro placed himself into this continuum of the praying doge in his own Promissione, where he is shown kneeling in supplication before an image of the Madonna and Child. Because of Job’s rather undefined position in the corpus of saints, his association with the dogate would be unusual, but in the San Giobbe Altarpiece, he universalizes the plight of Venice, alluding to the doge and his role as the effecter of the Republic’s, albeit hopeful, turn towards good fortune in his stance. Like the watercolor depicting Moro genuflecting before the lion on the Arco Foscari described in Chapter 2, the San Giobbe Altarpiece announces Venetian renovatio sustained by the Doge.

The placement of the figure of Job, in supplication before the Virgin and Child, positions Job as an intercessor, as the doge, for Venetian divine ordination. Job becomes the doge. The figure of St. Job in the San Giobbe Altarpiece constitutes a portrait of the dogate and Venice, adorned with a halo rather than a ducal crown, the *corno*. It reflects the ducal patronage of the church for which it was painted, promoting the Office of the Doge as the political authority of the position waned. In Fra Angelico’s San Marco Altarpiece, Sts. Cosmas and Damian pray before the image of the Virgin, they are not necessarily portraits of Cosimo de’Medici who paid for the Altarpiece depicting his name-saint, but the position of the saint in a supplicant position would imply that in this gesture, they refer to a more mundane subject—the patron. (Figure 161)

The pose of Job emphasizes the Republic’s indebtedness to and great devotion to the Virgin but the repetition of the motif evoked Byzantine imagery in which images of the enthroned Christ activate a divine ruler. According to Ernst Kantorowicz, the funerary effigy of the ruler developed around the time of the 1215 Doctrine of Transubstantiation. The effigy claimed the royal presence of the body by substituting the body natural with the frozen image of the king that would serve to stave off fear during the interregnum. Transubstantiation announced the body of Christ in the Eucharist. The sculpted figures of deceased rulers on tombs were more than representations; they were treated as animate objects. In the funerary effigy, the collective memorializing of the social body was activated by the representation of the natural body. By representing his resurrected body for Job at an altar used for the Corpus Domini, Doge Moro would be memorialized by the activity that occurred at the altar. Meals were often offered to the effigy of the king for sustenance of the political body. 172 During the celebration of the mass at the altar to St. Job, the Elevation of the Host would not only be displayed as the body of Christ to

172 Kantorowicz, 426.
the worshippers before his image in the San Giobbe Altarpiece, but it would serve as an expression of the many bodies of Christ that could be present in different spheres and times on earth. One of those bodies could belong to the Doge.

Any claim that the figure of Job represents a specific doge would be speculative, but as an image painted for a church patronized by Moro, Job may very well be a posthumous representation of the Doge. One of Bernardino Pinturicchio’s 1502 panels commemorating the life of Pope Pius II in the Piccolomini family Library in Siena discussed in Chapter 2 offers the only known portrait of Moro with a beard. (Figure 13) The penultimate of the panels in the series shows Pius II disembarking in Ancona with the papal troops for the initiation of his unsuccessful Crusade in 1464. In the panel, the Pope is ceremoniously carried into Ancona on the papal throne and the Venetian galleys can be seen in the background. The physical afflictions that must have heralded his imminent death from old age and gout are concealed. There is a figure kneeling before him to his left who would likely have been the Emperor of Hungary, Matthew Corvinus based on the turban. The pope looks down upon the bearded figure kneeling to his right in an ochre ducal robe, whose corno is being held by an assistant nearby. Historically, it would have to represent Cristoforo Moro, Pius’ ally in the Crusade, who accompanied the Venetian galleys to Ancona.

There is no other representation of Moro with a beard. Unlike all other representations of Moro, Pinturicchio portrays the doge with a beard, but a bearded doge in the 1460s would have been atypical. The papal ambassador to Venice during Moro’s rule, Cardinal Bessarion, was

---


174 The inscription reads, "10 PIVS CUM ANCONA EXPEDITIONE IN TURCOS ACCELERARET EX FEBRE INTERIIT CUIUS ANIMAM HEREMITA CAMALDULEN IN COELUM EFFERRI VIDIT CORPUS VERO PATRUM DECRETO IN URBEMREPORTATUM EST."
famously mocked for his beard by other cardinals following the death of Pius II. While the image of Job can not be assuredly assigned to any particular Venetian, the representation is closer to Pinturicchio’s Doge Moro, adorned with a penitential beard as he vows to help Pius II save Christendom.

