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Preface

In order to truly understand the full relationship between a father and his daughter in Italian Renaissance, one must look beyond the social context to the private sphere. Daughters overshadowed in public life were not afraid to rise to authoritative positions in their private lives. The current opinion of scholars in regard to the father/daughter relationship in Italian Renaissance does not adequately take into account the personal aspects and emotions involved in such relationship; thus ignoring the factor that makes each case unique. Steven Ozment, an American historian who specializes in European history talks about the topic of inter-family relationship. In his book *When Fathers Ruled*, he mentions that “The rearing of a child was a rational act, not an emotional venture”\(^1\); this quote epitomizes the argument supported by several modern scholars of the Renaissance, as well as the view held by literates of the time. Both tended to undervalue the emotional connection between the father and daughter because the existence of such a bond was in contradiction with what was deemed to be socially acceptable. Analyzing the personal relationship between famous fathers and daughters of the Renaissance, I will attempt to add another dimension to current knowledge of the topic. I will be looking at three specific case studies that are among themselves quite different yet work collectively toward expressing the same principle. The analysis of these specific examples will redefine the concept of father/daughter relationship in Italian Renaissance in a way more similar to the modern day definition. The choice of looking primarily at three famous father/ daughter pairs has been dictated by the availability of secondary and primary sources. The cases illustrate the influence that various social norms had on the parent-child relationship, and demonstrate how the hierarchy of power existent between these two figures can vary within several contexts. In

\(^1\) Steven Ozment, *When Fathers Ruled: Family Life in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge, 1983),132
addition, our daughters exemplify the true strength of figures who were neglected due to their gender: from the angelic figure of Maria Celeste Galilei to the rebellious personality of Artemisia Gentileschi, to the evil character of Lucrezia Borgia, these women affirmed themselves within the boundaries of their social realities.
CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

THE CURRENT STATE OF KNOWLEDGE: THE SOCIO-CULTURAL CONTEXT OF ITALIAN RENAISSANCE

1.1 HOUSEHOLD AND GENDER HIERARCHY: THE PATERFAMILIAS’ AUTHORITY

Two hierarchies defined the father-daughter relationship in the Renaissance: household and gender. Daughters were inferior to their fathers because of their social status as offspring and because they were women. Their inferiority was a direct consequence of the patriarchal nature of Renaissance society. In theory, children were to their father what citizens were to their king; the father being ruler of the household. In his book When Fathers’ Ruled, Steven Ozment describes in depth the duties of Renaissance children. The most important duty was obedience, also a fundamental duty of women. Paternal authority was unquestioned: children were to honor and respect their parents, especially their fathers, who represented a ruling figure and symbolized God’s authority. They were expected to give love and care to their parents for they were their creators and deserved respect and gratitude. 2

Daughters were to submit to their fathers as parents but also to the authority of fathers as men, for the female gender were deemed inferior to the male. 3 The idea of female inferiority had very old origins. The asserted right of men to control women is traceable back to the Old Testament, when Eve, as representative of the female sex, showed herself to be prone to temptation in the Garden of Eden. As stated in Genesis, women were to submit to men: “et sub

---

2 Ozment 150-153, citing Johann Moeckard in Special instructions written for the youth of Augsburg and his document written in 1550 as special instruction for the youth of Ashbourg (Germany)

3 Ozment, 150-152
viri potestate eris et ipse dominabitur tui”.  

In the medieval ages, submission of women was further developed as an expression of God’s will to keep women away from sin. Women were condemned as the main culprit for the misery of men because of their responsibility in original sin. Francesco Furlan, an Italian historian, extended this notion to the culture of the Renaissance which viewed women as weak and more prone to sin and for this reason in need of control. Furlan describes the connection between gender and evil as that of sex/evil/woman/sex.

This correlation had been strongly supported since ancient times and became embedded in the principles of medieval church. The idea was strongly endorsed in the Renaissance, not anymore as a direct command from God but taking on a more personal, almost misogynist viewpoint.

Ruth Kelso, a 20th century pioneer feminist, confirms this view when she says that “women’s whole life was a lesson in submission to the will of another.” The “other” was usually a father or husband, but in their absence, just the closest male figures. Fathers were nonetheless considered mainly responsible for the actions of their female family members. They were expected to hold their daughters’ and wives’ uncontrolled passions. Women were therefore to be hidden behind the shadow of men, as our daughters were outwardly outshined by their renowned fathers.

The socio-cultural patterns developed from the interaction of gender and family hierarchies came to structure everything from a woman's education to her role in society. Since the role of women was defined by their marital and economic relationship with men, society did

---


5 Furlan 37

6 Furlan 40 “Sesso/ Male /Donna/Sesso”

7 Ruth Kelso, Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance (Urbana,1978), 45

8 Furlan says “strutturalmente debole, la donna va sostenuta; strutturalmente prona al peccato di lussuria in particolare, essa va controllata, disciplinata, corretta”, 17
not leave much space for those who did not submit to men in some way. The limited role women played in society was reflected in their education which aimed to inspire ideas, but rather to suppress any possibility of developing a personality or being independent. They were taught to be inferior\(^9\). Women were recognized as fundamental to the functioning of society, yet they were considered passive collaborators since they were not allowed to talk or participate actively to public life.\(^{10}\)

Gender hierarchy shaped the rearing of the children and educational curriculum. The true purpose of the education of women was to limit their power by teaching them acceptable behaviors as well as their duties and expectations from society: “The first lesson that a little girl must learn, all agreed, is to love goodness, particularly chastity and to hate evil”\(^{11}\). Education was considered a way to impart discipline to prevent women from falling into lust and sin. The training aimed to transform a good daughter into an ideal wife.

Women did not have much independent social relevance and did not matter unless they were royal figures. They were taken in consideration in terms of their roles but not as individuals. The social idea of women enforced their gender identity at the expense of their character. Women were objectified and talked of in monetary terms, or to be more specific in terms of dowry contracts. As Furlan states, men did not ignore the existence of women as part of their families, yet they only spoke of them in monetary terms and seldom said anything that

---

\(^9\) Kelso, 59

\(^{10}\) Leon Battista Alberti, *I Libri della famiglia* (Torino, 1969). Alberti discusses the structure of family along with proper behaviors and social norm. In this work he includes a quote that explicates the gender stereotype of male/female. Here it follows: “*Si come sarebbe poco onore se la donna trafficasse fra gli uomini nelle piazze. In pubblico, cosi a me potrebbe ancora biasimo tenermi chiuso in casa tra le femmine quando a me stia nelle cose virili tra gli uomini, co’ cittadini*”. Alberti, 12. He emphasizes the spheres of interest that each gender should be devoted to; respectively, male to public life and women to domestic.

\(^{11}\) Kelso, 40
could allow one to understand anything about their personality.\textsuperscript{12} In this context, historians and original sources of the Renaissance depict fathers as emotionless despots, who looked at their daughters as a possibility for money making rather than as beloved children.

The role of fathers in the Renaissance was culturally shaped as much as that of women and children. Given the patriarchal nature of Renaissance society, it was only logical for the father to be the primary figure in society. Leon Battista Alberti, a major writer of the Renaissance, spends numerous pages on the topic of paternal responsibility and explains in his treatise on the family that the father is the one in charge of the future of all the members of his family: his duty is to provide for their material well being as well as their moral well being. The future of the family depends on the success of the progeny; therefore, a major duty of the father is to educate his children. He is to guarantee an economic future for his sons and a marriage for his daughters. Historians recognize that the relationship between a father and his children varied depending on the child’s gender. The relationship between a father and the son was privileged and placed above that even of the husband with his wife or mother. Daughters on the other hand were not considered as important, at least by social norm.

Mother and father were both involved in the rearing of children yet the father’s role was dominant. The mother mostly took care of the child in the early year while the father took on the education when the child reached the age of 6 or 7 and was morally more mature.\textsuperscript{13} The father was seen as the leading figure in the house, almost as a prince in his state.\textsuperscript{14} He was considered a benevolent but authoritative figure. Daniela Frigo, a modern Italian historian, discusses the metaphorical mingling that often time took place in the context of paternal authority, where the

\begin{footnotes}
\item[12] “a tutti essi danno nome; per tutte fanno menzione della dote portata in casa o viceversa fatta uscire da essa; di ben poche purtroppo essi ci dicono qualcosa che ci permette se non di ricostruirne la personalità, almeno di indovinarla” Furlan, 14
\item[13] Ozment, 133
\item[14] Kelso, 39
\end{footnotes}
political and social concepts of power came together, both being supported by references to the “natural order of things”.\textsuperscript{15} In educating his children the father was expected to be fairly severe because the mother was the one to give affection and emotional warmth. If a father’s duty for his son was to help him build a career, for his daughter it was to guarantee that she remained under control of a man for her whole life. He was able to do that by marrying her off or by making her a nun. Either way she was under an authority. Kelso explicates the latter situation, saying “he [the father] takes her from her home and gives her to religion, and she goes from his control to the power of ecclesiastical superiors”.\textsuperscript{16}

The foregoing prescriptive norms take into consideration only the public aspects of the father/daughter relationship which was highly influenced by the father’s attempt to fulfill social expectations to protect the interest of his family. Yet, the true nature of the relationship can only be illustrated by recognizing the importance of personal documents and by interpreting the choices of the father within the constraints of the society in which he lived.

\subsection*{1.2 DAUGHTERS OF THE RENAISSANCE}

“A woman’s wrong begins at birth when her father, bitterly disappointed not to receive a son…dampens the whole household by his downcast behavior”.\textsuperscript{17} In this quote Kelso summarizes the way in which female offspring were generally perceived in the Renaissance: the birth of male child was celebrated as a fortunate event while the birth of a daughter was seen as

\textsuperscript{15} Daniela Frigo. \textit{Il Padre di Famiglia: Governo della Casa e Governo Civile nella Tradizione dell’Economia tra Cinque e Seicento.} (Roma, 1985). 202 Frigo writes: “la casa come imagine dello stato, dunque: il padre come imagine del principe.” She is using as a reference Botero, V. Castiglione, both of whom discuss the authority of prince as unquestionable, given by nature. Household government in this context becomes a sort of civic government, or quite similar.

\textsuperscript{16} Kelso, 123

\textsuperscript{17} Kelso, 123
problematic, especially if the child’s family was not wealthy. While a male child brought money to the family, females had to be married off and took with them a portion of the family’s wealth with their dowry. Children’s care followed different paths depending on their gender, starting from birth. Boys and girls were raised following different standards and were taught different values and skills. Rudolph Bell wrote about the differences between male and female children in his book *How to Do It*. He illustrates that in the Renaissance “all boys, rich and poor, should be sent to school to learn reading, writing, and arithmetic. Girls need less, just enough reading to get through a simple prayer book and a bit of writing.” The purpose of this distinction is once again correlated to the role of male/female in society. Being secluded in the domestic realm, women were in no need of high levels of education. Women were educated to a complete dependency upon the will of their husband and to be concerned only with care of the house.

Kelso advances the idea that men’s suppression of women’s individuality was a result of their fear of women’s abilities. Men were afraid of female empowerment and therefore kept them at a safe distance from knowledge. Margaret King describes fathers’ attitude toward their daughters’ education as not favorable for the most part. She goes on to say that fathers favored the social order that put them atop the pyramid to avoid endangering the power of man. To maintain the household order as socially established meant that the father maintained his honor

---

18 Rudolph Bell, *How to Do It: Guides to Good Living for the Renaissance Italians*.(Chicago, 1999), 165, based on St. Basil’s rules for disciplining young monks from Antoniano, *Tre libri dell’educazione cristiana*.

19 Kelso, 59. In this case Kelso uses a rather harsh but truthful tone to describe how women were submitted to men by means of fear and ignorance that were purposely instilled in them since birth through the course of their training. It is rather ironic how humanist men looked for freedom in their ‘knowledge’ while depriving women of their own freedom through their limited abilities to learn.

20 King, 186. “Most fathers did not desire a learned daughter: those who supported or encouraged their daughters’ education were rare. Reading was seen as a not-useful skill, but it threatened the order of the households.”
and respect. A woman in power would have invaded a man's realm, and would have been considered as an attempt to be a man. Men under the authority of women would have lost respect and masculinity. A man seen as a woman would have been associated with weakness and lack of control. Obviously a paterfamilias could not afford to do that.

