CHAPTER I

Brunelleschi

When the dome of Florence Cathedral was completed in 1436, Alberti praised it as the first great achievement of the new art, equaling or even surpassing antiquity. With that, he spoke for the whole of his generation, and it is important in this connection to remember that the admiration Brunelleschi received even in his lifetime was paid to the artist no less than to his engineer. Indeed, the unique importance of Brunelleschi can only be fully appreciated if the creative power of his design is seen as the product of a ceaseless interaction between aesthetic and technical considerations. The dome of the cathedral bears most eloquent witness to it.

As far back as 1357, the Opera of the Duomo had approved a model designed by a commission of eight artists, and declared it binding on all future work. From that time on, every master mason of the Duomo was sworn to respect this model, including Brunelleschi himself when he appeared on the scene half a century later. The model for the dome of 1357, which still adhered to Arnolfo di Cambio's design, can be visualized, within limits, from the dome of Orvieto's tabernacle in Or San Michele. The grandiloquent project was conceived in the spirit of classic Gothic; to give it visible shape involved the devising of technical means for the construction of the dome. Thus for fifty years there was here a practical problem which was almost a spiritual challenge. By 1410 the choir had risen so far that the great apses were roofed in and the drum of the dome raised to the springing level. The programme of the competition announced in 1418 was therefore the constructional technique of the dome. It dragged on for two years, the final winners being Filippo Brunelleschi and Lorenzo Ghiberti with a model worked out in collaboration.

Building began in 1420. The superintendence soon passed into Brunelleschi's hands. In 1436, after sixteen years of uninteruppted labour, the dome was finished. Then came the lantern, built after Brunelleschi's model of 1436. The foundation stone was laid just before his death in 1444, and building was continued and completed by Michelozzo, Manetti, and Bernardo Rossellino. While the original model of 1418, and the working details -- especially the use of suspended scaffolding -- were first prepared by Brunelleschi and Ghiberti in collaboration, the actual superintendence of the building was in Brunelleschi's hands in 1426. In 1433, Ghiberti retired. The dispute between the two for the superintendence described in later sources has proved to be a legend, but there is sober and unambiguous documentary evidence that the huge responsibility of the enterprise fell to Brunelleschi as the more experienced and more gifted architect, and that he, and he alone, must be given the credit of having mastered the gigantic task. Scholarly studies of every phase of the building and of every detail of its construction are available. What follows here is a mere summary of Brunelleschi's main achievements. He solved the chief problem by applying the system of the double shell with all the details it involved (simplification of the overdone means of support by reducing the weight of the masonry, ingenious brickwork in herringbone technique borrowed from antique buildings; substitution of the inadequate horizontal cable-chains by carefully calculated stone ribs connecting and strengthening the shell) and he supervised building operations down to the smallest detail, and supplied exact models for every shape of brick. The vast size of the dome -- 45 m. (148 ft.) in diameter and 87 m. (286 ft.) in height to the foot of the lantern -- involved countless practical problems. Brunelleschi designed all the scaffolding, invented a special hoisting apparatus for the transport of building materials into the area of the dome, and obtained a special licence for it.

In this field of practical building superintendence, Brunelleschi turned to account a knowledge of mechanics based on studies which seem uncommonly profound for the time (endless screw, pulley with multiple transmissions, etc. of dome construction). Yet whatever was devised and achieved on the technical side was no more than a means to the aesthetic end. Even in the last stage of building, Brunelleschi seems to have slightly expanded the outer contour of the dome, and thus to have given it its final form. The wonderfully vital tension of the curve, the emphasis on the forces pulling in it given by the ribs and the lantern, have brought its creator imperishable glory.

5. Filippo Brunelleschi: Florence Cathedral, dome 1420–36, construction
The dome of the cathedral of Florence was the perfect realization of a conception which was thoroughly medieval, though already inspired by the spirit of antiquity. The generation which planned it, however, lacked any means of giving its conception visible shape, and thus the dome of Florence Cathedral remains, actually and symbolically, what Alberti called it — the first work of the new style. The manner of building proves that the traditional knowledge of a medieval masons’ lodge had been enriched by the insights gained by one man in his study of theory and practice. By applying the rules for the classical order, he personally conceived the design of the Duomo building commission, he was also defending, perhaps for the first time in history, the standpoint of the sole responsible architect against the anonymous authority represented by the Opera. Looked at from this point of view, it becomes historically interesting that certain rights in the use of his own inventions conceded by the Duomo to Brunelleschi were taken away from his personal conception of the church.”

