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Abstract

The rapid urban development in Renaissance Rome meant constant excavation and the daily (re)discovery of antique arts and artefacts from the city’s rich classical past. As Rome’s new population began to unearth the domain of their native ancestors, they exercised a great deal of care to preserve the antiquities they found and to acquire and assemble collections. Subsequently, Renaissance families would construct new architecture (i.e., exterior facades, villas, sculpture gardens, etc.) for the purpose of their display. The resulting socio-cultural landscape saw that nearly all noble homes in Rome boasted a collection of antiquities accessible for viewing by guests by the end of the 1400s. The aim of this study will be to understand the motivations for such display; be the collections shallow exhibitions of taste, simply means for cultural preservation (cf. private museums), considered political strategy, instruments for the construction of social identity, or some combination thereof. Naturally, these motivations are contingent on the identities of the collectors who curated the groups. As such, the scope of my research will focus on one family’s collection, the del Bufalo at Rome, as both its curators and motivations shift from generation to generation, serving as an exemplar of the period on the whole.

This thesis offers a complete history of the family’s sculpture garden (c. 1450-1600 CE) in the Trevi district at Rome: offering the correct genealogy of the family, dates for curatorship, specific installation programs per individual, and the complete known contents of the garden. This collection of antiquities was chosen as it is understudied in and of itself despite being cited as the fifth largest collection in Rome at the time by Ulisse Aldrovandi and its many connections to the Farnese, d’Este, and Medici antiquities. Contextual discussion presents a clear picture of where this family and their collection fit into the broader social landscape of Rome.

Appendices include English translations of the most important primary sources available for the del Bufalo collection as well as a catalogue and provenance notes for identified extant statues.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

The practice of collecting antiquities at Rome – which, for the purposes of this study I will define “antiquities” as any art or artefact from the Classical cultures of Greece and Italy, c. 8th Century BCE–6th Century CE – goes back to the city’s ancient time when wealthy individuals such as Piso Caesoninus (c. 100-45 BCE) of the 1st century BCE (who built the Villa dei Papiri at Herculaneum) or cultural movers like the patron Maecenas (70 BCE-8 CE) outfitted their homes with a myriad of statuettes, wall-paintings, mosaics, tablets and the like. These collectors boasted “heterogenous collection[s]” of sculpture “indicative of a wide range of tastes and standards on the part of the collectors.”¹ Emperors such as Tiberius (42 BCE-37 CE) and Hadrian (76-138 CE) too brought together artistic wonders from the older Greek world to display in new, domestic settings as symbols of their prestige. Hadrian, for example, took a prominent role in the design, construction, and furnishing of his villa at Tivoli; working alongside his architects and artists to display older Greek sculpture, rich with allusions to an admired past.²

Late Antique Rome was still adorned with public and private collections, including those famous works of art at the Baths of

Caracalla which was furnished with colossal statuary for all to see. In the Middle Ages, however, antiquities were accessible to the public only in churches and civic sites and their reception was not always positive. The specific tradition of domestic collection analyzed in this thesis is a development of Renaissance Rome.

Antiquities collection expanded in the Renaissance when the rapid urban development at Rome meant constant excavation and the daily (re)discovery of antique arts and artefacts from the city’s classical Roman past. As Rome’s new population began to unearth the domain of their native ancestors, they exercised a great deal of care to preserve, acquire, and assemble holdings from the antiquities uncovered. Subsequently, Renaissance families would construct new architecture (i.e., exterior facades, villas, sculpture gardens, etc.) for the purposes of their display. The resulting socio-cultural landscape saw that nearly all noble homes in Rome boasted a collection of antiquities accessible to guests by the end of the 1400s.

---

In terms of scope, this project will focus on one family’s collection – the del Bufalo family – who lived during this crucial period in Rome’s history. Enjoying relatively sustained prominence between 1450-1600 CE, the collectors saw the reestablishment of Rome back from swamp to city, the expansion of the Vatican, the painting of the Mona Lisa, the writing of Machiavelli’s *The Prince*, and so much more. It was also in this period that Europe began sailing to the New World and helped to establish a connected global population inspired by the classical ideals rejuvenated in the Renaissance. Scholarship on the Bufali leaves plenty of room to make a meaningful contribution here. This particular clan has been left relatively untreated, especially, with respect to their antiquities. I will show here that the del Bufalo made a significant impact on the Renaissance cultural explosion, boasting one of the largest collections in all of Rome, having been curated at various points by different family members. Further, these art patrons developed socio-economic ties with such influential (and thoroughly treated) Renaissance families as the Farnese, d’Este, and Medici whose later collections comprised in large part of those pieces curated and made famous by the del Bufalo. So, making the Bufali holdings the perfect exemplar of early-Renaissance antiquities collection on the whole.
Research into antiquities collection generally has been approached using a wide variety of research methodologies over the years. For modern formalist art historians, beginning with Riegl and Warburg, the recovery and subsequent display of antiquities was believed to have been linked to the need for patrons and artists of the Renaissance to create artistic designs based on the classical models which came before them. Of particular interest was the structural program set out by Giorgio Vasari in his Lives of the Most Eminent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects, published in 1550 CE. This work asserts that those antiques which collectors appreciated most were those which inspired re-imaginings or imitations from artists like Michelangelo or Leonardo da Vinci. That is to say, formalist art historians believed that because antique model 'a' was known, Renaissance creation 'b' was conceived on its basis. Perhaps the most famous example of this particular relationship, between antique sculptures displayed in collections and commissioned works of Renaissance art, is in Michelangelo's St. Bartholomew painted in The Last Judgement in the Sistine Chapel:

With his exaggerated musculature and twisted upward posture, it is clear that the figure of Bartholomew directly borrows from

---

8 Vasari’s Lives was published in two versions. The first in 1550 was later expanded upon in 1568.
the form of the Belvedere Torso (Fig. 1). As well, Michelangelo’s product combines the physique of the classical piece with what many believe to be his self-portrait. This interpretation is not surprising as Michelangelo famously harboured an obsession for the forms of classical antiquity and often transcribed antique models into his own work; however, his personal relationship with antiquities is hardly emblematic of Renaissance artists on the whole. Rather, Kathleen Christian has convincingly argued that in Renaissance Rome antiquities collection and art patronage were quite disjointed. Patronage, in reality, was limited and inconsistently all' antica – that is, in the style of antiquity.

Nevertheless, emerging from the perceived correlation above was a proclivity among formalist scholars into the 1950s and 60s – when academic interest most often dealt with the reconstruction of ancient motifs in the Renaissance – to focus on the production of inventories and catalogues of Roman antiquities collections. These documents were composed to demonstrate exactly which ancient artistic models were available to which Renaissance artists at any given point in time. In 1969, Wiess began exploring the interest

---

10 Gregory, Sharon (2018). Michelangelo, St. Bartholomew, and Northern Italy, p. 786; The figure of Jesus in the last judgement is also believed, by Gregory, to have borrowed from the Apollo Belvedere of the same collection.
artistic patrons had with the themes of classical art renewed in the Renaissance commissions. Particularly important to these developments was the literary tradition of Ovid whose Metamorphoses, Ars Amatoria, and Fasti were widely known in the period. Certainly, Ovidian narratives and aesthetics inspired many Renaissance commissions including those in the Palazzo del Bufalo (see pp. 80-83).\footnote{Barolsky, Paul (1998). “As in Ovid, So in Renaissance Art” in Renaissance Quarterly, Vol. 51, No. 2, pp. 451-472.} The relationship between statues collected and the classical literary tradition among the educated nobles of 14-16\textsuperscript{th} centuries was then further brought to light in the 1970s in articles written by Elisabeth MacDougall and Phyllis Bober who each took the motif of the ‘Sleeping Nymph’ as their case study.\footnote{Macdougall, Elisabeth (1975). “The Sleeping Nymph: Origins of a Humanist Fountain Type,” in Art Bulletin, Vol. 57, No. 3, pp. 357-365; Bober, Phyllis (1977). The Coryciana and the Nymph Corycia.} By the 80s, articles coming out of Italy by Settis, Franzoni, and Pinelli continued structural thematic studies and began to notice issues of post-antique restoration and the Renaissance re-interpretation of classical themes in art.\footnote{Settis, Salvatore ed., (1984-1986). Memoria dell’Antico nell’arte Italiana; Franzoni, Claudio (1984-1986). “Remembranze d’infinte cose. Le collezioni rinascimentali di antichita,” in Memoria dell’antico nell’arte italiana, ed. Salvatore Settis, Vol. 1, pp. 298-360; Pinelli, Orietta Rossi (1984-1986). “Chirurgia della memoria: scultura antica e restauri storici,” in Memoria dell’antico nell’arte italiana, ed. Salvatore Settis Vol. 3, pp. 183-250.} Not only, they discovered, were Renaissance collectors displaying the ideals of the classical past but they were also displaying new, personalized motifs accentuating familial interests and their contemporary Rome.
While this structural approach is absolutely integral to the study of antiquities collection in the Renaissance on the whole, it has innately limited the scope of understanding. Structuralist art historians have focused on the independent aspects of visual culture and from this focus had come a narrow canon of studied pieces from which to work. Interest in the conception of the High Renaissance style, especially as derived from those statues which take what Christian calls “Renaissance antiquities” (e.g., the Belvedere Torso as above) for their model, produced structuralist scholarship on a short list of ‘master works.’¹⁶ Works whose qualities are “determined solely by sensory or physical properties — so long as the physical properties in question are not relations to other things and other times.”¹⁷

In recent years, the trends have shifted slightly from analysing individual pieces housed within collections to analysing entire collections as complete entities. Such research projects have been carried out on and produced inventories for the familial assemblages of Pomponio Leto, the Farnese, Barberini, Medici, Savelli, Colonna, Soderini, and della Rovera to name a few. The aim of these studies has been to ‘solve’ the collections. A goal which most usually means, to suggest a singular iconographic

---


program. Less effort is made in addressing the psychology, trends, or broader socio-cultural context inherent in the collection process. While, in fact, collections, might more persuasively be defined as fluid constructs. Especially, given their proclivity for changing curatorial hands, being added to or subtracted from, as well as being bought and sold quite regularly.\textsuperscript{18} Take, for example, the papal collection at the Belvedere Courtyard:

Constructed between 1502 and 1504 CE as part of Bramante’s designs for the expansion of the Vatican, the Belvedere courtyard exhibits what may be categorized as a clear iconographic program. Outfitted with the personal collection of Pope Julius II the court appears to create the haunt of the classical god, Apollo. The yard is set up on the traditional site of the ancient Temple of Apollo, on the west bank of the Tiber; the Parnassus of Raphael there forces those looking out onto the courtyard from inside the Apostolic Palace to keep the god in mind; while the inscription “Pocul este, profani” at the entrance to the courtyard, spoken by the Cumaean Sibyl, forces the viewer to keep in mind his acolytes.\textsuperscript{19} The same sibyl who spoke those words foresaw the foundation of a new Rome, from the ashes of its predecessor, and its glory under Julius Caesar, Pope Julius II’s namesake (Verg. \textit{Aeneid}, 6.789-
The Venus Felix (via the ancient Roman folk hero Aeneas), Laocoön, and Apollo Belvedere all further allude to Apollo and the prophetic tradition of a Julius’ reign.

While this thematic analysis fits well, a unifying “program implies that a systematic idea was carried through from the instigation to the completion of a sculpture collection.” The Belvedere courtyard, however, must not have had in mind the Apollo Belvedere since Julius II inherited it and the piece was his from before his papacy. The Apollo only being placed within after the Belvedere court’s conception and construction. The Laocoön was only uncovered in 1506 CE and the Parnassus, which Julius did commission, was painted in 1511 CE. Rather than a single program, more likely is the idea that the theme of the courtyard was a development. So, created incrementally as the mythology which surrounded Pope Julius II as the quasi-Julius Caesar of a new Rome took shape.

While this thesis will take a post-structural approach to the study of antiquities collection, it is important to note that many aspects of traditional art-historical structuralism, in terms of formalism, the construction of inventories and catalogues, and some idea of programmatic analysis must be brought to bear.

---

Essays such as those in Payne, Kuttner, and Smick have recently recognized and gone about re-interpreting structuralist contributions to the study of classical art in the Renaissance.\textsuperscript{22} Their idea that the display and impact of an antiquities collection both informs the appreciation of antique art (and culture) and necessarily expands past the confines of the physical holdings is profound, with far reaching implications. In this vein, analyses of antiquities collections in the Renaissance which deal with these discrepancies include those done by Leonard Barkan and Kathleen Christian who are unique in their applications of post-structuralist methodologies, tending to analyse antiquities collections not merely as curated models for secondary design, but as independent, primary agents of cultural change.\textsuperscript{23} In 1999, Barkan’s \textit{Unearthing the Past} employed a post-structuralist lens to create an impressive collection of object biographies, the result being described as:

“A documentary history that aspires to rigor but that is properly skeptical about the discursive practices that are called history. It also seeks to tell one story among many – that is, of one moment that might be called ‘archaeology’ – while investigating what the larger archaeological paradigms of story and history might be.”\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{22} Payne, Alina, Kuttner, Ann, and Smick, Rebekah (2000). \textit{Antiquity and Its Interpreters.}
Barkan models his own methodology on that championed by Foucault who believed that nothing comes from nothing. Foucault says:

“The conditions for the appearance of an object of discourse, the historical conditions so that we can ‘say something about it’...[are] the conditions for it to fit itself into a network of relationships with other objects.”  

That is, those antiques which were included in collections are those most readily understood, assuming that the ‘network of relationships’ in which they exist is intentional and possible to discern. As such, in Barkan’s analogical translation and understanding of Foucault’s idea – he asserts that no antiquity, simply by way of being, with no reason to be, and with no network has any weight or influence in and of itself.  

When Rome’s ‘other population,’ then, began to re-emerge from the surface of the ground, as Foucault puts it metaphorically, the impact on contemporary Roman culture was unprecedented. Authorial intent in collecting reshaped the cultural landscape on the whole and rocketed the city to new heights. This was precisely because the objects existed within a complex web of relationships including those between art and institution, economy, and politics while operating on primary, secondary, and reflexive levels. They spoke to the collector’s impression of the prestige of the classical

period, the prestige of the modern city which displayed them, and they spoke to their own prestige as antiquities.

In her book, *Empire Without End*, Christian argues that antiquities which formed collections could therefore be used to serve political purpose. Essential to her argument is the belief that these antiquities came together, not only to provide a singular function, but a multitude of ever-shifting functions. Rather than simply being exhibitions of a particular aesthetic taste and shallow displays of wealth, Renaissance collections are to be seen as “active agents of cultural change.”29 Patrons sought to equip their estates specifically with sculptures, ancient epigraphs, and artefacts that would not only demonstrate their social status but also their pagan and Christian virtues, classical sophistication, and connection to their historical Roman ancestors. The antiquities included in Renaissance collections then, such as statues of ancient Roman leaders, heroes, monsters, and gods, are analogous with ancient lares – or ‘ancestor deities.’ Christian argues that this approach, to what she calls creating ‘Ancestor Collections,’ was an active effort among the nobles to establish legitimate, national identities when family clans in Rome competed for social relevancy.30 In antiquity, Cicero believed

---

that such Lares were necessary to stake legitimate claim to one’s own house (Cicero, *On his house*, 108-109); Apuleius considers them benevolent ancestral daemones (Apuleius, *On the god of Socrates*, 15). Renaissance families appear to have agreed.

A close reading of every statue in the Bufali collection as an important signifier for their chosen purposes - be that making an ancestral, political, or social claim - is necessary to understand its position and impact in and among the collection as a whole. So is an examination of the relationship popular viewers who entered the Bufali sculpture garden shared with the antiquities. Just as modern museum patrons interact with statuary today, a similar experience would have been available for Renaissance viewers. I, therefore, put the formal elements of art historical structuralism under scrutiny and expand the fluid meanings of classical art in a post-classical context. That is, I hope to understand the purposeful reference collectors are trying to make and the sense of their audience’s reception.31

To this end I have applied Gottlob Frege’s ‘Sense and Reference’ theory where appropriate. The ‘reference’ in this symbolic theory is the object which an author (of any sort) means to indicate. For example, when someone refers to the *Hesperus* (i.e., ‘the Morning Star’), the reference is to the actual planet

31 For more on linguistic ‘sense’ and ‘reference,’ see Frege, Gottlob (1892). *On Sense and Reference.*
Venus. Because, however, both Hesperus and Phosphorus (i.e., ‘the Evening Star’) refer to the same celestial body observable at different times of the day, the ‘sense’ is different when using either term. This distinction between ‘sense’ and ‘reference’ is necessary to be informed by the sentence, “Hesperus is the same planet as Phosphorus;” because, while the ‘reference’ is the same planet the ‘sense’ of each label connotes a different meaning.\footnote{Frege, Gottlob (1892). On Sense and Reference, p. 37}

This theory when applied to the semiotics of sculpture – simply put – will help to inform the reception of antique materials in the Renaissance. For example, a statue of Atlas in antiquity connotes the pagan legend of the titan’s punishment following the Titanomachy. While, in the Renaissance, the iconography took on a new relationship with the Christian Saint Christopher and becomes a representation of Atlas-Christophorus.\footnote{Wrede, Henning (1983). Der Antikengarten der del Bufalo, p. 15} So, if two collectors 1200 years apart were to set an Atlas as the centre-piece to their collection (which the Bufali Family arguably does), for both the Antique and Renaissance viewers respectively the ‘reference’ is the same but the received ‘sense’ is different. For the purposes of this thesis we shall, where necessary, follow the principles espoused by Frege to determine the specific intended function of individual pieces in the Bufali garden (i.e., ancient vs. modern) while those methodologies of Foucault (network relationships),
Barkan (object contexts), and Christian (object purpose) will help to appreciate the larger contextual network of relationships in which the Palazzo del Bufalo antiquities operated during the 15th-16th centuries.

The aim of this thesis is to answer the questions: which antiques did the Bufali family choose to acquire? What were their limitations either social, financial, or otherwise? Who was in charge of acquisition and display and at what times? What did the physical space of the sculpture garden look like and how did that inform the relationship between antique and viewer? What was the political impact of the garden? And what impact did the collection have on the wider Roman (and Italian) socio-cultural sphere? This study will demonstrate the motivations for the family’s display—elaborating on how the del Bufalo collection and those similar to it were exhibitions of taste, means for cultural preservation (cf. a modern private museum), considered political strategy, and were instruments for the construction of social identity. In this way, I will demonstrate how the collectors employed classical cultural memory to their advantage (how they repackaged classical artefacts to be sold into later, more famous collections, too) and clearly present how those collectors in the Renaissance employed and disseminated material culture from the Classical period, why they did so, and to what specific ends.
Chapter 2. Antiquities Collections in Rome, c. 1450-1600 CE

2.1. The Era of Collecting and its Purposes

The collection in the Palazzo del Bufalo, as it will be presented, was put together to solidify a political identity for the family in Rome— the city to which they had moved some time in the thirteenth century. Members of the del Bufalo household took minor political steps in their adoptive home throughout the 14\textsuperscript{th} and 15\textsuperscript{th} centuries, working their way into the municipal government and Roman Curia.\textsuperscript{34} They hoped, however, that a manufactured reputation as learned antiquarians of Roman history could lead to even higher promotions within Church and state; even when pitted against other qualified native Roman families, who contemporary Renaissance Roman nationalist Marcantonio Altieri (1450-1532) called the “Romani Naturali.”\textsuperscript{35}

Of course, the purposes of the del Bufalo collection only held the necessary political worth, so long as the elite at Rome continued to appreciate antiquarianism as a valuable cultural commodity. The following chapter will explore the climate in which antiquarian interest in general was nurtured, the types and specific examples of collections that earned repute in Rome, as well as where the Bufali fit into the picture.

\textsuperscript{34} Christian, Kathleen (2010). Empire without End: Antiquities Collections in Renaissance Rome, 1350-1527, p. 280.

\textsuperscript{35} Altieri, Marcantonio (1511). “Li Baccanali,” in Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo. Fonti per la storia dell’italia medioevo, ed. Laura Onofri, Vol. 8.
Many starting points have been proposed for the “Era of Collecting,” as Kathleen Christian calls the time in which the Bufali operated.\textsuperscript{36} In Chapter One (pp. 14-15), I presented the reign of Pope Julius II (r. 1503-1513) and the development of the Vatican Belvedere as a milestone in early Renaissance collecting. Others have suggested a beginning of collection culture with the resurgence of humanism experienced under Sixtus IV (r. 1471-1484) which coincided with his plans for the Renovatio Urbis Romae.\textsuperscript{37} There is, however, even earlier evidence for the beginnings of private antiquities collection starting with the first papal restoration of Rome under Nicholas V (r. 1447-1455) in the mid-15\textsuperscript{th} century.

Beginning with Pope Nicholas V, we see an effort among Renaissance Roman leaders to call back to the ancient past with material culture and in so doing, attempting to lend classical authority to their political actions. For example, to celebrate the Roman jubilee of 1450, Pope Nicholas V purposefully imitated the restoration of the Temple of Concord by the ancient Senate in 121 BCE with his own restoration of the Trevi Fountain on the antique Aqua Virgo – the fountain which had served ancient Rome.