When a female child was born, the family immediately began to plan her future, or in other words picked a husband or a monastery for her.\(^1\) The limited training made available to girls served two basic purposes: to educate them to their ‘social role’ and to prevent them from evil. Women were trained either to be wives or to be nuns; no other alternative was suitable to them. In both they were to be transferred from the authority of the father to that of another man (husband, or ecclesiastical superiors), never to be left unsupervised.\(^2\) Women were exposed to what King refers to as “female culture”. The teachings included how to maintain a household in good shape and how to perform basic domestic tasks, always enforcing a system focused on obedience.\(^3\) Education of a wife was different from the education of a nun, for nuns were cloistered, hence deprived of the possibilities of gaining social or political power and were therefore allowed to pursue higher levels of education.

The concept of honor for a daughter also differed from that for a son. While courage and respectability were among the preferred traits in a male child, to be a good woman one had to be modest and above all chaste. As Kelso states “the first lesson a little girl must learn…is to love goodness, particularly chastity, and to hate evil”.\(^4\) Chastity, the trait that made Renaissance woman honorable, reflected upon her family rather than herself, enhancing the respectability of

\(^1\) Margaret King, *Women of the Renaissance*. (Chicago, 1991), 25 Quoting primary sources to prove her point. Particularly striking is a quote by Dante taken from his Divine Comedy. He says “Faceva nascendo, ancor paura/ la figlia al padre” or Francesco Datini’s claim that “because as you well know girls do not make families but rather *unmake* them”

\(^2\) Kelso, 125

\(^3\) King, 164

\(^4\) Kelso, 41
the man who controlled her. If a woman was pure, it was not considered her merit, but the man who ‘supervised’ her and had succeeded in keeping her away from sin.

A woman’s chastity was in the hands of men. To keep her chastity meant to a man to be able to keep his honor. Also chastity had monetary value: when a woman got married her “value” was higher if she was a chaste virgin. The social idea of women and the standards dictated by social customs of the time, prevent historians from seeing clearly the individually characterized relations that may have existed between father and daughter. Fathers, at times, recognized and respected the intellectual and spiritual strength of their daughters and therefore treated them as equals. The father/daughter relationship was inflected by an emotional factor: the love of a father might influence his decisions. Fathers dedicated themselves to fulfilling social norms, but they also recognized their daughters as individuals and valued their personalities and ideas. Even if daughters were not public heroines, they still played a major role within the boundaries of the world in which they lived. In order to prove this hypothesis, I will take into consideration personal documents shared by fathers and daughters, such as letters. Comments and correspondence of contemporaries will also enhance the analysis. While in the case of Maria Celeste Galilei and Lucrezia Borgia letters constitute the bulk of the primary sources used, Artemisia Gentileschi’s case poses some challenges. Due to the unavailability of correspondence between father and daughter, this part of the analysis will be developed around civic documentation and her artistic production which equally efficiently convey the idea.

25 King, 31
CHAPTER 2

Maria Celeste & Galileo Galileo

"Assomiglierei VS al pellicano, che sìcomin egli per sostenere i figli sviscera se stesso, cosi lei per sovvenire alle necessita’ di noi sue care figlie non avrebbe riguardo di privar se stessa di cosa lei necessaria"

MARIA CELESTE AND GALILEO: LIKE THE EARTH TO THE SUN

Galileo Galilei and his daughter shared much more than a consanguineous bond. His paternal care derived not only from a sense of duty, but also was motivated by affection. On the surface, Maria Celeste seems to fulfill precisely the idea of what a woman was supposed to be in the Renaissance. She was deeply devoted to her father; she was chaste and religious; and when it came to deciding her future, she gladly accepted the choice her father made for her to be a nun. This angelic figure seems to be free from any behavior that would support my argument; nonetheless, by looking more deeply at her actions, within the social boundaries that restrained all women, one comes to see that her relationship with Galileo was definitely not one of unquestioned submission. The immense affection that Galileo bestowed upon Maria and his many acts of care beyond fatherly obligation show that their relationship was not founded solely on the hierarchical power of the father. Galileo respected and trusted Maria, and he did not simply impose his authority. For her part, Maria too expressed her personality and exercised much power within the boundaries allowed by society. Their relationship, at the most intimate level of father and daughter, was founded on reciprocity dictated by a deep emotional attachment.

1 Maria Celeste Galilei, Lettere al Padre (Genova 1992) - Collezione diretta da Giuseppe Marcenaro
April 10, 1628. “I would compare you to a pelican, who to nurture its offspring, sacrifices itself, in that manner you provide for the needs of your beloved children, and would yourself of things that yourself need”
Letters written by Maria Celeste to her father, many of which are preserved, facilitate an analysis of the personal relationship between them. The responses written by Galileo unfortunately are not preserved, but from Maria’s letters, it is reasonably certain that they once existed. The letters reveal a deep affection between the two, which turns out to be the central motivation for many of Galileo’s life-changing decisions.

2.1 GALILEO: THE FAMILY MAN

Many historians have written biographies of Galileo Galilei, the famous scientist, but very few focus on his private life. Carlo Arduini, is among the exceptions. He was an Italian professor responsible for the discovery of 97 of the 124 letters written by Maria Celeste to her father Galileo. He decided to write a biography centered upon these documents and focused upon Galileo as a man rather than as a scientist. In his book La primogenita di Galileo, Arduini reveals aspects of Galileo’s life that enhance our understanding of the nature of his relationship with Maria. Galileo was always a dedicated family man.² This statement might seem quite unreasonable, considering that he never married the mother of his children, nor legally recognized his offspring. Arduini explains this apparent inconsistency by arguing that Galileo merely followed socio-political norms. After the death of his father, family money was scarce, yet Galileo was bound by Renaissance customs to marry within his rank as established by his deceased father, and also preferably to find a wife within his native land.³ Because he could not

² Carlo Arduini. La Primogenita di Galileo Galilei Rivelata dalle sue Lettere Edite e Inedite. (Firenze, 1864). The main source of Galileo’s marriage philosophy comes from writings by Carlo Arduini, one of the first historians who studied the letters written by Maria Celeste along with the personal life of Galileo. “con la madre, col fratello e le sorelle dovette farsi d’animo ed esser maggior di se stesso , dovette consolarli consigliarli, essendo, come primogenito, il capo di casa, la mente e il braccio della stessa madre” Arduini, 72. Before his father died he had already collaborated in guaranteeing the well being of the family after he became the head of the family.

³ Arduini, 79 “lui non ricco si doveva ammogliare come se possedesse patrimonio, doveva contrarre matrimonio indissolubile sotto arbitrato della chiesa .cioe’ doveva prendere in moglie una donna
marry in this way due to lack of founds, he resolved not to marry at all. Yet the desire for love and sex, as well as for companionship and a family of his own, must have been strong; these desires found satisfaction when he met Marina Gamba, relatively poor Venetian, who did not fulfill any of the societal requirements that Galileo’s suitable wife should have possessed. Firm in his decision against an improper marriage, Galileo proposed to Marina’s father a deal, composed of two main clauses. First, the ceremony would not be presided over by a priest but instead by Galileo’s friend Girolamo Magagnati, and that under the terms of this ceremony Galileo would take an oath to provide for Marina and any possible offspring to come, no matter what future circumstances might bring. Galileo promised Marina, were he to leave the Venetian state, a proper wedding with some suitable man (not himself, of course) and to take any of their future children with him, and provide for them. Secondarily, and in return for Galileo’s promises, Marina had to agree always to trust him with his scientific theories, even when they were in disagreement with common beliefs. She agreed further to keep up church rituals only in her home and to avoid contact with priests. The reason for these last two clauses was primarily the controversy between Church and science in which Galileo’s theory was found to be potentially heretical, since the fact that concubinage was looked upon by the church as an illegitimate relationship hardly mattered and was widely tolerated even among clergy. The pseudo-wedding initiated Galileo’s future as a family man who then fathered three children, Virginia, Livia and Vincenzo.

2.2 ILLEGITIMATE CHILDREN: TO SAVE A CHILD BY MEANS OF CLAUSTRACTION

Arduini, 125-126
Galileo never legitimized the offspring that resulted from his ten-year concubinage with Marina, and although everyone knew that they were his children, by law they were illegitimate. Documents testify to the birth of Maria Celeste (born as Virginia), recording the name of the mother but reporting the father’s identity as unknown, ‘padre incerto’. During the Renaissance, the legitimacy of a child had to be publicly established in order to be recognized. If the child was legitimized, he/she became entitled to the care of his/her parents. In the instance of a informal marriage such as the one between Marina and Galileo, children were entitled to certain rights based upon agreement but the law did not force the father to take care of his offspring. Galileo never publicly recognized his children but he asserted his paternity indirectly by providing for their material needs and by designating them with precisely the names of two of his sisters and his father. The illegitimate status attributed by legal code to Galileo’s daughters was directly connected to Galileo’s decision to send them to a convent. By social practice, the birth status of Virginia and Livia diminished their possibility of contributing to the family’s honor, hence automatically reducing the possibility for a respectable marriage for them. Sixteenth century scholar Francesco Barbaro explicates the possible reasoning behind this choice in De Re Uxoria. He states that “experience has established that those who are conceived illegitimately in uncontrolled love making often turn out to be inferior and infamous and are much more prone to

---

5 Arduini, 156. Also see.Favaro. *Galileo Galilei e Suor Maria Celeste.* (Firenze, 1935) who cites the archive di Padova baptismal document of Virginia’s birth :“a di 21 Aprile 1600 Virginia Figliuola di Marina di Venetia, nata di fornicatione il 13...” 61

6 Thomas Kuehn, *Illegitimacy in Renaissance Florence.* (Ann Arbor, 2002) , 35. There were different types of illegitimate children in the Renaissance, who based upon their condition of birth fell under various categories:
- Legitimi et naturales (born of a legitimate marriage)
- Legitimi tantum( adopted)
- naturales tantum ( born of a concubine kept in one’s home “maritali affectu”
- Nec legitiimi nec naturales ( ex. born from adultery and incest)

Galileo’s daughter would have fallen in the naturale tantum category since the marriage was putative not legal.

immorality”. There is no evidence that would lead one to think that Galileo himself accepted this profoundly hostile attitude toward illegitimate children, and his love for his daughter surely suggests that he did not think of her as innately immoral, but he was constrained by social realities to recognize that he could not assure a good and proper marriage for her and her sister. Dava Sobel, a modern American writer, focused her book, *Galileo’s Daughter*, on Galileo’s private life and on his correspondence with Maria Celeste, taking up the approach that Arduini had initiated a century earlier and casting the family relationship in a modern feminist context. In regard to Galileo’s choice to send his daughters to a convent, Sobel looks more deeply at the situation by taking in account the daughters’ interest. Sobel asserts that Galileo did not choose to seclude his children to avoid spending money on a dowry, as might be assumed judging only by social standards. Rather, he made his decision for the best interests of his daughters, who because of social norms would not have had a bright conjugal future.

Antonio Favaro, a nineteenth-century mathematician, was fascinated by Galileo’s life and wrote the book *Galileo Galilei*. Favaro provides more proof to support the argument that Galileo’s decision to put the girls in a convent was dictated by circumstantial difficulties and meant to guarantee a more respectable future for them. Favaro explains that at the time, Galileo experienced economic difficulties which together with the birth status of his daughters made a marriage at Galileo’s family rank dictated hard to achieve. Galileo did not mean to get rid of his daughters, but instead to take proper care of them, concluded Favaro. Furthermore, considering

---

8 Arduini, 95
9 Sobel, 35
10 Antonio Favaro. *Galileo Galilei e Suor Maria Celeste.* (Firenze, 1935) “Già per Galileo era abbastanza grave il pensiero quello delle due figlie le quali e per la macchia della nascita e per le relative scarsità dei suoi mezzi assai difficilmente avrebbe potuto accasare così onorevolmente come sarebbe stato richiesto e dall’antica nobilita della famiglia, è dall’alto ufficio del quale era stato investito” Favaro, 97
the peacefulness with which Maria accepted convent life and her deep religiosity, the decision to become a nun may well have been the girl’s own first choice.

