



# Studies in the History of Gardens & Designed Landscapes

An International Quarterly

ISSN: 1460-1176 (Print) 1943-2186 (Online) Journal homepage: <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tgah20>

## The monster in the garden: the grotesque, the gigantic, and the monstrous in Renaissance landscape design

Luke Morgan

To cite this article: Luke Morgan (2011) The monster in the garden: the grotesque, the gigantic, and the monstrous in Renaissance landscape design, *Studies in the History of Gardens & Designed Landscapes*, 31:3, 167-180, DOI: [10.1080/14601176.2010.530389](https://doi.org/10.1080/14601176.2010.530389)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14601176.2010.530389>



Published online: 06 Sep 2011.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 2817



View related articles [↗](#)

# *The monster in the garden: the grotesque, the gigantic, and the monstrous in Renaissance landscape design*

LUKE MORGAN

The monstrous is an instance of the marvelous in reverse, but it is, nonetheless, an instance of the marvelous.

Georges Canguilhem

Mikhail Bakhtin has suggested that the image of the gaping mouth is the real ‘hero’ of François Rabelais’s comic ‘chronicle’ *Pantagruel* (1532).<sup>1</sup> The giant Pantagruel’s name means ‘all-thirsting’ and the notable events of his childhood are mostly associated with eating, drinking and swallowing. Bakhtin notes, for example, how:

At each feeding he sucked the milk of 4,600 [*sic*: it is actually 406] cows. He was served his gruel in a gigantic bell. His teeth were already so strong and solid that he chewed off a big portion of his bowl. One morning, wishing to suck one of the cows, he freed one hand from his swaddling clothes and, seizing the cow by its legs, chewed off the udder and half the stomach, as well as the liver and kidneys. The cow was taken away from him, but he held on to one of the legs and swallowed it like a sausage. Another time [his father] Gargantua’s pet bear came near Pantagruel; he seized it, tore it to pieces and devoured it as if it were a chicken. He was so strong that he had to be chained to his cradle, but one day he appeared carrying the cradle on his back in the hall where Gargantua was presiding over a huge banquet; the child’s hands were tied, so he put out his tongue and licked the food off the table.<sup>2</sup>

For Bakhtin, this emphasis on ‘sucking, devouring, swallowing, tearing to pieces’, and on the ‘gaping mouth, the protruding tongue, the teeth, the gullet, the udder, and the stomach’, is a distinctive feature of grotesque realism. He goes on to argue that, ‘the most important of all human features for the grotesque is

the mouth . . . The grotesque face is actually reduced to the gaping mouth; the other features are only a frame encasing this wide-open bodily abyss’.<sup>3</sup>

The origin of the word ‘grotesque’ is in the Italian ‘grottesca’, which refers to ‘grotta’ or cave. In fact, ‘grotesque’ derives its etymological meaning from the erroneous Renaissance identification of the decorated rooms of the *Domus Aurea* as underground grottoes. The style soon became widely emulated. As early as 1502, Pinturricchio was commissioned to decorate the Piccolomini Library in Siena Cathedral ‘with such fantastic forms, colours and arrangements as are now called grotesques ( . . . *che oggi chiamano grottesche*)’.<sup>4</sup>

The Rabelaisian motif of a cavernous and insatiable mouth, perpetually agape, also appears in garden design of the period. The colossal ‘Hell Mouth’ of Pier Francesco ‘Vicino’ Orsini’s *Sacro Bosco* at Bomarzo (c. 1552–85), for example, is at once a grotto, a grotesque disembodied head and an al fresco dining room (complete with a stone table) (figure 1). The imagery and function of the ‘Hell Mouth’, which is emphatically associated with eating, drinking and swallowing, suggests that it may be an exemplary artefact of Bakhtin’s theme in Renaissance landscape design. Likewise, the fortuitous origins of the word ‘grotesque’ in, if not precisely the context of gardens, then at least in the *idea* of the subterranean, or of the grotto, which is a quintessential structure of the garden, indicates that the grotesque, as articulated by Bakhtin and others, may have played a more significant role in Renaissance landscape design than has been acknowledged.<sup>5</sup>



FIGURE 1. 'Hell Mouth', *Sacro Bosco, Bomarzo*, 1552–85 (photo: Luke Morgan).