In this recognition of ‘intellectual property’, we see the change in the relations between the architect and his patron.

How could so strong a personality be formed and develop precisely at that time? If we consider the course of Brunelleschi’s career with this question in mind, one fact will stand out which, to my knowledge, has not received sufficient attention, namely the many years of humanistic schooling which preceded his artistic training. He was born in 1377, the son of a wealthy and respected notary of Florence, who held high offices and was entrusted with diplomatic missions. We know from the sources that Brunelleschi’s father, with a view to a professional career for his son, gave him the higher education of his class, which included the liberal arts. There is documentary evidence of young Filippo’s extraordinary brilliance. It was only when he began to feel drawn to the visual arts that his father placed him with a well-known goldsmith. Bearing in mind that Brunelleschi was enrolled in the goldsmith’s guild in 1398, when he was twenty-one, and accepting the usual apprenticeship of six years before passing master, he must have begun his artistic training about 1403, that is, when he was sixteen. That age would leave time enough for a thorough liberal education beforehand. Since we also know that Brunelleschi continued his comprehensive technical studies — especially in mathematics and mechanics — in later years, we may conclude that, thanks to his special gifts, he developed his own way of combining theoretical and scientific knowledge with practical studies, and thus developed, autodidactically, the intellectual faculties which are so peculiar to his creative work as an architect. By deepening his knowledge in the disciplines of the quadrivium and systematically turning it to account in his professional work, he fulfilled in himself that new blend of the liberal and mechanical arts which pointed the way to the ‘applied sciences’ of our own day. To my mind, it was this synthesis which was a determining factor in Brunelleschi’s genius. It enabled him to invent the science of perspective construction, to which he owes the whole science of perspective construction, to which he owes the whole.

Brunelleschi’s first public building, the Foundling Hospital in Florence, begun in 1419, was already fully representative of his personal style. Recent research on the building has led to the surprising realization that the simple aisles of the hospital was carried out entirely in the current idiom of the transitional style (orobs of the open timber roof). It is only in the outer parts of the building that the new apparatus of form makes its appearance, so that the date of the turning-point in Brunelleschi’s style may be fixed between 1419 and 1420. The new elements of form to which he rigidly adhered all his life, and which he only varied in proportion and degree of sculptural volume, are: unfitted column shafts, eight-volute Corinthian capitals, restrained, but clearly moulded profiles of architraves, friezes, and door- and window-frames, fluted pilasters framing corners, roundels in the spandrels, shallow domes in the bays of the loggias, groin-vaulting in those of cloister walks, and coves or flat ceilings in the interiors. All these formal elements reveal the desire to achieve a kind of classical order offering a sharp contrast to the Late Gothic syntax current at the time which can be seen in the hospital loggias of S. Matteo in Florence and S. Antonio at Lastra a Signa; built not long before (c. 1410). To a type of building which was very much a type belonging to these years (the highly interesting history of the rise of modern hospital building in the fifteenth century will remain to be written), Brunelleschi gave a new form in two respects: firstly in the regularity of the plan [3] and the architectural elements and motifs, and secondly in its artistic structure. The decorative features employed by him were derived almost exclusively from the formal repertory of pre-Romanesque and Early Romanesque architecture in Tuscany, especially in Florence itself. The Romanesque architecture lay in the precise, almost austere purification of these medieval forms, which was immediately felt by contemporaries. Further, it was characterized by a practical mathematical ratio in the proportions. The disposition of the whole organism is governed by proportion throughout; its elements are the square and the circle, and its composition is determined by a centralizing arrangement. This only, by means of which a multiplicity of spatial units is mathematically evolved from a module and respects its a priori symmetry, determines the absolute harmony which was the culmination of the new concept of beauty. The spreading vista of the building, the first to be built in Florence, is more than a mere continuation of the facade, it is a true and cohesive organism that continues in the interior; we feel it on entering the courtyard or any single room. A comparison with so intricate a spatial
organization as the hospital of S. Maria Nuova [5] shows how clear and immediately intelligible the layout of the Innocenti is, and that was all to the good for the utilitarian purpose of the building. Finally, by his placing of the building Brunelleschi set a standard which was to determine the whole future layout of the piazzas. Brunelleschi's Innocenti inspired the portico of the Servites, which dates from about 1518 and is by Antonio da Sangallo the Elder, and the loggia of the Annunziata, which followed in 1500 and is by Caccini. 