As promised in his marriage agreement, when Galileo left Venice he took the children with him and began his search for an adequate accommodation for his daughters. Two main factors guided Galileo’s search for a convent: firstly, he wanted the girls to stay together in the same convent, and secondly he wished that the convent be close so that he might visit them. Two main problems prevented him from achieving his plans. First, the girls were too young for clausturation and secondly the regulations in Florentine convents denied entry to siblings because such sister entries would foster attachments to family, which is precisely what the religious orders wished to minimize. After several letters to cardinals and popes, in 1613 Galileo obtained permission to have both daughters in the convent of San Matteo D’Arcetri. 11The choice of convent was carefully reached and it was the best solution at the time. Also in this period, Galileo’s trouble with religious authorities began to arise in earnest, which further convinced Galileo of the immediate need to cloister his daughters to ensure their safety and future welfare. The Church began to contest Galileo’s support and development of Copernicus’ geocentric theory, for it went against the biblical heliocentric interpretation.12 Virginia and Livia officially became nuns in 1616 and 1617, respectively known as Suor Maria Celeste and Suor Arcangela.

2.3 CLAUSTURATION: POWER WITHIN THE CONTEXT

Although monasticism necessarily involved deep restrictions on the social and economic lives of women, it indirectly allowed much more authority within its enclosed world than women

11 Arduini, 100-103
12 Sobel, 59 the interpretation of the church was based upon a passage of the Bible from the book of Joshua “ O, lord my God, thou art great indeed, thou fixed the earth upon its foundations not to be moved forever” [ 103:1, 5]
would have had as wives. Religion always focused on charity and on empathy, two qualities often attributed to women as well. Religious women were considered to be potential messengers of God, and for this reason they were allowed to pursue a level of education not allowed to others of their sex. While nuns could not preach or function as public ministers, they were encouraged to learn to read and write, as well as to teach within those convents that ran schools. Realistically speaking, a learned woman in a convent could not have caused any power disruption to the social order, considering that she was isolated from society, so perhaps the patriarchy had less reason to stifle educational opportunities for convent women.

Gabriella Zarri explicates the philosophy and dynamics of monastic life, and provides a more specific analysis of the social norms that directly affected Maria Celeste. Knowing the context and the norms by which Maria Celeste lived, provides a better understanding of her power within convent walls. Like many other monastic orders of the period, the order of Saint Clare that Maria joined was cloistered, meaning that after officially taking vows, nuns were heavily secluded for the rest of their lives. They were encouraged to dissociate themselves from the outside world, including even their biological families, to safeguard the moral standards of the convent and to nurture their exclusive concentration on spiritual concerns. The monastery was a society unto itself and the mother superior was the only family common to all. In less restrictive orders such as the Poor Clares, biological family members were allowed to visit but even here, nuns were to prioritize monastic life. Nuns were to live in poverty and they were not allowed to own private possessions; all they had was to be shared with the rest of the monastic community. The rule of the Order of Saint Clare is typical of monastic rules followed in the period. As cited by Sobel the rule states:

“The form of life of the order of the poor sisters which the blessed Francis founded is this: to observe the holy gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ by living in obedience without anything of one’s own and in chastity.”

Thus after Maria Celeste entered the convent of San Matteo, she was supposed to lead a life of seclusion, poverty and isolation from the outside world. She did live in poverty and did not leave the convent but thanks to her father, who made her an active participant of his life, she was never in complete isolation from the outside world.

2.4 LETTERS

The correspondence between Galileo and his daughter is deeply intimate and personal. Maria’s words reflect indirectly the happenings that shaped Galileo’s life and tell us much about the nature of the relationship between them. Narrations of daily happenings at the convent, food exchange and illness seem nothing exciting to read about, yet it is in the telling of these personal needs and venting about little setbacks that one is able to discover the profound relationship between a father and his daughter. As discussed in the previous chapter, the dominant image of fathers in the Renaissance is that of an emotionless despot whose interests derive principally from the possibility of economic and political gain. The letters furnish instead a portrait of a figure who stands at the opposite end of the spectrum: a loving and caring father, respectful and egalitarian toward his child.

The first known letter found is dated May 10th 1623, written by Maria to her father on the occasion of his sister’s death. Maria expresses her deep sorrow and serves as well as a messenger to her sister. The letter is simple in literary style, as are all the others she wrote, yet it shows clearly how Maria is still connected to the outside world through the eyes of her father and the deep attachment she has to him. Although Maria Celeste fulfills the stereotype of Renaissance

---

14 Sobel, 82
15 Galilei, 15. May 10th, 1623
woman by being a nun and fully submitting herself to a state of obedience, she becomes extremely influential to many people and manages to gain agency within the context in which she lives. Her existence revolved around that of Galileo, but what many historians have failed to consider is that reciprocally, his existence revolved around hers. In the introduction of *Lettere al padre* (the edition of letters I studied), Giuseppe Marcenaro, the author who put together the edition of letters used in this thesis, includes in his book a passage written by Giovanni Ansaldo in 1927, wherein Galileo is portrayed as an inattentive father and claustration is depicted as the easiest way for him to get rid of his daughters. I would argue, however, that when the two children lost their mother, who as promised by marriage agreement wed a respectable local man when Galileo left Venice, this particular father did not shirk his parental responsibilities. He and his blood relatives became the only family the children had and he supported them appropriately. Moreover, if Galileo had been worried about liberating himself from a burden, he would not have written to popes and cardinals for special permission to have the children close to him and together. Also noteworthy is the letter Galileo wrote to his brother Michelangelo, in which he reveals openly his fatherly affection, as he describes Maria Celeste as wise, charitable, and intelligent.

The letters in themselves are evidence of care and love, for from Maria Celeste’s responses one sees the attentiveness of her loving father. Each letter opens with a new happening of the day, a request or a prayer. Each letter ends with an appeal to God to preserve the lives of those in the convent and especially that of her beloved Galileo. In all, Suor Maria never fails to

---

16 The nun was well known in the area surrounding the convent. She was the one who negotiated for any request the convent might have. Her influence was particularly evident at the time of her death when many letters of condolences were sent to Galileo. Among some of these letters were one from the ambassadress Caterina Niccolini and one from the archibishop of Siena. Sobel, 345
17 Galilei, 10
18 Favaro, 145
remind her father of the depth of her love for him. On August 13, 1623 she writes, “I save all the letters that you write to me daily, and when I am not busy, with much enjoyment I reread them several times”.19 This line is primarily indicative of Maria’s affection but it also shows that Galileo was assiduous in writing to Maria. The letters he sent to Maria, although possibly preserved during her lifetime, went missing upon her death. As a rule of Franciscan convents, nuns were not allowed to have private possessions other than a breviary; the letters were indeed her own and therefore may have been disposed of by her fellow nuns or the Mother Superior upon her death.

Maria, knowing that her father was alone, was never able or willing to fully isolate herself from outside world. Through her letters she participates in her father’s life, as she gives him advice and prays for his recovery from various illnesses. The first record of his sickness goes back to 1623, the year in which the first letter is dated. On these occasions, Maria Celeste expresses a maternal concern and advises him on what is best, worries about him and sends him gifts, regretful of the fact that the conditions of seclusion prevent her from visiting him in person.20 As the eldest daughter of the family, Maria may have felt especially deeply the responsibility of taking on the matronly role that society assigned to a wife or to an unwed aging daughter in a respectable family. The caring maternal aspects of Maria’s character arise as well in times of difficulty between Vincenzo, her younger brother, and their father. Again, Maria finds herself giving advice. One example is a letter dated on October 29, 1623 wherein Maria recommends her brother to Galileo, asking him to be magnanimous and forgiving because

19 “Io metto da parte e serbo tutte le lettere che giornalmente mi scrive, e quando non mi ritrovo occupata, con mio grandissimo gusto le rileggo più̀ volte” Galilei, Lettere al padre, 17. August 13 1623
20 “è d’inverno ch’io non m’avvengo mai d’esser monaca se non quando sento che VS e ammalata, poiché allora vorrei poterla venir a visitare e governare con tutta la diligenza che mi fosse possibile” Galilei, 18. August 17 1623
Vincenzo’s mistakes are caused by his youth. The letter does not specify what Vincenzo had done; she just advises her father to bring his son with him to Rome to help him.\textsuperscript{21}

In her letters to her father, Maria Celeste does not demonstrate submission to paternal authority; rather, she expresses willing devotion to him.\textsuperscript{22} Even “Maria Celeste” (Heavenly Mary), the name she adopted when she took vows as a nun, may also have been inspired by her father’s interest in the sky.\textsuperscript{23} In keeping with monastic rule, each nun chose a patron saint or devoto to whom to reveal all her joys and heartaches, an inspirational source. Maria Celeste chose instead to assign her father to fulfill this role, stunningly in violation of the Rule’s intent but nicely revealing the very human and affectionate relationship that shines through in these letters.\textsuperscript{24} The devotion Maria had for her father was reciprocated in his efforts to guarantee her well being. He bent the rules and occasionally visited both his daughters at the convent and often he sent them presents, including food and wine. Galileo understood that the convent where he had placed his daughters was poor, but given the circumstances it had been his best choice. Nuns of the Order of Saint Clare, he knew full well, were not allowed to have private possessions. Therefore when Galileo sent something to his daughters, he had to consider that it would be shared with all. For the most part, this restriction does not seem to have inhibited him from sending food and provisions, as the letters show, but on one occasion he did ask if he could send

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{21}“Gli raccomando bene il nostro povero fratello….la prego ormai di perdonargli il suo errore scusandola sua poca età ch’è quella che ha indotto a commettere questo fallo…si che torno a pregarla che di grazia lo meni di su a compagnia a Roma …gli dia quelli aiuti che obbligo paterno e la sua naturale benignità e amorevlezza ricercano” Galilei, 24. November 21,1623
\textsuperscript{22}“Io l'amo più di me stessa poiché d[o]p[o] Dio l’esser lo riconosco da lei” Galilei, 51. March 22, 1629
\textsuperscript{23}Celeste – in Italian is an adjective indicating something belonging to the sky – del cielo- clear reference to the sky which in this particular context might be indicating a reference to heaven but might as well be a reference to Galileo.
\textsuperscript{24}“VS mi perdoni se troppo infastidisco con tanto cicalare, perché oltre che ella mi inanimisce col darmi indizio che gli siano grate le mie lettere, io fo conto che ella sia il mio devoto …con il quale mi comunico tutti i miei pensieri e partecipo dei miei gusti e disgusti e trovandolo sempre prontissimo a sovvenirmi” Galilei 74. November 2, 1630
\end{flushright}
gifts only to the two girls. The answer was a firm “no”. Maria often mentions the poor conditions in which they lived; in another example she told her father about the lack of quality of the bread and of her duty to share everything with her sisters. In another letter she mentions that the convent was in extreme necessity and if it were not for the few donations that people made, the nuns would risk dying of starvation.

The convent’s meager donations were not enough and the nuns survived only with the additional yield of a small garden. Nuns produced all within the convent, and did not mind sharing the little they had. Even from this small store house of goods, on numerous occasions Maria Celeste sent gifts to her father; whether these were *pere cotte* (cooked pears) or *vasetti di marmellata di fiori di ramerino* (jars of marmalade made from rosemary buds), she prepared everything with care and love. Galileo was of service to the convent, at times their provider and on other occasions their voice beyond the walls. With the renowned mathematician as a messenger to the world outside, Maria became a key person in the convent since she could provide for its needs by communicating them to her father.

The bond shared between Galileo and Maria Celeste is exemplified by the ample degree of involvement Galileo allowed his daughter in his life. He shared most happenings with her, good or bad. An example comes in a letter dated August 10, 1623 in which Maria expresses her happiness upon receiving and reading the letters that the new pope had sent to Galileo. The trusted daughter/nun was also employed by her father in small tasks such as copying letters and mending clothing items, also indicative of the maternal role she played. Had Galileo thought of
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25 Galilei, 65.April 6,1630
26 “solo gli diro che la provisione che ci da il monastero è di pane assai cattivo....Basta, lo partecipo anco con le altre com’è di dovere”
27 “siamo in estrema necessita , e se non fosse per l’aiuto che aviamo di qualche elemosina,andremmo a risico di morir di fame “ Galilei,45. December 10, 1628
28 Galilei 16. August 10, 1623
Maria simply as a religious woman cloistered from the outside world, he would not have shared his affairs with her, nor would he have charged her to keep up his house while he was on one of his numerous trips.\(^{29}\) Above all, he would not have informed her of his manuscripts and works, both of which she mentions at various times in her letters. In her letter dated on November 21, 1623, for example, Maria asks her father to send her a copy of his book, *The Assayer.* Additionally, Maria shows her leadership role in Galileo’s life when she actively participates in his negotiations to buy a house for Vincenzo and later for Galileo himself when in 1631 he decided to move closer to his daughters.\(^{31}\) On October 29, she explicitly thanks her father for keeping her aware of happenings in his life.\(^{32}\)

The nuns of San Matteo were malnourished, cold and in poor health. Maria was no exception. From her writings we learn that she must have suffered from ear infections and tooth decay; she had too little to eat and often got sick. When she informed her father of her aches and pains it was often the occasion to ask for something to alleviate her symptoms. Always she took her suffering as the will of God, hence she accepted her tribulations.\(^{33}\) Maria Celeste exemplified

\(^{29}\) In a letter dated March 5, 1633 Maria informs her father of things needed and done at his house after having been informed by Piera, possibly a maid. “la Piera sta bene le viti dell’orto sono accomodate; di lattuga venduta si e preso fino qui un mezzo scudo”. She also took care of his affairs “sto aspettando l’ordine circa di dare altri denari al Landucci questo mese presente” Galilei, 108

\(^{30}\) “le mando la copiata lettera …essendomi di grande gusto e contenta d’occuparmi in suo servizio “Galilei 21. September, 1623

\(^{31}\) In the letter dates May 18, 1631. She informs Galileo of proprieties that are on sale around the convent area. Galilei, 95.