The 'Hell Mouth', is colossal but it is unlike other well-known Renaissance colossi, from Donatello's now lost terracotta figure of Joshua for the Duomo in Florence to Michelangelo's *David*, in that it had a participatory dimension. Simply put, it could be entered. It was intended, in other words, as a penetrable body, or as one that is open rather than closed on the classical model. Its mouth, as a traversable threshold, is crucial to its purpose and meaning. In Bakhtin's view:

Contrary to modern canons, the grotesque body is not separated from the rest of the world. It is not a closed, completed unit; it is unfinished, outgrows itself, transgresses its own limits. The stress is laid on those parts of the body that are open to the outside world, that is, the parts through which the world enters the body or emerges from it, or through which the body itself goes out to meet the world. This means that the emphasis is on the apertures or the convexities, or on various ramifications or offshoots: the open mouth, the genital organs, the breasts, the phallus, the potbelly, the nose. The body discloses its essence as a principle of growth which exceeds its own limits only in copulation, pregnancy, childbirth,

the throes of death, eating, drinking, or defecation. This is the ever unfinished, ever creating body, the link in the chain of genetic development, or more correctly speaking, the links shown at the point where they enter into each other.<sup>6</sup>

This theme of the open, unfinished body is not unique to the 'Hell Mouth' in Renaissance landscape design. There are, for example, several other open mouths at Bomarzo: the Mask of Madness, the ogre, and the fountainheads of Jupiter Ammon. Gaping mouths also appear at the Villa Aldobrandini, Frascati and at the Giardino Giusti, Verona.<sup>7</sup> The genital organs are, similarly, common motifs of the early modern garden. Valerio Cioli's fountain sculpture of a urinating boy, depicted continuously soiling the laundry of a washerwoman at the Villa Medici, Pratolino, serves as an example, but there are numerous others. In his *Horticultura* (1631), Peter Lauremberg even provided a design for a parterre, which incorporates several stylized phallic motifs — literally, a priapic parterre.<sup>8</sup> Exposed breasts are also a commonplace of the Renaissance garden. There are many examples, which include figures of Venus, nymphs, and harpies. *La Madre della Natura* at the Villa d'Este, Tivoli, depicted as the Ephesian Artemis, is perhaps the most striking (or excessive). Distended bellies sometimes appear too. Cioli's *Nano Morgante on a Tortoise* (c. 1561–64), for the Boboli Gardens in Florence, depicts the Medici court dwarf with a large potbelly and a disproportionately small phallus. The flaring nostrils of the 'Hell Mouth' and other similar heads also recall Bakhtin's emphasis on the 'openness' of the grotesque body.

The imagery of the material body derives from old popular traditions associated with festivals and celebrations. As anthropologists and historians have shown, in early modern Europe such rituals or carnivals functioned as brief moments of respite from the restrictions of class, gender and place in which, for a day or two, the established order was turned upside down under the auspices of mock kings, princes and bishops of misrule. In his study of Rabelais's 'grotesque realism', Bakhtin went further and claimed that carnival was not a historically specific social phenomenon restricted to early modern festival culture, but constituted a trans-historical discursive mode. Writing in which distinct forms of literary discourse ('high' and 'low' for example) are deliberately brought into conflict with one another is, in Bakhtin's terms, 'carnavalesque'. The 'Hell Mouth', which is at once terrifying and comic, clearly fulfils this criterion.