Brunelleschi received the commission for S. Lorenzo almost at the same time as that for the Innocenti.\textsuperscript{35} The Prior of the foundation, Padre Dolfini, had planned an enlargement of the old foundation on the model of the great monastic churches, and had begun the building of a new choir on those lines. In 1421 Brunelleschi was called in as adviser on the suggestion of Giovanni di Bicci de' Medici, the patron of the church, and at once made his authority felt in the planning.\textsuperscript{4} True, he had to allow for the parts of the building already begun, but his genius in exploiting the exigencies of the site is all the more admirable. His plan evolves from the square of the crossing, and all the other elements are derived from it in clear order and proportion [6, 74]. With the approval of the Sagrestia Vecchia and its counterpart – later the Sagrestia Nuova – to the apse, with the side chapels carried round the transepts, a centralizing note is given to the basilican plan. Thus the traditional and schematic design of Padre Dolfini was transformed into a new, unexpectedly rich and delightful composition. The scenographic widening of the spatial picture, which can be felt even in the ornamental pattern of the ground-plan, comes to full expression in the elevation; the structure of the interior can, so it were, be read off from the decorative articulation; every detail has its clearly appointed function. 

The Sagrestia Vecchia has always served as an exemplary demonstration of the logical evolution of a Brunelleschian single scale of proportions. In the novelty of its structural members, just described, in the austere purity of its forms, and in the simple harmony of its proportions, S. Lorenzo corresponds exactly to the contemporary idea of a work which could hold its own beside antiquity.\textsuperscript{37}

In S. Spirito [10, 76], begun in 1436, Brunelleschi developed further the type of the centralizing basilica, particularly as he was not, as in S. Lorenzo, hampered by existing parts of the building.\textsuperscript{38} His original project envisaged a most splendid complex; the façade was to look out on to the Arno, with a monumental piazza in front of it stretching down to the river bank, so that fishermen, looking up from their boats, would have the church before them. This superb plan was rejected, to the latter regret of the clients, it is said.\textsuperscript{39} All the same, Brunelleschi's proposal to erect the new church on the site of the old one was accepted, so that the church and the monastery remained untouched for the time being.\textsuperscript{40} The old church was demolished till 1481. The new building was turned round by 180 degrees, so that its entrance front faces the present Piazza S. Spirito.

Only parts of the external walls were erected in Brunelleschi's lifetime, the first column-shaft being delivered the year he died. Yet those parts of the building were finished which were of essential importance for the plan of the whole, a building which Brunelleschi himself called 'a church fulfilling his intention concerning the composition of the edifice'.\textsuperscript{41} With this type of basilica with centralizing space [5, 9]. It is a plain cube, with the 'zone of change' of the pendentives forming the transition into the inscribed circle of the dome.\textsuperscript{42} The pendentive is a characteristic invention – or more precisely a rediscovey – of Brunelleschi's and is of the greatest importance for the whole development of modern architecture. The form evolved as it were by necessity from the configuration of Brunelleschi's design. Wherever he may have found his model,\textsuperscript{43} the decisive point is that he reintroduced the pendentive in this new aspect of an abstract mathematical concept of space. And from it Brunelleschi derived the structure of his domes, the so-called \emph{voluta a vola} (the 'umbrella dome') over the cube of the sactyry, the small one over the little choir of the sactyry, and the dome over the crossing.\textsuperscript{44} The strictness of this structure is made visible in the articulating members, the motifs of which – the concentric double arcades, the order of pilasters, the entablature and the sprigging of the dome – arise of themselves quite logically from the composition. This inherent logic of Brunelleschi's structural members also explains the introduction of the famous impost between the capitals and arches of S. Lorenzo's nave, which, in the strict sequence of the elevation, correspond to the entablature of the walls.\textsuperscript{45}

As a whole, S. Lorenzo is a happy blend of the formal austerity of Romanesque architecture with Gothic spaciousness. With the means of a new and rational handling of form, a spatial composition has been created which has been studied down to the smallest detail and is governed by a