Nicholas believed that public works which were seen to emulate those endeavoured by the ancient government would increase their favourable reception to greater heights. The inscription on the ‘new’ fountain directly parallels the inscription on the restored **Temple of Concord**. Compare:

Nicolaus V pontifex maximus post illustratam insignibus monumentis urbem ductum aquae Virginis vetustate collapsum sua impensa in splendidiorem cultu restitui ornariq[ue].

Pope Nicholas V, ordered that the Acqua Vergine, having fallen to ruin with age after the city had been glorified with illustrius monuments, be embellished and restored to splendid order at his own expense.

And on **Aedes Concordiae**:

SPQR aedem Concordiae vetustate collapsam in meliorem faciem opere et cultu splendidiore restituit.

The Senate and the Roman People restored the Temple of Concord, which had fallen to ruin with age, to good order and embellished its splendour.\(^{39}\)

The ‘Nicholas’ inscription emphasizes the importance of both the form and function of the ancient fountain as well as the remarkable urban landscape it had once been a part of. To this end, the Pope invoked the formal structure of the ancient decree. Note the repeated phraseology and word choice (e.g., **Acqua Vergine**: vetustate collapsum...in splendidiorem cultu restitui; **Aedes Concordiae**: vetustate collapsam...cultu splendidiore restituit).

---

\(^{38}\) Pinto, John (1986). *The Trevi Fountain*, pp. 3-37.

That notices such as this continued to be in Latin is, in and of itself, indicative of an effort by the papacy to lend classical authority to public works.

Nicholas V’s restoration of Rome, having broken ground at Trevi Fountain, not only inspired an interest in the antique all over the city but locally, in Rione Trevi for the Bufali family. Likely, it led to the purchase of Palazzo del Bufalo on the very same block as the Trevi Fountain under the Acqua Vergine; caused the solidification of the Bufali family’s antiquarian interest; and moved them to construct their own fountain there after water returned to the area in the 13th Century via the renovated aqueduct (Fig. 2).\textsuperscript{40} As, by the 1480s, travellers had described visiting the already established home of Angelo del Bufalo observing several inscriptions there, the statue of Atlas, and the Puteal.\textsuperscript{41}

As Rome’s Renaissance population begun to break more ground, they carefully preserved the antiques which had been left behind by their ancient ancestors. In turn, an antiquities market flourished where private and public entities could buy, sell, and assemble collections from the ancient pieces they uncovered. In this period collection boomed. Antiques emerged constantly and

\textsuperscript{40} Karmon, David (2005). “Restoring the Ancient Water Supply System in Renaissance Rome: The Popes, the civic administration, and the Acqua Vergine,” in \textit{The Waters of Rome}, Vol. 1, No. 3, p. 1 n. 3. Please note that I will use the Latin Agua Virgo to refer to the aqueduct in its ancient context (as per ancient Roman inscriptions), and the Italian Acqua Vergine to refer to its reconstruction in the Renaissance (as per Renaissance inscriptions). The titles refer to two distinct and very different building phases of the same aqueduct.

\textsuperscript{41} CIL 6: 12234.
aesthetic interest in classical forms surged as a result. Essayists, poets, scholars, and sculptors flocked to Rome to find artistic inspiration in classical artefacts and many nobles found that the opportunity to invest their wealth in a stock with the enduring value of fourteen odd centuries on its side became increasingly tantalizing. Especially, when encouraged by the Church’s leading example.

About twenty years after Nicholas’ jubilee, under Sixtus IV’s Renovatio, the ‘Noble’ people of rapidly expanding Rome rallied together with the mission of restoring the city to its ancient splendour. The ‘Plebeians,’ always wary of ambition, wealth, and excess in their leaders began to look skeptically upon the Church for enforcing such an interest. Especially, because many of the images which began to again populate the streets and private homes of those made wealthy largely by association with the Church were pagan.\textsuperscript{42} Ingeniously, Pope Sixtus insisted that the city take those remnants and ‘residents’ of the classical past, the artefacts and statues that emerged from the ground below them, and display them in the name of ‘public utility.’\textsuperscript{43} The pope argued that by excavating, restoring, displaying, and maintaining Rome’s ruins, the wealthy were actually benefitting the metropolis by restoring

its beauty and its worldly reputation. The Latin phrase employed by Sixtus, “Utilitas Publica,” became the slogan for his renovation program and inspired public organizations and private citizens alike to keep the products of the ancient city in mind as they expanded their new homes. Pontiff Sixtus IV put his own call into action, delivering a beautiful display of bronze sculptures to Rome’s historic Capitoline hill, in what is now regarded as the first civic museum in the Eternal City. As Christian frames it:

By displaying sculpture in the name of utilitas publica collectors need not be accused of satisfying their own voluptas, the greedy personal pleasure associated with the worst qualities of the Roman emperors. Instead, works for the common good – such as the display of sculpture – were tied to the rhetoric of pietas, a virtue that vindicated sin and offered one of the greatest goals of Christian life for the leaders of the Church.

Unfortunately for him, by the time Julius II had constructed his Belvedere Courtyard and moved his personal collection into Vatican City under the pretense of modest Christian piety (c. 1504; see, pp. 14-15) popular Roman tensions had already reached a breaking point. This friction was all too familiar to Romans as, even in antiquity, when Greek sculpture began to disappear from public view into private villas, the population experienced their

---

own anxiety and demanded public accessibility. So, fearing a return to the same quasi-Imperial power under the rich popes of Renaissance Rome, the municipal government began to pass legislation to place minor checks and balances on the access of antiquities collected. They did so, in the hopes that antiques remained publicly useful as initially intended; and not hoarded and stolen away by wealthy clergymen.

In 1514 a Roman bill entitled *Supernae Dispositionis Arbitrio* enforced that a cardinal’s house be “an accessible home, and a haven and refuge especially for honest and learned men.” Marchesano, Pommier, and Stenhouse have all taken this legislation to include sculpture gardens, *loggia*, and other private displays owned by *Cardinales*. Marchesano and Stenhouse particularly believe that the bill is specific enough to mark and maintain ownership of the collected pieces by their respective patrons while still regulating the type of access the populace had to the wishes of those patrons. That is, viewing was largely still by invitation only – despite being deemed ‘open.’ In terms of access, it is important to note that private collectors intended to appear as

---

useful to the public as they could while framing the prestige and power of the collection to those public figures who could increase their return on investment politically and financially. For example, it was more important to the Bufali family to invite and allow native, noble clergymen or famous sketch artists and documentarians to their homes than it was for them to attract the common man. If a cardinal from the church was impressed by their collection, then the family’s reputation would increase and more political opportunities could open up. The same can be said about the Bufali welcoming famous travellers like Aldrovandi and Boissard into their court. In ancient times, many states, cities, and sites throughout Italy tried to draw such tourists to their localities by advertising their natural features, expensive building projects, and famous works of art. Often, as O’Bryhim points out, “tourism was the lifeblood of their [local] economies.”

So, collectors like the del Bufalo family who were able to exploit this demand were concerned with maintaining control over their collected pieces, authoring what those collected pieces could mean to onlookers, who those onlookers would be, all while bringing as many in as possible under the given personal parameters of visitor worth.

---

2.2. The Types of Settings for Antiquities Collections in Rome

Renaissance Roman collectors created three main settings for their displays from 1450-1600. Stenhouse describes these settings as either 1) a Studio within city limits housing smaller antiques such as coins, busts, and gems; 2) the courtyards of familial Palazzi within the city proper, in which could be placed free-standing sculpture amidst domestic landscape architecture - a Renaissance Roman manifestation of the ancient idealised *rus in urbe*; or 3) *all' antica* Roman Villas and gardens, scattered about the edge of the ancient city walls, which were capable of housing monumental sculpture alongside alternative attractions like farms or vineyards.\(^{51}\) The acceptable sculptural contents for the latter two settings were based on the pillars of Pliny’s art appreciation (i.e., life-sized marble sculpture in the round) as established by the trendsetting curators of the Della Valle, Della Rovere and Piccolomini collections.\(^{52}\)

Studios, which were innately more private than Villas or Palazzi, offered owners and classical academics housed sanctuaries for scholarly endeavours amongst a select group of colleagues. Based on the memory of Cicero’s Tusculan Academy and Pliny the Younger’s Library at Como, these rooms were the first settings for

---


The often eclectic collections in these settings reflected more personally the taste of their particular owners and their close circle of friends than those of the much-trafficked Palazzo gardens constructed in the name of Sistine public utility. For instance, the Studio of Franceschino da Cesena (c. 1489) housed in an old convent contained five hundred ancient coins and medals, alabaster vases, mythological plaquettes, busts, column capitals, and many books. Additional personal oddities included miscellaneous gesso casts, devotional paintings, marble fragments, a portrait of himself, and the egg of an ostrich – a markedly self-indulgent inventory.\footnote{Domeniconi, Antonio (1965). “Un inventario relativo a un custode della Biblioteca Malatestiana; frate Franceschino da Cesena (1489)” Studi Romagnoli, Vol. 16, pp. 179-180; Thornton, Dora (1997). The Scholar in his Study: Ownership and Experience in Renaissance Italy, pp. 84-85; Vout, Caroline (2018). Classical Art: A Life History from Antiquity to the Present, p. 278 n. 154.}
Many families in fifteenth and sixteenth-century Rome owned a Palazzo and utilized a sculpture courtyard. Some contemporaries of the del Bufalo family in this regard were their neighbours, the Colocci. The Colocci family set their Palazzo and courtyard on the Acqua Vergina too, complete with its own sculpture court and fountain (similar to the del Bufalo’s). The fountain was inhabited by a sculpture of a Nymph (like the Bufali Cleopatra), reclining on a tablet inscribed with the famous Huius Nympha Loci epigram.\textsuperscript{56} In accordance with his particular interests of watercraft and classical literature, Angelo Colocci, the family’s first curator, had a special part of his courtyard dedicated to antique ship weights and measures and an impressive collection of stone epigrams.\textsuperscript{57} The inscription which he placed above the entrance to his courtyard welcomed his guests as friends, framing the courtyard space as a refuge and venue for Epicurean joy and inspiration in the presence of beautiful artefacts:

“Here is a place of spirit where pleasure is the only concern. Either live by the law of the genius or leave. Here spirit, humour, and pleasure without strife live happily. While strife, care, and labor retire.”\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{56} Boissard, Jean-Jacques (1597). “The Sleeping Nymph of Angelo Colocci,” in Romanae Urbis Topographia et Antiquitates, ed. Feyrabend Johannes, Pars. 6, Plate 25. This Nymph guarding the fountain is a nearly identical composition to the Cleopatra mentioned in the courtyard of the del Bufalo in Aldrovandi. These fountains, by their descriptions, either backed each other or were one and the same. No second fountain containing a reclining female figure is mentioned in the Palazzo del Bufalo in Boissard. This is perhaps an attribution confusion on the part of Aldrovandi.


Perhaps the most famous example of the third type of setting, the *all’ antica* Roman villa, was the Villa Medici at Rome. The spectacular home was acquired by Ferdinando de’ Medici in 1576 and built on the ruins of the ancient Gardens of Lucullus on the Pincian Hill. The Villa was renovated under the cardinal’s insistence by Bartolomeo Ammannati (1511-1592) with a special interest in unearthing the particular statues and bases left behind by the classical owners and resurrecting them *in situ*. The expansive garden attached to the Villa was expanded upon with a new *loggia* to house even more sculpture bought on the Roman markets and made open and accessible to the Roman public. More on the function of these spaces will follow.

### 2.3. The Political Purposes for Antiquities Collections in Rome

Settings such as those above played host to collections which, by and large, served three political initiatives among citizen collectors in Rome. While, of course, not all curators had exactly the intentions I will outline here, some variation of these three
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tropes was overwhelmingly intended. Firstly, I agree with Kathleen Christian’s category of 1) “Ancestor Collections,” formed to establish legitimate, indigenous identities among Roman citizens and curia members who found themselves losing authority to the above immigrant collectors; but I would also add to this the categories of 2) ‘Appropriative Collections,’ organized to fabricate and realize connections to the antique by non-Roman/foreign families, with a focus on Roman artefacts; and 3) luxurious ‘Institutional Collections’ designed to assert economic prowess and public utility. The third typology being owned by individuals who had great enough independent wealth to survive ecclesiastical orders to abandon pagan art and take up calls for material modesty.

Taking Christian’s example of the Santacroce family, I will explain what she calls an “Ancestor Collection.” This type of collection endeavoured to solidify tenuous familial nobility by emphasizing the autochthonous status of the Roman family who organized it. Often, this would entail an attempt to trace their lineage back to ancient Roman statesmen or heroes. In effect, these types of collections begun early in the Renaissance collecting tradition when the bulk of ancient artefacts were still

---

inscriptions and historical reliefs which depicted the lives and testaments of the ancient republicans.61

Following the first translation of Plutarch’s Life of Publicola appearing in Italy in 1434, Andrea Santacroce formulated his connection to the past. Sometime between the 1450-1460, Andrea began pretending that his family members were the descendants of the ancient Roman consul Valerius Publicola. At his home near Santa Maria in Publicolis, he gathered inscriptions and reliefs with a penchant for the historical and a spotlight on Valerius, outfitting his home with purported links to the man. Santacroce even renovated his neighbouring church in the name of the ancient consul, using some brilliant politicking and the cognate association of the Italian Publicolis and the Latin Publicola to his advantage.

Above the lintel of his house, Andrea placed a fragment of the Fasti Capitolini (a list of chief magistrates of the Roman Republic), which he owned that bore the name “P. Valerius Publicola” who Andrea believed was the same Publicola he admired and who he attempted to convince his fellow Romans was his ancestor. The family continued the ruse by inscribing an ordinary, unidentifiable Togatus statue with the title “VALER. PUBL. CC” (“Valerius Publicola, Repeated Consul”) to feature in the

The Publicola narrative was maintained by Andrea’s son Prospero when he added additional figural sculpture to the courtyard, and again when Prospero’s son Antonio finally built a new Palazzo to hold the expanding collection around 1500. By c. 1532 Maarten van Heemskerck came to the Santacroce courtyard to sketch these antiquities and in 1550 the Italian Aldrovandi came to describe the family’s court for the same book in which he wrote about the Palazzo del Bufalo, as below. Some impressive sleight of hand can be observed when taking into account the “Ancestor” narrative of the Santacroce and this visit by Aldrovandi:

As Stenhouse writes of courtyard tours generally, “the picture of visitor’s experiences, particularly in gardens,” like Aldrovandi in the case of the Santacroce, “is complicated in that accounts of visits to antiquities collections tend to use the passive voice – ‘we were shown,’ ‘a statue was pointed out,’” implying that they were taken around private collections by guides who would elucidate the details of houses, courtyards, and individual pieces. The downfall of this tradition was that guides were not always as earnest as the visiting documentarians. So was the case in antiquity, when Pausanias, for example, travelled

---

around Greece. The ancient documentarian was often at the mercy of his guides. As Andrew Stewart notes:

“[Pausanias was] a careful, pedestrian writer ... interested not only in the grandiose or the exquisite but in unusual sights and obscure ritual. He is occasionally careless or makes unwarranted inferences, and his guides or even his own notes sometimes mislead him, yet his honesty is unquestionable.”\(^\text{64}\)

Aldrovandi was very likely shown the ‘Publicola Togatus’ by such a guide and given a sensationalized rundown on the reasons why the consul was such an admirable figure, how the statue came to be in their house, and how sure it was that he was their ancestor. Aldrovandi trustingly relays: “In the courtyard of the house, you can see a Togatus of Valerius Publicola...found in the foundations of this house.”\(^\text{65}\) While it is possible that the Togatus was uncovered during the construction or subsequent renovations of the Santacroce house, certainly, the inscription is counterfeit and the tone of the guidance was calculated to further push the narrative of ancestry and autochthony.

The Santacroce would have us believe that as they lived across from the church in Publicolis, so too did Publicola, and his statue which was uncovered there, now again resides in the house. Many of the Romani Naturali mentioned above practiced this type of


\[^{65}\text{Aldrovandi, Ulisse (1562). Delle Statue Antiche che per Tutta Roma, ed. Mauro, Lucio, p. 102: Nella corte della casa, si vede un Valerio Publicola togato, quasi à tutto rilevo in una tavola di marmo, con questa inscrizione nella base. VALERIVS PVBLICOLA. Fu ritrovato ne’ fondamenti di questa casa.}\]
collecting and asserted the idea that the antiquities of Rome were the exclusive property of Roman families and to be used for their prestige building alone.

In contrast, the Bufali family collection occupies setting number 2, the courtyard of a family Palazzo, and is an Appropriative Collection, designed with political purpose number 2 in mind: to establish a Roman identity for the foreign family. The elaborate collection of ancient Roman heroes, monsters, gods, and statesmen drew the citizens and clergymen of Rome to the Tuscan family’s home and established them as a mainstay of the Roman antiquities collection scene. The size and popularity of the del Bufalo courtyard even drew the attention of Giorgio Vasari who noted its painted decoration, erudite patronage, and exceptional reputation. Aldrovandi called it the 5th largest collection in all of Rome. Another version of this type of collection was covered in our discussion of Pope Julius II’s Caesar Program in the Belvedere Courtyard above (pp. 14-15). Certainly, Aldrovandi and Boissard hold great reverence and respect for the Bufali family and its collection; Aldrovandi calling the courtyard, “a delightful and beautiful place that any happy and kind spirit would live a quiet and happy life” and Boissard stating, “whatever is

seen in the house of this patrician is worthy of a king and the richest leader." While the Bufali Palazzo survived past the 1600s it did so with a much diminished collection after the changing appreciation for pagan antiquities which came along with the close of the Council of Trent (1563). Unfortunately, the family depended too much on the wealth and reputation garnered by their association with the Church to ignore the writing on the wall telling them to sell. This will be discussed in more detail in Chapters 4 and 5.

During these later years of the Council of Trent (1545-1563) pagan art collections fell out of favour with the Church. As cardinals and clergymen began to question the benefit of reinvigorating the presence of antiquities in the city, the families who once forged their prestige by their way were forced to abandon their art in the name of piety. Bishop Antonio Augstin (1517-1586) wrote to Fulvio Orsini (1529-1600) in 1566 with this in mind, saying:

“I doubt the value of excavating all these naked statues, because no details are going to come forth as a result. All those aggressively masculine herms of gods in the Cesi and Carpi gardens, that hermaphrodite with the satyr in the chapel certainly seem bad...they may have a certain scientific value for scholars and artists, but transalpine visitors are terribly shocked by them.”

This was the general sentiment brought about when Pius V (r. 1566-1572) was inaugurated. This pope famously objected to the contents of the Belvedere collection and floated donating the artefacts to the Capitoline. Following the Church leaders, many men of the cloth reluctantly began to sell their collections, including the Cardinal Giovanni Ricci, the Archbishop of Milan Carlo Barromeo, and even Paolo del Bufalo, the brother of our Stefano. Those collections which could survive the changes most strongly felt in Rome in the mid-late Cinquecento are included in (and the majority of) those which I call ‘Institutional Collections.’

Taking a look at those collections which immediately survived the del Bufalo collection, we can comfortably examine those to which the Bufali sold. In the sale of 1562 Paolo del Bufalo sold the lion’s share of the familial collection to Alessandro Farnese (1520-1589). Later, in 1572 the Bufali sold a further eleven statues to Cardinal Ippolito d’Este of Ferrara (1509-1572) which would eventually make their way into the Medici collection before 1598. Smaller, undocumented sales left only a select few antiquities to remain in the Palazzo del Bufalo by the time of its destruction in 1885. Foreign buyers, like the Florentine Medici

---


34
and the d’Este were well aware of the ecclesiastical pressure being placed on Roman families to sell their wares at this time and were ready to pounce, purses in hand, whenever curatorship turned over, a nobleman died, or a family faced financial pressure from the Church. At home in Rome, the Farnese family who had become wealthy during the papacy of their Paul III (1534-1549) and continued to amass a considerable fortune in the following decades became renowned for their extravagant patronage of the arts. By the late Cinquecento, they would rival the Medici for the most luxurious collection of classical arts and artefacts in the world.

The collection of the Farnese served to prove nothing. Their heritage was certain. Their political clout was certain. Their wealth was certain. This collection was a spectacle and a demonstration of the family’s prestige; not an attempt to gain it. As one of the wealthiest patrons of the arts in Italy, Alessandro Farnese grew his collection and worked with artists and scholars from all over the world to make the pieces as accessible as possible. In this way, the Farnese collection was more closely related to the idea of Utilitas Publica than a great many collections discussed here and treated elsewhere from the period since the Sistine decrees of the late Quattrocento.

The Farnese family focussed on the accessibility and visibility of Roman antiquities with the continental populace creating a galleria in their upper loggia to house antiquities, a
Studio for more intimate scholarship, and a number of courtyards to hold his veritable cornucopia of monumental sculpture. In this way, Alessandro Farnese combined all three Roman collection settings into his Villa and successfully translated the original purpose for Renaissance collection into an accessible refuge for all who wished to learn from classical artefacts – doing so in the name of Roman utility and Roman preservation. In this spirit, Farnese stipulated in his will that every classical book and art in his collection remain in his family Palazzo at Rome ad infinitum; a sentiment which was echoed in a letter from Fulvio Orsini (1529–1600) to Gianvincenzo Pinelli (1535–1601) which states:

“every individual statue, made of marble, bronze, or whatever other material...and the whole of the library, with all its books of whatever type, he decreed should be protected, guarded, and remain in Rome, in the Palazzo Farnese; and he decreed that they could not be moved from there, under whatever pretext, whether in their entirety or in the smallest part, and that they could not be exported, sold, used as a gift or pledge, or lent in any way.”