Subsequent writers have pointed out that the mocking, subversive, and critical activities of carnival were generally tolerated by ruling elites.<sup>9</sup> As

carefully controlled and temporary inversions of the usual order of things, they served to consolidate and reinforce class and gender stratification in hierarchical societies. It has been argued that Bakhtin overestimated the critical agency of the carnivalesque, partly as a result of his own circumstances as a philosopher and literary critic in the Soviet Union with scholarly interests in Western culture.<sup>10</sup> But that criticism does not in the end invalidate Bakhtin's fundamental insight: that the functions and imagery of the 'lower stratum', the prosaic necessities, processes and desires of the body form the substance of a neglected (at times actively suppressed) literary and artistic tradition of 'grotesque realism'. This essay will explore the possibility that the material body, its permeability and capacity for extension — the mundane corporeality of the *living* body rather than the static, closed and reified body, the body expunged of its functions — is an important theme of the Renaissance garden.

### Mountains, abysses and the 'mystique of the colossus'

According to Bakhtin, 'The artistic logic of the grotesque image ignores the closed, smooth, and impenetrable surface of the body and retains only its excrescences (sprouts, buds) and orifices, only that which leads beyond the body's limited space or into the body's depths. Mountains and abysses, such is the relief of the grotesque body; or speaking in architectural terms, towers and subterranean passages'.<sup>11</sup> In a note, he adds that: 'This grotesque logic is also extended to images of nature and to objects in which depths (holes) and convexities are emphasized'.<sup>12</sup>

Giovanni da Bologna's *Appennino* (Villa Medici, Pratolino, c. 1579) is both a mountain and an abyss (figure 2). Standing at approximately eleven metres tall, the figure is a colossal personification of the mountain range depicted squeezing the life out of a 'monstrous head'.<sup>13</sup> The interior of this garden giant contained a network of grottoes in which painted scenes of shepherds, mining and metallurgy appeared, as well as two working fountains, one of which portrayed Thetis.<sup>14</sup> This is perhaps not quite as comprehensive as the 'entire inhabited universe' that is located in Pantagruel's mouth, but, as in Rabelais, one could still 'descend into the stomach as into an underground mine'.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, mining was represented in the belly of the *Appennino*.

There are well-known Classical sources for Giambologna's giant, from the figure of Atlas in Virgil's *Aeneid* to Dinocrates' ambitious proposal to carve a

colossal man out of Mount Athos in honour of Alexander the Great and Pliny the Elder's description of the Colossus of Rhodes.<sup>16</sup> The giants of the sixteenth-century garden are also suggestive of what Charles Seymour Jr. has described as the 'mystique of the colossus', which was inspired 'by humanistic admiration of the Antique'.<sup>17</sup> It is, however, important to acknowledge that the relationship of the Renaissance garden to its Classical precedents is peculiarly complex in that, obviously, no ancient garden had survived to serve as an exemplar and, moreover, the few extant texts that had been transmitted from Antiquity furnished little unambiguous information. Pliny, despite the influence of his concept of 'harmonious and regular variety', is notoriously vague about what his gardens actually looked like and Vitruvius has almost nothing of use to say on the subject. The other main sources were the agricultural treatises of Cato, Varro and Columella, which are largely concerned with propagation and husbandry.<sup>18</sup>

A more immediate model for the colossi at Bomarzo and Pratolino may have been Francesco Colonna's description of the reclining giant in the courtyard of the 'Egyptian Pyramid' that Poliphilo enters early on in the *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* (1499):<sup>19</sup>

I was advancing carefully when I saw a vast and extraordinary colossus, whose soleless feet opened into hollow and empty shins. From there I went with trepidation to inspect the head. I guessed that the low groaning was the result of divine ingenuity, caused by the wind entering through the open feet. This colossus lay on its back, cast from metal with miraculous skill; it was of a middle-aged man, who held his head somewhat raised on a pillow. He seemed to be ill, with indications of sighing and groaning about his mouth, and his length was sixty paces. With the aid of his hair one could climb upon his chest, then reach his lamenting mouth by way of the dense, twisted hairs of his beard. The opening was completely empty; and so, urged on by curiosity, I proceeded without further consideration down the stairs that were in his throat, thence into his stomach, and so by intricate passageways, and in some terror, to all the other parts of his internal viscera . . . And when I came to the heart, I could read about how sighs are generated from love, and could see the place where love gravely hurts it. All this moved me deeply, so that I uttered a loud sigh from the bottom of my heart, invoking Polia — and instantly heard the whole machine resonating, to my considerable fright.<sup>20</sup>