5. Florence, Hospital of S. Maria Nuova, fourteenth century and later (after a plan of the eighteenth century).


7. Filippo Brunelleschi: Plans of Florentine churches: (a) S. Lorenzo, begun 1421 (b) S. Spirito, begun 1436; (c) Pert Chapel, commissioned 1430; (d) S. Maria degli Angeli, 1424–30; (e) Cathedral, lantern, model 1436, executed 1445–57; (f) Cathedral, ciborium, 1458 ff.

features, a type of church was created which expressed the ideal of its epoch. Once more the square of the crossing is the module for the whole composition. Of a form which more exact in their proportional integration than those of S. Lorenzo. The way he continues the aisle round the transept and the west front, and the width of semicircular chapel niches, which were originally visible from the outside, is of the greatest boldness. The building, perfectly symmetrical even in plan, thus evokes its strictly observed proportions: while in S. Lorenzo arcade and clerestory are in the ratio of 3:5, in S. Spirito the ratio is 1:1. The closer setting of the columns caused by this considerably enhances the impression of sculptural massiveness, which is still further heightened by the sturdy columns and by the deep mouldings of the arches and cornices. In the exterior, the homogenous external shell of S. Lorenzo is replaced by powerful piers framing the niches. In a general way, as compared with S. Lorenzo, S. Spirito is a far more massive structure, the spatial effect of which mainly arises from the powerfully sculptural quality of its individual members.

In S. Spirito too, the architect has obviously aimed consciously at the effect of a saccheggiatic vista. Yet its effect is not exhausted in one single 'perspective', with the observer standing perhaps at the entrance to the church; it is just as true and effective from several points in the building. From the entrance, the 'vista' of the nave stretches beyond the crossing to the chancel, but on the other hand the observer standing in the crossing can see the four arms of the cross in one coherent picture, and the 'corridors' of the aisles contribute their own scenic effects. Thus what we have is a specifically architectural perspective which arises from an interplay of geometrically abstract and solidly concrete perceptions. The space is comprehended through the functions of its component members, as 'picture' and as 'mass'. That is how Brunelleschi's concept of the composto dell'edificio should be understood.

At the same time principles of design appear in S. Spirito, far more than in S. Lorenzo, which point the way to the whole of modern architecture; the functional forces at work in the members of the organism, which determine its character as volume and as space, are clearly revealed.

The Pazzi Chapel in S. Croce has at all times been regarded as the supreme example of Brunelleschi's art and therefore of the new style [11, 12]. The most recent research has gone far to destroy this ideal picture. The building dates are scanty. The commission was given in 1430. In 1433 part of the arcade of a cloister was demolished to make room for the new building. In 1442 Pope Eugenius IV lodged in a room above 'the chapel of the Pazzi'. There is no evidence of any energetic building activity before the forties; when Brunelleschi died, the building was only standing in the rough but it is uncertain how much of it. The domes of the chapel and the porch bear the dates 1449 and 1451. Traces on the entrance wall show that the first plan provided for a façade without a porch. Thus the whole porch may have been added by Brunelleschi's successors; in that case the chapel, which had always been regarded as the time flower of the master's art, would have to be relegated to his anonymous successors. On the other hand, the porch may be explained as Brunelleschi's own alteration of his plan, and so 'rescued' as his invention.

Let us first look at the general layout [7, 13]. The chapel was commissioned by Andrea Pazzi to serve both as the chapter house of the monastery and as the assembly room of the family. Brunelleschi erected the building on a site whose shape was largely determined by the existing parts of the monastery. It is precisely in the exploitation of the given situation that the inspired quality of Brunelleschi's composition makes itself felt: a rectangular hall is subdivided into three parts; over the central square a dome rises, the side bays are tunnel-vaulted. Thus the cubic 'cell' of the Sacrestia Vecchia has been developed into an oblong hall. The modelling of the walls, and even the pattern of the pavement, strict the strict logic which governed the evolution of the spatial organism, and it has remained a model of perfection down to our own day. The Pazzi Chapel ranks with the most famous buildings in the world. The logic of the structural elements permeates even the details; the pilasters on the façade wall are a little more slender than those on its inner side, in order to adjust their diameter exactly to the columns of the portico. With this subtle gradation of forms, based on the view of the façade from the entrance to the cloister, one is loath to detach the porch from Brunelleschi's total conception and consider it a later addition. That is why I regard a change of plan by Brunelleschi himself as being more likely. The porch, in form a continuation of the Gothic cloister arcades, seems to offer another example of the fertility of Brunelleschi's imagination: six columns support a tunnel-vault which is interrupted in the middle by a shallow dome, a motif which, as it were, sets the key for the chapter house. The construction required a horizontal architrave here, which is broken by the great central arch leading into the domed bay. The cornice and the arch are articulated with classicizing motifs - a fluted frieze and panels; the whole may have been crowned by a flat pediment. In this architectural conception, where perfection is born of simplicity, the aim at a scenographic effect from the entrance to the cloister is unmistakable. A very remarkable feature is the heightening of the outer shell of the dome, so that the drum and helmet rise freely above the façade and reach their full effect.