---

The political climate in which the del Bufalo collection operated was complicated and risky for upper middle-class families. For their purposes, the era of collecting encouraged a spike in prestige for the family as they capitalized on the call for the *Utilitas Publica* of antiquities collection and the *Renovatio Romae*, especially for the Quattrocento jubilee restorations around the Trevi fountain where they called home. The family owned and operated a sizable collection, in the middling courtyard setting, that drew great repute from all over the continent. Their collection established the foreign family as a well-founded Roman presence with ties to the municipal government and the Roman church. When the Council of Trent was nearing its close in 1563 the del Bufalo who had not the wealth necessary to fund a moral break from the Vatican was forced to sell their antiquities. As such, they were unable to transition their ‘Appropriative Collection’ into an ‘Institutional Collection.’
3.1. Overview

The evidentiary basis for the Bufali Family Collection of sculpture is varied and disparate. Especially as neither the Bufali statues nor their former whereabouts exist now as they once had. Formerly, the garden and house occupied most of the North-East city block in Rione Trevi surrounded by the Via della Stamperia to its South-East, the Via del Nazareno to the North-East, and the Via del Bufalo to the North-West (Fig. 3). The garden’s South-Eastern edge ran up on the remains of the Aqua Virgo which acted as its water supply (Fig. 4). Neighbouring on either side of their modest Palazzo were the houses of the D’Aragonia and Colocci to the West and East respectively; the latter is discussed in Chapter 2. The house and the courtyard where the Bufali displayed their antiquities were demolished and paved through in 1885 during the expansion of the Via del Tritone; while most of the antiquities once displayed on site were dispersed in the late 16th century. As such, the evidence for which antiquities we know to have been in the collection come from an assemblage of unique textual and representational sources.

The configuration of the Casino and Garden-courtyard posited by Wrede and supplemented by a number of maps by Bufalini (1551), Falda (1676), Nolli (1748), Ruga (1824), and Gregoriano (1835) indicate that the Casino was set on the north of the block facing
the Via del Bufalo. As well, the garden was composed of four quadrants, cut with a cross-shaped path, bordered by an outer path along the perimeter.\textsuperscript{74} The property also had a small extrusion on the North-West extremity and a larger head of the garden near the Aqua Virgo, which likely fit the garden’s famous spring.

### 3.2. Documentary Sources

Of the documentary sources, our first mention of the Bufali collection was made sometime after 1484 and before 1497 with Petrus Sabinus’ description of the Puteal (Fig. 9) in the house of Angelo del Bufalo.\textsuperscript{75} Brief mention is made shortly thereafter of a broken Obelisk once within a second del Bufalo garden in Porta Pinciana in Francesco Albertini’s 1510 \textit{Opusculum de Mirabilibus Novae et Veteris Urbis Romanae} which was moved to the new garden in Trevi, spotted there by Marco Fabio Calvo in 1514-1515 in his \textit{Antiquae Urbis Romae cum Regionibus Simulacrum} published in 1527.\textsuperscript{76} Stephanus Pighius documents a ‘Hercules’ from the \textit{vinea del Bufalo}

\textsuperscript{74} For these maps, see Figs. 5-8, and 1 for Gregoriano.
\textsuperscript{75} Sabinus, Petrus (1484-1497). Sabinus Sylloge, Fol. 123v.: "...in eadem vicinia (i.e. prope domum Triapanum in Trivio) in domo Angeli Bubali, ubi est statua Herculis et multorum deorum in ciclo..."
\textsuperscript{76} Albertini, Francesco (1510). \textit{Opusculum de mirabilibus novae et veteris Urbis Romanae}, R iii v: "erant praeterea Obelischi duo apud Mausoleum Augusti longitudine ped[um] xliii equibus unus adhuc in Vinea bufalorum iacet contractus non longe a porta Pinciana."; Calvo, Marco Fabio (1527). \textit{Antiquae Urbis Romae cum Regionibus Simulachrum}, n.p.: “Sexta vero Regio Alta semita dicitur...Circum Floralium, cuius obeliscus hodie quoque humi stratus, in vineto nobilis civis romani Antonii de Bubalo, cernitur.”
in his *Hercules Prodicius*, which included details from his travels in Rome c. 1547–1555 to be published later in 1587.\(^{77}\)

The 1556 publication of the Italian naturalist Ulisse Aldrovandi’s 1550 walk through the garden, featured in his *Tutte le Statue Antiche Che in Roma* is perhaps the most important source for the Palazzo del Bufalo. His description provides the most complete account of the collection (surviving on a total of 4 pages) in its heyday having changed hands from Antonio to Stefano del Bufalo. Aldrovandi’s work on the whole has been essential for documenting a number of sculpture gardens and collections of antiquities that existed in Rome during the mid 1500s and contributes to the discussion in Chapter 5. His passage on the “Casa Di M. Stefano dal Bufalo” has been included, translated into English by this author, in Appendix 1 for future study on the topic.

In 1555, Jean-Jacques Boissard dedicated two more pages for his *Romanae Urbis Topographiae et Antiquitates* to the del Bufalo collection, published in 1597. This text then is written at around the same time as Aldrovandi’s and supplements that work’s enumeration of the artefacts under Stefano.\(^{78}\) Boissard’s discussion

---


on the “Aedes Buffalorum” has also been included, translated into English in Appendix 2.

Pirro Ligorio made mention of the history and presence of a Hercules statue made of Parian marble (probably the Atlas Farnese (Fig. 10) currently housed within the Naples Archeological Museum) in the house of Stefano del Bufalo dating to between 1559-1561.79

With respect to the later history of the Bufali collection, there is also the record of a bill of sale for statues sold to Alessandro Farnese by Paolo del Bufalo in 1562, which is corroborated in a 1568 inventory completed at the behest of the same Farnese nobleman.80 Another bill of sale, to Cardinal Ippolito d’Este, survives detailing the purchase of a further eleven statues from the Bufali collection in 1572.81 Finally, an account of the collection survives from fifty-five years later, as part of the famous cartographer Judocus Hondius’ 1627 Nova et Accurata Italiae Hodiernae Descriptio which summarizes both the work of Aldrovandi and Boissard with an enviable concision.82

82 Hondius, Judocus (1627). Nova et accurata Italiae hodiernae descriptio, p. 150.
3.3. Representational Sources

Our representational sources are most helpful in identifying specific extant antiquities now without the collection. These sources corroborate the documentary evidence and identify artefacts known to the Renaissance but not mentioned in writing. As a number of travellers walked through the Palazzo del Bufalo between 1450-1600, they made a visual record of what they saw, which in many cases has survived into modernity:

First off, an anonymous pen-wash drawing from c. 1530 renders the Puteal among a variety of artefacts unlikely to be antique; save for what could be the Sarcophagus with Iunctio Dextrarum (Fig. 11) but the marked ‘handshake’ is not at all visible from the depicted angle.\(^\text{83}\)

An anonymous Roman, included in the Codex Coburgensis, meticulously mapped both the Puteal and fragmented statue of Atlas, along with the zodiacal signs he holds up, on a total of 6 pages in a book of drawings composed sometime between 1550 and 1555 (Figs. 12-13).\(^\text{84}\) Another anonymous artist appears to have copied these drawings into their own work around the same time - in this effort, the artist included detailed composite projections of both the Puteal relief and the sculpted Cosmos (Figs. 14-15).\(^\text{85}\) Both


\(^\text{85}\)Anonymous (1550-1555). Codex Pighianus, Fols. 226r-229r and 315v A-B.
artists also render the **Trajanic Lady Relief** (Fig. 16) which can be found near the spring at the back of the garden – likely part of the carvings featured on the **Funerary Altar of Vettia Magna**.\(^\text{86}\)

In 1560, the same **Atlas** may be seen in a sketch attributed to Maarten de Vos; however, this drawing shows the statue’s restorations about the face, arms, and legs now completed (Fig. 17).\(^\text{87}\) Its location is not clearly stated.

Also from 1560, pen-drawings of the Bufali **Bust of Commodus**, **Bust of Maximinius Thrax**, the **Funerary Altar of Vettia Magna**, an unidentified **Bust of an Emperor**, the **Bust of a Man**, and the **Sarcophagus with Iunctio Dextrarum** survive from the Sketchbook of a one Giovannantonio Dosio with the express designations: ‘a nel giardino del buffalo’ for the first three and ‘in casa di quel del Buffalo’ for the last three (Fig. 28).\(^\text{88}\) It is plausible to identify the **Bust of a Man** with the ‘head of a Greek man’ as described by both Aldrovandi and Boissard.\(^\text{89}\)

The **Male Mask** was drawn with the inscription ‘IN VIRIDARIO BYBALORVM’ into Antonio Lafreri’s **Libro delle Maschere** in the 3\(^{\text{rd}}\)
quarter of the Cinquecento. Presumably, this was before a second mask was included in the collection in time for Boissard’s visit.

As can be seen in many of his sketches, the Frenchman Pierre Jacques has included the explicit designation ‘Bufaly’ under statues he recorded during his trip(s) through the Palazzo del Bufalo. Some trouble comes when no designations are included in his sketches at all, making it uncertain which of the statues not explicitly labelled (if any) also belong to the Bufali collection. Jacques’ sketches are of those antiquities which yet remained c. 1573, after the two major fire-sales, as above, to the Farnese and d’Este. There is more detail of Jacques’ sketches to come in Chapter 5.

3.4. Ulisse Aldrovandi

Aldrovandi begins his walk by describing that he entered through the portico of the house, immediately seeing a statue of a clothed Venus. Near her, he goes on to tell of two portraits, one of Jupiter and one of ‘Spain’ (Spagna) – the latter identification Wrede condemns as obviously erroneous. Boissard’s account clears up the confusion below (see p. 59). Inside a room on the right-hand side of the portico, he describes a beautiful

---

intact “Apollo,” who has his right arm missing and holds in his left a lyre. Aldrovandi also mentions a beautiful swan at the figure’s feet. This piece was thus identified by Wrede (among others) as a highly reconstructed Roman replica of Skopas’ Pothos from the late Classical period (Fig. 18). The piece is now housed within the Naples Archeological Museum as a consequence of its sale to the Farnese family in 1562.93

Still within the Casino, the author describes a clothed statue of Harpocrates, or ‘Silence,’ along with his female jurisdiction partner, Angerona who is here depicted with a closed and covered mouth. Nearby, is an ancient naked Apollo ‘made of clay’ (di creta) and with no arms. As well, there is the Male Mask discussed above.94 Lafreri’s designation of the Mask as ‘in the arboretum’ (in viridario), if taken as literally as possible, would lead one to believe that the mask appeared within the garden itself; but, Aldrovandi (and Boissard below) seems to contradict this.

Inside another room on the ground floor of the casino is the Bacchus and Satyr Group which has the pair ‘embracing each other sideways’ (abbracciati di traverso insieme) with a ‘tiger’ at their feet. This statue receives treatment by Pierre Jacques (Fig. 19) and the scale, style, and form closely resemble the statue of

---

93 de Valeriis, Melchior (1562). Roma, Archivio di Stato. Prot. 767 A.S.A.; I would like to thank Maria at the information desk at Naples Archeological Museum for pulling a great many strings during my brief stay in Naples during Oct. 2019 to allow me to see Skopas which was at that time in storage during the reconfiguration of the collection. 94 Lafreri, Antonio (1550-1577). Libro delle Maschere, No. 13.; Jacques, Pierre (1573) Album de Pierre Jacques, Fol. 9r.
Bacchus and Ampelos currently housed in the Uffizi. This work, however, has not yet been attributed to any known extant sculpture.\textsuperscript{95}

Curiously, what Adrlovandi describes next must be the Puteal: “You can also see a beautiful ancient round base with many figures in relief around it; which are, Mars, Apollo, Jupiter, Mercury, Hercules, Bacchus, and Asclepius.”\textsuperscript{96} Wrede believed that this ancient wellhead was the centrepiece of the del Bufalo garden. He notes, however, that at the time of Aldrovandi’s tour the Puteal was drawn into the casino, perhaps in storage. Wrede also posits that the Atlas would usually be displayed on top of the Puteal, using the piece for its base. But in Aldrovandi, the Atlas is nowhere described in the house of the del Bufalo; rather, it is in the house of Bernardino de Fabii near Santa Lucia.\textsuperscript{97}

Wrede argues that it was at this time that the Atlas was undergoing restorations in the de Fabii house. This supposition resolves the discrepancy between the lack of arms and legs in the Codices Corburgensis and Pighius of c. 1550-1555, the description of the piece as still fragmentary in the House of the de Fabii in Aldrovandi (c. 1550), and the restored Atlas depicted in the De

\textsuperscript{95} Jacques, Pierre (1573) \textit{Album de Pierre Jacques}, Fol. 9v A.
\textsuperscript{96} Aldrovandi, Ulisse (1562). \textit{Delle Statue Antiche che per Tutta Roma}, ed. Mauro, Lucio, p. 136: “Vi si vede anco una bella antica base tonda con molti imaginette di mezo rilevo intorno; che sono Marte, Apollo, Giove, Mercurio, Hercole, Bacco et Esclapio.”
\textsuperscript{97} Aldrovandi, Ulisse (1562). \textit{Delle Statue Antiche che per Tutta Roma}, ed. Mauro, Lucio, p. 96.
Vos Sketchbook published c. 1560.\(^9\) It is not possible to place the Atlas securely back within the del Bufalo garden using the de Vos sketch, as none of the other statues on the page represent antiques known to be owned by the family. It is, however, possible that the Sketchbook renders the Atlas among those statues on which de Fabii had completed restorations, including, perhaps, the torso of Bacchus described in Aldrovandi alongside the fragmentary Atlas and seen at the bottom right of the sketch in full.\(^9\) This is conjectural, of course, but the timeline is reasonable. Having positively placed the fragmentary Atlas in the de Fabii restoration house at 1550, and finished sometime before c. 1560, that gives a ten-year period in which De Vos may have seen it. Keeping that in mind, De Vos may very well have sketched the piece when he was travelling in Italy (c. 1552-1558) after training under Tintoretto.\(^10\) In contrast, Netto-Bol does not believe that the sketchbook was drawn by de Vos or even drawn in Rome. Rather, that the book copies Roman sketches of art taken from an earlier artist - namely, Maarten van Heemskerck.\(^11\) This conclusion is not possible. At the time of van Heemskerck’s drawings in Rome (c.


1532–1536) the Atlas was still fragmentary and will not have enjoyed completed restorations until some 20 years later. De Vos is the most plausible candidate for the drawing and corroborates Wrede’s argument.

Returning to Aldrovandi’s account, he says there is a statuette group of Venus and Cupid in the Casino, the same one now in the Capitoline Museum. Entering into the garden itself Aldrovandi says one is immediately faced with a large marble Cerberus – which Jacques draws in his album (Fig. 20).\(^\text{102}\) Aldrovandi also makes reference to the mythology of the creature noting his position as protector of the underworld and spoil for Hercules. This statue has now been restored into a Chimera in the Villa Albani-Torlonia at Rome. Next, a Tiger (almost certainly the Lion now within the Florence Archeological Museum) stands on a base opposite Cerberus – also, drawn by Jacques (Figs. 21–22).\(^\text{103}\)

Past the gate and the beasts, to the right, are a number of statues lining the walkway of the garden: First is a Diana, dressed and armless. The second, the Pomona identified in Wrede as the ‘Autumnal Hore’ in the Uffizi (Fig. 23). This beautiful luni (Carrara) marble statue was so striking that it may have inspired Botticelli’s Flora in the famous Primavera housed on the same floor.

\(^{102}\) Jacques, Pierre (1573) *Album de Pierre Jacques*, Fols. 77v-78r.

\(^{103}\) Jacques, Pierre (1573) *Album de Pierre Jacques*, Fols. 78r-79r.
of the same museum (see pp. 121-122). Third is a **Togatus**, of a Flamine, housed in the Florence Archeological Museum. To its immediate side is either one of the two **Kneeling Captive Persian statues** now in the Naples Archeological Museum (Fig. 24). Aldrovandi writes that the **Persian** is ‘made of a mixed stone’ (*di mischio*). The body of this piece is composed of pavonazzetto marble with the head and hands in nero antico. **La quarta** is a ‘fully dressed’ (**intiera vestita**) Venus. The fifth is a nude of **Hercules**, described as a little boy (**garzonetto**). No extant sculpture has been assigned to this statue but the type seems to be the same as the **Young Hercules** in the Capitoline Museum at Rome with the lionskin on his shoulder.

Moving on from the outer track, at the upper-end of the garden behind the spring, is a ‘two-fold marble table’ (**una tavola marmorea doppia**); perhaps the **Funerary Altar of Vettia Magna** which can be positively placed within the Bufali garden by its inscription between 1550 and 1564. On it, he describes ‘a number of carvings (**con varie scolture**) which are glossed over, save for Three Graces, ‘embracing each other’ (**abbracciate insieme**). This

---

105 Perhaps the distinction of **intiera** is important to contrast this statue with that of the first Venus seen upon entry to the Casino.
106 Ligorio, Pirro (c. 1573-1580). *Antichità Romane*, Vol. 18, Fol. 54v.: "DIS. MANIBVS VETTIÉ. MAGNAE, PATRONAE BENE. NERENTI Q. VETTVS. NICEPHOR. L." This piece was also featured in the *Dosio Sketchbook* as above: *Dosio, Giovannantonio* (1560). *Dosio Sketchbook*, Fol. 1r. Aldus Manutius copies the inscription verbatim in 1566, however, the location at that time cannot be determined: Manutius, Aldus (1566). *Orthographae Ratio Collecta*, p. 722, No. 2.
piece may have been the relief drawn by Cassiano dal Pozzo, in his Album from around the late 16th Century (Fig. 25). With similar sketches drawn in the codices Coburgensis and Pighius c. 1550 – 1555 we may also include the Trajanic Lady Relief.107 Pierre Jacques seems also to have a detail of this image in his Album along with the relief Woman and Loves.108

Briefly digressing from his discussion of antiquities, Aldrovandi describes the artificial spring in the garden which receives more detailed treatment in Boissard. “Here is a bizarre spring,” Aldrovandi says, “rustic in a very charming way, so composed in the rough mound from which the water comes out, as if from the very soil itself - which is trampled - and in every other part of it.”109 There, on the ‘walls’ (mura) – that is the Casino walls – a number of ancient portraits, one of which he identifies as an Antinoös.

In another, smaller, fountain there is a statue lying down and Aldrovandi believes it is a Cleopatra. The statue is very likely the Sleeping Ariadne housed in the Florence Archaeological Museum and currently on loan to the Uffizi (Fig. 26).110

---

Turning back now to face the rest of the garden, Aldrovandi describes how some portrait busts rise above of the precincts of the Bufali garden and are displayed in order: the first, that comes straightaway, is of the Emperor Commodus. The second is of a Greek Man and it is in the ‘Greek Style’ (di maniera). The third to come is of Marcus Aurelius, on whom Aldrovandi renders a positive moral judgement as a ‘good emperor’ (che fu buono Imperatore). The fourth, is a Maximinius Thrax, against whom he renders a negative moral judgement (fu cattivo principe); this piece is in the inventory of the Uffizi but is on loan to the Villa Corsini some 7 kilometres away. The fifth is of Marius. The sixth is unidentified. And, the final portrait of this array is of Tiberius, the successor to Augustus who is condemned as having crucified Jesus (Salvator...crucifisso).

Up from the garden, there is a loggia which houses a series of studi. In the doorway leading into this place, there are two more portraits: one of a Hadrian and another Scipio Africanus. The first room of the upper floor is described as having a lineup of portrait busts, placed on ‘their own bases’ (co’ petti poste sopra le basi loro). The first statue is a bust of Venus, wrapped with a cloth around her neck. The second is of the Emperor Geta as a
young man; again, wrapped with a cloth around his neck and shoulders. In the place across from Venus is a bust of Vespasian on a base ‘made of a mixed stone’ (basi di mischio) – a type of which there are examples in the British, Naples Archeological, and the Capitoline Museums. This particular statue has not yet been identified. Above la ciminera there is a bust of a dressed Antoninus Pius, next to the Head of a Woman with her chest covered, and the bust of a Hercules.

In another room, there is an unidentified, but specifically ‘ancient’ (antica), bust and two nude busts of male Children. In the third room of the upper loggia, there is a nude bust of another Antoninus Pius. As well, there are two Greeks: one the Head of a Woman in the Greek Style (di maniera); the other, the bust of the Greek orator, Lysias. The latter, conspicuous by the inscription “ΛΥΣΙΑΣ” on his neck (Fig. 27). Aldrovandi’s tour of the del Bufalo garden concludes here and is supplemented by the description by Jean-Jacques Boissard.