The Picture within the Picture

Within the crosier held by St. Louis, there is an image of two armed angels carrying off two half-length figures over what appears to be an altar table. The presence of two half length figures standing side by side over an altar table has a precedent in medieval Rome. Sometime after a fire destroyed the liturgical end of the basilica of San Giovanni in Laterano in 1361, Pope Urban V returned to Rome from Avignon to repair the roof during what was a false end to the Papal Schism. On 1 March 1368, Urban V rediscovered the heads of saints Peter and Paul in the papal chapel. The relics are held in a ciborium designed by Arnolfo di Cambio over the tomb of Pope Martin V in the basilica in reliquaries shaped like the heads of the two saints. (Figure 162 & Figure 163)

In the early sixteenth century, the Venetian artist Lorenzo Lotto portrayed Pope Urban V, not yet canonized, holding a panel with saints Peter and Paul in a barrel vaulted space before the Madonna and Child enthroned. (Figure 164) Worshippers appealed to the beatified Urban V as a curer of the plague, leprosy, restoration of the dead to life. He was also believed to have freed people from Muslim captivity and rescue sailors, all attributes which addressed Venetian concerns. While the Bishop’s hat worn by the saint identified as Louis in the San Giobbe

177 F. Martinucci, Intorno le reparazioni esguite all’altare papale Lateranense e suo Tabernacolo, Rome, 1854.
Altarpiece is not as elaborate as that worn by the popes, it is possible that Bellini meant to invoke this obscure beatified pope who patronized a hospital which cared for poor sailors as the plague ravished the city.

The images of Sts. Peter and Paul are also important in the legends of Emperor Constantine. In one of thirteenth-century panels depicting the Legend of Constantine from the Chapel of St. Sylvester in the church of San Quattro Coronati in Rome, the leprous Constantine has a dream in which Peter and Paul appear to him, telling him to ask Pope Sylvester for a cure to his skin disease. Paul and Peter brought about an end for Constantine's physical suffering but they also provided a visual cue for the liturgical center of the Constantinian church in the ciborium of San Giovanni.

In the same Chapel of St. Sylvester, there is another fresco depicting the Donation of Constantine, the spurious document that granted Pope Sylvester I control of the Church as granted by Emperor Constantine. In about 1440, the Humanist Lorenzo Valla had made a case for it as a forgery based on its language. He dated it to 800 and attributed it to Charlemagne as an attempt to assert the primacy of the emperor over the papacy. In the fresco at San Quattro Coronati, Constantine hands over the papal tiara to the Pope after telling him about how Peter and Paul helped cure him of leprosy with the help of Sylvester's teachings. (Figure 32) Both pope and emperor are covered by parasols, helping to confirm the function of these umbrellas as signs of diplomacy, a sign that Venice later adapted to express its power. The overall effect is one which alludes to a Byzantine past and a Roman origin for Venice.

Conclusion

While this chapter began by addressing the art historical discourse of the San Giobbe Altarpiece with an assessment of its chronology and patronage, I tried to the move beyond the
course of study which tends to be directed at the altarpiece and move to the ritual function of the image. In *Likeness and Presence*, Hans Belting distinguishes between medieval and Renaissance images which had ritual connotation and those which played a role in the drama of the Christian liturgy. The evidence tying Doge Moro to the Altarpiece is largely circumstantial, but just as the executors of the Doge’s will continued to lobby the Council of Ten to improve and enlarge San Giobbe in honor of Doge Moro after his death, the program of the Altarpiece suggests that it reflects the church’s ducal patronage.

For a Doge who tried to align himself with the reform movement of the church in the form of the Observant Franciscans, recalling its earliest days provided a way to show support for the movement. But the San Giobbe Altarpiece illustrates how, in a city cloaked in Republican mores, Moro tried to subvert the signs of equality and evoke an imperial tradition in the identity of his rule. In this vague detail of the double portrait of the crozier lay a microcosm for Moro’s rule: one with princely ambitions, interested in creating networks of imagery to the past and the East, and ultimately, indiscernible in the details.

As the reconstituted Job inhabits a hospice patronized by Doge Moro, Bellini’s Altarpiece constructs a metaphor which asserted the healing powers of the Republic’s leader. The idea of the statesman as medic would have translated into political clout at a time when Venice was politically unstable. But the metaphor pushed at the edges of reality as outbreaks of the plague raged across the lagoon. In the San Giobbe Altarpiece, all of the optimism of the society has

---


been placed on Job’s body; the Altarpiece denies the inevitable death of the body. Venice fashioned itself as a serene and judicial Republic which transcended the factional strife that tore through Florence. This myth of the serene Venice shrouded its problems and served to stave off the potential breakdown of the Republic. The San Giobbe Altarpiece is one of the points of entry into these myths.

---


Conclusion

In this study, I discussed Doge Christoforo Moro’s campaign to reconstruct the image of his political career through his artistic and charitable patronage. Moro ruled over a Venice that was dealing with new threat to its territory, its religion, and its public health. I tried to understand the ideology of Moro’s patronage, how it might relate to external political pressures, and how his works diverge from conventional modes of ducal representation. Doge Moro, like many patrons, had a particular understanding of how collective memory could replace history in Renaissance Venice. In Mystic Chords of Memory, Michael Kammen wrote that, “Societies reconstruct their pasts rather than faithfully record them.”¹ For Jan Assman, cultural memory is a, “Body of reusable texts, images, and rituals specific to each society in each epoch whose ‘cultivation’ serves to stabilize and convey that society’s self image.”² Assmann’s understanding of cultural memory encapsulates Doge Cristoforo Moro’s program of artistic patronage. Each of Doge Moro’s acts of patronage throughout the city showed him laboring to undo the problematic history of his dogate through visual imagery. Moro turned meetings with future saints into prophesies, a failed Crusade became a signature act of piety, and in his final act of self-definition—his burial monument—pride was converted into humility. When Venetian autonomy and the control of the government were threatened, ducal patronage could overturn the more threatening realities.