\(^{32}\) “la lascio pensar a lei quale sia contento che sento in legger le sue lettere che continuamente mi manda; che solo il vedere con quale affetto VS si compiace di farmi partecipe e consapevole di tutti i favori che riceve” Galilei, 23

\(^{33}\) Galilei ,24. Novembre 21, 1623 “per non aver io camera....ma a questi freddi vi e tanto la cattiva stanza che io che ho la testa tanto infetta non credo potervi stare se VS non mi soccorre prestandomi uno dei suoi padiglioni ...” “io ancora non sto molto bene ma per esser ormai tanto assuefatta alla poca sanità ne faccio poca stima, vedendo di più che il signore gli piace di visitarmi sempre con qualche poco travaglio”
the Christian ideal that physical suffering was part of a rigorous and life style that would ultimately lead to salvation through better discipline of the soul.\textsuperscript{34}

Maria understood the controversy that surrounded her father’s works but she always admired him and never thought of him as a heretic. With the publication of \textit{Il Saggiatore} and \textit{Il Dialogo} the controversy between Galileo and the church worsened. He was condemned to a trial and after struggling for many years and engaging in numerous battles, his work was banned by ordinance of the church.\textsuperscript{35} Maria was aware of the trial her father underwent. In her letter dated April 20, 1633 she tells her father that she has been informed about the punishment that resulted from the trial and that he was being held by the clerical commissioners. Her words are words of reassurance. Sentence was pronounced on June 22, 1633. Maria wrote about her father’s condemnation on July 2, 1633, after she had heard the news from Signor Geri Bocchierini, a family friend. He had been forced to house arrest and a penance of prayers.

On this occasion more than ever her advice to her father was to look to God and hope for the best. A few months later, Maria wrote about the sentence her father received. She had been able to see it and knowing that Galileo was physically weak, decided to take upon herself the recitation of psalms that was included in his sentence.\textsuperscript{36} Taking the burden of the sentence was not the only way in which Maria gave her father aid and comfort. She also worked hard for a long time in writing letters to Rome to request Church officials to return her father to Arcetri. So she wrote in her last letter, dated December 10, 1633.\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{34} Zarri, 190. “Chi si è dedicato completamente alla vita religiosa deve sottoporsi a una severa disciplina del corpo per raggiungere una più rigorosa disciplina dell’anima”
\textsuperscript{35} Favaro 169-170
\textsuperscript{36} “è con l’addossarmi l’obbligo che ella ha di recitar una a volta a settimana li sette salmi è già da un pezzo cominciai a soddisfarlo e lo fo con molto mio gusto” Galilei 164. October 3,1633
\textsuperscript{37} Galilei, 187
Maria died of dysentery at the age of 33 on April 2, 1634. Letters of condolence arrived to Galileo from many people whose lives had been touched by this holy woman. He was much inflicted by sorrow and in this context once again showed his deep affection for his daughter. In a letter to his friend Geri Bocchineri he wrote: “I feel sorrow and immense melancholy, lack of hunger, I hate myself, and I feel myself called by my beloved daughter”.  

Galileo describes his emotional and physical pain, indeed his state of depression, freely and unambiguously. Maria’s death brings him to feel almost as if his own life has come to an end. Galileo Galilei does, of course, live on for another eight years but clearly in the twilight of his earlier accomplishments and passions. Historians understandably attribute this diminution of his powers to advanced age and to his condemnation by Rome but to these factors one should add the death of his beloved Maria Celeste.

---

38 Favaro, 204-206 “una tristizia e malinconia immensa; inappetenza estrema, odio a me stesso, e in somma mi sento continuamente chiamare dalla mia dilettissima figliuola”
CHAPTER 3
Lucrezia & Rodrigo Borgia

"Nai fu visto il più carnale homo, l’ama questa Madonna Lucrezia in superlativo Gradu"

THE POPE’S DAUGHTER

Among our three Renaissance daughters and their fathers, Lucrezia Borgia’s story is the most difficult to decipher. Given the great power held by her father, who diligently followed the marriage norms of this time, it becomes difficult to view their relationship as mutual and sharing, at least on the surface. In appearance, the pope used his daughter, and his other children, as pawns in his efforts to increase his political power. Yet his relationship with Lucrezia became something more: she was not simply used, instead she came to be an active participant in her father’s plans. Although respectful and aware of her role, Lucrezia had a very strong personality and her power within her household relationships came to be significant. She was Rodrigo Borgia’s favorite, the child to whom he was most attached. He was confident in her abilities and often let her step into roles usually reserved to men.

In order to understand the personal relationship between Lucrezia and her father Rodrigo, it is fundamental to know the events that shaped their lives, a matter of some controversy. One of the main factual sources is Ferdinand Gregorovius’ Lucretia Borgia, a biography that emphasizes her relationship with her father, who was central to her life. A German historian, Gregorovius wrote in the mid 19th century, and specialized in Roman history. His account, considered by many to be Lucrezia’s official biography, subsequently became the main source for later biographies. He includes letters and documents that contribute substantially to proving the

1Ferdinand Gregorovious, Lucretia Borgia, according to original documents and correspondence of her day. (New York, 1903), 58. Despach of Ferrarese ambassador Boccaccio to the duke of Ferrara, Rome, April 1493: “Never was seen a man more passionate, he loves Madonna Lucrezia in the highest way”
argument presented in my thesis. Another source, one that complements Gregorovius, is Sarah Bradford’s *Lucrezia Borgia*. Bradford, a popular modern historian, expands upon the father/daughter relationship without excess repetition of what is already contained in Gregorovius, and transcribes many additional personal letters and documents that enhance an analysis of the father/daughter relationship.²

Pope Alexander VI (Rodrigo Borgia) does not fit neatly into the stereotype of a Renaissance *paterfamilias*, yet he was one. To be both Pope and father seems oxymoronic; nonetheless in those years of the Renaissance the combination was accepted. The true nature of Rodrigo's persona was controversial. Gaspare da Verona, a contemporary of the Borgias, described Rodrigo as “handsome; of a most glad countenance and joyous aspect… the beautiful women on whom his eyes are cast he lures to love him and moves them in a wondrous way, more powerfully than a magnet influences iron”.³ A letter transcribed by Gregorovius, signed by Petriolo⁴ gives an example of Rodrigo’s lascivious lifestyle. “None of the allurements of love were lacking and you were conducting yourself in a wholly worldly manner ...you and a few servants were the leaders and inspirers of this orgy”.⁵ This letter of reprimand implies the frequency with which clerics engaged in inappropriate behavior. In his book *The Prince*, Macchiavelli, a Renaissance philosopher and writer, suggests the frequency with which such behaviors took place and their indirect acceptance by a society that did not fight hard to stop them. He illustrates the ill that afflicted Renaissance Italy as follows: “we Italians are irreligious and corrupt above others because the churches and representatives set us for the worst example”.

³ Gregorovius (quoting Gaspare da Verona, a historian that lived during the papacy of Paul II), 9
⁴ Gregorovius does not include further identification of this “Petriolo”
⁵ Gregorovius, 7
Rodrigo Borgia fathered several children, some with unknown mistresses, but three born by one of his two favorite mistresses, Vannozza Cattanei, and among these was Lucrezia Borgia.

### 3.1 LUCREZIA

Rodrigo Borgia, a man of Catalan origins, met the Roman Vannozza Cattanei (Contessa dei Cattanei) between 1466-67. His affair with her lasted about thirteen years, during which time he managed to keep her reputation intact by arranging two formal marriages (with other men) for her. Lucrezia was born on April 18, 1480. On that date, as Gregorovius reports, Roman and Spanish astrologers congratulated Rodrigo upon casting Lucrezia’s horoscope, for she prospected to be brilliant in life. Although born out of wedlock, Lucrezia never suffered the disadvantages of illegitimacy. She was legally an illegitimate child but one recognized by the pope as his own daughter. Further confirmation of such recognition is reported in a letter written by Lorenzo Pucci, in which he describes a scene at the court of Pesaro and talks of Lucrezia as “Madonna Lucrezia, the daughter of our master”. Additional proof is given by the way in which Rodrigo referred to Lucrezia, such as the heading of a letter written in 1494 by Rodrigo, after he had ascended to the papacy. On this occasion, as on many others, he began a letter to Lucrezia with

---

6 Rodrigo’s second lover was the teenage Giulia Farnese also known as Giulia “la bella,” whom he encountered after the birth of Lucrezia

7 Bradford, 15

8 Gregorovius 10

9 Gregorovius 13

10 Illegitimacy as mentioned in Chapter 2 is discussed by Thomas Kuehn in Illegitimacy in the Renaissance (Ann Arbor,2002) In this case Lucrezia falls under the cathegory of Nec legitimi nec naturales (ex. Born from adultery and incest)

Maria Bellonci in her rather poetical biography of Lucretia illustrates “figlia di un cardinale potentissimo, ella sarà stata tenuta in grande considerazione ; e nemmeno per un momento dovette andare riflettendo sulla singolarita della sua posizione nel mondo, se non per compiacersene come di un privilegio”. Here the author brings attention to the differences of status that illegitimacy can create. Looking at Maria and Lucrezia it is possible to see that difference in their fate was influenced by their social condition. Status at times was a mean to override social norm.

11 Lorenzo Pucci brother in of Puccio who was Giulia Farnese’s brother in law- in the letter written on December 23/24 1493 Lorenzo is discussing the marriage plans that are being made for Giulia’s daughter by the Borgias. In this context Lorenzo Pucci talks about Lucrezia as well asserting her relationship to the Pope, Gregorovius, 69
the salutation: “Donna Lucrezia, Dearest daughter”.  

Cardinal Rodrigo was among the wealthiest churchmen in Rome; he was therefore able to provide for his children and guarantee them a prosperous future. People were aware of the girl’s illegitimacy but did not contest her status given the power of her father.

Rodrigo’s relationship with Vannozza continued until 1482. Around that time Lucrezia, who had been living with her mother, was entrusted instead to the care of Adriana de Mila, Rodrigo’s kinswoman and close confident. Although her mother still lived in Rome and saw her from time to time, from that point on the most important figure in Lucrezia’s life became her father. In keeping with traditions in Christian culture, at least in the case of courtly women, Lucrezia was placed into the care of nuns for a few years, until her matrimonial prospects came to the fore. This pattern was not unusual; Jacob Burckhardt mentions a similar process in his book *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*. He writes “after the briefest acquaintance with her future husband the young wife quits her convent or the paternal roof to enter upon the world”.

Lucrezia received the typical education expected for a courtly woman, very similar to the one described by Juan Luis Vives in his treatise, *The Education of a Christian Woman*, which was completed in 1523. In this book he writes about the educational stages and the particular circumstances a young woman might come across in her life. On the education of a young woman, Vives mentions the importance of the relationship between a mother and her new born

---

12 Gregorovius, 74  
13 Gregorovius 75 Adriana de Mila [of the house of Mila] as the daughter of a certain Don Pedro, Rodrigo’s first cousin. She married into the Orsini family (to Ludovico Orsini). Gregorovius 23  
14 “Vannozza remained in her own house in the Regola quarter. …from this time Vannozza and her children saw each other but little, although they were not completely separated … the mother profited only indirectly by the good fortune and greatness of her offspring “ Gregorovius 53  
15 Jacob Burckhardt. *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy.* (Greenwich, 1965), 256
child in the formation of a well behaved girl. Such beliefs may have influenced Rodrigo in his decision to leave Lucrezia to the care of her mother until the age of three. Vives goes on to discuss the early years of a girl’s life, when she begins to understand the difference between evil and good. In those years, after “she has been weaned and has begun to speak and to walk,” a girl must be shielded from evil and indecent behavior, so that the will not learn of such disgraceful manners. For this reason, the girl is to be kept under the supervision of a nurse; in Lucrezia’s case Adriana de Mila served this role.