3.5. Jean-Jacques Boissard

Boissard begins his tour, like Aldrovandi, by describing that he entered the Casino through the portico, immediately seeing a statue of Venus. This time, however, the Venus seen by the Frenchman is described as a nude (Veneris nudae). The next statue described is again the Apollo / Pothos near the statues of
Harpocrates (no Angerona this time) and the Bacchus and Satyr Group, described in very similar syntax to Aldrovandi (qui sese mutuis tenant complexibus), with a tiger at their feet. There is also the clay Apollo whose material is not mentioned here. New additions to this part of the course appear to be a Juno, a Jove, and ‘other gods’ (aliorum Deorum). As well, heads of Jove and Palladas. Seeing as Spain is often rendered allegorically as a woman with a helmet, spear, shield, and gorgon it is possible that the confusing helmet-wearing female head marked by Aldrovandi ostensibly as ‘Spagna’ might be reconciled by the pairing of a ‘Jove’ a.k.a. Jupiter as here with his daughter ‘Palladas’ a.k.a. Minerva.

Still within the casino, on the ground floor are two Masks this time. Then Boissard remarks on what is unmistakably the Puteal: a ‘great base’ (basis magna), with a beautiful relief of Jupiter, Apollo, Bacchus, Hercules, Mercury, Mars, and Asclepius. If both Aldrovandi and Boissard believed that the Puteal was meant to be a base, it follows that so too did the del Bufalo family. Seeing as no Atlas is described in this garden by Boissard either, the likeliest motivation remains that the Puteal’s presence inside was its preservation until the statue which rested on top of it was returned to the garden. The Puteal was of course open and deep set and therefore particularly susceptible to rain and water.
damage. Last in the house, the Venus with Cupid statuette, likely the same one noted in Aldrovandi.

Boissard is much more enamored with the natural and naturalistic features of the arboretum than his Italian predecessor and takes great care in detailing the many trees and plants he sees. First, he notes the palms, cedars, and pomegranate trees around the property; as well, the medicinal benefit of having myrtle on the lot. The small digression leads to the beautiful image of the colossal, three-headed Cerberus and the Tiger a.k.a. Lion from before, ‘amongst the trees’ (intervallis arborum). In Boissard’s account the beasts are described as being opposite each other (ex opposito).

Again, on the immediate track of the garden Boissard lists a Diana, a Pomona, and a Flamine in the same order as Aldrovandi. Then he mentions a complete and clothed Venus, a Hercules as a young boy, a new addition of a Sabine Woman, and the pavonazzetto Kneeling Captive Persian.

Within the first cubicle of the Garden Boissard reiterates the seven busts in Aldrovandi: A Commodus, a Greek Man, a Marcus Aurelius, a Maximinius Thrax, a Marius, and the final bust still unidentified. Here there are no new additions.

In the entrance to the upper loggia, Boissard confirms the presence of a Hadrian and of a Scipio Africanus. The description of the first room in the loggia is a near carbon copy of Aldrovandi;
yet again including the bust of a Venus, a Hercules, a Vespasian, a Marcus Aurelius as a youth, as well as a woman, here identified as a Sabine. Less clearly located are the group in Boissard of the Emperor Geta, two statues of Antoninus Pius, two statues of male Children, a Greek looking Woman, and the Lysias. From Aldrovandi it is possible to locate the two Children in the second room along with the Geta whose age is not mentioned in Boissard. In the third room, the Greek Woman, the Lysias, and both of the two – one apparently newly acquired – Antoninus Piuses.

Going back out into the garden, Boissard delights in the spring at the upper end. He says the piece was created from marine tufa and covered so brilliantly in shells, clams, Indian cochlea, and large pearls that there might be nothing more splendid to see in the whole garden (nihil speciosius usquam videri possit). A system of copper tubing causes a rush of water to shoot out all over the fountain, supplied by the Acqua Vergine at the edge of the space. Trees of laurel, cedar, and tamarisk were planted all around the artificial crag to provide shade for the ‘three most-elegant statues of muses’ (tria Musarum elegantissima), the two-fold marble table, and a statue of Caracalla. Boissard further notes that images of Demetrius, of Maximinius, Phillip, and Claudius, among others, can be seen arranged around the spring (disposita sunt undique signa, quae suis e loculis extant).
The final detail noted of the Bufali garden by Boissard is that of a Mosaic. It is unclear whether or not this piece was antique and so found on the property or a new commission. Nevertheless, Boissard crafts an elegant picture of a nearby outdoor mosaic of chalcedony, porphyry, alabaster, thassian, parian, and marmaric marble, ophite, and Ethipoian opal. A work he describes as demanding the highest admiration.

3.6. Supplementary Sources

Of the pieces not solidly placed by either Aldrovandi or Boissard within the garden - or out for restorations - there remains evidence for seven statues. Three of which are identified in the Codex Berolinensis by Giovannantonio Dosio under the explicit designation “le tre figure sono nel giardino del Buffalo” (Fig. 28). The first of the three female statues is a Hygiea, draped, and holding her typical goblet and snake - this statue is currently housed in the Palazzo Pitti in Florence (Fig. 29). The second figure is the so-called Muse of Atticanus in the Uffizi (Fig. 30) who received corroborative treatment in a 16th century sketch by Jacopo Strada in the Codex Miniatus with its curiously transliterated inscription: ΟΡΟΣ ΑΤΤΙϹΗΝΙΓ ΑΛΠΟΣΙΠΕΝΙΓ (Fig. 31). The last is dubbed Draped Standing Female and has been

112 Dosio, Giovannantonio (c. 1560). Codex Berolinensis, Fol. 59r.
113 Strada, Jacopo (c. 1500-1600). Codex Miniatus, Fol. 48.: An odd transliteration for ‘opus atticiani[s] afrodisiensis.’
positively identified by the Census as Niobid #296, currently placed within the stunningly curated Niobid Room, also, in the Uffizi Gallery (Fig. 32). Hygiea is the only statue sketched twice within the Berolinensis, each drawing by a different artist. In the sketch by Dosio, she bears the inscription ‘MAZΩΝ KAKIOP;’ when featured individually by an anonymous author, it is recorded ‘KMAZΩΝ AKIOP’.114 These inscriptions may not necessarily be authentically antique; it is possible that the mix-up is the result of an imposed Renaissance-era ‘classicizing’ inscription.

An Amor with Cloak of Mars (Fig. 33) is drawn in Pierre Jacques’ Album (c. 1573) with the inscription ‘bufaly’ unmistakably below.115 This statue is in the inventory of the Florence Archeological Museum but currently on loan to the Villa Corsini, in Florence.116 The unique statue is not mentioned in any documentary sources and seems therefore either to be a late addition into the Palazzo del Bufalo or moved to a more prominent position following the liquidations in 1562 and 1572.

A Draped Female Statue can be seen with the label ‘bufaly’ in the Album of Pierre Jacques but has no parallel in the documentary sources. The label may not be certain either as it appears to be

114 Dosio, Giovannantonio (c. 1560). Codex Berolinensis, Fol. 59r; Anonymous (c. 1560). Codex Berolinensis, Fol. 62r. The meaning of either inscription is not immediately clear. From the condition of the base rendered in the anonymous artist’s drawing it appears as though the statue was once a part of a larger group (or at least a larger base) with a more complete version of the inscription.

115 Again, thank you to Mario Iozzo, Director of the Florence Archeological Museum for helping me to track the Amor to the Villa.
more directly related to a fragmentary figure whose arm is all that remains featured on the same page. A sketch which appears to depict a bearded Drunken Reclining Satyr or a Silenus type (Fig. 34) also finds no parallel in our texts. Again, both of these statues come from the Album which followed the liquidation of many of the Bufali antiques and may represent later additions to the collection. In this case, there is no way to securely place these sketches in location within the Palazzo, whether in the garden, casino, or upper loggia.

Finally, it has been put forward by Henning Wrede that a painting by the Cinquecento mannerist Taddeo Zuccaro, which once hung in the del Bufalo garden house, demonstrates that a statue of Minerva also stood there.\textsuperscript{117} She is in the Hope-Albani or Farnese Type. It is possible, Wrede asserts, that this Minerva stood next to the Pothos who is represented here as well. The Pothos / Apollo was considered among the most beautiful statues in the garden and presents a perfect touchstone for Zuccaro’s work; the Minerva is described by Wrede as having “obviously supplemented arms,” as well as “a modern helmet and shield.”\textsuperscript{118} The grouping of the painting focusses strongly on the Apollo / Pothos while the Minerva stands to one side. Taddeo Zuccaro (and his brother Federico) often depicted Minerva in paintings as an allegory for art, wisdom, and

\textsuperscript{117} Gere, J.A. (1969). Taddeo Zuccaro: His Development Studied in His Drawing, No. 109
\textsuperscript{118} Wrede, Henning (1983). Der Antikengarten Der Del Bufalo Bei Der Fontana Trevi, p. 8.
learning (cf. Zuccaro, Taddeo. *A Kneeling Man Holding A Tablet, Presented by Minerva to an Enthroned Pope*; Zuccaro, Federico. *Pallas Athena Shows Taddeo the Prospect of Rome*.) In fact, her common association with memory was utilized by collectors in the Renaissance too. Unfortunately, Wrede was not able to identify the Minerva of the painting with an extant statue despite exploring examples in Copenhagen, Paris, and Vatican City - nor can I.\textsuperscript{119}

These are the antique arts and artefacts in the Bufali Family sculpture collection.

\textsuperscript{119} Wrede, Hennning (1983). *Der Antikengarten Der Del Bufalo Bei Der Fontana Trevi*, p. 23 n. 73.
Chapter 4. The Bufali Family and Dates for Curatorship

The lineage of the Del Bufalo family may be reproduced in two ways. These multiple versions are the product of some ambiguity as to whether the Stefano del Bufalo featured in this thesis is the son of Paolo del Bufalo (husband of Giulia di Mario Altieri) or Antonio del Bufalo (husband of a one ‘Nicolina’) and owner of the Obelsik from Chapter 3. The latter seems most likely given the following summary of state archives. Working from the records in Venditti and De Dominicis, ‘Genealogy A’ may be compiled from state documents starting in 1437 with the presumptive Great-great Grandfather of a ‘Stefano del Bufalo,’ named Angelo del Bufalo de’ Cancellieri. Succession occurred generationally, as follows:

Genealogy A

| Angelo del Bufalo de’ Cancellieri (Gen. 1) | Christophoro del Bufalo (Gen. 2) | Antonio del Bufalo (Gen. 3) | Paolo del Bufalo (Gen. 4) | Stefano del Bufalo (Gen. 5) |

Sources

Angelo del Bufalo de’ Cancellieri (Gen. 1)

---


This succession is confused by the record of a second man named “Stefano del Bufalo” living in Rome around 1550, to whom De Dominicis attributes half of our Stefano del Bufalo’s accomplishments. Testimony by the correct Stefano, whose garden was decorated by the frescoes of Polidoro Caldara da Caravaggio...
and Maturino Fiorentino, claims a father by the name of "Antonio." Further, Paolo del Bufalo (Gen. 4) of 'Genealogy A' cannot be the father of Stefano del Bufalo because he had no son also named 'Paolo.' A Paolo in the same generation of our Stefano is necessary to the proper genealogy as we know that a brother with this name takes over curatorship of the garden when Stefano leaves the role in the 1560's. As such, our del Bufalo lineage is most accurately rendered in this way:

**Genealogy B**

![Genealogy Diagram](attachment:image.png)

**Sources**

- Angelo del Bufalo de' Cancellieri (Gen. 1)
- Christophoro del Bufalo (Gen. 2)
- Antonio del Bufalo (Gen. 3)
- Stefano del Bufalo (Gen. 4)

---

127 De Dominicis describes his dates and fatherhood as “per lui (?),” expressing some unknown confusion, see, De Dominicis, Claudio (2017). “del BUFALO, del BUFALO CANCELLIERI, del BUFALO della VALLE” in Biografie e famiglie - Accademia Moroniana, p. 28.


For this chapter, if patronage of the house is assigned to those members of the family indicated in descriptions of the sculpture garden and Casino through time, we can match the genealogy above with the sources for the garden and securely date individual curatorship.

The lineage of ‘Genealogy B’ begins in the same place as ‘Genealogy A,’ with Angelo del Bufalo de’ Cancellieri, and both continue onto Christophoro. Where proper identification of Stefano’s father occurs, however, the order of inheritance for the familial property - as well as curatorship of the garden-casino - becomes clearer and follows generationally until the time of Paolo. No such conclusive rendering of the Trevi del Bufalo has been done before; so, it will be explained by the following evidence.


There is record of Angelo’s curatorship at the house in Trevi from c. 1484-1497 with Petrus Sabinus’ description of the Puteal. Sabinus writes: “...in the same neighbourhood (i.e., near the Domum Triapanum in Trivio) in the house of Angelo del Bufalo...there is a statue of Hercules and many other gods in a circle.”\(^{133}\) This corresponds with biographical records for an Angelo del Bufalo de’ Cancellieri which begin in 1437 and span to his un-recorded death “after 1479.”\(^{134}\) According to state documentation, Angelo became the first of his family to work in the Capitoline Offices being named Conservatore of Campidoglio (i.e., the area of Capitoline Hill – between the Roman Forum and the Campus Martius) in 1437, was made Consul of Wool Merchants in 1439, and would be knighted under Pope Martin V on November 11\(^{th}\), 1464.\(^{135}\) After his knighthood he began to split time between a house in Porta Pinciana and the Trevi Palazzo del Bufalo.

\(^{133}\) Sabinus, Petrus (1484-1497). Sabinus Sylloge, Fol. 123v: “...in eadem vicinia (i.e. prope domum Triapanum in Trivio) in domo Angeli Bubali, ubi est statua Herculis et multorum deorum in ciclo...”


There is a single extant reference to Angelo’s son, Christophoro (Stefano’s Grandfather), as the patron of the Casino del Bufalo which will be discussed below.\textsuperscript{136} Roman municipal archives indicate that, just like his father, Christophoro was a prolific actor in the Church and more involved than his offspring in political affairs. He, again like his father, was appointed Conservatore of Campidoglio, was a delegate representative sent on behalf of the Pope to welcome King Charles VIII and King Francis I from France into Rome on two separate occasions, and was named the Perpetual Chancellor of the People of Rome (Cancelliere Perpetuo del Popolo Romano) until his death in 1499.\textsuperscript{137} It can be assumed that Christophoro funneled money earned through his political endeavours into his family home while also working to restore and preserve the monuments of Rome and excelling the reputation of the city under (and in the period immediately following) Sixtus IV.\textsuperscript{138}

The politician married two women, his first wife a ‘Paolina’ (who is on record as having died in 1475 and having been buried at the Basilica di Santa Maria Sopra Minerva) and later Francesca


\textsuperscript{138} cf. the discussion of the Renovatio Romae on pp. 23-26.
Orsini.\textsuperscript{139} With them, Christophoro had six children including Stefano del Bufalo’s father Antonio to whom Christophoro left the Palazzo at Trevi.\textsuperscript{140} Being that there is a single reference to Christophoro operating the garden it is difficult to put forward a complete tenure. Fortunately, the same writer, Petrus Sabinus, who could only have written about Angelo del Bufalo between 1484-1497, also records Christophoro as the curator which must necessarily have been observed later.\textsuperscript{141} We have, therefore, an approximate earliest date of 1497 while mentions of Antonio del Bufalo below provide the latest.

The next explicit note on curatorship at the Palazzo del Bufalo names Antonio. The attestation comes from Italian philologist Marco Fabio Calvo’s swan-song reconstruction of Roman Antiquities, \textit{Antiquae Urbis Romae cum Regionibus Simulacrum}, published in 1527. The work featured in this book was executed and compiled around 1514-1515.\textsuperscript{142} These dates coincide then with stipulations made about the accessibility of gardens to “honest and learned men” in the \textit{Supernae Dispositionis Arbitrio} bill of

\textsuperscript{142} Calcagini, Cello (1608). \textit{Epistolarum criticarum et familiarium libri}, Bk. 7, Ep. 27. For the identification of the chronology of Calvo’s work see, Fontana, Vincenzo and Morachiello, Paolo (1975). \textit{Vitruvio e Raffaello: il De architectura di Vitruvio nella traduzione inedita di Fabio Calvo ravennate}, pp. 27-44.
1514, some eighteen years after the last public record of visitors to the Bufali garden.\textsuperscript{143} Calvo’s excerpt regarding the del Bufalo Obelisk reads, “even today this Obelisk can be seen laid upon the ground in the garden-house of the noble Roman Antonio del Bufalo.”\textsuperscript{144}

In the same year that Calvo’s work was published, the mutinous troops of Charles V attacked in what would be the 7\textsuperscript{th} Sack of Rome. The sack led to the destruction or scattering of many antiquities collections across the city. Antonio del Bufalo’s neighbour at the time, Angelo Colocci (discussed above on p. 32) was forced to liquidate his assets to fulfill ransoms in the aftermath. He consequently lost his coin collection and library too; motivated soon after to sell his adjacent property to Antonio del Bufalo sometime before 1531.\textsuperscript{145} These records, paired with Kultzen, Wrede, and Coffin’s conclusions that Caravaggio and Maturino painted their fresco cycle c. 1525 under Antonio’s direction, present a clear picture of the length of his tenure as property manager at the Palazzo del Bufalo. He is on record as \textit{Pater Familias} in this


\textsuperscript{144} Calvo, Marco Fabio (1527). \textit{Antiquae Urbis Romae cum Regionibus Simulachrum}, n.p.: “Sexta vero Regio Alta semita dicitur...Circum Floralium, cuius obeliscus hodie quoque humi stratus, in vineto nobilis civis romani Antonii de Bubalo, cernitur.”

regard until the second quarter of the 1500s when Vasari named his son, Stefano del Bufalo, as the new head of household.

Stefano’s time as curator is the most well documented and will be discussed in great detail in Chapter 5. For now, it is to be noted that there is clear evidence that he was running the garden before the 1550s and this is made explicit by many authors (see Chapter 3). The evidence for this period starts with Vasari who could only have visited Stefano’s garden during sporadic visits to Rome between 1527-1532 and 1540-1546. This passage explores Polidoro’s paintings. Given the evidence for Antonio’s curatorship during this first period it is more likely that Vasari visited the del Bufalo garden between 1540-1547 while he decorated the Palazzo della Cancelleria. He calls the garden specifically the “giardino di messer Stefano dal Bufalo.” Vasari would then have observed the paintings some fifteen years after their completion. By the end of his second stint at Rome, Vasari had finished writing his Vite and would return to Tuscany shortly thereafter.

Only two other records of Stefano’s life exist in the state archives: first, when he was made a canon at the church of the Vatican Basilica in 1534, and second, when he was made a canon at the church of Santa Maria in Via Lata in 1561. It is therefore safe to record the curatorship of Stefano del Bufalo from around

---

1540 (earliest possible record) to 1561 - at which time his brother Paolo took over. Although, the period between 1534-1550 is uncertain.

The public record for the life of Paolo del Bufalo (son of Antonio and brother of Stefano) begins at 1545 when he was named Consigliere di Colonna on a term-by-term basis. His curriculum vitae ends in 1582 when he was named Maestro delle Strade (‘Master of the Streets’) for the second time - a role similar to the ancient plebeian Aedile. During the time of his brother Stefano’s curatorship at the Casino del Bufalo, Paolo was made Caporione di Colonna three times (1545, 1550, and 1553), Consigliere three additional times (1545; 1546 (x2), and 1549), and one of the three Conservatori di Roma – a role modelled on the ancient Consul and the highest executive role in 16th century municipal Rome – in 1559.147 One year later, Pirro Ligorio would visit the Giardino del Bufalo in 1560 still referring to it as the house of Stefano.148

In 1561 when Stefano was made a canon at the Church of Santa Maria in Via Lata and presumably offered rectory. It was then that he must have relinquished the Palazzo del Bufalo and moved into the clergy house in Via Lata where he likely stayed until he died.149 There is a hiatus in Paolo’s state administration after

his time as Conservatore di Roma until the Farnese Sale of 1562 when curatorship is explicitly recorded to have been already been passed from Stefano to him. The notary for this sale, Melchior de Valeriis, identifies “Paulus de Bubalis” as the “dominus” of the house. They events explain why for the first time, leadership at the Casino del Bufalo did not transfer generationally but rather laterally to another sibling. We shall see that this change in leadership and transitional phase led to the del Bufalo family selling their antiquities beginning in 1562.

As mentioned in Chapter 2, during the later years of the Council of Trent, Church powers focussed discussion on the value of Pagan art and classical restoration to the Catholic cause. They criticized the collection and idolization of pagan relics and began to compel followers of the Church to abandon antiquities in favour of Christian artefacts. Foreign buyers and the exceedingly rich (such as the Farnese and the d’Este) were well aware of the obligation devout upper-middle class Roman families felt to sell their wares. Especially, they noticed, whenever curatorship turned over, a nobleman died, or a family faced financial uncertainty were they to renounce the Church. These buyers happily relieved them.

150 de Valeriis, Melchior (1562). Roma, Archivio di Stato, Prot. 767 A.S.A.: “...Constitutus personaliter magnificus dominus Paulus de Bubalis nobilis et civis ramonis sponte...”
For the del Bufalo who had ingratiated themselves to the Church for generations despite being a non-Roman family this was the case. When Stefano took up rectory at *Santa Maria in Via Lata*, his obvious devotion to Christianity and the necessary transfer of curatorial power to his brother presented the perfect opportunity to the buyer’s market and for the Bufali to continue their climb up the list of noble (and, perhaps more importantly for them, devoted) Romans.