Colonna's automated colossus is lovesick, stricken down with unsated desire. Like the *Appennino* and the 'Hell Mouth', his despondent giant is an open,







permeable body that can be traversed and inhabited, but it is also one that simulates corporeality to an extraordinary extent. The giant may be a marvel of 'divine ingenuity' but it is very far from being an idealized, otherworldly figure. It is, perhaps, all too human in its susceptibility to desire and in its physical malaise; that is, in its status as a material body.

### 'Seeing, hearing, bathing, and tasting'

The material body is, crucially, a sensual body. In his critique of modern and contemporary architecture's bias towards the visual rather than the tactile or sensual, Juhani Pallasmaa argues that: 'The most archaic origin of architectural space is in the cavity of the mouth'.<sup>21</sup> The 'Hell Mouth' may not be meant as an image of the origin of architecture, but Pallasmaa's intuition does at least point to the fact that taste, along with smell, hearing and touch are as important as sight to the reception of the garden, perhaps even more so than to the reception of architecture strictly defined.<sup>22</sup> Gardens are, after all, irreducibly *haptic* spatial environments capable of eliciting multi-sensual responses.

Claudio Tolomei wrote in a letter to Giambattista Grimaldi (dated 26 July 1543), that contemporary garden fountains appealed not only to 'seeing', but also to 'hearing, bathing, and tasting'.<sup>23</sup> In an important recent article, Anatole Tchikine has brought together numerous contemporary references to the water effects of Renaissance gardens, in which they are described in acoustic, rather than visual terms. The words used are revealing: murmur (*mormorio*) and gurgling (*gorgolio*), for example. Hydraulic organs, of course, such as the famous one at the Villa d'Este, Tivoli, produced music, which did not, however, always meet with approval. Tchikine notes the response of an anonymous nineteenth-century British traveller to the music that was 'played' by figures of Apollo and the Muses at the Villa Aldobrandini, Frascati: 'Any pretended music more harsh, bellowing, and squeaking, I have never heard; Pegasus himself seemed to me to be braying'.<sup>24</sup>

'Bathing' in the Renaissance garden was often inadvertent. Vasari, for example, notes that at the Villa Medici, Castello, Tribolo:

united the waters of Arno and Mugnone under the level of the labyrinth in bronze channels, finely devised, filling the pavement with slender jets, so that by turning a tap all those who came to see the fountain are sprinkled, and escape is not easy, because Tribolo made a stone seat about the fountain, supported by lions intermixed with marine monsters in bas-relief. . . .<sup>25</sup>

At Pratolino, likewise, *fontanieri* made sure that visitors were drenched, regardless of their eminence (an instance, perhaps, of carnivalesque inversion in the Renaissance garden).<sup>26</sup>

Gardens were also sites for al fresco meals. The 'Hell Mouth' at Bomarzo provides an example, but there were numerous others, often equipped with a water supply. Montaigne describes a dining room at Pratolino in which was installed 'a marble table in a hall of the castle around which there are six seats, at each of which you raise a lid of this marble by a ring, and under the lid there is a vessel attached to the said table. In each of the said six vessels there springs up a fountain of fresh water in which each man may cool his glass, and in the middle is a big one to put the bottle in'.<sup>27</sup> Early Modern gardens were also productive sources of food — from crops to fish.