Moro distinguished his patronage from that of most other doges primarily through the heroes and patrons of Venetian history that he promoted in defining his own rule. He evoked Sebastiano Ziani, the doge exalted in Venetian history for forging a peace between the Emperor and Pope in his patronage, and he promoted his personal saint protector, Bernardino of Siena. By evaluating Moro’s relationship to St. Bernardino, it becomes evident that the Doge understood the process of self-projection and myth. During his dogate, Moro embarked on a program to characterize his rule as one sanctified by Bernardino. The saint’s prediction of Moro’s rule validated the office of the doge as one managed from above as Venice faced the threat of the Turks and the loss of territory. Bernardino of Siena, lived, died, and was canonized during an average lifespan in the fifteenth century. Champions of Bernardino, like Moro, took an active hand in reconstructing the events of his life, but they also took pleasure in watching Bernardino grow from ascetic to preacher to saint. In his artistic and architectural commissions, Doge Moro not only drew on the saint’s hagiography but helped to write it.

But Moro’s projects throughout Venice fit into a typology of ducal power: coins commemorated his election as doge, his coat-of-arms decorated sites of ceremonial importance. Even his identification of a personal patron saint, to whom he could genuflect and pray for Venetian well-being, fit a long-established tradition. Moro, like other doges, was often depicted in supplication before the Madonna and Child, presented by his patron saint, Bernardino. The mutually beneficial relationship between future doge and future saint formed the basis for Moro’s personal imagery throughout his dogate. The real and the fictive relationship between the Doge and St. Bernardino corresponds to the larger context of Venetian history framed by the
theft of St. Mark’s relics and Mark’s protection of the city.\(^3\) One of the ways in which Venice portrayed itself as a perfectly functioning republic was to promote the idea that St. Mark the Evangelist chose for his relics to rest in Venice. I believe Moro engages this foundational narrative in his promotion of Bernardino and in his attempt to transport the relics of St. Luke the Evangelist to Venice. The message, I have argued, is that under Moro, Venice would be restored to the glory with which it was imbued when the doge had more authority and the burgeoning city was capable of staving off foreign powers.

While imagery was employed to offer the suggestion that the voting process was overseen by divine will, chronicles helped situate the ducal families on the lagoon. Ensuring that the landscape of Venice factored into Moro’s history was a distinctly Venetian characteristic of representation as well. Venice was overtly anti-dynastic and doges were elected by a complex voting system meant to stamp out the possibility of factionalism or corruption, yet legitimate heritage and sustained residence on the lagoon were prerequisites for the dogate by the time Moro was elected.\(^4\) For Venetian identity, ancestral roots in the lagoon became a hallmark of republicanism.\(^5\) Thus, the names of relatives believed to have founded the islands in the fifth century were exhumed and attached to the name of the doges. Moro’s post as Procurator of San Marco and suppressor of the Trieste uprising was reconfigured in history as behavior that had
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been inherited from his Procurator grandfather and an ancestor who defeated the Triestini in the thirteenth century. Moro’s individual history elided with his family’s history and all of Venice. Moro rigorously promoted the constitution of Venetian civic identity as a Republic that was in existence and which would succeed due to a mandate by god.

The representation of the doges in death perpetuated the image of a divinely overseen Venice. John Ruskin was one of the first to take up the study of the doges’ tombs about sixty years after the last doge was deposed by Napoleon in 1797. In the *Stones of Venice* written between 1851-3, Ruskin provided an assessment of the first extant ducal tombs—presumably beginning with the earliest in existence: that of Doge Jacopo Tiepolo at Santi Giovanni and Paolo from the mid thirteenth century. Ruskin believed that these early tombs reflected a reserve appropriate to the Republic. He wrote,

> We find the early tombs at once simple and lovely in adornment, severe and solemn in their expression; confessing the power, and accepting the peace of death, openly and joyfully; and in all their symbols marking that the hope of Resurrection lay only in Christ’s righteousness…

Then, things degenerated. “But the tombs of the later ages are a ghastly struggle of mean pride and miserable terror, the one mustering the statues of the Virtues about the tomb, disguising the sarcophagus.” It is unclear when exactly, for Ruskin, the tombs became disagreeable. He found “utter coldness of feeling” in the tomb of Andrea Vendramin dated to about 1476 but he also complains about the tombs after Vendramin’s for they refused to show the doge recumbent in death. Rather the figures tossed aside their pillows and, “raised themselves on their elbows, and began to look round them.” Ruskin found the rejection of death

---
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distasteful in a burial monument. For Ruskin, the greater the fear of death, the more aggrandizing the tomb. Ruskin ascribes moral value to those monuments which embrace death and criticizes those which treat death as an unnatural process that needed to be concealed and Philippe Aries noted a change from early modern to modern burial monuments in the way in which death was acknowledged in each. Ruskin’s assessment of ducal tombs illustrates how difficult it is to understand breaks like Moro’s within a genre. Regardless of the flaws in Ruskin’s progression of monuments from modest to fantastical, his understanding of the ducal monument as a reflection of what image the individual doge wished to impart to posterity stands at the core of our understanding of these monuments and continues to thread through later explorations of the ducal tombs in Venice.