When the opportunity first arose to sell their goods to the Farnese, Paolo took it. This sale under Paolo in 1562 was a great success for the family. In its wake he was offered Caporione again in 1563, then in 1566 he was made Caporione yet another time in the first year of the famously anti-antique-art Pius V’s papacy (r. 1566-1572). After this, Paolo continued his meteoric rise when he was appointed Governor of the prefecture of Norcia and Montagna later that year.\textsuperscript{152} When Gregory XIII succeeded Pius V in 1572, however, Paolo del Bufalo maintained municipal political roles only (the reasons for this will be explored in Chapter 5). He last appeared in the public record in 1582 as Maestro delle Strade for the second time.\textsuperscript{153}

\textsuperscript{152} Remember that Pius V regretted that the antiquities within the Belvedere collection were housed in the Vatican and considered donating the artefacts to the Capitoline. See, Weber, Christoph (1994). *Legati e governatori dello Stato pontificio (1550-1809)*, p. 312; Stenhouse, William (2005). “Display, and Reception in the Antiquity Collections of Late-Renaissance Rome”, in Renaissance Quarterly, Vol. 58, No. 2, p. 412.

For the sake of clarity, the exact order of family lineage and curatorship where recorded explicitly is represented as such:

Ownership/Curatorship* at the Palazzo Del Bufalo:

- Angelo del Bufalo de’ Cancellieri (Gen. 1)
  o Curator: c. 1484-1497 CE

- Christophoro del Bufalo (Gen. 2)
  o Curator: c. 1497-1514 CE

- Antonio del Bufalo (Gen. 3)
  o Curator: c. 1514-1525 CE

- Stefano del Bufalo (Gen. 4)
  o Curator: c. 1540-1561 CE

- Paolo del Bufalo (Gen. 4)
  o Curator: c. 1562-1572 CE

*Curatorship not exact range but represents the date of first and last mention.

Now that the chronology of who ran and curated the collection and when has been established, we can turn our attention to the analysis of the collection itself. In the following chapter we will determine what this Bufali family collected and why. Further, I will offer a recreation of where the pieces in the collection stood and to what effect.
Chapter 5. Analysis and Interpretation

5.1. Previous Analyses of the Bufali Collection’s Artistic Program

Only one other analysis of the del Bufalo sculpture collection has been undertaken since it was dispersed in the latter half of the 16th century. This analysis was published as part of the 4th Edition of the Winckelmannsprogramme at The University of Trier, Germany. Professor Dr. Henning Wrede wrote Der Antikengarten der del Bufalo bei der Fontana Trevi in 1982 and the subsequent publication was presented at the Winckelmanns-Feier on December 9th, 1983.

From the evidence listed in Chapter 3, Henning Wrede deduced that the collection, at one point or another, consisted of approximately 29 artefacts. Eight of which, he believed, could be solidly identified with extant statuary.\textsuperscript{154} My own research suggests the total number should stand at 79 artefacts and 18 extant identifications. Wrede asserted that the crown jewels of the collection are the Puteal and Atlas Farnese which served as the Bufali’s centrepiece and set the tone for an Atlas-focussed thematic program. Wrede does not treat the portrait busts known through Aldrovandi and Boissard in detail; the one exception being the Ancient Greek orator Lysias – whose identity, whereabouts, and

\textsuperscript{154} Wrede, Hennning (1983). Der Antikengarten Der Del Bufalo Bei Der Fontana Trevi, pp. 3-18.
provenance are made certain by Wrede, owing to its inscription. Unfortunately, there is no thematic analysis of this figure.

When looking for an artistic program among the statues Wrede states, “the list [of antiques] confuses rather than clarifies.” Instead of relying on the statues themselves, Wrede turns to the fresco paintings that decorated the walls of the casino explaining: “We must turn to the Renaissance décor with its clearer statements, since it has taken up or predetermined the programmatic intentions of the Antique Garden.” For this, Wrede turns to the fresco cycle reconstructed by Rolf Kultzen in his Die Malereien Polidoros da Caravaggio im Giardino del Bufalo in Rom (1960). This was the first commission of frescoes implemented on the angled wall of the garden house c. 1525 under Antonio del Bufalo:

1. Left wall:
   a. Top: Danae in Golden Rain.
   b. Bottom left above the interior portico: Perseus eavesdrops on the Hesperides.

2. Right wall (Fig. 35):
   d. Top left of the Loggia: Perseus frees Andromeda.
   e. Top right of the Loggia: Votive with Cepheus and Cassiopeia.

---

155 Inscribed in the bust’s neck is the name ‘ΛΥΣΙΑΣ.’
g. Bottom right of the niche: Pegasus beats Hippocrene onto the Helicon / Consecration of the poet.

These paintings by Polidoro and Maturino were removed in 1885 and sold to the Capitoline Museums for 1000 Lire. Today they are housed in the Museo di Roma of the Palazzo Braschi.¹⁵⁸

Kultzen’s own analysis marked the narrative similarities between Books 4-5 of Ovid’s Metamorphoses and the scenes featured in the fresco cycle - while Wrede emphasizes the deviations.¹⁵⁹ Of course, the paintings feature Perseus, Andromeda, and Atlas; however, they neglect to depict Medusa who represents the climax and living-MacGuffin of the Perseus myth. In place of this conclusion is an idyllic scene of four Hesperides, who are the mythical Conservatori of the garden. Another monster is also absent from this scene who might normally be expected: Ladon. The dragon’s presence in the cycle would have “given the cheerful scene a grimly disjointed accent,” Wrede remarks.¹⁶⁰ The substitution made for Ladon is that of a river god, with his back to the viewer, leaning on a broken amphora from which water rushes out. This episode is

an invention of the painters. Wrede concludes that an abstraction such as this, which belies the greater Ovidian narrative, must be a concerted effort on the part of the curators to represent the programmatic intention of the del Bufalo.\(^\text{161}\) The same effort which led to the depiction of the **Hippocrene** and the **Consecration of the Poet**. Polidoro was using these scenes to transition from the well-known myth of Perseus to the competition between the Muses and Pierids, featured in Ovid 5 (294-340).\(^\text{162}\) The contest takes place on Mt. Helicon by the Hippocrene and put into focus the Bufali emphasis on water imagery.

On the top left wall of the casino this imagery presents itself with the *Danae in Golden Rain*. Where one would expect the impenetrable tower of Danae’s imprisonment there is a large arch in its place which imposes itself on the middle of the picture. Danae and her nurse stretch their arms up to the rain falling from its apex, as if the rain is dripping down from the arch itself. Wrede believes that the *Danae* scene represents a famous, real, raining arch on the *Aqua Virgo* / *Acqua Vergine*, citing Martial (4. 18. 1-2) who reports: “the gate close to the Vipsanian columns / drips and the stone is wet and slippery because of the constant rain.”\(^\text{163}\) This view subscribes also to Thomas Ashby who has equated


Martial’s arch with the Fornix Claudii, located just a few meters outside the garden.\textsuperscript{164} If correct this would mark an attempt by Polidoro to make the mythical golden rain of Zeus analogous to the actual falling water on the Renaissance Acqua Vergine. In this way, the ‘virgin’ Danae’s immaculate conception and the dripping arch provide a pictorial allegory for the ‘Vergine’ aqueduct that brings its bounty to the Palazzo del Bufalo – and quite possibly influenced its construction.\textsuperscript{165} The analogy with the Christian Virgin Mary is obvious.

In 1560, Stefano del Bufalo commissioned Taddeo Zuccaro to paint a Parnassus to be hung inside the loggia on top of Polidoro’s Helicon. The painting featured the del Bufalo Apollo / Pothos and Minerva. The specific location of this piece within the loggia is not known. Wrede considers it to have hung in the West-wing, on account of its smaller size, while Kultzen believes it was hung in the East-wing.\textsuperscript{166} This work does little to further Wrede’s aquatic program nor does it feature the Perseus myth. What the picture does satisfy, however, is the continuance of the idyllic aesthetic of the garden and loggia rooms. The depicted scene has nothing

explicitly to do with Atlas or his Hesperides; but it was still a
garden of inspiration and the arts with other mythological
allusions. More on this to come.

Where Wrede’s arguments are less convincing is in his
discussion of how directly the themes of the Renaissance paintings
commissioned by the del Bufalo link to the antique sculptures given
by Aldrovandi, Boissard, and others. In the context of the Helicon
and Parnassus paintings, the association between poetry,
inspiration, and the Graces described on reliefs by Aldrovandi and
those in the round noted by Boissard seems clear.\textsuperscript{167} His argument
that Pomona, whose name and apple-cloth bring to mind the apples
of the Garden of the Hesperides, lines up. Wrede begins, however,
to bend the antiquities to his perceived program rather than
letting the pieces speak for themselves. He asserts that those
passerby of the Cleopatra in the fountain might see her as a
Castalia; thus, hinting to the Parnassus. But when Aldrovandi
passed her in 1550 (where she was included at least ten years
before the Parnassus was even painted) he called her “Cleopatra.”\textsuperscript{168}
Wrede earlier in his paper admits that in the Renaissance,
Cleopatras were “transformed into nymphs-at-the-rock-fountain by
mostly very extensive revisions;” but no such revisions are noted

\textsuperscript{168} Aldrovandi, Ulisse (1562). Delle Statue Antiche che per Tutta Roma, ed. MaurG, Lucio,
p. 137: “Dentro un’altra fonticella, che pure quivi è, si vede un’antica statua giacere,
et è Cleopatra”; Wrede, Henning (1983). Der Antikengarten Der Del Bufalo Bei Der Fontana
Trevi, p. 13.
here or anywhere of the extant statue now in the Uffizi. The first
mention of the piece as a nymph at all was in Winckelmann’s
assessment of her as a “sleeping nymph” in 1776. Before that the
artist Matteo sketched her in the Villa Medici sometime between
1715-1730 with the transcription “Cleopatra in Villa Medici no.
113.”

The “Lion,” Wrede believes, would have reminded the viewer of
Hercules, his labours, and eventual trip to the realm of the
Hesperides; but, no one who wrote of the statue referred to it as
a lion. The animal was only ever known as the Tiger in this
period. As Mark Fullerton notes in his review, Wrede also
suggests that the del Bufalo Caracalla might have been considered
a Perseus equestrian statue by the addition of apples to his left
hand and the Medusa on his base. Unfortunately, Boissard
explicitly calls the statue “the Emperor Caracalla” and goes on to
say the depicted man “is conspicuous being covered by his typical
marble cloak.”

---

statue of the Emperor was ever in the garden. It is upon its sale called the “Cavallo.”\textsuperscript{173}

Finally, the centrepiece of Wrede’s \textit{aufstellung programme} is the \textit{Atlas}. Wanting to paint the del Bufalo courtyard as the Garden of the Hesperides in Trevi, Wrede attempts to connect each of the above elements (i.e., the \textit{Cleopatra} / “Castalia,” the \textit{Tiger} / “Lion,” the \textit{Caracalla} / “Perseus,” and the \textit{Graces} / “Muses” / “Hesperides”) with the \textit{Atlas}. Of course, Atlas is the father of the Hesperides and the foe of Perseus and Hercules. More to Wrede’s point, the celestial map of the \textit{Atlas} features Perseus fighting a sea monster near the constellation of Taurus. Wrede, hopes that the Taurus and Perseus will bring to mind the family name, “del Bufalo” and the familial ‘program’ respectively. This point resonated so strongly with the author that a year after his first publication on the garden he would write a second article entitled \textit{Perseus als Heros der del Bufalo} (1984) in which he argued that the del Bufalo took Perseus as the ancestral hero of their family.\textsuperscript{174}

While the place of Perseus among the frescoes would not have easily been missed, Christian argues that the visitors might never have seen nor remarked on the Perseus in the celestial globe of the \textit{Atlas} (Fig. 36). She goes on to argue that this connection

\textsuperscript{173} de Valeriis, Melchior (1562). Roma, Archivio di Stato. Prot. 767 A.S.A.
between the frescoes and miniscule detail on the globe is too tenuous to be a credible linchpin for the program.\textsuperscript{175} That is not at all to mention that - like the \textit{Tiger}, \textit{Cleopatra}, or \textit{Caracalla} - no one ever referred to the statue as anything other than \textit{“Hercules”} during its recorded tenure in the Palazzo del Bufalo from c. 1550 until it was sold in 1562.\textsuperscript{176} A point which Wrede gently concedes.\textsuperscript{177}

While Wrede’s idea of an installation program is far from all-encompassing (not incorporating statues such as the \textit{Diana}, the \textit{Harpocrates}, the \textit{Angerona}, the \textit{Bacchus and Satyr} group, etc.) it is convincing in so far as its rendering of the aquatic motif, idyllic themes, and interest in Perseus cycle are concerned.

His conclusions are drawn under the assumption that an artistic ‘program’ is the product of an overarching goal being systematically carried to completion from the beginning of the collection to its final days.\textsuperscript{178} It is important, however, to remember that by the end of the 1500s the del Bufalo collection had been active for roughly ninety years and had changed hands four times. Such a unified program is universally unlikely and


\textsuperscript{176} Interestingly, when Aldrovandi saw the statue in the De Fabii restoration house he called it "Atalante;" So too did de Valeriis the notary of the Farnese sale in 1562. But the \textit{Atlas} is always referred to as Hercules in the del Bufalo Garden (see, p. 87). See, Aldrovandi, Ulisse (1562). \textit{Delle Statue Antiche che per Tutta Roma}, ed. Mauro, Lucio, p. 136; de Valeriis, Melchior (1562). \textit{Roma, Archivio di Stato}. Prot. 767 A.S.A.;


certainly not executed in the Bufali garden. Wrede’s program may represent the real intentions of the del Bufalo at one time or another; but it does not represent the whole picture.

5.2. The Bufali Collection Through Time

This section will identify a new total of 79 artefacts within the del Bufalo Casino and Sculpture Garden and will place them as specifically as possible in accordance with the given evidence. Where appropriate, I will also attribute the documentary or representative evidence to extant sculptures. In order to give the most complete inventory possible, I will employ the descriptions of Aldrovandi and Boissard and supplement other authors and artists as I see fit.

5.2.1. Angelo del Bufalo de’ Cancellieri (c. 1484-1497 CE)

When Angelo del Bufalo moved into the house in Trevi, he had already been collecting some antiquities in Porta Pinciana before he moved into the family’s new house in the period before 1510. As only two pieces (i.e., the Obelisk and the Puteal) are known in this time it is not possible to make a determination on any type of artistic program. What can be determined is that the Puteal was in the house at Trevi already by 1484-1497. Petrus Sabinus’ description of the ancient base in the house of Angelo del Bufalo as “a statue of Hercules and many other gods in a circle” confirms
this. What Sabinus does not make clear is whether or not the Atlas stood on top of the base at this point.\[179\] Due to the billing, size (c. 80cm H x 86 cm W), and relative un-remarkability of Hercules on the Puteal relief I am inclined to believe that it did. In this case at the very least this group would suggest the del Bufalo had in mind the divine hero when it purchased both pieces. This is of course speculative.

5.2.2. Christophoro del Bufalo (c. 1497-1514 CE)

Christophoro del Bufalo is only mentioned as the patron of the garden once and it as owner of a simple ancient inscription which reads: D. M. P. VALERIO CHRESIMO P. VALERIUS IUSTUS PATRONUS LIB. B. M.\[180\] The account is dateable through this study to c. 1497-1509. The inscription is an epitaph (marked by its address to “D. M.” i.e., Dis Manibus) and fits into a series with at least six more funerary inscriptions later documented within the garden by Giovannantonio Dosio in 1560.\[181\]

Collecting funerary inscriptions characterized the late Quattrocento antique mode which fixated on historical inscriptions and reliefs with a focus on historical Roman figures. The aim was

---

\[179\] Sabinus, Petrus (1484-1497). *Sabinus Syllage*, Fol. 123v.: “…in eadem vicinia (i.e. prope domum Triapanum in Trivio) in domo Angeli Bubali, ubi est statua Herculis et multorum deorum in cileo…”


\[181\] Dosio, Giovannantonio (1560). *Dosio Sketchbook*, Fols. 1r, 14v.
to shape the appearance of deep, domestic ancestral lineage (see the discussion on pp. 34-38).\footnote{182} There is no way of knowing for certain who among the Bufali collected the inscriptions; however, this type of collecting swiftly fell out of vogue by the early Cinquecento in the period following the Renovatio Romae of Sixtus IV. So, they very likely came from the time of either Christophoro or Angelo del Bufalo.

5.2.3. Antonio del Bufalo (c. 1514-1525 CE)

When Rome switched over to a court society influenced directly by the papacy at the turn of the century, ancestral relief and bust collections fell out of favour and monumental sculpture gardens of the curial elite gained an important status uptick.\footnote{183} The del Bufalo shifted gears rather successfully. Working with the antiquities already owned by the family, Antonio del Bufalo (Christophoro’s son) began assembling an impressive round sculpture collection. Mention is made by Marco Fabio Calvo in 1514-1515 in his *Antiquae Urbis Romae cum Regionibus Simulachrum* that Antonio had at this time already brought the *Obelisk* from his grandfather Angelo’s *Porta Pinciana* home into the house at Trevi.\footnote{184}

In the following ten-year period Antonio would introduce the idyllic, mythological character of the garden and increase its reputation by hiring Polidoro da Caravaggio and Maturino Fiorentino to paint the cycle of Perseus as discussed above. This was around 1525.

It is in Antonio’s curatorship where Wrede’s proposed installation program becomes very interesting. I believe Wrede is right to note that you can learn quite a lot about the garden by the Renaissance-paintings within it. If at this time Antonio wished to make programmatic additions to the garden which thematically focussed on the idyllic nature of the Perseus cycle - knowing that the Graces, Pomona, Hercules as a Youth, and fully-grown apple trees (which take up to six years to fruit) are present in the garden by Stefano’s curatorship c. 1540 - then it is likely that they were all introduced in an attempt to make the garden stand in for the Garden of the Hesperides in Trevi under Antonio.

Included in the decorations by Polidoro da Caravaggio and Maturino were pictures of a Fortuna, Mars, and Venus as seen in the engraving of the western façade of the casino by Enrico Maccari in 1876 (Fig. 35). The Mars and Venus flanked the central fountain of the façade and indicate a devotion by the foreign

\[ \text{vero Regio Alta semita dicitur...Circum Floralium, cuius obeliscus hodie quoque humi stratus, in vineto nobilis civis romani Antonii de Bubalo, cernitur.} \]

\[ 185 \text{ Maccari, Enrico (1876). “Graffito Esistente in Roma: Facciata del Giardino del Bufalo,” in Graffiti e Chiaroscuro Esistenti nell' Esterno delle Case, Engraving.} \]
family to the tutelary gods of ancient Rome. Their inclusion advertises to all passerby that the del Bufalo family see themselves as a Roman family and clearly marks out their assemblage’s status as an Appropriative Collection (see the discussion on pp. 38-39). Further reverence, now for the future of Rome, is displayed by the family in the top right corner of the façade with its Fortuna. This specific variant of the god is made conspicuous by the inscription at her feet which reads: C. FORT. REDUCIS SALVOS VENIRE. This message means ‘[it is] safe to come [with] Fortuna Redux.’ The sentiment originates from an altar to the same god near Sant’ Andrea dei Portoghesi which reads “Salvos Venire,” verbatim, on one side and “Salvos Ire” on the other (‘Safe to come / Safe to go’). Not only does this inscription, like that over the Colocci’s house (see p. 32) welcome their guests into the home as requested by the Supernae Dispositionis Arbitrio bill of 1514 but Kultzen offers the opinion that her motto also welcomed back the purity and fortune of the Acqua Vergine. I argue, this is a direct response to the calls for restoration and

---

continued preservation of Rome by Nicholas V begun at Trevi fountain on the same aqueduct.\textsuperscript{187}

There are no more sources for Antonio del Bufalo’s term at the garden following the Sack of Rome in 1527. However, the aquatic themes set out by Wrede very likely led to the celebration of this same return of water to the home and to Rione Trevi with the “fontana bizzara” described in Aldrovandi, Boissard, and Hondius. Key to placing the fountain in the period of Antonio’s curatorship is its relation in Aldrovandi:

“Here is a bizarre spring, rustic in a very charming way, so composed in the rough mound from which the water comes out, as if from the very soil itself – which is \textit{trampled}.”\textsuperscript{188}

If, in fact, Antonio meant to celebrate the Acqua Vergine as well as the cycle of Perseus and the Hippocrene on Helicon it is clear why Aldrovandi describes the soil as ‘trampled.’ In vignette 2, G of the Polidoro and Maturino cycle Pegasus beats the Hippocrene and water springs forth. Of course, the fountain got its name (Ἵππου κρήνη lit. ‘Spring of the Horse’) from being formed by the hooves of Pegasus. If Stenhouse’s determination that visitors to antique gardens in the middle-Cinquecento were led by guides privy to the intentions of the curator then, Aldrovandi would have

\textsuperscript{187} Enough of the del Bufalo family became Conservatori to see they not only preached but practiced calls like this under Sixtus IV (Christophoro del Bufalo), Clement VII (Antonio del Bufalo), and Pius IV (Paolo del Bufalo). See, De Dominicis, Claudio (2017). “del BUFALO, del BUFALO CANCELLIERI, del BUFALO della VALLE” in Biografie e famiglie – Accademia Moroniana, pp. 9, 6-7, and 24-25 respectively.