Tolomei omitted smell from the sensual impressions that he derived from fountain design, unlike Abraham Bosse who, in a print of the seventeenth century depicting the sense, directly equated it with the garden, along with flowers and sniffing dogs.<sup>28</sup>

These experiential dimensions of the Renaissance garden are, in most cases, irretrievable. Yet the historical record does provide enough fragmentary evidence to suggest that the visual, architectonic and structural elements of the garden have been overemphasized at the expense of the sensual, embodied responses of contemporary visitors. If so, then Colonna's emphasis on the affective content of art, architecture and the garden, on the sensual impression or extra-visual response of the visitor, and on the rich and variegated *materia* of objects and environments may mean that the *Hypnerotomachia* is a more authentic distillation of the Renaissance experience of landscape than other ostensibly factual accounts. Vasari, for example, writes that at the Villa Medici, Castello: 'In the middle of the garden are high and thick cypresses, laurels and myrtles, growing wild, and forming a labyrinth surrounded by a hedge two and a half braccia high, so regular that it looks as if it had been produced by a brush'.<sup>29</sup> His description is notably ocularcentric. The highest praise that he can muster of Tribolo's design for the Medici garden is that it resembles a painting, which clearly privileges the latter medium.

Yet 'seeing, hearing, bathing and tasting', as Tolomei put it, were vital dimensions of the complex experience of the garden, which — to put it in Bakhtinian terms — addressed itself as much to the 'material bodily principle' as it did to visual or aesthetic principles.

### Art, nature, and violence

An important additional dimension of grotesque realism, according to Bakhtin, is its characteristic 'downward movement'. According to him, we see this 'downward movement in fights, beatings, and blows; they throw the adversary to the ground, trample him into the earth . . . debasement is a fundamental artistic principle of grotesque realism; all that is sacred and exalted is rethought on the level of the material bodily stratum or else combined and mixed with its images'.<sup>30</sup> Violence, debasement and death are thus inherent in the grotesque mode, but they are also themes of the Renaissance garden.

The *Appennino*, for example, appears to be crushing the life out of a monstrous head. At Bomarzo, one giant viciously tears apart another, while elsewhere in the garden a dragon is attacked by lions. In Ammanati's sculptural group of Hercules and Antaeus for Tribolo's fountain at the Villa Medici, Castello, the jet of water that issues from the mouth of the struggling Antaeus can be interpreted as his last breath — a paradoxical image.<sup>31</sup> Water, which is after all an element necessary to life, is here made to represent Antaeus's last exhalation before death. Pirro Ligorio also mentions a fountain depicting Hercules killing the Lernean Hydra, and another showing the Rape of Europa.<sup>32</sup> Even the apparently harmless *giochi d'acqua* of the Renaissance garden were interpreted in military terms. As Tchikine has pointed out, the experience of being drenched by hidden jets of water was often likened to 'a sudden attack of enemy soldiers emerging from secret hideouts' in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century texts.<sup>33</sup> The most extreme example perhaps is provided by Lorenzo Lippi's burlesque epic *Il Malmantile Racquistato*, which contains a fictional description of a garden in which the urns and obelisks have been replaced with gibbets and pillories and the statues have become ancient mummies 'restored' with recently severed heads: a dramatically dystopian reversal of the idea of the garden-as-idyll or untrammelled *locus amoenus*.<sup>34</sup>

Although the violent imagery of Renaissance landscape design — the 'sucking, devouring, swallowing, tearing to pieces' — has rarely, if ever, been seriously considered for what it reveals about the garden as a whole, violence has often been implicit in modern accounts. Historians have tended to interpret the Renaissance garden in terms of sets of polarities, or as Manichean 'battles of seeming oppositions'.<sup>35</sup> The most important of these oppositions is generally always that of art and nature; the contest between which in early modern landscape design is usually seen as having been won by art. Certainly, the Renaissance concept of *paragone*

(rivalry) is as important in landscape design as it is in other fields, and some evidence can be found in support of the idea that the garden was occasionally conceptualized as a triumph of art over nature during the period. The Florentine sculptor Baccio Bandinelli, for example, once said that 'the things one builds must be the guide and superior to those one plants', when he was asked to design a fountain for the Boboli garden in 1551.<sup>36</sup>