In devising a model with which to approach the tomb, I looked at burial slabs of high ranking church and political officials both in and outside of Venice. That the slab of Doge Moro at San Giobbe can not be seen at eyelevel where most tombs were generally displayed nor read like a text for iconographic interpretation, it requires an alternative approach for study. The stress in the burial is focused on the position of the body and its posthumous index, the marker. Because Moro’s tomb marker at San Giobbe was integrated into the fabric of the church on the ground, its placement in the church takes precedence over its visual attributes and markings. The production of its meaning can not be divorced from its architectural context. I tried to account for the bodily demands made on the viewer that other tombs do not, for it forces the viewer to look down as though in the form of a mirror of humility. The burial monument of Moro was activated by both its position in front of the altar and by the position it forced the worshipper to assume.

Compendia of burial slabs have been published, and there are countless well-preserved examples throughout the Italian city-states. Studies that look at burial slabs often undertake the
monumental task of cataloguing the slabs or they focus on the slabs as discreet aesthetic objects that can divulge stylistic transformations in sculptural practice. I focused instead on the experience of the funerary slabs during the Renaissance. In order to try to define a set of parameters, I concentrated on literary references to tomb slabs. I found that many theological and medieval literary sources assigned spatial positions to humility, but I began with the frequent requests for burial markers that expressed humility in the testaments of those high ranking political and church officials buried under slabs. I believe that the notion of humility has been taken for granted and glossed over in studies of Renaissance burial commemoration for it was a stance that was generally taken in preparations for death. Spatially, Moro gives in to theological conceptions of humility. St. Bernard defines it as, “A virtue by which a man knowing himself as he truly is, abases himself.” The humble were promised exaltation and a place above, in heaven, while the prideful, were warned that they would be forced into the lowly position they consciously rejected in life. Moro’s rejection of the wall monument in itself gives into the virtue of humility as recognition of one’s limits as defined by St. Thomas Aquinas.9

Despite the humility inherent in the Doge’s slab, the common rhetorical tropes in praise of the Doge’s piety and devotion, and his patronage of a church and hospice that served the poor, his interventions around the basilica of San Marco emerge as instances of ducal power. Even in his tomb, I argue, the prominence of his family coat-of-arms which adorn the entrance to the chancel, the size of his tomb, and its position on axis with the high altar belie the humility inherent in the slab. The production history of Moro’s work in the high altar chapel of San Giobbe shows that his sponsorship of the rebuilding of the church on the outskirts of Venice afforded him complete control. In the 10,000 ducats he donated to the church for its

9 For Thomas Aquinas, humility, “consists in keeping oneself within one’s own bounds, not reaching out to things above one, but submitting to one’s superior” (Summa Contra Gent., bk. IV, ch. lv).
enlargements, in changing the dedication of the high altar and requesting burial before it, and in prohibiting anyone from meddling with his burial requests. The doge persuaded the Venetian senate to make Bernardino the first saint protector of the Republic in 500 years, since St. Mark, ensuring that his burial slab would lie before a saint who protected the entire city. Thus, I see the conflicting personas of the doge as a religious man and one who carefully planned the presentation of his legacy for popular memory. Doge Moro participated in an attempt to appear pious and humble, in contrast to his counterparts who merged their individual personas with the glory of the state in their monuments.

Moro’s patron-saint, Bernardino of Siena would not have approved of his burial scheme. During one of his public sermons, he railed against the conspicuous display of personal insignia.

At the churches where they bring their *stemme* and their arms with their standards and place them high up in the church in memory of he who has died, as if, until his death, he had adhered to such adoration of the Lord. I have even seen coats-of-arms adorning the top of the crucifix. So when I see these things, I say, ‘O Lord God, Oh, you have the devil over you, and he is pissing on your head.’

Enough.¹⁰

St. Bernardino was not complaining about anyone in particular in his sermon of 1427, but church burials continued to invoke the wrath of several theologians throughout the fifteenth century, culminating with Savonarola. At the end of the fifteenth century, preachers like Savonarola were still criticizing church burial. He declared, “Only saints should be buried in the church. Even worse are those great masters who bury themselves beneath the altar, where daily
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the holy sacrament is delivered.” The preacher likely had Cosimo de’ Medici in mind when he railed against ostentatious burials. Cosimo was also placed in front of the high altar and under a dome just after his 1464 death. Cosimo had asked for a burial in the church of San Lorenzo in Florence marked by a slab that was “low and humble.” His burial arrangement must have served as a model for Moro’s tomb made only six years later. Moro ruled as Cosimo de’ Medici prepared for death, and like Cosimo, he took over the patronage of an entire church. Cosimo de’ Medici serves as the closest analogue to his patronage, but rulers and oligarchs throughout the Italian city-states adapted similar schemes.