\textsuperscript{188} Aldrovandi, Ulisse (1562). Delle Statue Antiche che per Tutta Roma, ed. Mauro, Lucio, p. 136.
undoubtedly been sold the story of how, like the mythological Hippocrene, this fountain was the product of Pegasus’ efforts. Or, meant to be read as such.\textsuperscript{189}

In 1550 when Aldrovandi visited, only the Graces Relief and six portrait busts including an Antinoös are present at the fountain. By Boissard’s visit in 1555 there are precious shells, pearls, and giant Indian Cochlea there. The whole fountain is said to have been surrounded by laurel, cedar, and tamarisk trees. At its foot are the three round statues of Muses (i.e., the Muse of Atticanus, the Hygiea, and the Niobid) and the Emperor Caracalla equestrian statue. All of which are notably missing from Aldrovandi’s work. Perhaps all that can be expected to have come down from Antonio then are the natural decorations and the trees. The laurels are particularly reminiscent of the contests at the Hippocrene and Parnassus.

5.2.4. Stefano del Bufalo (c. 1540-1561 CE)

We have determined that sometime before c. 1540 Stefano del Bufalo became the curator of the garden at Trevi. This is the period from which most of our sources come. The first written

The report for the sculptures of this period comes from Stephanus Pighius, c. 1547-1555. The Dutchman writes:

“\[I\] remember a statue of Hercules appeared to me in the vinea of Stefano del Bufalo, at Rome; \[a statue\] which is not a sundial or an instrument for horoscope with a head but it has a remarkable celestial globe with the zodiac and he carries it having been embellished with the most beautifully sculpted constellations.”

Pighius’ visit may then be successfully narrowed down to 1547-1550 as when Aldrovandi visits in 1550 the Atlas is already being restored at the De Fabii.

In the period of Stefano (c. 1540-1561) the garden was outfitted in the manner described in Chapter 3 (see pp. 50-65). In this section I will break the Bufali statuary into sub-groups, divided by location, and indicate the years in which they were reported within the garden. The documentary sources for this list are Ulisse Aldrovandi (1550), Jean-Jacques Boissard (1555), and Pirro Ligorio (1559-1561) while our representational sources are from an anonymous Roman from the Codex Coburgensis (1550-1555), another anonymous artist from the Codex Pighianus (1550-1555), Antonio Lafreri (1550-1577), Giovannantonio Dosio (1560), and

---

190 Aldrovandi, Ulisse (1562). Delle Statue Antiche che per Tutta Roma, ed. Mauro, Lucio, p. 135-138; Vasari also wrote about this period but mentioned only the paintings which had already been completed by Polidoro and Maturino c. 1525.

191 Pighius, Stephanus (1587). Hercules prodicius, seu, Principis iuuentutis vita et peregrinatio, pp. 360-361: "Vidisse me memini Herculis statuam Romae in vinea Stephani Bubalii repertam; qui non horographium sciotericon, sive vsc horoscopum cervice, sed caelisphaeram ingentem Zodiaci atque fixarum stellarum imaginibus pulcherrime sculptis exornatam gestabat.”

192 Aldrovandi, Ulisse (1562). Delle Statue Antiche che per Tutta Roma, ed. Mauro, Lucio, p. 96; In Aldrovani he describes the Atlas for the first time as “Atalante” while it sat in the De Fabii restoration house.
Maarten de Vos (1560). If a location is given in one source but not in another the documented location will be assumed until expressly changed. Each sub-group will be briefly analyzed in location and then incorporated into the larger designs of Stefano del Bufalo’s garden thereafter.

Palazzo del Bufalo Antiquities, c. 1550:

1) Portico:

Venus (1550; 1555), Juno (1555), Jupiter (1555), Head of Jupiter (1550; 1555), and Head of Spain / Palladas (1550; 1555).

2) Casino:

Apollo with Lyre (1550; 1555), Harpocrates (1550; 1555), Angerona (1550), Clay Apollo (1550; 1555), Male Mask (1550), Mask (1555), Bacchus and Satyr Group (1550; 1555), Puteal (1550; 1550-1555; 1555), and Venus and Cupid Group (1550; 1555), Hercules / Atlas (1550-1555; 1559-1561; 1560).

3) Garden Entryway:

Cerberus (1550; 1555), and Tiger (1550; 1555).

4) Main Path:

Diana (1550; 1555), Pomona (1550; 1555), Togatus of a Flamine (1550; 1555), Kneeling Captive Persian (1550; 1555), Venus (1550; 1555), Hercules as Youth (1550; 1555), and Sabine Woman (1555).

5) Main Fountain Area:

Funerary Altar of Vettia Magna (1550; 1555; 1560), Three Graces Relief (1550; 1555), Muse (x3) (1555), Emperor Caracalla (1555); Trajanic Lady Relief (1550-1555).

6) Back Fountain Area:

Unknown Portrait (x6) (1550), Bust of Demetrius (1555), Bust of Philip (1555), Bust of Claudius (1555), Antinoös (1550), Cleopatra (1550), and Mosaic (1555)
7) Garden Precincts:

Bust of Commodus (1550; 1555; 1560), Bust of a Greek Man (1550; 1555), Bust of Marcus Aurelius (1550; 1555), Bust of Maximinius Thrax (1550; 1555; 1560), Bust of Marius (1550; 1555), Bust of Tiberius (1550; 1555), and Bust of a Man (1555).

8) Loggia Entryway:

Bust of Hadrian (1550; 1555) and Bust of Scipio Africanus (1550; 1555).

9) Loggia Room #1:

Bust of Venus (1550; 1555), Bust of Emperor Geta (1550; 1555), Bust of Vespasian (1550; 1555), Bust of Antoninus Pius (1550), Head of a Woman / Bust of a Sabine Woman (1550), Bust of Hercules (1550; 1555), and Bust of Marcus Aurelius as a Youth (1555).

10) Loggia Room #2:

Ancient Bust (1550) and Bust of a Child (x2) (1550; 1555).

11) Loggia Room #3:

Bust of Antoninus Pius (1550; 1555), Bust of Antoninus Pius (1555), Bust of a Greek Woman (1550; 1555), and Bust of Lysias (1550; 1555).

12) Undisclosed Location:

Bust of an Emperor (1560), Bust of a Man (1560), and Sarcophagus with Iunctio Dextrarum (1560).

*Where Bust of a Man is listed multiple times it assumed to be different statues.

The street facing 1) Portico pictured here advertises devotion to the tutelary god of Rome, Venus; the father of the gods, Jupiter; and the personification of Spain. There, an austere tone is set. Venus, of course, represents the progenitor of Rome; Jupiter, the solemn father of the ancient gods; and the Spain, who
was determined to be Boissard’s Minerva in Chapter 3, was the Renaissance Roman sponsor of the arts, wisdom, and remembrance. Many Renaissance families had a grouping of three gods at their door often including a Jupiter and Minerva under whose auspices guests were welcomed into antiquities collections.\textsuperscript{193} Their presence forebode the gravitas of the ancient representations within.\textsuperscript{194}

The 2) Casino rooms at this point represent a dramatic shift in tone from the reverent entryway to the gods in 1) Portico. As you leave the streets of Rome on your way into the garden the inside of the house acts as a transition for the visitor from the severe majesty of the Eternal City to the whimsical, mythical harbour of pleasure inside the courtyard. The light-hearted gods of wine, music, love, and sex implore guests of the del Bufalo to let their guard down as they move through the house. The Atlas, which is missing from the del Bufalo collection in Aldrovandi and Boissard’s accounts, is sketched within the date range c. 1550-1555 (twice in the same folio as the Puteal) by Anonymous artists—one copying the other.\textsuperscript{195} It is impossible to know whether the two


were drawn within the same collection but the Atlas is drawn pre-
restoration with no arms, legs, or face (Fig. 37).

When the Atlas returned and was situated on top of the Puteal
inside the 2) Casino by c. 1560, Wrede argues for a composition
which faced the monumental statue and base in opposition to the
gods of pleasure above. He says:

“If we ask about the conceit which in this room connected
the two groups of statues with the monumental sculpture of
the Atlas, one must think of the contrast between virtue and
vice...the carefree gods of wine and love contrasted with
his tremendous effort.”

The transition between the severe efforts of Roman daily life
represented on the portico (e.g., revitalizing their city,
governing the populace, and upholding the formidable values of the
Catholic Church) and the respite from burden within the walls of
the garden is emphasized ever further in this dichotomous
composition. Important here is the Christian context of the
Renaissance garden.

Beginning in the 1400s the figure of the bearer of the
celestial sphere had been influenced by Christian theology. In
this way, the Atlas, whether viewed as Hercules or the burdened
Titan, is steeped in the iconography of Christophoros (i.e., St.
Christopher who carried the Christ-child across a river and became
the patron saint of travellers). In depictions of the saint, Christ

---

sits or stands within the celestial sphere as the bearer supports him across a river. Their received characters were so intertwined that when sketched in the Codex Coburgensis our Atlas appears with a doodle of the head of baby Jesus superimposed onto his fragmented shoulder (Fig. 37). The meaning behind Atlas-Christophoros’ effort is two-fold: In Renaissance iconography, he represents the tremendous, burdensome effort of the Church to afford good works unto the known world; while specifically, within the Casino del Bufalo, the patron saint of travellers offers safe passage to those who have come from far and wide to the respite of the courtyard. In this way, Stefano also picks up on the theme of Fortuna Redux underlined by his father where he communicates to all guests ‘it is safe to come,’ either with Fortuna, Atlas, or St. Christopher.

It should be noted as well that images of Apollo, the celestial sphere, and statuettes such as the Venus and Cupid group are holdovers from the era of the Studio, before Stefano’s time (see the discussion in Chapter 2, pp. 30-32). The Harpocrates and Anserona too, remind visitors of this old use of the casino. That is, that the indoor space is a place for silent reflection and thoughtful learning in studio. That the 2) Casino atrium was fitted

197 Wrede, Henning (1983). Der Antikengarten Der Del Bufalo Bei Der Fontana Trevi, p. 15. Wrede also suggests this representational example wherein the Codex Coburgensis the fractured surface of the right shoulder of the Atlas was transformed into the head of the Christ Child next to the celestial sphere, see, Anonymous (1550-1555) Codex Coburgensis, No. 216.

198 Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum (CIL), Vol. 6, No. 830: “C. FORT. REDUCIS SALVOS VENIRE.”
with ancient gods at all came from the accepted views of Pliny and Vitruvius whose guidance on this location for ancestral gods was clear (Pliny, *Natural History*, 35. 6-7; Vitruvius, *On Architecture*, 3. 6).

The 3) Garden Entryway was framed with a Cerberus on one side and what was known as a Tiger on the other. So, the area is characterized by its mythical animals. The purpose for having the Cerberus at the threshold to the Garden is obvious; as the guardian of the underworld in ancient myth, our Cerberus guards the final threshold after the 2) Casino from the outside world into the Bufali garden of pagan fantasy. Cerberus was popularized in this role within Renaissance gardens by the Orsini at Bomarzo in the Sacro Bosco. The same Orsini with whom the Bufali had been friends since the Quattrocento as we know from the wedding list of Orso Orsini in 1499 and Christophoro del Bufalo’s marriage to his second wife Francesca of the same name.199

The Tiger has proven to be less easy to characterize. Wrede, whose analysis suffers slightly from an anachronistic appreciation for the depicted animal refers only to it as “Leo.”200 Today, the piece is understood to represent a lion, even in its original, ancient model. However, the Ionian original work from the 5th

century BCE was at the time of the Bufali known only as the Tiger.\textsuperscript{201} It is unlikely that three separate authors (i.e., Aldrovandi, Boissard, and Hondius) would confuse the image of a lion with a that of a tiger in this way unless explicitly told that it were a tiger by a guide or some identification within the garden. Perhaps the Tiger hints at Dionysus and so the ideals of sex, divine madness, wine, and the East. Whereas Wrede believes the big cat recalls the deeds of Hercules and in turn the Garden of the Hesperides, his idea for the Bufali’s aquatic program may be the more appropriate categorization here.

Boissard specifically marks out the statue as “Tigris,” calling to mind the river deity of ancient Mesopotamia. When compared to the Belvedere Courtyard c. 1506 whose contents included both a depiction of Tigris and a Cleopatra featured in water it appears that some emulation was occurring in the Palazzo del Bufalo. Further, the Tigris in the Belvedere had an urn under his arm which the River God panel of Polidoro’s cycle echoes closely. To the ancient Romans, Tigris was one of the children of Oceanus and Tethys and so an Oceanid, numbered among the likes of Nilus, Indus, Achelous, and of course Euphrates (cf. Ps-Hyginus, \textbf{Fabulae}, Preface). I argue that the Tiger which guards the garden along

with Cerberus is a representation of the Tigris river god received in the Polidoro cycle and Belvedere Courtyard. This would also suggest that these two pieces were acquired and placed under Antonio del Bufalo in accordance with his aquatic and liminal motifs. Such a play on cognates was earlier seen in the Santacroce house (see p. 35).

The 4) Main Path was grouped into facing statue pairs like in the 2) Casino. First the Diana and Pomona, then the Flamine and the Persian are placed side-by-side across from the clothed Venus, the final pair is the Hercules as a Youth and the Sabine Woman. The Diana and Pomona represent the commonest dichotomy trope of ancient female images; the virginity / purity of Diana (cf. the Acqua Vergine themes above pp. 82-83) contrasted with the fertility and prospect of fecundity presented by Pomona. The Christian context for this particular dualism is well documented. Further, the Pomona offers an indirect link to the Garden of the Hesperides (see p. 84).

The Flamine and Persian grouping along with the clothed Venus represent the virtuous generation of Rome, the authority of the Church, and an uncomfortable veneration of conquest and orientalism under God. In 1550 only the Hercules as a Youth stood

---


203 Wrede offered the reading that the Flamine and Kneeling Captive Persian likely expressed the triumphant glory of Rome and the contrasting report of Aldrovandi who described them as a Priest and a sacrificial victim. See, Aldrovandi, Ulisse (1562).
along the path. This rendition of Hercules had a young man’s face peering out of a lion’s head with the body being some variation of the Boston or Farnese type which have in common that they hold apples behind their back. In 1555, Boissard adds the Sabine Woman to the pairing. These two figures signpost a similar meaning to the Diana and Pomona as their appearance of purity anticipate their mythological virility and productivity. Among the ancient Romans, Hercules received veneration as a male fertility god. In Renaissance Italy, however, he became a symbol for rape and conquest. Thus, our young Hercules is the perfect partner for the Sabine, given the del Bufalo’s particular fascination with Ovid who believed that the abduction of the Sabine Women was a base expression of Roman sexual desire rather than a righteous attempt to take wives for the sake of citizen production as in Livy.

All of these images and their themes were popular in the Renaissance and easily accessible if not quite as academically understood. The emphasis on deep myth-historical storytelling through monumental sculptures in the round suggest to me that this

---


area was populated by a later curator whose strict fascination with the Hesperides Garden motif had tapered off slightly. The addition of the Sabine between 1550 and 1555 implies that this area was actively being outfitted during the curatorship of Stefano del Bufalo.

Perhaps the biggest draw to the Palazzo del Bufalo was the 5) Main Fountain Area. This was largely due to the magnificence of the fountain and its use of the rejuvenated Acqua Vergine. The sculptures in this area reflect a convergence of collecting trends and an installation-program which is more-or-less confusing. The Funerary Altar of Vettia Magna which holds the Trajanic Lady relief and the Three Graces Relief, and Woman and Loves most likely came from the collecting tradition of Angelo and Christophoro del Bufalo. The Three Graces relief, however, was probably expanded upon in the Hesperides phase of the garden under Antonio. Later spinning off into the three Muses which have been determined to be additions under Stefano. Even among these piecemeal additions, the Caracalla seems most out of place.

Wrede believed due to the figure’s base and supplemented apples that this was a representation of Perseus on horseback.\textsuperscript{207} As I said above, this conflicts with our sources because Boissard

clearly calls the statue conspicuously Caracalla.\textsuperscript{208} If it is, however, unlikely that Aldrovandi missed a monumental equestrian statue in the collection and if it is that Boissard reports the piece among those statues by the largely Hippocrene-influenced fountain then the following must be possible: When the guide was showing the antiquarian Boissard the antiquities in the garden he may have shown him the Caracalla as a Renaissance Perseus, but pointed to the ‘caracalla’ (lit. ‘cloaked tunic’) that the figure wore as a hint of its classical identity. No other Roman leader in the garden is given an iconographical aside such as this. If this is true then the statue was added by Stefano between 1550-1555 and is a classical antique re-packaged to play off of the Hesperides-motif of his father. On the whole the 5) Main Fountain Area incorporates elements from the earlier garden collections of Angelo and Christophoro, while the Father-Son duo of Antonio and Stefano combine efforts to fulfill the Helicon program begun in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} quarter of the Cinquecento.

The 6) Back Fountain Area was pressed against the side of the loggia façade and included only Roman historical figures coming from outside the Italian Peninsula. The Bust of Demetrius probably alludes to Demetrius I Soter’s time as a hostage in Rome and his eventual conflicts with the Jewish People – a story featured in

\textsuperscript{208} Boissard, Jean-Jacques (1597). Romanae Urbis Topographia et Antiquitates, p. 115: “Caracallae Imperatoris, qui pallio marmoris cotognitis tectus est.”
the Bible (1 Maccabees 7-10; 2 Maccabees 14-15). The **Bust of Philip** depicts the 3rd Century CE Philip the Arab who was one of the first Roman Emperors whose policies were sympathetic to Christianity.\(^{209}\) The **Bust of Claudius** represents the Emperor born to Drusus and Antonia Minor at Lugdunum in Roman Gaul despite being Sabine. He is a minor outlier of this group; however, through his mother he is the grandson of Mark Antony and is part of the Julio-Claudian dynasty both of which had ties to the centrepiece of the 6) **Back Fountain Area**: the **Cleopatra** (for her relevance see pp. 84-88).

Finally, the **Antinoös** along with the **Cleopatra** could represent a fascination with the romantic history of the Roman interaction with Egypt. Not to mention around 30 statues and busts of Antinoös were known to the Renaissance creating a relative market surplus.\(^{210}\) There is also the **Antinoös Belvedere** who shared the Vatican Courtyard with a **Cleopatra**, **Tigris**, and **Apollo**. This type of flattering analogy may have been all that was necessary to dictate the **Antinoös’** inclusion in the del Bufalo garden.

Naturally, the six **Unknown Portraits** cannot be analyzed. As well, there is no information about the **Mosaic** save for its materials (i.e., chalcedony, porphyry, alabaster, ophite, Ethiopian opal, thassian, parian, and marmaric marble) which are


all imported. Boissard, who is particularly interested in the comparison between the Bufali garden and the Papal collections describes the mosaic as a lavish and expensive work befitting “the highest admiration” and “the richest leader.”\textsuperscript{211} This fountain is a home for the busts of lesser known figures in Roman history; but the focal point is clearly the Cleopatra with the busts being set in niches along the wall behind her. For the visual theorist, this composition of the sleeping woman-at-the-bath with a wall of Roman portrait heads looking-on behind her is certainly a striking composition.

If the smaller fountain housed busts of lesser known Romans, then the 7) Garden Precincts were home to the bigger names. Here could be found the busts of Marius and Tiberius who were two of the greatest Roman Generals and each a symbol for massive Roman conquest; the Bust of Marcus Aurelius and the Bust of Commodus whose familial dynasty marked the end of the Classical Roman period; and the Bust of Maximinius who governed in the period of Rome after the Aurelians. Aldrovandi remarks that in comparison with the Tiberius’ real-life stepfather, Augustus who he associates with Jesus Christ, Maximinius Thrax was a poor leader whose own disaffected followers assassinated him.\textsuperscript{212} Aldrovandi’s

\textsuperscript{211} Boissard, Jean-Jacques (1597). Romanae Urbis Topographia et Antiquitates, p. 116: “Opus summa admiratione dignum...et opulentissimo puta principe.”

\textsuperscript{212} Aldrovandi, Ulisse (1562). Delle Statue Antiche che per Tutta Roma, ed. Mauro, Lucio, p. 137.
commentary suggests that the point of this grouping was to render Christian-based moral judgement on the leaders of ancient Rome. Unfortunately, there is no discernable evidence for who placed these busts here and when.

Continuing to leave behind the fantastical garden themes, the historical busts which have ushered the visitors in the direction of the loggia continue into the 8) Loggia Entryway. Here, stand the busts of Hadrian and Scipio Africanus. The connection between these two figures is not and cannot have been immediately obvious. One possibility for their grouping is that both men emphasized Greek learning in the Roman world and were patrons of the arts in their own right. As one moved up into the loggia which likely served as separate studio spaces overlooking the Giardino del Bufalo they were reminded of the academic interests of classical antiquity. Both figures also had villas of their own, outside of Rome, where they would die in retirement.

One, more speculative, assertion is that these two emperors played the part of the ancient Roman god of doorways, Janus. Janus was known to the Renaissance in large part through Ovid’s Fasti and was the custodian of those who came and left the household. As such, Ovid offers that even his name comes from the Latin verb ‘ire’ – so too relating the god to the motto of Fortuna Redux. By Ovid’s account:
"Every door has two fronts, this way and that, whereof one faces the people and the other the house-god, and just as your human porter, seated at the threshold of the house-door, sees who goes out and in, so I, the porter of the heavenly court, behold at once both East and West" (Ovid. Fasti. 1. 134-140).