The decoration of the Pazzi Chapel [11, 14] is the most ornate ever employed by Brunelleschi; its beautifully proportioned structure is unquestionably based on his design, though it was executed for the most part long after his death. The relief of the articulating mouldings is far deeper than that in S. Lorenzo. The play of colour harmonies in the majolica roundels on the walls and in the spandrels against the austere grey-white of the background is very subtly graded and is a delight to the eye. The pendentives, handsome cornices calculated with an eye to a sotto in su effect, may have been designed by Brunelleschi himself. There are no precursors in the whole of the Romanesque and Gothic traditions for this combination of an architectural structural system with decoration in coloured majolica relief; it is an innovation of the epoch, and it was partly through its influence that the Pazzi Chapel became the prototype of a type of church which developed with the greatest freedom and grace in the following generations and became a characteristic feature of the architectural style of the Renaissance. In the Pazzi Chapel, the portico, with its beautiful contrast between the heavy covered vaulting and the majolica dome; for that reason I continue to regard it as Brunelleschi's own design, executed by a later generation.

Brunelleschi's oratory of S. Maria degli Angeli (1453-7) is a completely centralized church [15, 16]. The example in the monograph is in the main for the development of this type of building in the succeeding epochs. It was here that Brunelleschi first employed the pure type of construction on piers. The central space and radiating chapels are formed by a simple ring of eight fully developed piers. They support the drum and dome of the octagon and form the side walls of the eight chapels. On the outside they are connected by walls, so that a figure of sixteen sides is created with flat surfaces alternating with recessed niches.

In the Sacrestia Vecchia and the Pazzi Chapel the walls merely enclose the space like a shell, S. Maria degli Angeli [15] is entirely conceived in terms of mass; it is the three-dimensional substitute of the piers which shapes all Brunelleschi could only have learned this kind of composition from the monuments of ancient
Rome, and it may not be wise of the mark to suggest that this is a new kind of approach to antiquity which differs essentially from the first stage of his studies of the antique. In that first phase he was mainly concerned with investigating the building technique of ancient structures, and turned to account in the dome of Florence Cathedral. In this later phase, it was the Roman monument as a whole which interested him. His own development had led Brunelleschi to recognize in the architecture of antiquity that sculptural treatment of architectural forms which came to govern his own work. The plasticity of the Pazzi Chapel, which is rather more marked than that of the Sagrestia Vecchia and S. Lorenzo, is still restricted to a more vigorous moulding of the articulating members. But in S. Maria degli Angeli this sculptural quality invades the very core of the building, since its very substance is modelled throughout. This procedure, which appeared here for the first time, is also characteristic of Brunelleschi’s other late works—S. Spirito, the lantern of the dome, and the so-called exedra of the drum of the dome.43

In spite of this closer approach to antiquity, we must never
so much as suggest, in any work by Brunelleschi, an intention to imitate. That idea is put out of court at once, firstly by the completely independent handling of the decoration, which, in its purity and restraint, contains no single truly classical motif, and still more by the layout of his buildings, which is always dictated by the practical requirements of their sacred or secular purposes. That is as true of the hospital of the Innocenti as of a religious building such as S. Maria degli Angeli. The latter was endowed as an oratory dedicated to the Virgin and the Twelve Apostles inside the Camaldolese house. The choir niche facing the entrance was to be dedicated to Our Lady, while the altars of the Apostles were to be distributed in chapels through the six remaining chapels. (The eighth served as an entrance.) A circuitous disposition of the chapel was therefore not impossible in this case; it was even an advantage. Thus Brunelleschi with his central plan for the oratory of the Angeli was by no means sacrificing the needs of religion and the liturgy to the ideal building type of his time: on the contrary, he was making quite special allowance for them.44