Why would Moro have broken from ducal burial convention in Venice? Moro ruled Venice after the 1453 Fall of Constantinople shook the stability of the Venetian military and posed ominous threats to Republican autonomy. Closer to home, virulent outbreaks of the plague assailed the lagoon. In July 1470, the penultimate year of Moro’s rule, Negroponte, the seat of Venetian power in the Aegean Sea, had fallen to the Turks. While descriptions of the bloodshed that accompanied the takeover of Constantinople were often tempered by accounts of Sultan Mehmet II’s admiration of the city, the reports of the Turks landing at Negroponte are more gruesome. At least 30,000 residents of the Venetian colonial outpost, including Venetian officials, were said to be massacred as Mehmet breached the fortified city. The island fell quickly under Turkish power. Now, with the Aegean controlled by the Turks, their penetration into the Adriatic seemed plausible.

In September 1470, a few months after the loss of Negroponte became the burning policy issue in Venice, Moro wrote out his final testament and had his tomb slab carved. The Fall of Negroponte may have been the blow struck during Moro’s dogate that persuaded him to abandon

---

established ducal burial norms. Moro’s election and his plans for crusade were commemorated in Venice, but by the time he prepared for death, the traumas faced by the Republic and indeed all of Italy, may have required a different type of burial monument—one that did not glorify the reign of a doge who had just seen the Republic through one of its greatest crises. Rather, Moro’s monument represents a penitential leader, atoning for the circumstances that rendered the fall of the Republic conceivable.

Moro’s tomb, a burial slab placed in the ground in the high altar chapel, represented a temporary break from ducal burial tradition in Venice. By focusing on the tomb of the Doge, I evaluated the evolving nature of commemoration practice, and I tried to devise an approach to the study of a commemorative object that can not be read as an iconographic text like many other contemporaneous ducal tombs. Moro’s monument consciously challenged standard notions of civic representation in Renaissance Venice in its modesty and location. In the ground, Moro embraced death and the changes it wrought on one’s body. The tombs of the doges were meant to represent celebrated lives, but Moro rejected the traditional heroic figurative monument in favor of a simple floor slab. He specified in his will that he wanted to be buried without honor but it is unclear as to whether he was referring to the pomp of ducal funerary exequies or his eternal monument. The monument of Moro changed the commemorative landscape of Renaissance Venice. The history of his rule was not addressed explicitly in the monument, but it expressed his humility and piety. In the case of Moro’s monument, the commemorative act is completed not only by the worshipper reading it, but by the act of prayer that takes place at the high altar in front of it. In a Venice which was desperately optimistic in its visual representation, Moro’s monument does not idealize the Doge, but asks for deliverance.12

12 Young, 1990, 90-105.
APPENDIX

Document 1
ASV, Arti 152, Forneri Atti Diversi 1447-1797.
“Christophaus Maurus Dei Gratia Dux Venetiarum et Universis, et singulis fidelibus nostris tam presentibus, quam futuris presentes litteras inspecturis patent evidenter. Eorum suplocaatum est nuper nostro dominio nomine fidelium nostrorum Universitatis fomariorum huius nostre civitatis Venetiarum, ut cum inter eos sint multi et state et variis segritudinibus confecti; et quotidie accidat quod multi eorum etiam ob multa infortunia in paupertatem deveniant, quibus non habent modum subveniendi in dictis eorum necessitatibus; cum non habeant aliquod receptaculum necque domos idoneas ubi ipsos tenere curare alere possint et ob hoc multi pereunt defectu provisionis, et cure, qui evaderent si talis comoditas haberetur; et propterea implorabant et de benignitate et gratia nostra sibi concederemus ut pro dicta eorum Universitate et Schola possent emere, et acquivere ins hac nostra civitate Venetiarum unum teritorium, seu domos ubi habite et comode fabricare, et instriere possint habitatores, et domos pro remedio, et subuentione ac comoditate pauperu predictorum, sicut et alii scholis pro similis causa a nobis concesu est. Duamobue pro consuetudine nostra erga fideles nostros preseritru res pias, atque honestas postulantes. Visa responsione Vivoru Nobilium provisiorum Nostorum commis consulentium dictam concessionentes cum nostris consiliis minori de dieci, et maiori facimus eis gratiam sicut petierunt, et dicti Provisiores nostril consuluerunt; in cuius rei fides et evidential pleniore presentes has fieri iussimut, et bulla nostra plumber pendente muniri. Data in nostro Ducali palatio die vigesimo nono mensis lunis, Indicyione decimal tertia, anno 1465.”

Document 2
ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 5, xlviii, 15r-16r, 13 December 1569.
“Nel 1560 del mese di Marzo, havendo il q.m Zuanne Marcello all’hora Prior del ditto ospedal fabicato parte sopra un muro proprio et parte accostatosi aproprio la nostra Capella Granda pregiudicandone proprio tereno, a grave Danno, et pregiuditio delle raggion di monasterio nostril, e per il Reverendo Guardian di quel tempo fu ottenuto chiamor, e Commandato a lui Prior non dovesse continuar la fabrica, come in esso chiamor, e commandato. Dove, che redutosi per tal causa vostre li sopra il loco, et visto bene e diligentemente le raggioni, et grave me di esso nostro ponevissimo monasterio sapendo, che era nececssario a destruga la fabrica predetta, et slontanarsi da essa nostra Capella, onero muro con molto discomodo, et spesa di esso ospedale vedendo anco re: padre: Clarissime che essa nostra capella era in termine di cascara, et rovinarsi con evidente pericolo d’un giorno amazar tutti li frati che in coro si troverca.