This attitude in the loggia entryway again echoes the Fortuna Inscription above the main entry to the Palazzo. Janus, the two-faced god was also often depicted in the Middle Ages and Renaissance with one bearded visage and another clean-shaven youth (Fig. 38). Art historically speaking, Hadrian and Scipio Africanus are famous for popularizing these respective hirsute depictions.

The 9-10) Loggia Room(s) #1-3 were filled with busts. Having moved inside to where the del Bufalo would have entertained guests over dinner, visitors would have immediately stepped into 9) Loggia Room #1. Here is a return to mixed historical and mythical busts: the historical busts were the Bust of Emperor Geta "when he was young," the Bust of Vespasian, the Bust of Antoninus Pius, and the Bust of Marcus Aurelius as a Youth; the mythical images included a Bust of Venus, a Sabine Woman, and the Bust of Heracles.

---


214 The depiction of Geta as a youth is a particularly interesting identification made by both Aldrovandi and Boissard given that he was the victim of Damnatio Memoriae. This bust has not yet been identified among extant statuary and could be purposefully misidentified for dramatic effect. That is not to say portrait busts of Geta as a youth do not still exist, neither should it rule out the possibility of this statue’s authenticity. It is simply remarkable.
It is possible that the Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, and Hercules (with Hercules in place of another Commodus) attempted to reconstruct the paternal lineage of the last few classical Roman emperors; but this interpretation is speculative and not necessary. Special note is made that the Geta, Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, and Venus figures are clothed. Whether their vestments are sculpted or supplementary is not clear. Only the Hercules, Vespasian, and Sabine are left ambiguous in terms of clothing. It is probable that this is the room in which the del Bufalo would host Roman noblemen and clergymen in accordance with the sensitivities for nude pagan art (see pp. 39-40).

10) Loggia Room #2 has very little recorded about it. All that is known are its contents of an Ancient Bust, and two statues which each depict a Male Child.

The last location of the Palazzo del Bufalo known in Stefano’s curatorship is 11) Loggia Room #3. In this studio are two busts of Antoninus Pius, the Bust of a Greek Woman, and the Bust of Lysias. Most intriguing is the Lysias, of which only two portraits were known to the Renaissance. No explicit link is given in the documentary sources as to why the Attic orator appears in the Bufali garden; but here again, a connection with the cycle of Polidoro might bear a clue. In vignette 2, G we see the Consecration of the Poet at the Hippocrene which Wrede connects with the Acqua Vergine saying:
“Where the water of the Virgo, always perceived as cool and pure, flows, where it falls as a golden rain and creates the virtus and the fame of Perseus, it transforms the garden into the paradisiacal abode of the Hesperides, which, when entered, initiates the apotheosis [of the visitor]. It bubbles up there as the Hippocrene of Helicon, where all those who join the poet-bard receive the draught of inspiration, the consecration of the muses, and the laurel of fame.”

While Lysias makes no mention of such mythical inspiration in his orations, he is at the centre of the dialogue between Socrates and Phaedrus in Plato’s Phaedrus. Phaedrus recounts a speech of Lysias' which is the jumping-off point for the entire conversation and covers the topics of the wisdom of the soul, the madness of love, and divine artistic inspiration. These themes resonate within the garden as the orator is shown to demonstrate that the divine madness of poetic inspiration is offered specifically by the gods Apollo, Dionysus, Aphrodite, Eros, and the Muses (Plat. Phaedrus. 265d); all of which feature in the Bufali Garden. The themes of virginity and inspiration by the muses are further explored when Socrates responds to Lysias’ speech saying:

The third kind [of madness] is the madness of those who are possessed by the Muses; which taking hold of a delicate and virgin soul, and their inspiring frenzy, awakens lyrical and all other numbers; with these adorning the myriad actions of ancient heroes for the instruction of posterity. But he who, having no touch of the Muses' madness in his soul, comes to the door and thinks that he will get into the temple by the help of art - he, I say, and his poetry are not admitted; the sane man disappears and is nowhere when he enters into rivalry with the madman.

(Plat. Phaedrus. 245b)

Here again the image of purity and virginity are set in symbiotic contrast to the promise of fruitful inspiration.

The Phaedrus was known to the Renaissance largely popularized after its publication, commentary, and translation into Latin in 1484 by Marsilio Ficino. This avenue for the del Bufalo to Lysias seems more promising than in the direction of Lysias’ own Orations. That is because there is evidence of completed manuscripts of the Orations in Nicaea in the late-12th / early 13th century – the product of Byzantine scholarship – later being copied in Western Europe during and after the 15th century with minor scribal corrections but no full text had been established until the 16th to 18th centuries. Translations of Orations only began in earnest in the 18th century. 216

The statuary which is included in category 12) Undisclosed Location includes the Bust of an Emperor, Bust of a Man, and Sarcophagus with Iunctio Dextrarum which are vague, cannot be placed, and, as a result, difficult to fit into the above analyses.

In terms of Renaissance commissions, we know of only one in the time of Stefano del Bufalo. Around 1560, perhaps in an attempt to unify his own antique additions and legacy at the garden, Stefano commissioned Taddeo Zuccaro to paint a Parnassus (Fig. 39). The painting was completed and hung in the loggia above

Polidoro’s cycle. The Parnassus depicts the mythologized mountainscape and provides the loggia with an idyllic scene where the nine Muses embrace each other in a mannerist repousoir that delivers the viewer’s eye to the God Apollo playing his lyre, front and centre. To his back-left is Minerva. The Apollo in this piece closely imitates the Apollo / Pothos which the del Bufalo had restored and supplemented to represent the sun-god. And, although no documentary evidence exists from c. 1540-1561 of a Minerva, she appears on the 1572 bill of sale between Paolo del Bufalo and Cardinal Ippolito d’Este. This suggests that between 1555 and 1572 the Minerva here was included in the Bufali collection (see further discussion on pp. 64-65).\textsuperscript{217}

While the Apollo with Lyre / Pothos is already known to be within the 2) Casino surrounded by the Harpocrates, Angerona, Bacchus and Satyr, the Venus and Cupid group, and another Apollo, it is not possible to place the Minerva here certainly. First of all, the god of Wisdom does not fit within the facing composition of the 2) Casino discussed above (pp. 98-101); and secondly, the composition within the painting itself puts Minerva at the back of Apollo, amongst the trees. Perhaps her place was in the garden then, among the ‘Muses’ there.

The addition of the Parnassus suggests that Stefano del Bufalo wished to separate his artistic commission from the specific narrative of his father’s time while maintaining a continuity of motif. While the Helicon and Parnassus represent separate places, they are both locations famous for poetic and artistic inspiration. In Stefano’s view it was not important to specifically reference the Hesperides Garden and the Helicon, but rather maintain an air of poetic inspiration within an idyllic setting, among mythical figures. This calculated choice may have been based on the upper-middle class financial status of the family and a limited supply of classical Roman wares at a time when richer and richer families - both foreign and domestic - were seeking to buy. Representing the Garden as a generic place of mythical inspiration in this way meant that statues like the Bacchus and Satyr group, the Venuses, the Minerva, Cerberus, and the Tiger are allowed to operate logically. So too can the busts of ancient Romans who had an inspiratory power of their own in the context of the Renaissance.

Renaissance nobles based the practice of filling their halls and gardens with busts on the practices of their ancient forbearers. Take for example the sentiment in this fictional correspondence between Poggio Bracciolini, Niccolò Niccoli, and Lorenzo De’ Medici, written by Bracciolini in 1538. The imagined Medici states:
It is known that even the ancients kept images and reliefs of most learned men as models for their many works and studies. Cicero himself, Varro, Aristotle, and others both Greek and Latin, outstanding among all learned men, spurred themselves on to study with the image of virtue, and in this way adorned their own libraries and gardens with these [portraits], and the very places in which they were set up were ennobled, those places which they wanted to be locales of praise and industry. For they believed that the images of those who excelled in the study of glory and wisdom, placed in front to the eyes, greatly inspire and ennobled the spirit.²¹⁸

In this way, it is made certain that the very collection and subsequent display of antiquities was considered an admired act of classical reception in and of itself.

The period of Stefano del Bufalo (c. 1540-1561) was the height of the del Bufalo collection. Further, it is clear from the statues above not only that the garden and its ‘programs’ fluidly shifted as it was passed down generation-to-generation. But also, thematic breaks and episodic vignettes were created on a by-location basis. Through time and by setting the intention of the del Bufalo curators, whoever they were and when, transitioned as the greater collecting trends shifted in in Rome around them. The result of which was a series of ever recontextualizing micro-programs of (p)repackaged classical

motifs. When Stefano took rectory at the Santa Maria in Via Lata his brother Paolo took over control of the Palazzo.

5.2.5. Paolo del Bufalo (c. 1562-1572)

The first mention of Paolo’s new role was in the 1562 record of sale between himself and Alessandro Farnese. This began the period of purge within the Palazzo del Bufalo. Included in this first sale were the Apollo / Pothos; Kneeling Captive Persian; an Equestrian Statue, which Fullerton connects with the Caracalla; a previously undocumented monumental Cupid; a Bust of Brutus; a Minerva; the Puteal; and the Atlas (called by the name “Atalante” instead of “Hercules” for the first time since its restorations in the house of the De Fabii). Notable are the three new finds of the Cupid (which is not the Amor with Cloak of Mars), the Minerva, and the Bust of Brutus. The Cupid’s corroboration in the Farnese Inventory of 1568 notes that it is a “most beautiful Cupid,” and garnered the high price of 250 Scudi. This price matched the return on both the famous Atlas and the Apollo / Pothos; therefore, this Cupid is most likely the Eros Farnese, the only life-size

\[\text{\footnotesize Wrede, Henning (1983). Der Antikengarten Der Del Bufalo Bei Der Fontana Trevi, p. 8.}\]
statue of the god which belongs to the Farnese collection of that period.\textsuperscript{222}

As the Council of Trent came to a close in 1563, Paolo had already sold a large proportion of his family’s antiques in anticipation and was offered Caporione for the fourth time. In 1566, the first year of the famously anti-antique art pope, Pius V’s, papacy (r. 1566-1572), Paolo was appointed Governor of the prefecture of Norcia and Montagna.\textsuperscript{223} In Pius V’s final year as Pope, Paolo sold the majority of his family’s remaining antiquities to Cardinal Ippolito d’Este (1509-1572) – likely eager to continue pleasing the Pontifex. The exact date for this sale was July 24\textsuperscript{th}, 1572. In this sale the d’Este family acquired the Hygiea; Muse of Atticanus; the Niobid (all three of which comprised the Muses group in Boissard); an unidentified Muse (I offer the Pomona whose provenance is unknown but whose modern location is shared by the Muse of Atticanus and the Niobid); the Minerva from Zuccaro’s painting; the Togatus of a Flamine here called a ‘Consul;’ the Cerberus; and the Tiger, here for the first time listed as a ‘Lion;’ as well, three more unidentified statues bringing the total up to eleven.\textsuperscript{224} This sale would be an unfortunate misstep in the management of the del Bufalo garden.

\textsuperscript{222} Wrede, Henning (1983). Der Antikengarten Der Del Bufalo Bei Der Fontana Trevi, p. 9.
Having grown accustomed to Pius V’s disdain for antiquities, Paolo had been primed to sell his statuary from the beginning of his tenure as patron of the Palazzo del Bufalo. When, however, Pius V died and Gregory XIII succeeded to the papacy, the landscape of antiquities collection in the Roman world changed again. As part of his pastoral visits, Gregory XIII sent an invitation to visit the Villa of Cardinal d’Este with a tentative date set for September 1572. Immediately, Cardinal d’Este set about renovating and outfitting his garden in honour of the new Pope whose familial coat of arms featured a Dragon. D’Este, taking note of this, connected the coat of arms to the mythical dragon, Ladon and set a new theme for his private garden: The Garden of the Hesperides in Rome. In May, Gregory XIII ascended; in July, Paolo sold his statues; and by September, the Bufali antiques entered the garden of the d’Este.

With his new offerings, Ippolito created a magnificent Fountain of the Dragons (Fig. 40), erected statues of Hercules with apples around the garden, and embellished the imagery with his four new statues of "Muses" (the Hygiea; Muse of Atticanus; the Niobid; and the unidentified Muse from the del Bufalo garden) whom the Renaissance often conflated with the Hesperides. Ippolito completed the story with the Bufali Minerva; the god who

---

joined the Muses on Helicon. Gregory XIII fell in love with the Villa and in quite the unfortunate twist, the del Bufalo sold their Hesperides Garden to see it come into vogue elsewhere. It may be worth mentioning that the entire set was moved the Villa Medici shortly after Gregory XIII died in in 1585.

The final record of Paolo’s time as curator came when Pierre Jacques came to sketch for his *Album*. This list will only include those pieces with which the designation ‘Bufaly’ may be seen: In 1573 there was left the *Bacchus and Satyr* group, a *Cloaked Woman*, the *Trajanic Lady* relief, the companion relief *Women and Loves*, the *Amor with Cloak of Mars*, and a *Reclining Drunken Satyr*. Also featured by Jacques are the *Cerberus* (Fig. 20) and *Tiger* (Fig. 21). These two creature statues had of course been included in the sale of 1572 but were mandated to remain in the garden until 1575 according to the certificate of Leonardo Astronio.226 These pieces represent the disjointed remains of about ninety years of art collection.

---

Chapter 6. Conclusion

At the end of the period discussed in this thesis (c. 1450-1600 CE) some Bufali antiquities travelled further, into the Roman collection of the Medici. These pieces, all eleven from the d’Este sale, reached the house of Ferdinando de’ Medici (1549-1609) before 1598. The Cleopatra was set into most impressive focus there, painted in situ in Fig. 41 by Diego Velázquez, c. 1630. The Medici Cardinal, whose wealth was unburdened by the shifting whims of the Vatican, displayed the del Bufalo antiques alongside other sculpture they had bought from the Della Valle, d’Este, and earlier Roman holdings. This villa would house the only major new collection of antiquities at Rome in the last quarter of the 16th century. In this period, then, both of the major Institutional Collections at Rome, the Villas Medici and Farnese, were stocked with del Bufalo antiquities. These pieces would later be donated to the Uffizi and Naples Archeological Museum respectively.

In the Uffizi, the del Bufalo collection is represented also in the work of Botticelli. Wrede suggests that Botticelli was inspired to paint the Primavera and Birth of Venus by statues he saw in the Bufali garden in its early period. It is possible that Botticelli, then, saw the statue during his time in Rome c. 1481-1482 BCE when he painted at the Sistine Chapel. The Pomona was

---

suggested as the prototype for the Flora in Primavera. The Graces and Venus Victrix reliefs are also suggested as formal models for figures in this painting. These antiquities, being surrounded by fruit trees in the painting, if Wrede’s assumption is correct, may not explicitly render the del Bufalo Garden but perhaps borrows from its arboreal composition. The Venus Anadyomene in the Birth of Venus is also speculatively suggested by Wrede to be based on the del Bufalo Muse of Atticanus.\textsuperscript{228}

The lasting legacy, as such, of the del Bufalo sculpture collection is just as fascinating as its history. Starting under Angelo del Bufalo de’ Cancellieri who built and moved the family into the Palazzo del Bufalo in Trevi, passed the garden on, in succession, to Christophoro, Antonio, most famously Stefano, and finally Paolo del Bufalo over the course of ninety odd years. The family took advantage of the preservation initiatives headed by the Vatican to make the antiques of the classical Roman past useful to the public and to renovate Renaissance Rome in its image. Those members of the Bufali family who achieved curatorship owned and operated the fifth largest collection in Rome at a time, in an urban Palazzo courtyard setting that drew attention from artists and travellers all over the continent. Always in mind at the Bufali garden house, was the city of Rome’s intersection between the pagan

past and Christian future. So, when the Council of Trent closed in 1563 and taste for pagan artefacts had seemingly given way to Christian asceticism, the del Bufalo whose reputation and power depended too greatly on the Vatican’s favour were forced to sell their antiquities. When Pagan relics were positively revaluated soon after, under the papacy of Gregory XIII, the del Bufalo had already sold their stock of ancient wares and their collection became a lost relic itself.

What has become clearer from the post-structuralist scholarship of the 90s on (as discussed in Chapter 1), however, is that there is so much more to discern from sculpture collections like that of the del Bufalo than just provenance footnotes for museums and ancient models for Renaissance compositions. The greatest impact in these studies is found in the complex network of relationships within which every acquired antique operates. Not only can a catalogue be made of the Bufalo holdings but so too can object biographies, like that presented here of the Atlas a.k.a. Hercules, for example. In this period, the Atlas / Hercules not only affected the collection of the del Bufalo between 1450-1600, but also the de Fabii, and the Farnese. That is to say, not only was the antique statue important in and of itself, but so too was its interaction with the city of Rome. Wrede argued that the Atlas was important as it interacted with the Puteal, the gods of love and sex in the Casino del Bufalo, the Caracalla, the Lion, the
Renaissance frescoes of Polidoro and Maturino, and the abstract familial myth-history of the del Bufalo itself with the Taurus on its celestial globe. Those who came from the Vatican, and the Christian sphere in general, saw the figure as a St. Christopher and minded its supportive relationship with God. The statue’s role as a liminal figure, I have demonstrated, also insists on two members of the del Bufalo family’s motto and that of Fortuna Redux. For Antonio, Stefano, and their classicizing Fortuna the Atlas-Christophoros encouraged those who came to visit, that it was “safe to come” under both pagan and Christian auspices.

The lives of antiquities therefore expands out, beyond the collection itself. So, by examining the recorded sales and sources for their antiquities’ afterlife we can understand the fluctuating power of sculpture garden programs in the restored city and the precarious value of pagan art in the eyes of the adolescent Church. Of particular interest to Classical scholars here is the del Bufalo family’s micro-programmatic display of antiques. This relatively early collection served to pre- and repackage an interpretation of classical motifs, created by and for the Bufali garden (such as its Hesperides motif); then to sell them off in sets to the most influential collectors in Italy. For example, in the case of Paolo del Bufalo, the Cardinal d’Este, and the Vatican: The Three Graces were each first identified as Graces by the Bufali only in the Renaissance despite their original conception. Here, they played
the part of Muses. In this way, the Minerva statue was associated with the Muses in the Ovidian episode on Helicon in the painting by Zuccaro, despite her most often context being martial or political. Along with the unidentified Muse these pieces were sold together as an established, classical thematic unit to fit the specific programmatic intention of the d’Este. For the Bufali, their reception and use of Classical themes was necessarily done after the fact. Their financial status meant that they could only afford to buy what statues were available to them and not which statues best fit their designs – unlike the families who bought from them. By adapting the identities of statues to be muses, creatures, heroes, and gods of their choosing they retrofitted classical material to meet their desired ends. Having done so, they could sell their newly framed antiquities for specific Renaissance purposes and gain socially and economically from the transaction. This sort of repackaging and micro-programmatic display translates into modern exhibits of classical material like in the Niobid Room in the Uffizi which features one of the Bufali Muses as Niobid #296.

Evident from the presentation above is that the type of collection emblematized by the del Bufalo was not just a shallow expression of wealth but a calculated political investment. The del Bufalo increased their standing in Rome through their pagan art display until such time as its value had apparently depreciated
and they sold it. They chose next to invest their time in the Church alone. It can, of course, be argued that the importance of studies such as this is in the collection’s formal contribution to Renaissance art and the idea of the modern museum. I argue here that a complete history of a Renaissance family’s quest for identity through the presentation of its collected antique artefacts is also possible and holds additional, worthwhile weight.

This study has shown how precarious the Bufali collection was in several ways, not least of which was how much the family was prone to the political and religious vicissitudes of the time. Chapter 2 illustrated the types of settings and political avenues available to the del Bufalo in the 15th-16th centuries. While the family made every effort to grow their collection and its accessibility, their conditional social standing (when compared even to later Institutional Collections) amounted to only brief success despite their every effort to solidify economic class and social standing. Chapter 3 presented the height of their collection’s reputation as the del Bufalo played host to many travellers and enjoyed relative fame. The introduction from, Boissard, however, tells us:

Under Quirinal Hill is the Palazzo del Bufalo – small, if compared with those bigger houses of the Cardinals on the
Palatine, and the Pope - but it does not yield to the rest with respect to all of its collected antiquities.\textsuperscript{229}

The crown jewels and linchpin for the reputation of the del Bufalo family in Rome was its beautiful collection. The discussions in Chapters 4 and 5 demonstrate the concerted effort Bufalo curators expended attempting to add to this antique assemblage, paint frescoes which featured their pieces thematically and figuratively, and to maintain access to the public. In these chapters also, I have elaborated on the brief uptick in economic and social success experienced by the del Bufalo at this time; success which was all too briefly enjoyed as Institutional Collections whose class and status in Renaissance Rome were certain began to crop up and prey on smaller, lower-class collections and collectors in times of unrest. Future studies based off of this work by classical scholars and Renaissance art historians could explore areas such as the formation of classical motifs and allegorical meaning in the Bufali garden, the impact of the earliest Ancestor and Appropriative collections on later (often predatory) Institutional collections, along with the associated economics of class and status these predatory practices imply, the status of lower-upper class families in Renaissance Rome in general, and the status of the Bufali specifically in 1500s Rome, as well as the influence of antiquities at their point of reception.

in the post-antique world on a vast network of relationships spanning from the classical period to the modern day. This study has pointed in the direction of several of these avenues of inquiry and, with the foundational work on the Bufali collection completed, future work on these issues should prove fruitful.