It is not until the twentieth century, however, that Renaissance gardens are *systematically* interpreted as an expression of man's dominance over nature. David R. Coffin's statement, in his important study of the Villa d'Este (1960), is representative. He claims that: 'In the tradition of ancient Roman gardening, all the elements of nature — water, stone, and verdure — were meant to reveal man's dominance'.<sup>37</sup> More recently, however, Claudia Lazzaro has argued that this unequal relationship between art and nature, which she sees as a gendered one ('the subjection of female nature in a male space'), has its origins in the ideologies of modern Italy rather than in sixteenth-century attitudes.<sup>38</sup> She points out that an important impetus to the modern study of the Italian Renaissance garden was provided by the 1931 exhibition *The Italian Garden*, which was staged at the Palazzo Pitti in Florence under the auspices of Mussolini's Fascist government. In the exhibition catalogue, the garden was defined as the 'dominion of man over nature' and in subsequent texts, 'military metaphors proliferated . . . along with the description of the Italian garden as emphatically "male"'.<sup>39</sup>

These points recall the provocative claim of the sociologist Zygmunt Bauman, for whom the gardening impulse is an unacknowledged motor of Nazism. In his book *Modernity and Ambivalence* (1991), Baumann quotes a chilling 1930 statement of the future Nazi Minister of Agriculture, R. W. Darré, as evidence:

He who leaves the plants in a garden to themselves will soon find to his surprise that the garden is overgrown by weeds and that even the basic character of plants has changed. If therefore the garden is to remain the breeding ground for plants, if, in other words, it is to lift itself above the harsh rule of natural forces, then the forming will of a gardener is necessary, a gardener who, by providing suitable conditions for growing, or by keeping harmful influences away, or by both together carefully tends what needs tending, and ruthlessly eliminates the weeds which would deprive the better plants of nutrition, air, light and sun.<sup>40</sup>

In Bauman's analysis, the violence that art does to nature in gardening and garden design turns out to be an endemic feature of the project of modernity.

The Renaissance garden, however, resists being pressed into service as the ultimate source of this modern cultural attitude, despite the persistence of the idea in garden history that it embodies the superiority of art over nature. In mid sixteenth-century writings on landscape and gardens, the relationship between art and nature was described as a fluid one, which was more often than not understood as collaborative rather than oppositional in character. In a letter of 1541, for example, Jacopo Bonfadio wrote that in the garden the interaction of art and nature produces more extraordinary effects than either could achieve on its own. According to him, this collaboration resulted in a 'third nature'.<sup>41</sup> A few years later, in his treatise *La Villa* (1559), Bartolomeo Taegio expanded on the point: 'nature incorporated with art is made the creator and connatural of art, and from both is made a third nature, which I would not know how to name'.<sup>42</sup> Garden fountains and grottoes were frequently thought to exemplify this idea. In 1543, for example, Claudio Tolomei wrote an enthusiastic letter about fountains in which he claimed that it was difficult to distinguish between the respective contributions of art and nature.<sup>43</sup>

In his book on the grotto that he had planned for the Duc de Montmorency, the sixteenth-century French potter and garden designer Bernard Palissy referred to the 'monstrosity' (*monstruosité*) of his design. As Carlo Ginzburg has suggested, Palissy seems to have meant both the extreme naturalism of the motifs that he incorporated into the grotto and his pursuit of bizarre, or what have come to be thought of (inadequately), as 'Mannerist' effects. These included 'terracotta statues whose worn aspect simulated the effects of time; columns made of shells, sculpted in the shape of rocks eroded by the wind, or "rusticated" (*rustiquées*) as if they had been struck by a hammer; and so forth'.<sup>44</sup>

Palissy's grotto is no longer extant, but what he was describing is a familiar production of Renaissance architecture. Grottoes are hybrid entities, which, like fountains (the terms were used interchangeably during the period), exemplify contemporary ideas about the garden and its forms as a 'third nature'. According to Tolomei:

By combining art with nature, it has become impossible to discern which is which. Sometimes it looks like a natural artifice, sometimes like an artificial nature: in this way nowadays they have learned how to make fountains which look as if they had been made by nature, not by chance but through a masterful artifice.<sup>45</sup>

From this perspective, Palissy's quality of 'monstrosity' resides in the status of the grotto and its automata as extraordinarily convincing simulacra of nature, but ones in which nature by definition always has priority.