Sapendo la poverta nostra fu promesso per il tanto commodo che esso ospedal riceveva da noi, di porgerne qualche aguito per la reformatione et reparatione della Capella predetta del che volendo il reverendo Guardian qualche chiarezza, fu proposti due partiti l’uno di formar una scritura in tal material da esser sottoscritta per vostre S:rie, l’altro che il chiamor predetto doveste continuar et romanir fermo per cautione delle raggioni nostre sino alla perletione, et sottoscrittione di essa scrittura. La quale essendo sta formata, et data al Claris.mo Alessandro Tiliol per la reformatione, et sottoscrittione.
Per li molti negori di S.S. Cl.ma et per la poca cura dell’Intervenienti del monasterio per che essa scrittura smarita dove, che il chiamor, et commandamento prdetto e rimasto ferm si come si puol veder per virtu del quale sempre possiamo far destruer essa fabrica, e dar molto discomodo et spesa al ospedal predette: il che non essendo de nostra opinione ma ben di veder con bona gratia vostra di reformar essa nostra Capella et asecurarsi la vita...."

**Document 3**

ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 8.

"De mandato dlli Reverendi et Clar.mi s.vi al tribunal della Santa Inquisitione, se fa proclamar al tenor Insfrascritto. Essendo sta alli giorni passati levato per tutta questa citta una falsa et giotenesca calumnia contra li ven.di frati di san job all or.ne di san francesco de osservantia zoccolanti de alcuni incogniti, quali in obbrobrio et desion di tutta la religion per detta hano falsamente desseminato, che li fratti per dicti di san job habbino sotterato uno frate vivo, con un sbadacchio in bocca, con torzi accesi alle quatro hor di notte, et con altri false, et ementite corconstantie, come normai a tutta la terra et no. Et cendone sta formato un longo processo per li per ditti R.mi et clar.mi s.ri del ordine del serenissimo Principe et dell ill.ma s.ia in pleno collegio et conosciuto chiamamente la ditta falsa colunnia, et infamia haver hanuto origine da huomeni di pessima coditione, et fama. Et desiderando le sue s.ie Reverendosme et Clar.me che tutte quelle tal persone incognite, le quali malignamente hano calumniato ditto moasterio et fratti di San Job contra la verita, et in dispregio, dishonor, et infamia, della loro s.ta Religione siano manifestate alla institia, accio possino haver il suo debito castigo. Per6 si fa a saper oer il ponte publico proclama del mandato et smmossione delle perdetti s.ri soper le heresie, che se alcuna persona di qualunque grado, et condition essere si voglia manfesara in termine di giorni vinti dopai la publication del ponte proclama alcun reo complice, et particpe, qual se habbia ingerido, così in publico, come in secreto a dar origene, over aiuto, et favor alla infamia perditta, contra li preditti fratti Z, et mendicanti, de qua super. Item che per la sua manifestation si regnara il luce della verita guadagni lire cinquencento de pizzoli delli beni delli delinquenti, et accusati ut super, se ne sarano, se no delli beni del off.o della s.ta Inquisitione. et sera’ tenuti secreti et de piu per il ponte proclama se fa intender a caduana personasia di qual condition esser si voglia, che de cetero non ardisca dir, affermar, ne manco scriver fora di questa Terra, che in la chiesa de San Job sia intervenuto il caso ditto di sopra per esser una ribaldesca, et giotonesca colunnia falsa, et ementita in tutte le sue perte, come e’ ditto di soper sotto quelle strettissime pene che all’arbirio della s.ta clar.mi s.ri appareva convenisse. Et se alcuno manifestara una prosontuosi. Item che per la sua manifestation se regnara il luce del delinquete guangani similmente. L 500. da esser pagati in li beni di delinquenti, et malfactti predetti, et sia tenuto secreto da esser pagati ut super. Ex officio se inquisitionis venetiarum die 14. junii.1561."

**Document 4**

ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 4, XLI, 82r-86v.

"15 Sett. 1609 Dichiarando, che per le cose ut supora fatte, non li intenda fatto alcun benche piccolo preudito alle ragioni dell’altra commissaria, ne in questa in modo alcuno derogato, anzi che questa vesti confermata nella sua Patronia libera, che haveva, et ha tutta via della detta capella, et Altare, obligandosi ditto Sig. Pre, et supra interveniente, far poner nelli pedestali delle colone, o nel frontispicio di ditto Altare l’arma del Serenissimo P. Moro sudetto, in segno della Patronia, che ha la sudetta comissaria della predetta capella, et Altare. Per le qual tutte cose d’esser attese, et osservate esse parti contrabenti hanno obligato, et obligano tutti questi beni di
ditto Monasterio, et commissaria, rispettive di cadauna sorte presenti, e future, et in cadaun logo esistenti. De et semper quibis omnibus, et singulis voyaverunt presens instrumentus....