Thus S. Maria degli Angeli stands as a mature and very personal solution within the development of Brunelleschi’s style, which is, in its turn, a perfect synthesis of medieval and classical traditions. Although the building was left unfinished, it set a standard both of architectural composition and building technique. Its influence can be felt in Bramante’s plan for S. Pietro’s and even later.45 And finally, in his last two works, the lantern and the so-called exedra of Florence Cathedral, Brunelleschi laid down ideal rules for the whole field of decorative form in architecture. For the lantern46 (submitted in model in 1435, begun in 1445, not finished till 1447), he discovered a new form which differed from the current type of columned pediment and clearly expressed its double function as a structural member and an ornamental feature of the dome. Structural members, round an octagonal columned temple and with a conical roof it set a ring of lower buttresses terminating in volutes which support the central structure. The superb sense of the ribs of the dome comes to a harmonic end in the movement of the volutes. Brunelleschi here introduced an inspired reversal of the classical console, which itself—though in its function as a bracket—formed the transition between two members meeting at right angles. To have employed them as buttresses is an ‘invention’ which seems to me most characteristic of the creative power of Brunelleschi’s logic and formal imagination. From the lantern of Florence Cathedral the volute set out on its triumphal way as one of the most versatile decorative elements in modern architecture.47

While the ornamental forms used on the lantern, in particular the capitals, were left to Brunelleschi’s successors to execute in detail, we are probably right in thinking that he himself had provided here for a more ornate manner of decoration than he was otherwise accustomed to use.48 A similar type of decorative architecture can be seen in the exedrae of the drum of the dome [71].49 They were structurally necessary in order to brace the thrust of the drum on the four free corners of the substructure; for structural reasons, therefore, they had to be very massive. Brunelleschi created for these supporting blocks an ornamental casing which was in keeping with their massive character. Niches with walls in deep relief are scooped out of the semicircular mass of the wall, and the mouldings employed on the pedestal and architrave are deeply undercut. The most notable feature, however, is the coupled half-columns, a variant of the twin pilasters of the Pazzi Chapel enhanced to yet greater sculptural effect. This powerful and beautiful motif was here used for the first time in modern architecture. In the same way as in the lantern, Brunelleschi seems to have made full allowance in calculating these members for the fact that they were to be placed at a great height and distance: the elongation of the base and of the capitals, and the thin abaci can only be explained through the calculation of their visual effect in distant perspective.50

In comparison with his churches, Brunelleschi’s work in diocesan architecture is remarkably meagre. The evidence for the many palazzi and houses he is said to have built is very scanty. Yet the details which have recently come to light
Although the cannon of Brunelleschi remained the standard for the later development of architecture in Italy, he must run counter to the whole Brunelleschian canon. But on the other hand Michelozzo aims – and in this case with success – at giving the 'Gothic' vaulted space a classical aspect by means of its articulation. The hall is divided by very plain pilasters and heavy transverse arches; the spatial impression is massive, yet does not lack a certain austerity and dignity. The 'classicizing' Gothic console capitals (prototype in the Loggia dei Lanzi) are fully in keeping with the unadorned type of the building, and so are the plain pilaster strips and cornices on the exterior. This formal idiom, which aimed at supreme simplicity, appears in a more mature and subtle form in the friary of S. Marco in Florence, which Michelozzo built in the thirtyies to the commission of the Medici. The layout is perfectly lucid and beautifully proportioned [17]. Vasari called S. Marco the most beautiful monastery in Italy – and the restraint and economy of the decoration is fully in keeping with the grave unpertinencesness of the friary church. In the cloisters and the library [18] – the first library to be built in the Renaissance and the model for many that came later – there are new formal elements: the plain Ionic capital, which Brunelleschi hardly ever employed, and, in the cloister, the pedestals to the columns. In the refectory the stepped base at the entrance to the reading pulpits is worthy of notice; with its intentionally weighty and uncomplicated outline, it is remarkably well proportioned. The church, which was very much altered in Baroque times, was originally a large, plain hall with a low-pitched open timber ceiling; the chancel was separated from the main space by a heavy transverse arch, similar to that in S. Francesco al Bosco and in the later Noveidiate Chapel of S. Croce (1445), also by Michelozzo. Michelozzo’s chief religious work was the rebuilding and enlargement of the SS. Annunziata in Florence (begun in 1449). Here too he follows his natural bent to the greatest

15. Michelozzo di Bartolomeo: Florence, S. Marco, late 1430s, plan at first-floor level