Palissy's use of the term 'monstrosity' to describe his design for a grotto can be interpreted more literally. Nearly every Renaissance garden contained representations of sphinxes, harpies and hybrid creatures of various kinds — monsters in other words — though, surprisingly, these have never been made the subject of a dedicated study.

### 'The imaginary, turbid, vertiginous world of the monstrous'<sup>46</sup>

In a classic essay, Georges Canguilhem asks the question: 'Is a giant enormous or a monster?'<sup>47</sup> He concludes that gigantism is ambiguous. 'Enormity tends towards monstrosity', but an unusually large man nonetheless remains a man, despite his enormity, and not a monster.<sup>48</sup> The *Appennino* may, therefore, be gigantic but it is not monstrous. ('We may say of a rock that it is enormous, but not of a mountain that it is monstrous, except in a mythical universe of discourse in which mountains may possibly give birth to mice'.<sup>49</sup>)

The 'Hell Mouth' at Bomarzo, however, presents a different case. It too is gigantic, but it is also disembodied and incomplete. The incomplete or unfinished body is, as has been said, a leitmotif of grotesque realism, as well as being a theme of the Renaissance garden. Incompletion, along with distortion and excess, are also, however, defining characteristics of the concept of monstrosity. According to Canguilhem: 'monstrosity is the accidental and conditional threat of incompletion or distortion in the formation of form'.<sup>50</sup>

In medieval and early Renaissance teratology, monsters generally appear as omens or portents, signs of forthcoming misfortune. The famous monster of Ravenna provides a good example. The Florentine apothecary and diarist Luca Landucci wrote in March 1512 that:

We heard that a monster had been born at Ravenna, of which a drawing was sent here; it had a horn on its head, straight up like a sword, and instead of arms it had two wings like a bat's, and at the height of the breasts it had a *fio* [Y-shaped mark] on one side and a cross on the other, and lower down at the waist, two serpents, and it was hermaphrodite, and on the right knee it had an eye, and its left foot was like an eagle's.

Two weeks later, Ravenna was sacked by papal troops. Landucci commented: 'It was evident what evil the monster had meant for them! It seems as if some



great misfortune always befalls the city where such things are born; the same thing happened at Volterra, which was sacked a short time after a similar monster had been born there'.<sup>51</sup>

Towards the end of the sixteenth century in the work of, among others, Ambroise Paré whose *Des Monstres et Prodiges* was first published in 1573, there are increasing attempts to account for monsters within medical and pseudoscientific categories. Paré, who was a physician, discusses the natural and biological causes of the generation of monsters, which include 'a fall, or blows struck against the womb of the mother, being with child' and 'hereditary or accidental illnesses'.<sup>52</sup> But he also writes about mythological beasts such as harpies and marine monsters, drawing no firm distinction between the natural and the supernatural. Jean Céard has nonetheless argued that Paré's treatise is the most sustained attempt in the sixteenth century to 'naturalize' monsters.<sup>53</sup> In his work, the monster becomes a sign of nature's copiousness and variety, albeit not without a lingering sense of the monster as portentous.