"21 Maii 1622. Havendo li m.o R. Pri di S. Giobbe di questa città principatio à far fare i banchi nella capella grande della sua chiesa, qual capella è di ragion della commissaria della felice memoria del Serenissimo Principe Moro, come si vede dal suo testamento, e d’una confessione fatta da essi Pri m.o Rv.dri per istrumento celerbato l’anno 1591, 19 Genaro nell’atti di D. Luca Gabrieli Nodaro di Venezia, alla qual opera havendosi apposto la Scuola di S. Bernardino con commandamenti fatti ad essi m.o Reverendi Pri per l’officio de medesmi Sig. Proveditori di comun, che dovessero d’estruger quello che era fatto, sive d’esister da quello, che havevano principiato a far fare, il che intese dal Sig. Zorzi Querini Commissario di detta Comissaria per metter gusete fra detti m.o R.di Pri, et i Fratelli di detta Scuola, et acciò dette differenze non apportino scandalo a devoti, e diano causa di marmoratione, essercitando la sua autorità. Per vigor del ponte publico istrumeto dichiara, come da, et concede licenza ad essi m.o Reverendi Pri di far finir essi banchi gia principiati con questo però, che siano obligate farli far l’arma d’esso Serenissimo prencipe in loco conspicuo, per segno della Patronia, che ha la d.a commissaria in essa capella, e volendo anche metterli l’arma della sua religione per segno d’haver loro fatto quella spesa, lo possino fare. et accioche per l’avvenir non succeda per simil causa più tali differenze, però dichiara come da’ el concede licenza ad essi m.o R.di Pri. di poter far far in essa capella tutti quei concieri el adornamento con di quadri, come di pitture, e di qual’altra sorte, che li paressero bisogni, con obligo però di far sempre metter l’arma d’esso Serenimssimo Prencipe sopra tutto quello, che faranno fare per perch’el altar d’essa capella è stato sempre l’altar di S. Bernardino, sopra il quale s’attrovava anco gia tempo la testa, et per pigie d’esso s. Bernardino di relieve, qual era inanzi essa palla, qual Testa fu levata dai predetti m.o R.P., e portata nella sagrestia e doppo levata anco la palla d’esso altare e posto vi il serenissimo Sacramento con le figure di rilievo si S. Bernardino, e s. Francesco, il che pero fu fatto con licenza d’esso medesmo commissario, come appar per istrumento celebrato nellì atti di D. Fabrizio Federigo Figolini Nodaro di Venetia sotto li 19 settembre 1609. per devotion del qual santo essendosi gia tanti anni levata la scuola di S. Bernardino qual ha fatto sempre, e fa diverse spese a Gloria di sua divina Maestà, e viverenza d’esso Santo, però detto M.mo commissario per virtù del presente istrumento da, e concede licenza ai Fratelli di detta scuola di poter far, celebrar in essa capella, e inanzi esso Altare le sue solite messe, e officii, con quella sorte di Musici, e quantità di cera, che li parerabbi dando però sempre la solita limosina ad essi m.o R.P., e di più li da, e concede licenza di poter far far in essa Capella tutti quei concieri, et adornamenti con di quadri, come di pitture, o altro che li paressero necessarii, con obligo però de far metter l’arma d’esso serenissimo Prencipe sopra tutto quello, che daranno fare, non potendo però far cosa alcuna, se prima non faranno intender ad essi m.o R.P. quello che voranno fare....

Document 5

"...Essendo che l’anno 1583 li 6 ottobre per li Reverendi Padri del Monasterio du San Giob. Di questa citta delle ordine di San Francesco de Osservanti sia stano concesso al Eccl.o Sig.o Lorenzo Priuli hora patriarca di Venecia, luoco della capella maggiore d’essa chiesa, la qual cappella insieme col’altar Grande di S. Bernardino posto in essa e di ragione del q Serenissimo Doge Moro di poster far Arca, et ivos portare esso altare da loco a loco e refabricarlo da novo con li modi ordini Hobrighi e condicione come appar per instrumento fatto nelli atti del q In
Iambattista Ruention Hodoro di Venezia sono detto giorno del havendo l’eccss.o In Zorzi Querini fu dell’Eccss.o Signore Vicenzo Moro delli Commessarii del detto q Serenisimo P Moro per tal causa tratenuto a detti RP i danari per del Pro del Monte Vecchio cioe la paga di Moro 1511 lasciatoli per il testamento del detto serenissimo per fabricare, e ordinare detto chiesa, viver et vestire de i detti Padri a fabricare il detto monasterio come per li tempi parera esser piu de bisogno iusta la sua ordinacione, et havendo ando quelli a tal effetto posti in banco Gradenigo, come partida di esso banco appore sono li 9 decembrio 1589 per voler di essi dar lui principio alla Fabrica del sopradetto Altare, il che savia in grandissimo danno di detto Monasterio, rispetto olli molti debiti, e qua poverta, nella quale al presente detti Padri si ritrovare, da che Mosso il detto Illustrimo et reverendo Patriarca cose ricercolo da essi R. P. Habbia a quello volentariamente rinociata la detta cessione, come appar nelli atti di M Gasparo fabbio Nodaro di Venezia sotto li Ottobre prossimo passato. Onde volendo essi RP memori di molti beneficii ricenti e che receberano da detto serenissimo P Loro perpetuo benefaturo puder che per l’avenire non occori simili disordini, e per poter con piu facilita anco haver li sopra detti denari per suo sostentamneto lasciati. Pero a tole effecto nell’infracineto loro congregato solenmente al suono di Campanella come e costume ...