This thesis has increased the number of known antiquities within the halls and garden of the Palazzo del Bufalo from 29 to 79, of those it has solidly identified 18 in extant works. This thesis has suggested the order and dates of curatorship for the Bufali patrons (see p. 78), elaborated how the Bufali collectors employed, disseminated, and repackaged material culture from the Classical period into varied poignant reminders and displays of antique heritage, why they did so, and to what ends. This thesis has determined that the result of their efforts saw the del Bufalo family grow to relative prominence between 1450-1600 and enhance their reputation and role in both the Roman socio-cultural landscape (in this period family members garnered political positions as high as Conservatore di Roma and Governor of Norcia and Montagne and achieved knighthood in the Church). The antiquities included in this collection demonstrated overarching idyllic motifs of the purity and bounty of water (cf. the Aqua Virgo), poetic inspiration of the divine, and classical Roman virtue. On the smaller scale, micro-programs were created to present ideals of remembrance, epicurean pleasure, and the
intersection between pagan and Christian values. Their collection, which was designed to be an Appropriative Collection, endeavoured to establish a Roman identity for the Tuscan family. Their reputation among the “honest and learned men” of Rome surged because of their emphasis on accessibility and strong commitment to employing collection trends as they emerged. All of this was possible precisely because the antique statues above were valued by Romans as early as Late Antiquity to be a “population almost equal to its natural one” whom “posterity has embraced” (Cassiodorus, Variae, 7. 15). These sculptures continued to be valued as such through the Renaissance and to this day but in the late 16th century the del Bufalo collection was dispersed.

All that remained in 1885 (Fig. 42) of the del Bufalo antiquities collection (c. 1450-1600) was the Venus and Cupid statuette found buried under the arches of the Aqua Virgo and a Muse with Kithara mistakenly identified as a 3rd century Consular statue.230 Today there can be seen the expanded Via del Tritone, fractured remains of the Acqua Vergine, and a small bull insignia over the door of the modern construction (Figs. 43-45). A block South, crowds of tourists flock to the Trevi Fountain to throw coins.
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Appendix 1

Tutte le Statue Antiche, Che in Roma (1562)
By: Ulisse Aldrovandi

In Casa Di M. Stefano Dal Bufalo, Dietro S. Maria In Via

In the portico of this house, a dressed Venus is immediately found. Two portraits are also seen there: one of Jupiter and the other, some say, that it is Spain. Because, that statue in antiquity was one of the provinces and territories, as was said above about the Dacians.

A beautiful statue of a complete Apollo is found inside a room on the ground-floor on the right side of the portico. On his arm there is a cloak which hangs down, he holds a lyre – because music was his domain as has been said many times – and he has a beautiful swan at his feet. This is one of the most beautiful statues which can be seen.

There is also an entire dressed statue of Harpocrates, the God 'Silence,' as the ancients called him. Angerona, the Goddess of Silence is also here whose statue was composed with the mouth closed and covered. There too is an ancient, naked Apollo without arms and made of clay. As well, you have a great ancient Mask.

Inside another room on the ground floor under the portico, you can see a Bacchus and a naked, standing Satyr embracing each other sideways – below them is a tiger of the same marble. There, you can also see a beautiful ancient round-base with many small pictures in relief around it, which are, Mars, Apollo, Jupiter, Mercury, Hercules, Bacchus, and Asclepius. There is a statue of Venus and Cupid, her son; but Venus is headless.

In the garden of this house you can see a large marble Cerberus with three heads. The poets joked and called him ‘Cerberus,’ who in hell is a proud dog with three heads. They also said that when Hercules, still alive, went down to Hell he tied this dog up and dragged it out into the light of our world. Here you can also see an ancient marble Tiger placed upon a modern base.

There are many statues nearby, the first – found to the right, is a dressed, but armless, Diana. The second is a Pomona, with her lap full of fruits; because as mentioned above, this Goddess gave fruits abundantly to the world. The third is a complete Togatus of a Flamine, that is, an ancient priest. Nearby stands a Persian Slave made of a mixed stone, bent down with one knee on the ground.
and a weight on his shoulders. The fourth is a fully dressed Venus. The fifth is a complete nude of Hercules, as a boy, with the lion’s skin on his shoulders.

At the upper-end of the garden, behind the spring, which is there, you can see a two-fold marble table with various sculptures. Among the others there are three Graces embraced together, who the poets joked (as has been said above) they always find themselves with Venus dancing with her and celebrating her.

Here is a bizarre spring, rustic in a very charming way. Composed in the rough mound from which the water comes out, as if from the soil itself. The spring is trampled over in every part of it. You can see six ancient heads on the walls of this place, one of which is Antinoös.

Within another small fountain, which is also there, you can see an ancient statue lying down, and it is Cleopatra.

In a quadrant of the garden there are seven beautiful ancient portraits and busts placed in order. The first one, which is seen straightway, is of Commodus, the emperor. The second is of a Greek, and it is in the Greek style. The third is of M. Aurelius, who was a good emperor. The fourth is of the Emperor Maximinius. The fifth is of Marius, who was born in Arpino and was Consul of Rome seven times. The sixth is unidentifiable. The seventh, they say, is Tiberius, successor of Augustus; and in that time, he crucified our savior. Maximinius was a poor leader, he governed the Empire only three years after Alexander Severus and was killed by his own army in Aquileia.

These quadrants are such a delightful and beautiful place that any happy and kind spirit would live a quiet and happy life here.

In entering the upper loggia at the door, there is a portrait of Hadrian and another Scipio Africanus. In another room there are many portrait busts placed on their own bases: the first we see straightaway is a portrait of Venus, with a cloth on her neck; the second is of the Emperor Geta when he was young, with a robe buttoned over his shoulder. The third is of the young M. Aurelius, with a robe attached over his shoulder by a pin. Opposite Venus is the portrait bust of a dressed Vespasian, which is placed on a mixed-stone base. Above the fireplace is a portrait bust of a dressed Antoninus Pius. Then, there is a beautiful portrait of Hercules.
In another room, there is an ancient portrait bust. Two portraits of Boys with bare busts. In another room in that hall there is a portrait with Antoninus Pius’ nude bust.

Nearby is a head of Lysias—a person of great authority among the Greeks— which has its inscription on the neck: i.e., ‘ΛΥΣΙΑΣ.’ You can also see a portrait of a Woman in the Greek style, with a very beautiful bust.
Appendix 2

Romanae Urbis Topographia et Antiquititates (1597)
By: Jean-Jacques Boissard

Aedes Buffalorum

Under Quirinal Hill is the Palazzo del Bufalo - small, if compared with those bigger houses of the Cardinals on the Palatine, and the Pope - but it does not yield to the rest with respect to all of its collected antiquities.

Entering this place under the portico, there are statues of a nude Venus and of an Apollo, who holds a lyre of curved wood in his left hand. A statue against which nothing is seen as more excellent in all of Rome. There is a statue of Harpocrates, or “Silence;” a Bacchus with a Satyr, who hold each other in a mutual embrace, with a tiger at their feet; another Apollo, a Venus with Cupid; Juno; Jove; and statues of other Gods. In addition, heads of Jove and Palladas; and two Masks; and a great base, on which, in the most beautifully wrought relief, is Jupiter, Apollo, Bacchus, Hercules, Mercury, Mars, and Asclepius.

The garden is sown thickly with diverse and rare herbs and trees: palms, cedars, pomegranates - for medicine, myrtle and others. Palms, for instance, are found in many places in Rome but no garden has dates except for those which are at St. Maria del Popolo and St. Maria in Trastevere.

In this garden, amongst the trees of the del Bufalo residence are colossal statues of the three-headed Cerberus, and across from it, a Tiger - both of which are standing on their own marble bases. There are in that place several statues such as a Diana, Pomona, a Flamine which was a priest, a clothed and complete Venus, a Hercules as a youth, a Sabine Woman, and a Persian Slave made of a rare mixed stone.

In a cubicle near the garden there are seven portraits and busts: one of Marius, who was consul seven times, set up on his own base; one of Tiberius, one of M. Aurelius, one of Commodus, one of Maximinius, one of some Greek; and one of an unknown Man.

In the entrance to the loggia, there are two heads: one of Scipio Africanus and one of Emperor Hadrian. Elsewhere, within the loggia, there many portraits with busts each on their own base. Among them is a Venus, a Sabine Woman, a Hercules, a Vespasian, and a M. Aurelius as a youth. There is one of the Emperor Geta, two of
Antoninus Pius, two of Boys, one of a Greek man on whose neck is written 'ΛΥΣΙΑΣ,' and one of an unknown Woman.

Near the far end of the garden by the spring is a marble table on which Three Graces are depicted, holding each other in a mutual embrace.

Back in the garden a spring has been constructed of marine tufa as if it were a natural hill. As great the beauty of this spring, as great the expense of it, so great is the unique nature of its composition, such that there is nothing anywhere more splendid to see.

In this place are placed precious shells which carry brilliant pearls, and most beautiful, giant Indian Cochlea, and large iridescent single pearls. The whole artificial rock is covered most elegantly by laurel, cedar, tamarisk, and other trees which provide shade for the spring. Under it are three most elegant statues of Muses, and of the Emperor Caracalla - who is conspicuous being covered by his typical marble cloak.

Arranged all over are statues which are visible in their compartments such as a Demetrius, a Maximinius, a Philip, Claudius, and others.

The clearest water shoots forth from the rock of the spring by way of copper tubes and channels - a truly awesome display of artifice.

There is a stone-flooring arranged most exquisitely of marble pieces - a work of mosaic. The piece is made of chalcedony, porphyry, alabaster, ophite, Ethiopian opal, thassian, parian, and marmaric marble. A work befitting the highest admiration.

All of the above demands, though it is small, that the spring be compared with that on the hill of the Pontifex Maximus which can be seen at the gate of the Flaminian Way, on account of its beauty and with respect to the skill of its artifice. In summation, whatever is seen in the house of this patrician is worthy of a king and the richest leader, I believe.
## Appendix 3

Catalogue of the Palazzo del Bufalo (c. 1450-1600 CE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Antique Artefact</th>
<th>Palazzo del Bufalo Setting</th>
<th>Later History / Provenance</th>
<th>Modern Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Altar of Vettia Magna</td>
<td>Main Fountain Area</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Amor with Cloak of Mars</td>
<td>Undisclosed Location</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Florence Archaeological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Angerona</td>
<td>Casino</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Apollo / Pothos</td>
<td>Casino</td>
<td>Palazzo Farnese, Rome</td>
<td>Uffizi Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Apollo (Clay)</td>
<td>Casino</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bacchus and Satyr Group</td>
<td>Casino</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bust of an Emperor</td>
<td>Undisclosed Location</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bust of a Greek Man</td>
<td>Garden Precincts</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bust of a Man (1 of 2)</td>
<td>Garden Precincts</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bust of a Man (2 of 2)</td>
<td>Undisclosed Location</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bust of Antinoös</td>
<td>Back Fountain Area</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bust of Antoninus Pius (1 of 3)</td>
<td>Loggia Room #1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Bust of Antoninus Pius (2 of 3)</td>
<td>Loggia Room #3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Bust of Antoninus Pius (3 of 3)</td>
<td>Loggia Room #3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Bust of Brutus</td>
<td>Undisclosed Location</td>
<td>Palazzo Farnese, Rome</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bust of Claudius</td>
<td>Back Fountain Area</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Bust of Commodus</td>
<td>Garden Precincts</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Musei Vaticani (Pio-Clem.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Bust of Demetrius</td>
<td>Back Fountain Area</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Bust of Geta</td>
<td>Loggia Room #1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bust of Hadrian</td>
<td>Loggia Entryway</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Bust of Lysias</td>
<td>Loggia Room #3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Naples Archaeological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Bust of Marcus Aurelius (1 of 2)</td>
<td>Garden Precincts</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bust of Marcus Aurelius (2 of 2)</td>
<td>Loggia Room #1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Bust of Marius</td>
<td>Garden Precincts</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Bust of Maximinius Thrax</td>
<td>Garden Precincts</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Uffizi Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Bust of Philip the Arab</td>
<td>Back Fountain Area</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Location Details</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Bust of Tiberius</td>
<td>Garden Precincts</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Bust of Scipio Africanus</td>
<td>Loggia Entryway</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Bust of Vespasian</td>
<td>Loggia Room #1</td>
<td>Palazzo Farnese, Rome</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Caracalla - Equestrian / Cavallo</td>
<td>Main Fountain Area</td>
<td>Palazzo Farnese, Rome</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Cerberus</td>
<td>Garden Entryway</td>
<td>Villa d’Este; Villa Medici, Rome</td>
<td>Villa Albani-Torlonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Cleopatra / Sleeping Ariadne</td>
<td>Back Fountain Area</td>
<td>Villa d’Este; Villa Medici, Rome</td>
<td>Uffizi Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Cupid / Eros Farnese</td>
<td>Undisclosed Location</td>
<td>Villa Farnese, Rome</td>
<td>Naples Archaeological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Main Path</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Draped Female</td>
<td>Undisclosed Location</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Drunken Reclining Satyr</td>
<td>Undisclosed Location</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Harpocrates</td>
<td>Casino</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Head of a Greek</td>
<td>Garden Precincts</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Head of a Greek Woman</td>
<td>Loggia Room #3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Head of a Woman / Sabine</td>
<td>Loggia Room #1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Hercules / Atlas</td>
<td>Casino</td>
<td>Palazzo Farnese, Naples</td>
<td>Archaeological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Hercules as a Youth</td>
<td>Main Path</td>
<td>Palazzo Farnese, Rome</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Hercules - Bust</td>
<td>Loggia Room #1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Juno</td>
<td>Portico</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td>Portico</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Jupiter - Bust</td>
<td>Portico</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Kneeling Captive Persian</td>
<td>Main Path</td>
<td>Palazzo Farnese, Rome</td>
<td>Naples Archaeological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Male Child - Bust (1 of 2)</td>
<td>Loggia Room #2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Male Child - Bust (2 of 2)</td>
<td>Loggia Room #2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Male Mask</td>
<td>Casino</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Mask</td>
<td>Casino</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Minerva (1 of 2)</td>
<td>Undisclosed Location</td>
<td>Villa d’Este; Villa Medici, Rome</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Minerva (1 of 2)</td>
<td>Undisclosed Location</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Mosaic (?)</td>
<td>Back Fountain Area</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Muse (1 of 4) / Hygiea</td>
<td>Main Fountain Area</td>
<td>Villa d’Este; Villa Medici, Rome</td>
<td>Palazzo Pitti, Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Muse (2 of 4) / Muse of Atticanus</td>
<td>Main Fountain Area</td>
<td>Villa d’Este; Villa Medici, Rome</td>
<td>Uffizi Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Muse (3 of 4) / Niobid #296</td>
<td>Main Fountain Area</td>
<td>Villa d’Este; Villa Medici, Rome</td>
<td>Uffizi Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Muse (4 of 4) / Unidentified Muse</td>
<td>Undisclosed Location</td>
<td>Villa d’Este; Villa Medici, Rome</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Obelisk</td>
<td>Undisclosed Location</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Pomona / Autumnal Hore</td>
<td>Main Path</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Uffizi Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Puteal</td>
<td>Casino</td>
<td>Palazzo Farnese, Rome</td>
<td>Naples Archaeological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Sabine Woman</td>
<td>Main Path</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Sarcophagus with Iunctio Dextrarum</td>
<td>Undisclosed Location</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Spain / Minerva</td>
<td>Portico</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Three Graces – Relief</td>
<td>Main Fountain Area</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Togatus of a Flamine</td>
<td>Main Path</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Florence Archaeological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Unidentified – Bust (1 of 8)</td>
<td>Garden Precincts</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Unidentified – Bust (2 of 8)</td>
<td>Loggia Room #2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Unidentified – Bust (3 of 8)</td>
<td>Back Fountain Area</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Unidentified – Bust (4 of 8)</td>
<td>Back Fountain Area</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Unidentified – Bust (5 of 8)</td>
<td>Back Fountain Area</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Unidentified – Bust (6 of 8)</td>
<td>Back Fountain Area</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Unidentified – Bust (7 of 8)</td>
<td>Back Fountain Area</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Unidentified – Bust (8 of 8)</td>
<td>Back Fountain Area</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Valerius Inscription</td>
<td>Undisclosed Location</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Venus – Bust</td>
<td>Loggia Room #1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Venus (Clothed)</td>
<td>Main Path</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Venus (Naked)</td>
<td>Portico</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Venus with Cupid – Statuette</td>
<td>Casino</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Capitoline Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Woman and Loves – Relief</td>
<td>Main Fountain Area</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Untraced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1

Fig. 2

Building block 32 of the Rione Trevi including the palazzo del Bufalo and the Trevi Fountain. Pio-Gregoriano Land Registry (1824).
Fig. 5

Detail of the ‘Domus S. Bubali’ in Map of Roma.
Bufalini, Leonardo (1551).

Fig. 6

Detail of the Rione Trevi and del Bufalo house in Map of Rome.
Falda, Giovanni Battista (1676).
Detail of the Palazzo del Bufalo and the Palazzo Pontifico in Map of Rome. Nolli, Giambattista (1748).
Fig. 8

Detail of the Palazzo del Bufalo and the Palazzo Pontifico in Map of Rome. Ruga, Pietro (1836).
Fig. 10

The Puteal and possibly the Sarcophagus with Iunctio Dextrarum. Dosio, Giovannantonio (1560). Dosio Sketchbook, Fol. 14v.
Fig. 12

Sketches of the Puteal Relief.
Anonymous (1550-1555). Codex Coburgensis, Nos. 104 (Left) and 82 (Right).

Fig. 13

Sketches of the Cosmos Relief.
Anonymous (1550-1555). Codex Coburgensis, Nos. 216 (Left), 217 (Centre), and 218 (Right).
Fig. 14

Projection of the Puteal relief.
Anonymous (1550-1555). Codex Pighianus, 315v A-B.

Fig. 15

Projection of the Cosmos relief.
Anonymous (1550-1555). Codex Pighianus, Fol. 229r.
Fig. 16

Sketch including Atlas. De Vos, Maarten (1560). De Vos Sketchbook, Fol. 5v. The Atlas is the third figure from the Bottom-left. Here, the piece has been restored.
Fig. 18

Fig. 19

Bacchus and Satyr Group.
Jacques, Pierre (1573) Album de Pierre Jacques, Fol. 9v A.
Sketch of Cerberus.
Fig. 21

Tiger a.k.a. Lion.
Jacques, Pierre (1573) Album de Pierre Jacques, Fols. 78r-79r.

Fig. 22

Tiger a.k.a. Lion.
Photo taken in the Florence Archeological Museum (2019).
Fig. 23

Pomona a.k.a. Autumnal Hore.
Photo taken in the Ufizzi Gallery (2019).
Fig. 24

Kneeling Captive Persian.
Photo taken in the Naples Archeological Museum (2019).
Three Graces relief.
Dal Pozzo, Cassiano (c. 1575-1600). Cassiano dal Pozzo Album, GR 1948.4-23.1, Fol. 25.
Fig. 26

Cleopatra a.k.a. Sleeping Ariadne.
Photo courtesy of the Census of Antique Works of Art and Architecture Known in the Renaissance, CensusID: 159640.
Fig. 27

Bust of Lysias.
Photo taken in the Naples Archeological Museum (2019).
Three Graces a.k.a. (Left to Right) Hygiea, Muse of Atticanus, and Niobid #296.
Dosio, Giovannantonio (c. 1560). Codex Berolinensis, Fol. 59r.
Fig. 29

Hygiea.
Photo courtesy of the *Census of Antique Works of Art and Architecture Known in the Renaissance*, CensusID: 159300.
Fig. 30

Muse of Atticanus.
Photo taken in the Uffizi Gallery (2019)
Inscription on the Muse of Atticanus: ΟΡΟΣ ΑΤΤΙΧΗΝΙΓ ΑΛΛΟΕΙΠΕΝΙΓ; an odd transliteration for 'opus attici[n]s] afrodisiensis.'
Strada, Jacopo (c. 1500-1600). Codex Miniatus, Fol. 48.
Fig. 32

Niobid #296.
Photo taken in the Uffizi Gallery (2019).
Amor with Cloak of Mars.
Jacques, Pierre (1573) *Album de Pierre Jacques*, Fol. 10r A-B.
Fig. 34

Reclining Satyr.
Jacques, Pierre (1573) Album de Pierre Jacques, Fol. 17v A-B.
The Right Wall frescoes by Polidoro and Maturino.

Detail of the *Cosmos*, “The astrological domain of Taurus” with Perseus and the Seamonster.
Anonymous (1550-1555). *Codex Coburgensis*, Nos. 216
Fig. 38

Fig. 39

Parnassus.
Zuccaro, Taddeo (c. 1560). Fresco
View of the Garden of the Villa Medici.
Velázquez, Diego (1630). Oil on canvas.
Casino Façade from the Palazzo Del Bufalo taken before its Destruction (1885).
Photo in the Museo di Roma.
Southern Façade of the modern construction in the spot of the Palazzo del Bufalo on the Via del Tritone (2019).
Northern Façade of the modern construction in the spot of the Palazzo del Bufalo on the Largo del Nazareno (2019).
Fig. 45

Detail above the door of the Northern Façade of the modern construction in the spot of the Palazzo del Bufalo on the Largo del Nazareno with Bull Insignia of the del Bufalo (2019).