During her early years Lucrezia was known for being devout. Eventually she came to learn that the man she thought of as her father, Vannozza’s husband, was not her biological father. Rather she was Cardinal Borgia’s offspring. The situation she found herself in may have conflicted with the moral education she had received up until then. At that point she had two choices: reject her family origins or accept them and enter her father’s world. From the narration provided by Gregorovius it seems that Lucrezia’s fascination with her new found father overshadowed the immorality that characterized her condition. Rodrigo had big plans for his daughter, including marriage agreements to support political alliances. The first arrangement for Lucrezia’s marriage took place in 1491, when she was 11 years old. During that period, Cardinal Borgia was looking to expand his sphere of power in Spain, hence he arranged for his daughter to wed a man from Valencia. But later in the same year, Borgia abandoned the first contract and

Juan Luis Vives, *The Education of a Christian Woman: a Sixteenth Century Manual*. Ed. By Charles Fantazzi (Chicago, 1996), 53-54 Vives was a Spaniard and wrote the treaty for Queen Catherine d’Aragon, as Bell also mentions in “How to Do It”. Although the treaties was published in 1532, decades after Lucrezia was born, the standards used by the pope in educating his daughter seem to reflect those described by Vives. Also the Spanish origins of the Borgia family make Vives treaty most likely to reflect the values by which Lucrezia was educated.

Vives, 55

Ibid, 56

Gregorovius, 24-26

Gregorovius 30-31
arranged instead a marriage for his daughter with a certain Don Gasparo. Both these agreements were later dissolved, in favor of a new contract with Giovanni Sforza Duke of Pesaro, to favor Rodrigo’s chances to be elected as pope. This third agreement turned into an actual marriage and Lucrezia moved to Pesaro to began a new phase of her life. The marriage was officially agreed upon on February 2, 1493.  

Life at the Pesaro palace seemingly proceeded well, until difficulties in Rome and new hostilities convinced Lucrezia’s father, now elected pope, to switch allies. He secretly allied with the Kingdom of Naples and began thinking about a way to get his Lucrezia back. Soon after, when the Duke of Pesaro began to suspect the new alliance, the pope sent Lucrezia to the convent of St. Sisto for her safety. Lucrezia obeyed, as she was young and had infinite trust in her father. At that point Rodrigo saw annulment as the only possible solution to get rid of his Sforza son-in-law. During the Renaissance, divorce was not allowed and the only way out was to declare the original marriage invalid. Gregorovius writes on the nullification of their marriage: “it was said for two reasons: the first that, before he married her to another lord of Spain [Procida] secondly, it is said that since she was married the said lord has never consummated the marriage because he was impotent”. 

The charge of non-consummation, which caused shame to Giovanni Sforza, represented an attempt by the pope to protect Lucrezia’s reputation and was necessary to allow her remarriage. After the first marriage was nullified, Alexander began planning Lucrezia’s second marriage, which ultimately would have led to an alliance with the kingdom of Naples. At this time a rumor spread that Lucrezia’s original marriage promises to Don Gasparo had been annulled in an illegal manner, hence her marriage to the Duke of Pesaro had not been valid. In

---

21 Gregorovius 52
22 Bradford, 58
23 Gregorovius 51
these circumstances the pope quickly decided to publicly absolve Lucrezia for marrying the Duke of Pesaro while engaged to another man. Once absolved, she was able to commit herself to a new marriage to the nephew of the King of Naples, Don Alfonso, who as a result of this alliance received the command of the cities of Quadrata and Biselli (Bisceglie). \[24\] Lucrezia apparently willingly accepted her role within the family as she saw that the marriages of her siblings had served similar political purposes. And so she moved in again with a husband, to become Duchess of Bisceglie. Lucrezia grew fond of her new spouse and enjoyed the courtly life. After several miscarriages, Lucrezia was finally able to have a baby, whom she named after her father Rodrigo. However, this marriage was not to last. Alfonso was killed and rumors had it that Caesar, brother of Lucrezia, was responsible for the murder. For a period after Alfonso’s death, Lucrezia grieved; but then she moved with her child to Nepi, a town located in the Roman countryside. During this time she sent letters to a man named Vincenzo, her butler. Her tone in the letters changed as days passed. At first she was in despair, the *infelicissima*\[25\] but relatively quickly, she became more domineering and demanding. \[26\] She moved back to Rome in a few months and back to her father who without losing time found her a third husband, Alfonso d’Este, a widower who was heir to the Duchy of Ferrara. \[27\] Rodrigo intended to enhance Caesar’s career by guaranteeing him possession of the Romagna region\[28\]. At this point Lucrezia was involved enough that she even dealt in setting the dowry for the wedding, as I will discuss shortly. The marriage was successful and Lucrezia’s court became a center of intellectual life. In 1503 the Borgia dynasty came to an end as the pope became ill and died on August 18\[16\] of that

---

\[24\] Gregorovius 111  
\[25\] Gregorovius 156  
\[26\] Bradford, 99 – in letters to Vincenzo she complains about receiving the wrong cloth, orders clothing for her child and assumes a more administrative tone  
\[27\] Gregorovius 167  
\[28\] Bradford, 102
year. Caesar was soon to be killed and all the other members of her family were plummeted from their thrones. Rumors spread about the validity of Lucrezia’s marriage to Alfonso d’Este, given the contested annulment of her marriage to Giovanni Sforza, together with the fact that she had not yet borne a male child to the Este dynasty. Although these circumstances made her future precarious, she was very much liked by the d’Este family, which defended her as one of their own.29 The people who had been watching the Borgias’ affairs always knew that Lucrezia was a part of this game of interests played by the pope and his family. In a letter to Lucrezia, Pietro Bembo, known as Lucrezia’s romantic lover30 wrote “you would do well not to allow anyone to assume, as some might be led to infer in present circumstances, that you bewail not so much your loss but what may betide your present fortunes”.31 What in the beginning had seemed like a cruel plan, in the end saved Lucrezia. She was soon disassociated from the Borgia line and became more closely linked to the d’Este family.

After her father’s death, Lucrezia showed her strong character and her abilities to take control and manage the sociopolitical scene. These qualities had been overshadowed by her father and her relatives, but now came to the fore in the public sphere. She fought to save her brother by raising troops in Ferrara to help his soldiers in Romagna. She sent the children descendent from the Borgia family32 to Castel Sant’Angelo for their safety. Then she worried about the safety of her first born Rodrigo, son of Don Alfonso. She was advised by Ercole d’Este

29 Bradford, 199
31 Bradford 197, Bembo’s letter dated August 22, 1503
32 Rodrigo Bisceglie and Giovanni Borgia. Bradford, 202
to send him to Spain, but she instead decided to send him to his father’s kingdom of Naples, where he was raised.  

3.2 ONE WOMAN STANDING IN A CROWD OF MEN

Lucrezia has often been portrayed as the victim of a cruel fate dictated by the will of her father. After all she, as a woman, was considered to have no power given the social standards of the Renaissance. A close analysis of Lucrezia’s role at her father’s court, however, as well as a look at the personal correspondence with her father, reveal that Rodrigo Borgia always entrusted a great amount of power in the hands of his daughter. Lucrezia’s relationship with her father was not one of submission and unquestioned obedience but rather one of respect and trust. Lucrezia was the only daughter he wrote about extendedly and the only one he entrusted with his affairs of state.

In 1499, as a result of political complications, Lucrezia’s husband Alfonso escaped, leaving her alone. As Rodrigo attempted to get the husband back in Rome to his wife, he decided that it would be safe to send Lucrezia outside of Rome. He appointed her to be ruler of Spoleto and Foligno, for she was the only one he could trust, considering that Caesar was in France. The decision involved nepotism, which was common in the Borgia family, but also signified his trust in her. The pope wrote “we have entrusted to your beloved daughter in Christ, the noble

33 Ibid 203,293
34 Interesting quotes are offered by Bradford, 17. She takes in consideration two quotes that complement each other. One by Alberti taken from his work Della familia., He states “a man can do as he wills”. In the second one she quotes Lorenzo il Magnifico’s sister Nannina Rucellai, who once stated that “who wants to do as they want should not be born a woman”. These two quotes illustrate the gender hierarchy that dominated the renaissance scene by placing power in the hands of men.
35 Bradford, 79
lady, Lucrezia de Borgia, duchess of Bisceglie,\textsuperscript{36} the office of keeper of the castle, as well as the
government of the cities Spoleto and Foligno, having perfect confidence in the intelligence,
fidelity and probity of the duchess”.\textsuperscript{37} The ultimate goal for Alexander was to guarantee the papal
presence in all states. The pope did not trust people outside his family especially because the
Borgias were not Italian in origin and often times were seen as invaders and outsiders. Also, with
his political actions he had created many enemies and there were few in whom he could trust.
Another occasion on which the mutual trust of this pair was revealed, is when the pope upon his
departure from the Vatican, charged Lucrezia with the task of opening all the mail addressed to
him. Cardinal Burchard, Alexander’s chancellor, reports the episode in his diary. The report is
dated in 1501, when Alexander left Rome for political affairs to go Sermoneta. During that time
Lucrezia and her father were in the middle of their marriage negotiations with the Ferrarese
family. Cardinal Burchard on that occasion wrote: “before his holiness, our master [Pope
Alexander] left the city, he turned over the palace and all the business affairs to his daughter
Lucrezia authorizing her to open all letters which should come addressed to him”.\textsuperscript{38} Gregorovius
reports the matter in a rather dramatic tone saying: “she was entrusted with the secrets of all the
Vatican intrigues which had any connection to the future of the Borgias”.\textsuperscript{39} On that occasion
Lucrezia stood above the crowd of cardinals who controlled the Vatican, a young woman
presiding over grown men.

On other occasions as well, Lucrezia showed her capability in public roles. Burckhardt
reports that Lucrezia was an active participant in the negotiations of her marriage with Ercole I,
Duke of Ferrara. Negotiations were occasionally addressed to Lucrezia herself. The following is

\textsuperscript{36} Recognition of Lucrezia as Duchess of Bisceglie because at that time Lucrezia was married to Alfonso (second marriage)
\textsuperscript{37} Bradford, 7
\textsuperscript{38} Gregorovius, 173- Cerimoniere translates into “chancellor”
\textsuperscript{39} Ibid 101
an example: “Lady Lucrezia…Because in the instrument drawn up concerning your dowry a certain article has been remitted to your decision and judgment …”. In the Renaissance dowries as well as other marriage negotiations were usually reserved for the father (and occasionally brothers) to deal with. By contrast, this letter shows that she was aware of political interests and that she knew and contributed to her cause.

Lucrezia had power of choice; she was able to express her ideas and in general she related to her father as an equal. An excellent example of this shared power comes from an incident that took place in the summer of 1494, when Pope Alexander sent a letter of reprimand to his daughter Lucrezia after she had moved to Pesaro upon her marriage with Giovanni Sforza. At issue was the departure of Giulia Farnese, the pope’s current mistress, and Adriana Orsini from Pesaro that had taken place before the set time and without the pope’s permission. The pope scolded Lucrezia and Giovanni for allowing the two women to leave. Lucrezia responds to the letter immediately. She addresses each point made by her father, first and foremost the departure of Giulia: “Concerning the departure of the aforementioned lady [Giulia] truly your holiness should not complain of either my lord or myself”. She is direct, yet respectfully goes on to explain the effort she made to prevent the ladies’ departure. She writes “I beseech you not to take from this a bad impression of my lord or myself, nor to condemn us for something which was not our fault”. Considering the nature of the society – with the required submissiveness of women- to have such a direct communication means that there must have been a well developed personal relationship between father and daughter.