Document 6
ASV, Collegio Notatorio, Reg. 10, 48r, 177.
“MCCCCLXI die XX januarii. Alias de anno 1445 die x Augusti facta firit gratia et concessium per nostrum maius consilum ad instantia civium et habiatorum super que fundamento et Latere canalis canaregli: quod fieri et construi facere possent unum pontem Ligneum cum ganaratis super dicto canali seu rivo per quem iri et tranfiri possit ab uno latere ad aliud pro comodo omnium qui pons fieri deberet et teneri in concio omnibus eorum expensis illa prima inte et ab inde ultra ad eorum beneplacitum. Cum itaque dictus pons factus et constructus dierit secondum formam dicte gratie. Ut comodius ivi, et transivi posse tab uno later et ad eccliam sanctorum Bernardini et Job. Et ad presens dictus pons tendat in ruinam, et indigent nova reparacione, et constructione et primi pales nobiles nostri, et multi ali cives qui habent domos et possessiones in canareglo, sint contenti et offerant contribuere pro rata et portione eos tangente ut idem pons reficiatur, ficit constat per eorum propriam scripturam quise in quodam fulo manu propria subscripturunt ad requisitione, et instatiam venerabilium, et religiosorum fratrum dicte eccle sanctorum Bernardini et Job. Infrasti consiliarii pro executione dicte gratis alias capte in maior consilio ac voluntatedictorum civium et habitaratum canaregli, deliberarunt, et terminarut, quod dictus pons, mine et per futura tempora, fieri, construi, et reparari debeat, ac teneri in concio, ad expensas omnium civium et Parochianorum habentium possessiones in illa contrata et parrochia s. Hieremie de Canaregio.”

Document 7
ASV, Archivio Notarile, Testamenti, Atti Tomei 1238.
“Item volemo chel nostro corpo star deba hore xxiiii sopra terra prima sia seppelito, et sia veghiato di conbardetto da quarto bone persone alequel sia dato ductorum uno per una per lor mercede. Item lassemo el sia vestito quatro bone persone di sia experso ductorum xx per anima nostra. Item chel sia celebratorum messe mille per anima nostra el sepelir del corpo meo et per la qual celbretion sia desponsato ugal mentorium ductorum xxx oro...le qual mansionarie volemo che siamo ductorum inperpetu uu celebrando ogni di messa per lanima nostra una nela chiesa de missier san salvatore de venexa per quelli religiosi che sono di che serano per li futuri
et l’altra nela chiesa de Sancto Bernardin di Sancto Job per quelli religiosi che e al presente che se trovano, e troveranossi nel dicto loco per l’anima de nostro padre di nostra madre, di fradelli, e di sorelle nela qual chiesa volemo chel corponostro sia tumulato di sepulto cioe nelarcha dove e sepulto el corpo del nostro dilecto consorte missier christopalo moro olin inclitto dove ut supre per la quel sepultura volemo sia dato per l’elemosina ala ditta chiesa ductorum cinquanta oro per lanima nostra.”

Document 8
ASV, San Giobbe, Busta 2, xxii, 23r. 1549.
“...el corpo mio benche larcha nostra sia a s. Francesco nel inclauastro voglio essendo io de questa contra et li frati tutti cum ordine esser sepulto nella chiesa de s. job, dove se vita sara espenso cum aiuto de dio far far una capella cum una archa, che se la faro voglio el corpo et osse de mia madre et mio fratello siano portati da san Francesco et messi in ditta archa a s. job, et se io macharo anali in fazi far voglio esser sepulto a san Francesco in una cassa in dita archa nostra che non voglio dapi de mi in uno fazi far tal capella perche vedo mai non se compira tal cosa, ma se la principiero avanti che io manch. Voglio et ordino in sia compita et esser sepulto mi et li miei in quella come ho ditto, non voglio ceremonie de honori non y schivar spesa, ma y che mi parenon ponpenon covenicte a tal cose et tempi. Non voglio sexunti, el capitollo della mia contra I mansionarii aliquid siano datti ducati diexe forse dice 1.25. et siano obligate ql di et li segneche dir messe centoy tal limosine nella sua gesia, volglio li frati di s. job over s. Francesco nii vegnino afor de chasa over de gesia dove saro, dico li frati dove saro sepulto, et da loro portato se cusi vorano, vestito del suo habitio, et se non vorano portarani, trovar homini da ben iin portion, et pragarli, ne voglio oltra che forze diexe grosse nel compagnarmi.”
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