3.3 DADDY’S LITTLE PRINCESS

---

40 Letter from Ercole I, duke of Ferrara (1431-1505)) in Bradford, 110
41 Bradford, 43
Lucrezia exercised a great amount of political power because she was Alexander’s favorite child, the one he always hesitated to let out of his sight. The first time she got married and moved to Pesaro, the pope was initially unwilling to let her go and kept her in Rome as long as possible. Lucrezia was allowed to move to Pesaro, only accompanied by her father’s mistress Giulia Farnese and the woman who had raised her, Adriana Mila Orsini.42 Once there, the pope required her to write frequently. On a particular occasion, when Lucrezia fell ill and was unable to write for a few days, the pope wrote a letter that shows the distress of a loving father. Bradford provides a translated version of the letter: “Donna Lucrezia, most beloved daughter, truly you have given us four or five days of grief and grave worry over bitter news that has spread throughout Rome that you were dead or truly fallen into such infirmity that there could be no hope for your life. You can imagine how such rumor affected my spirits for the warm and immense love that I have for you.”43

The same pattern repeated itself when Lucrezia left after her third betrothal in 1501. An envoy from Ferrara describes Lucrezia’s departure: “his holiness went from window to window of the palace to catch a last glimpse of his beloved daughter”44 A letter from Johannes Lucas and Girardus Saracenus further illustrates the pope’s close ties with his daughter: “his holiness, our lord is so concerned for her majesty that he demands daily and even hourly reports of her journey, and she is required to write him with her own hand from every city regarding her health. This confirms the statement made to your Excellency – that his holiness loves her more than any other person of his blood.”45 The letter once again states the emotional attachment present between father and daughter by showing the demands of a worried father. On this same

42 Maria Bellonci. Lucrezia Borgia. (Milano, 1989), 59
43 Bradford, 42
44 Description of Lucrezia ‘s departure by Beltrald Costabili – Ferrarese envoy January 6, 1502 In Gregorovius
45 Updates on Lucrezia’s trip to Ferrara (January 13 1502) Gregorovius, 231
occasion the pope asked Lucrezia’s new relatives to treat his daughter well. He made the request almost in the form of a threat. Gregorovius reports that the pope had asked Cardinal Ferrari many times to warn the duke to treat Lucrezia in a kind way, and to remind him that “he had done a great deal for her and would do still more”. All these documents explicate a deep affection of a father for his daughter, one who devoted herself to furthering her father’s plans. Lucrezia accepted the family’s wickedness as a consequence of her being part of the family itself; yet she stayed and lived within those parameters. She enjoyed the courtly life and, as she mentioned in correspondence, she was pleased with her lifestyle. As Bradford states in her introduction, “Lucrezia operated within the circumstances of her time to forge her own destiny”. She was indeed a powerful woman and it was her father who provided her with the means to exercise such power. As for the pope and his decisions, they were indeed influenced by his interest on behalf of his children. He worked hard to place them in positions of power, thereby expanding his area of control and power. Gregorovius’s final evaluation of the pope is somewhat unforgiving but nevertheless supports the view that: “neither ambition nor the desire for power which in the majority of rulers is the motive of their armies was [the] cause of his evil deeds...it was however his sensuality and his love for his children – one of the noblest human sentiments”.

---

46 Gregorovius 237
47 Bellonci, 101
48 Bradford, XXIII
49 Gregorovius 289
CHAPTER 4
Artemisia & Orazio Gentileschi

"Questa femmina come e piaciuto a dio, avendola drizzata nella professione della pittura in 3 anni si è talmente appraticata co posso ardir de dire che hoggi non ci sia pare a lei, avendo per sino adesso fatte opere che forse I principali maestri di questa professione non arrivano al suo sapere"

BREAKING BOUNDARIES

The relationship between Orazio and Artemisia Gentileschi involved much more than just father and daughter. Throughout their lives they were master and student and eventually they became coworkers, perhaps with the former student now the master. Throughout these metamorphoses, their relationship was characterized by mutual admiration and respect. Orazio Gentileschi was always recognized as a talented artist of the Renaissance, yet he is now less prominent than his daughter, Artemisia. Artemisia Gentileschi is one of the few female artists of the Renaissance, who dared to transcend the gender role expectations dictated by Renaissance society in order to follow her passion. Nonetheless, such great achievement would not have been possible had her father not supported her when she first learned the art.

1 Tiziana Agnati, Artemisia Gentileschi: la Pittura della Passione. (Milano, 1998), 8, citing a letter dated on July 3, 1612 from “Notizie di artisti tratte dai documenti Pisani” 221-223
2 Judith Mann, Artemisia and Orazio. Edited by Keith Christiansen and Judith W. Mann. (New Heaven, 2001). Both artists were forgotten for sometime but rekindled scholarly interest at the beginning of 20th century. Mann states that “[Orazio] has not garnered widespread public attention and unlike Artemisia, has not become a standard fixture in college art – history curriculum”. Such a judgment derived from the different styles of the two artists but also from the themes they worked on. Those of Artemisia were more tangible and possible to visualize in the 20th century than those on which Orazio worked. Also many modern scholars look at Artemisia as an example of a strong woman- an early example of feminist attitude. Mann, 250
Artemisia lived with her father for most of her childhood and left him only after the resolution of the trial following her rape by Agostino Tassi. After the trial, Orazio and Artemisia became estranged and stopped communicating with each other, only to be reunited many years later through an artistic commission. At that point Artemisia was a mature woman, with children, and a well known artist. The affection present between Orazio and Artemisia is much more subtle than in the preceding analyses of Galileo and Maria Celeste and of Rodrigo Borgia and Lucrezia. In this case, the analysis of personal documents is substituted by other means. Actions, along with civil documents, and paintings narrate the story of the loving but turbulent relationship between Artemisia and Orazio.

4.1 HEREDITARY PASSION FOR ART

Tiziana Agnati, an Italian contemporary historian and author of Artemisia Gentileschi, furnishes most of the background information needed to set the scene for the purposes of my analysis. Her work includes documents and letters that are fundamental for depicting the context in which this father and daughter lived.

Orazio Gentileschi, a Florentine by birth, lived most of his life in Rome. He was married to Prudentia Montoni³ and they had six children, four of whom survived. Most of the information from Orazio’s family is given by civil and religious certificates, such as the ones that document Artemisia’s birth on July 8th, 1593 and her baptism in the church of San Lorenzo in Lucina two days later. Artemisia was their only daughter. Thus, when Prudentia died in 1605, Artemisia was left in a household of men, destined to receive an

³ There is no information available on Prudentia Montoni except that she was Orazio’s wife and she died in 1605. Agnati (see pg. 41 notes)
education suitable to them.⁴ Orazio as an artist could not afford to educate his daughter by the standards of Renaissance court ladies. Therefore, as circumstances dictated, he decided to teach her the art of painting, as he was doing with his male children. Ironically, Artemisia was the only one among her siblings who decided to pursue an artistic career.⁵ To be a woman and an artist in the Renaissance was a contradiction because the realm of art was part of the sphere of interest reserved to men. Margaret King, a modern historian specialized in the Renaissance, emphasizes the gender norms dictated by the period when she says of women: “their role is to reproduce, their home is their fortress and their prison, their destiny is endless work with needle and spindle. If they step beyond these limits they have become what women must not be: they have become men and turn men into women”.⁶ Becoming a painter, Artemisia had crossed that line and entered a manly world. Whitney Chadwick, a modern art historian, expands on the case by explaining that even when involved in artistic production, women were given tasks that did not require in-depth skills, due to the widely held separation of public and private spheres. Art in those years was considered a public activity, and as such was limited to men.⁷ In her essay “Artemisia in Her Father’s House”, Patrizia Cavazzini addresses the difficulties that women artists, and more specifically Artemisia, encountered in the Renaissance. The education of women artists was limited by the gender ideology. Artists in the Renaissance studied anatomy as a way to understand the body and learn how to paint in a more realistic way. The study of body implied that

---

⁴ Biographical information is mostly taken from Keith Christiansen / Judith Mann “Orazio and Artemisia Gentileschi” xiii-xx Also see Agnati 16-17
Keith Christiansen, Orazio and Artemisia Gentileschi. (New Heaven, 2001)
⁵ Agnati, 17-18
⁶ Margaret King. Women in the Renaissance. (Chicago, 1991), 188
⁷ Whitney Chadwick, Women, Art and Society. (New York, 2007), 69-67 “ the division of public and private in Florence at the time reconstructed art as a public, primarily male activity”
women were to see nude male bodies, which given the gender ideology of the period, endangered their chastity and their reputation.\textsuperscript{8} The semi-fictional French movie \textit{Artemisia}, directed by Agnes Merlet, insightfully offers several reasons that limited women access to painting; nudity is among the most relevant. The implications of nudity and the idea of women depicting naked male bodies was looked upon unfavorably by the Church. The movie illustrates the existence of a preconception of impurity that people had about female painters; a woman who dealt with nude bodies and worked closely to men was thought not to be pure; the male body was a temptation to which women, who were known to have no control on their instincts, would have responded.\textsuperscript{9} Given his unstable financial situation, Orazio had no choice but to work in his house. His workshop was located next door to the room in which he ate with his children. There he frequently received many kinds of people, such as artists, patrons, models. Although Orazio kept Artemisia closed in the house where very few could see and talk to her, the constant coming and going of people in the house hurt Artemisia’s reputation.\textsuperscript{10} Artemisia’s interest in painting began at a very young age. Eva Menzio, a modern historian, elaborates on the life of Artemisia and her works. She poetically describes an imaginary scene of how Artemisia was possibly introduced to the art of painting, underlining the biographical fact that Artemisia was a model for her father as a child. Menzio illustrates, “la si può immaginare ancora bambina incuriosita dai drappi neri e grigi che dividevano lo studio creando particolari effetti di luce posare vestita da angioletto o ignuda da putto e

\textsuperscript{8} Patrizia Cavazzini, \textit{Artemisia in her Father’s House}. Edited by Keith Christiansen and Judith W. Mann, 283
\textsuperscript{9} In the rape scene, in the movie Tassi seems to be surprised to discover that Artemisia was a virgin, he assumed the lack of her chastity because she worked and lived closely to men only.
\textsuperscript{10} Christiansen (Cavazzi), 286
Home was the real of women, yet the moment in which this home was turned into a workshop, it automatically became a public space inap the presence of a woman.
Poi come per gioco presi a prestito gli strumenti che Orazio usava con tanta maestria, cominciare a disegnare”.\textsuperscript{11} Painting for Artemisia started out as a game, when as a young child she used to pose for her father.

Orazio recognized and proudly supported his daughter’s talent from the beginning. In a letter dated in 1612, he wrote to Cristina di Lorena,\textsuperscript{12} praising his daughter and her precious painting skills. From the letter, we learn that within only three years of training, she was able to attain such mastery that she produced works that even great masters would not be able to accomplish in the same manner.\textsuperscript{13} In praising his daughter and promoting her continuation as an artist, Orazio was rejecting the social norms of his time. This letter written by Orazio, exemplifies the firm support that he always guaranteed to his daughter. This quality of Orazio is evidence of paternal love and pride for his daughter’s achievements. Artemisia became a great painter and mastered different techniques in a very short period of time. Following in her father’s footsteps, she focused on the depiction of figures rather than landscapes. Her first painting is thought to be \textit{Susanna and the Elders} (1610), a painting once judged to have been done in collaboration with her father, which seems fairly possible since during her early years Artemisia worked for him,\textsuperscript{14} on the painting, in fact is inscribed “\textit{ARTE GENTILESCHI}

\textsuperscript{11} Eva Menzio, \textit{Artemisia Gentileschi: Lettere. Precedute da Atti di un Processo per Stupro.} (Milano, 2004), 137 She describes and image of Artemisia as a child posing as an angel or naked as a ‘putto’ playing with the instruments that her father used to paint. Cavazzini, in Christiansen also mentions that Artemisia was used as a model by her father. Christiansen 286
\textsuperscript{12} Wife of the Gran duke of Tuscany Ferdinando De Medici
\textsuperscript{13} Agnati, 8 “questa femmina come e piaciuto a dio, avendola drizzata nella professione della pittura in tre anni si e talmente appraticata che posso ardir de dire che hoggi non ci sia pare a lei, avendo per sino adesso fatte opera che forse i principali maestri di questa professione non arrivano al suo sapere”
\textsuperscript{14} Mann, Edited by Christiansen 256
the name of Orazio’s workshop. More recent analysis by numerous experts has led to the conclusion that Artemisia alone painted the work. Regardless of whether the painting was fully completed by Artemisia, the inscription that links the painting to his workshop signifies master Orazio’s acceptance of it as representative of the standards dictated by the workshop. Just a year after completion of Susanna and the Elders, an event took place that profoundly changed Artemisia and Orazio’s relationship. Artemisia was raped by Agostino Tassi, a friend of her father who at the time was collaborating with him on the decoration of the ‘Sala del Consistoro’ in the Quirinale. The episode and the trial that followed led to the separation of father and daughter, not to be reconciled until many years later.

4.2 FOR THE HONOR OF HIS DAUGHTER: THE RAPE TRIAL

On March 1612, a year after the crime took place, Orazio Gentileschi filed suit against Agostino Tassi, accusing him of the rape of his daughter. He wrote a letter to Pope Paul V, explaining to him the circumstances and happenings, asking for justice. The episode to Orazio did not mean only dishonor for his daughter, as Bissell notes “to the father’s perception within the context of the seventeenth century Rome, the physical violation per se of his daughter might not have been the gravest of the offenses”, the dishonor of a daughter reflected upon her family and in this particular case, Orazio needed to take care of his children and his career. The reason why he waited so long to file the case against Tassi is unknown. He might have waited for his work in finishing the

15 Chadwick, 108
16 Ibid, 69
17 The fact is mentioned in all the sources – more easily found in Christiansen, XV
18 Ward Bissell, *Artemisia Gentileschi and the Authority of Art.* (University Park, 1999), 16
Quirinale commission; he may have been angered by the theft of some paintings, or he may have realized that the marriage promise made by Tassi to Artemisia was not a secure one and left his daughter’s reputation at risk. Another reason could have been the spreading of rumors about Artemisia. In this same period, Giovanni Baglioni, Orazio’s rival painter, painted a readaptation of Cesare Ripa’s *La Pittura*, making reference to Gentileschi’s artistic style and more specifically to Artemisia, in an obscene joke. The work aimed to hurt Orazio’s reputation by making a joke about Artemisia’s chastity.

In her trial testimony Artemisa admitted to having waited some time before telling Orazio about the rape, a major weakness in the case against Tassi. She explained that her loving father suffered at seeing her in pain, not knowing what was wrong because she was unwilling to confess at first. The motivations behind Orazio’s delay cannot be known with certainty; nonetheless, looking at what he wrote in the letter to the pope, among his main objectives in going to trial was the preservation of his daughter’s honor and thereby the reputation of his whole family. He wrote: “I kneel at your holy feet and I beg you by the entrails of Christ to respond to such brutal outrage with the appropriate justice against he who deserves it”.

---

19 “Il medesimo Cosimo furiere con sua chimera habbia cavato dalle mane della medesima zittella alcuni quadri di pittura di suo padre et inspecie una Iuditta di capace grandezza” Menzio 11 – Orazio’s letter to the pope

20 During the rape trial Artemisia admitted to willingly have had sexual intercourses with Tassi after the rape. She said she only did it because he had promised to marry her. “E con questa buona promessa mi racquetai e con questa promessa mi ha indotto a consenter doppo amorevolmente alle sue voglie” Menzio, 49

21 Bissell, 17

22 “Mio padre se ne doleva non avendogli io voluto scoprir la causa perché io stessi disturbata” From the trial record. Menzio, 18

23 Menzio, 11. Orazio’s letter to Pope Paul V “Però genuflesso alli sua Santi piedi la suppliche in visceribus Christi a provedere a cosi brutto esseso con li debiti termini di giustizia contro a chi si spetta, perché oltre al farne gratia segnalatissima, ella sarà causa che il povero supplicante non metterà in rovina li altri suoi figliuoli et gliene pregherà sempre da Dio giustissima ricompensa.”
Rape in the Renaissance was more than just a horrifying crime. Trevor Dean in his book *Crime, Society and Law in the Renaissance*, provides an in depth explanation on various meanings of “rape” in the context of the Renaissance. Rape was defined as any sexual intercourse outside marriage, but it mostly referred to sexual intercourse with a virgin. He also illustrates that “rape represented an offense against the family of the violated virgin”. As previously discussed, a woman’s honor was intrinsically correlated to her family’s honor since men were responsible to guarantee its preservation. A woman’s honor depended on her chastity and being raped meant a violation of chastity; therefore, a rape inevitably endangered the honor of the entire family. The loss of virginity also decreased the chances of a woman to be married to a respectable man.

Artemisia’s situation was further complicated by the fact that she was a painter. A woman in a world of men was often the victim of gossip. The odds were not on her side, and Artemisia found herself facing the consequences of going against social norms. Her father had always been aware of the danger to which Artemisia was exposed. In her trial testimony Tutia, Artemisia’s servant, provides an example of Orazio’s efforts to maintain Artemisia’s reputation. She says “Il signor Horazio quando si partiva sempre mi raccomandava questa figliola ch’io gli havessi cura e che gli sapessi dire le genti che

---

24 Trevor Dean, *Crime, Gender and Sexuality in Criminal Prosecution*. (London, 2002), 152
He talks about the different types of rape and the social moral against rape during the Renaissance.
Different categories of rape are:
- violent rape
- rape by deceit (that could even be a promise of marriage- in that case the act was not punishable as rape as long as the couple got married.

25 Ibid, 154
26 Chapter 1, 1.1 and 1.2
27 Agnati, 140
capitavano in casa”.

He always wanted to be informed whenever he was not at home and someone visited the house. Also, Orazio expressed several times the desire he had for Artemisia to become a nun, because such status would have protected her reputation, yet she always refused.

The decision of the authorities, as quoted by Bissell, clarifies the culpability of Agostino: “[he] had not only had carnal relations with the said Artemisia more than once but also had raped her with violence”. He was sent into exile, yet no punishment could make up for what Artemisia had to suffer during these two years of trial: She had been tortured with a thumbscrew instrument, checked by elderly women to prove the validity of her story, questioned and made to remember the moment of violence. By the time the trial was over, Artemisia was nineteen years old. She had reached the peak of marriageable age and needed to find a solution to restore what was left of her honor. The trial automatically exposed Artemisia’s lost chastity; therefore, after the ordeal ended she chose to move away, even though resolution of the matter had resulted in Tassi’s banishment, a rather Pyrrhic victory for her and her father. On November 29, 1612 the Florentine Pietro Antonio di Vincenzo Siattesi married Artemisia. He had known the Gentileschi family through his brother Giovanni Battista Stiattesi and for some reason, decided to marry the girl and moved away from Rome, where everyone was aware of the happenings. The newlyweds moved to Florence, where Artemisia worked with her uncle Francesco Lomi. At that point, she began to dissociate herself from her biological family by taking her uncle’s last name rather than her maiden name. The change of name may reflect an attempt to dissociate from the shame of her family and build a new

28 Menzio, 27
29 Bissell, 15
30 Bissell, 18
identity but there is no other evidence about her intent. In a letter Artemisia wrote to Cosimo II in 1619 she signed herself as “Artemisia Lomi”\textsuperscript{31}. Her signature changed again back to her maiden name during the years in which she went back to Rome and reconciled with her father and in a letter to Andrea Cioli dated 1635 she signed herself as “Artemisia Gentileschi”\textsuperscript{32}. When she went back to Rome, sometime between 1620\textsuperscript{33} and 1626, Artemisia already was famous in her own right. She began once again to talk with her father and, as Tiziana Agnati describes, the two established a relationship based on equality, as coworkers: “father and daughter established a relationship of equals, in which they were no longer master and pupil but colleague in art”.\textsuperscript{34} Bissell reports that in 1633, Artemisia and Orazio possibly collaborated in a commission. The assumption is based on a bill of framing that had been found. The bill listed the request of framing for three paintings listed as Orazio’s works, yet one of them was definitely painted by Lucrezia.\textsuperscript{35}

After she moved to Florence, Artemisia in 1613 gave birth to a child, she named him after her husband’s brother Gian Battista, he was the first of her several children. In 1617 Palmira was born, Artemisia’s only daughter who would survive. Documents testify that Artemisia lived with her husband only until 1623, after which she was said to be

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{31} Menzio 115. The letter read: “\textit{Umilissima e Devotissima Artemisia Lomi}”
\item \textsuperscript{32} Ibid, 116
\item \textsuperscript{33} Bissell cites a letter dated on February 10, 1620 in which Artemisia writing to her patron Cosimo II says “I will spend a few months there with my people”. Bissell, 23. In those years, Artemisia was experiencing financial troubles. Her husband had spent all the dowry she had taken with her. To recover from her financial troubles she decided to go back to Rome. At this point Artemisia was still with her husband who accompanied in her trip.
\item \textsuperscript{34} Agnati, 30 “padre e figlia stabilirono un rapporto alla pari, dove non erano piu maestro e allieva, ma colleghi d’arte”
\item \textsuperscript{35} Bissell, 147
\end{itemize}
living only with her daughter Prudentia. In that year her husband departed and she lost track of him; the reason why the two separated is however not clear.  

4.3 ARTEMISIA : LIFE NARRATED IN PICTURES

Orazio deeply influenced Artemisia’s life and career. She respected and loved him very much. Orazio, for his part, thought very highly of her and viewed her not only as a daughter but also a colleague. The two developed a relationship based on reciprocal love and respect, yet after the trial they separated physically and emotionally.

After the trial, as Artemisia left the paternal home, she prepared herself for a world dominated by men. The strong personality she had developed under the supervision of her father, prepared her successfully. Artemisia never accepted the inferiority assigned to her sex by the male centered society in which she lived. She showed her defiant attitude in a letter written to Antonio Ruff[i]o in 1651 in which she accused him of having understated her abilities in painting due to her being a woman. She writes “il nome di donna far star in dubbio finche non si e vista l’opera”.  

Artemisia was definitively a great exemplar of woman's advancement. She broke social norms and the social conception of a father-daughter relationship by becoming a public success on her own. She, the daughter, became the dominant figure in the relationship with her father, in a society that fundamentally promoted male dominance over women.

The episode of the rape, as well as her rejection of the gender stereotype claimed by society, still survives in her paintings. Her paintings are a permanent reminder of that violent act and portray the rage that she carried within, as well as her refusal to be

36 Christiansen, XVII  
37 Menzio, 123. Don Antonio Ruffo of Sicily becomes Artemisia’s mentor in her later years. The letter mentioned in part of a collection of 13 written c.1650s
thought of as less because of her gender. Artemisia’s life is characterized by a constant struggle between her identity as an artist and her role as a daughter, wife and mother.

At the age of seventeen, Artemisia had lived a life of seclusion. Few had seen her in person and no one knew her personally. Her father had tried many times to convince her to become a nun, so that she might keep her reputation intact, yet she always refused. She insisted living her life, as she wished, fully aware of her dangerous situation. The painting *Susanna and the Elders* (1610) depicts Artemisia’s social stand as a woman in a world of men. The scene narrated in the apocryphal Book of Daniel is interpreted from the point of view of Susanna. In the scene, the young woman turns surprised, with a fearing look, for she is being harassed by elders while bathing in a garden. The biblical episode narrates that the elders demanded sexual favors from Susanna, threatening to denounce her as impure to the rest of the community if she refused. Susanna refuses and her reputation is ruined until a young man finds out the truth by cross examining the two elders who got her in trouble. In the picture the two elders lean toward Susanna who crunches back in a contorted pose to get away from them. The scene takes place in the imaginary setting that although, an outside garden, is depicted as an enclosed space. The Italian art historian Ward Bissell, interprets the painting as Artemisa’s reaction as a woman painter, with men such as Agostino Tassi who made Artemisia’s acquaintance around the time of the painting. The painting reflects what Artemisia’s life in the painting
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38 Menzio, 59 “Tutia disse a mio padre che mi doveva mandare un poco a camminare e che mi noceva il stare sempre in casa”
“mi disse anco quando ci andai a stare che stessi avvertita e non di alla sua figliola ne parlavali di mariti ma che li persuadessi a farli monaca et io l’ho fatto piu volte , ma lei sempre mi diceva che non occorreva che suo padre perdesse tempo perché ogni volt ache li parlava di fari monaca li divento piu inimico” 61
39 Bissell, 2
40 Ibid, 3
business must have been like; constant verbal abuse by the men she worked with because she was a woman. In her analysis of Artemisia’s work and life, Garrard takes a rather feminist stands and claims that what the subjects of her paintings were “drawn subconsciously from the well spring of her female experience”41. As Bissell states “Artemisia was well aware of what men expected and did not expect of women and of women artists”. In her paintings Artemisia attempted to take a stand against such beliefs. 42 She was surrounded by men who took for granted her lack of chastity. Artemisia, like Susanna, did not give in. 43 The attribution by modern experts of such emotional charge to the painting, confirms the fact that this was primarily Artemisia’s work. Although Bissell’s analysis reveals parallels to Orazio’s, the compositions much as the presence of such similarities indicate a strong influence by the father on his daughter’s work. The same composition and style traits are presented in later paintings such Judith decapitating Holofernes, but in those cases the emotive power is hers alone. 44

Throughout her life Artemisia produced many works in which women are empowered. 45 Among the most famous of this type is Judith Decapitating Holofernes (1612). Artemisia produced the first version of this subject during the rape trial. Judith, given the centrality that sensuality and violence play in this depiction, is the character

42 Bissell, 113
43 Christiansen, 296
44 The same composition and stylistic similarities are present in Artemisia representation of Judith and Holofernes, unlike Susanna and the elders, this is known to have been made by Artemisia alone – Bissell, 4
45 In the catalogue Artemisia Gentileschi and the Authority of Art, Bissell presents a collection of fifty-seven works, forty-nine of which (ninety percent of the collection) portray women as the protagonist or place women at the same level as men. Bissell, 112
who most reflects Artemisia’s feelings of revenge that resulted from her experience.\textsuperscript{46} The subject is a biblical narration from the Old Testament. The painting depicts the story of Judith and her plot to kill of Holofernes, the Assyrian commander who had laid siege to her village. After dressing in her best clothes and seducing the inebriated commander, Judith proceeds to slash his throat and finally liberates her village. The scene depicted by Artemisia is the turning point of the story. Judith leans to the right, with her arms stretched out parallel to each other: one holding down Holofernes, one pushing the blade across his neck. Abra, a servant, is standing next her, holding down the agonizing Holofernes. In this context, Judith is the personification of courage and righteousness. Holofernes is symbol of lust and sin. Given the nature of the artistic market of the period, the subject might have been commissioned, nonetheless Artemisia’s interpretation and emphasis on the violence is arguably a result of her memory of the rape. \textsuperscript{47} Many have attempted to interpret this picture. A literal interpretation would respectively connect Artemisia to Judith and Tassi to Holofernes, almost as if Artemisia was taking revenge for what had been done to her. Some support the hypothesis that the picture reflects the emotional reaction of Artemisia to the trauma; others interpret that her work is an explication of the personal struggle within Artemisia between her persona and the damage that the act caused to her family’s reputation.\textsuperscript{48} Within any plausible meaning of this painting, it is indeed an example of Artemisia’s portrayal women as strong and highly erotic, just the opposite of what society imposed.

Another set of controversial works by Artemisia is that of her self portraits: many of Artemisia’s depictions of female characters resemble herself, either because she

\textsuperscript{46} Cavazzi, edited by Christiansen, 290
\textsuperscript{47} See other versions of the painting for instance the one by Caravaggio. Christiansen, 308-310
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid, 310
studied her own body or because she meant to make a statement about herself with her works.

In the *Self Portrait as a Female Martyr* completed in 1615, Artemisia depicts a woman who many believe represents herself, wearing a turban and holding a palm branch, which was usually utilized to identify martyrs. The depiction does not have any identifying attributes. The work inspired intensive debate on its nature, on whether this is a self portrait, a depiction of a martyr or even a depiction of Artemisia as a martyr. Another controversial portrait is the *Self Portrait as Allegory of Painting* (c.1630). On this occasion she depicts herself as “Pittura”, who as it was custom in the period was represented by a woman. She modified the composition and revolutionized the meaning of this standard depiction by making it a self portrait. Artemisia is depicted painting intently on a monochrome background which brings the focus of attention to her. Many have speculated on the significance of this innovative representation, nonetheless the importance of it is rather clear: the identification and social establishment of Artemisia as a painter. Garrard interprets this particular painting as an affirmation of women’s capability. Artemisia portrayed herself with unruly hair, which was not only a personal characteristic but also symbolized her independence and artistic temperament.

Artemisia went on to live the life of an artist. She fought her whole life against social impositions and her efforts were eventually recognized. The years after she left her
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49 Christiansen, 320
50 Yet the depiction didn’t follow the standards used in self portraits either. Usually addressing the viewer, holding a palette. Christiansen, 418
51 Garrard, 175
52 Ibid, 57 Garrard is a modern scholar interested in Artemisia in her artistic but also her social role.
father’s household are relevant to her artistic development and confirm the major hypothesis of this analysis. She was confident in her abilities and such confidence had been gained through the support of her loving father. Orazio and Artemisia never came back to the early relationship they had, but they reconciled on more egalitarian grounds. Eventually he worked under her command, a fitting way for a loving father whose misguided attempt to save her honor and his own had backfired badly to end his career.
ILLUSTRATIONS CHAPTER 4 – ARTEMISIA AND ORAZIO GENTILESCHI
SUSANNA AND THE ELDERS, ARTEMISIA GENTILESCHI (c.1610)
SELF PORTRAIT AS A FEMALE MARTYR (c.1615)
JUDITH AND HOLOFERNES (c.1612)
SELF PORTRAIT AS ALLEGORY OF PAINTING (c.1638-9)
CHAPTER 5

Conclusion

EXCEPTIONAL CASES: THE INVISIBLE FACTORS THAT CHALLENGE THE NORM

The fundamental lesson that should be taken away from the analysis provided in this thesis is an old and wise one. It is very much explicated by the old Italian saying “L'abito non fa il monaco” (fundamentally the same as the American “can't judge a book by its cover”). It is indeed a judgment based on appearance that ultimately led to the generalization of the same theoretical analysis to all instances, and to overlooking exceptional cases that challenge what came to be portrayed as the real state of things in the Renaissance. The father/daughter relationship as depicted by modern scholars of the Renaissance cannot be utilized to interpret all cases. Based on the two fundamental factors of power of agency and emotions, I attempted to show that the current state of knowledge overlooks exceptional cases that fall out of the 'norm'.

In theory, in all three cases taken in consideration in this study, the father fulfills the role of authoritarian master committed to fulfilling the social norm. For instance, we could say that Galileo secludes his daughters into a convent because they could not get married. Convent was the only socially acceptable alternative to marriage, hence the easiest solution to get rid of them. In the case of Rodrigo Borgia with his never ending wedding plans it seems as if he just used his daughter for political purposes. In these examples the modern scholarly theories seem to apply, but looking closely, through a more personal frame they do not fully explain the reality of circumstances. First and foremost, the assumption that daughters had no power of decision has to be taken in
consideration and challenged. In chapters two and three both Maria and Lucrezia seem to be subjugated to the authority of the father because they follow along the line of his plan. Yet is that really an unevenly shaped power relationship or just an agreement between the two parts? We must take in consideration the possibility that the decisions taken by the fathers corresponded to the will of their daughters. In the case of Maria Celeste, her deep devotion that her father so dearly admired, might have led to her being happy to embrace the monastic life, rather than her being forced to ultimately accept the decision of Galileo. In Lucrezia's situation, she was not forced all along to partake in her father's plan, she actually collaborated. Artemisia's power of agency is more evident due to her status as a painter and free spirit in some ways; her father supported her talent all along.

Artemisia with her situation most explicitly shows that women in some exceptional cases were able to exercise power within the context in which they lived and to take upon roles that were limited to men. An authoritarian woman disrupted the norm. Women like our daughters were able to take upon roles and were not open to others of their sex, because their fathers believed they were worthy of it, and were willing to challenge the social norms for them. Artemisia is the perfect example: Orazio's support and training allowed her to become a painter. This should not be seen as a form of authority that the father exerted upon their daughter, but rather as a form of protection, in order to shield the effects of social norms’ violations.

In all the exceptional cases taken in consideration in this thesis, fathers are the central figures to their daughters. The lives of these three daughters are marked by the absence of a maternal figure: Maria Celeste was taken away from her mother at a very young age, Lucrezia was not very much in contact with her mother after the age of three
and Artemisia lost her mother when very young. The absence of a maternal figure consequently resulted in the absence of a wife for their fathers. This particular condition characterized by the lack of an important figure on the part of the father and the daughter might have been influential to the creation of a special bond. A woman as a mother and a wife is a fundamental figure; when missing, the entire order of the family is disrupted and a new balance is found only when the void created by her absence is filled in somehow.

In these particular circumstances fathers and daughters seem to have found comfort in each other: daughter by taking up the partial role of wives and fathers by becoming a central figure to their daughters’ lives. A wife was to respect, support and take care of her husband. In the case of Galileo, Maria clearly takes up the role of wife in regards of her father. When Galileo finalized his marriage contract Marina Gamba, he required as one of the clause, the unconditioned support of his wife in regards of his theories and works. Once Galileo did not have Marina any longer, he found the support he needed in his daughter. Maria Celeste asked to read his manuscripts (an action which was controversial considering that she lived in a convent), she always believed in father, regardless of the accusations made by the church. A wife’s social position relative to her husband is more egalitarian than that of a daughter. The fact that these daughter had took up the role of wives might have justified the more egalitarian relationship they had with their father. For instance, Lucrezia supported her father’s plans and shared with him ideas as an active participant to his plan rather then just being subjugated to his authority. The necessity these fathers had for a supporting figure derived from their social vulnerability. Orazio, Galileo and Rodrigo occupied precarious positions in society. Galileo with his theories caused the rise of a church debate and was constantly questioned by the
authority. Rodrigo, as a Spaniard, was always considered an outsider by the Italian nobility, and given his illicit actions he came to surround himself with enemies. Orazio was also in a controversial position because he was a poor artist in the 17th century roman scene. His reputation, and the reputation of his family, suffered from the conditions in which he was forced to work given the lack of financial means.

As their fathers, daughters too felt the absence of a leading female figure in the household. The nurturing and emotional bond that one usually associates with mothers was in this case adopted by the father, who was otherwise seen as a strong, harsh figure in charged of children’s education. In the absence of maternal figure, the father assumed role of a mother as well, allowing the development of a much more emotional and close bond with his daughter.

The importance of the context that Maria, Lucrezia and Artemisia influenced is relative to their status and social position. Maria Celeste was very influential in her father's life. She took care of his house and economic transactions, she advised him on everyday issues and she was always a good listener, or so appears to be from the letters. Maria Celeste touched the lives of many around her, as was shown by the crowd that mourned her death. She was never a queen, yet she had much more power than an average nun of the period. Lucrezia, as a courtly lady and as daughter of the pope she was able to influence the political scene in which she was involved; she entered marriage negotiations and was also allowed to take on roles that were usually reserved to men, such as that of ruler of Spoleto and Foligno. Artemisia's place in society was as public as that of Lucrezia, yet she suffered the consequences of it because of her lower status. Status was a defining factor in defining one's social role and possibilities.
When social norms were not respected, daughters were not the only ones to suffer the consequence of such actions, their fathers as direct responsible, were also involved. A responsible paterfamilias would not endanger his reputation or the reputation of his offspring, to protect his daughter's interests if his daughter was to him only a way for him to reach political and economic power. A father would not trust any power of decision on his daughter, if he deemed her to be intellectually inferior or incapable, as Renaissance theories stated women were. Consequently, at least in the cases that have been taken in consideration, it must be assumed that these fathers believed in the personal and intellectual qualities of their daughters. A father's admiration of his daughter, along with his treating her in an egalitarian manner, shows a deep emotional affection on his part. Along the same lines, a daughter's apparent submission to the paternal figure was a demonstration of devotion rather then an acknowledgment of their inferiority. Ultimately the relationship between father and daughter seems to have been centered upon the emotional bond existent between the two parts. From this emotional attachment depended the development of a hierarchy of power that differentiated from the one dictated by society, and instead favored a more informal relationship, that theoretically was much more similar to the modern days idea of father and daughter. This fundamental aspect of the father/daughter bond is only visible in the personal most intimate realm of the relationship, as it has been shown; therefore a more general analysis based on the public aspect of the relationship would have overlooked the aspects that truly define each case previously described. Each case study described in this thesis revealed itself to be highly unique. Each pair (father/daughter) is taken from a slightly different time frame and socio-political status, hence the nature of such bonds cannot be justified by common
circumstances, they are truly exceptions; yet the randomness of such cases leads to questioning how frequent they might be, and ultimately calls for closer analysis of each case.
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