This concept of the monster as a natural wonder or marvel, rather than as a dread omen, is especially relevant to the early modern garden. An important subject of Renaissance landscape design is nature itself, which was conceived as both medium and collaborator. The conceptual links between the garden, a fundamental design principle of which was variety and contrast, the *Wunderkammer*, library, and other collections and categorizations of natural phenomena have been pointed out by other writers. A key criterion for inclusion in, especially, the *Wunderkammer* or cabinet of curiosities was the perceived *meraviglia* of the object. Renaissance collections often contained strange, hybridized specimens of nature's ludic propensity — the *lusae naturae* that demonstrated a ceaseless capacity for invention. Paré notes, for instance, that there is little explanation for the 'effigies of men and other animals', which sometimes appear in rocks and plants, besides the assumption that 'Nature is disporting herself in her creations'. Later, in his discussion of 'Marine Monsters' he writes that: 'There are found in the sea such strange and diverse sorts of shells that one can say that Nature, chambermaid of the great God, disports herself in the manufacture of them'.<sup>54</sup>

It should not, therefore, come as a surprise that the Renaissance garden is filled with examples of hybrid creatures both witty and monstrous, as well as paradoxical inversions (the 'Hell Mouth', for example, which is simultaneously a bodily grave and an unusual dining chamber, or Hercules and Antaeus at Castello, or the *water-breathing* dragons of the Villa d'Este), illusionistic tricks

and even practical jokes. All of these motifs and devices contribute to the omnipresent thematic emphasis in early modern landscape design on the variety, *copia* and inventiveness of nature itself.

The *Sacro Bosco* at Bomarzo provides the key example of the relationship between the Renaissance garden and Renaissance ideas about hybridity and monsters. It is, literally, a park of monsters (*Parco dei Mostri*, as it is now often referred to). But monsters of various kinds appear in many gardens of the period. In the Boboli Garden, to mention just one other example, four fountains around the Isolotto (by the School of Giambologna, but replaced due to their deterioration in c. 1778 with marble copies of the *pietra serena* originals by Innocenzo Spinazzi and others), depict hybrid creatures with human heads and torsos, short, bird-like wings, scaly bipartite tails, and snakes, which writhe in their hair (figure 3). They lean into *tazze* in the form of large shells and are shown astride toothy, voracious-looking fish.

These fountains are known as the *Fontane delle arpie*, but they are almost certainly not harpies. They are male, for a start, but they also lack talons and proper wings. It is much more likely that they are invented hybrids with no specific referent, virtuosic demonstrations of the *fantasia* of the artist.<sup>55</sup> In sixteenth-century Italian art theory, there are numerous accounts of composite or hybrid figures of this kind, nearly all of which recall the opening lines of Horace's *Liber de Arte Poetica* and, as such, belong to the period's general concern with elevating the status of the visual arts: *ut pictura poesis*, as Horace famously wrote.<sup>56</sup>

As early as 1504, Pomponius Gauricus noted with cautious approval in his *De Sculptura*, that: 'Even though the human figure is their fundamental object, sculptors are nonetheless moved to compose such figures as satyrs, hydras, chimeras and monsters, such as have never been seen anywhere'.<sup>57</sup> The most important cinquecento statement of this idea is, however, the one attributed to Michelangelo by Francisco de Hollanda. It is as relevant to grasping the significance of hybridity and monstrosity in later Renaissance sculpture and painting as it is to accounting for the presence of monsters in Renaissance garden design and thus deserves to be quoted in full:

[Horace] does in nowise blame painters but praises and favors them, since he says that poets and painters have license to dare to do, I say to dare, what they choose. And this insight and power they have always had; for whenever (as very rarely happens) a great painter makes a work that seems false and deceitful, this falseness is truth; and greater truth in that place would be a lie. For he will not paint a man's hand with ten fingers, nor paint a horse with the ears of a bull or a camel's hump;



FIGURE 3. *Fountain of the Harpies, Boboli Gardens, Florence, sixteenth century (photos: Luke Morgan).*

nor will he paint the foot of an elephant with the same feeling as the foot of a horse, nor the arm or face of a child like those of an old man; nor an eye or an ear even half an inch out of its proper place; nor even the hidden vein of an arm may he place where he will; for all such things are most false. But if, in order to observe what is proper to a time and place, he change the parts of limbs (as in grotesque work, which would otherwise be without grace and most false) and convert a griffin or a deer downward into a dolphin or upward into any shape he may choose, putting wings in the place of arms, and cutting away the arms if wings are better, this converted limb, of lion or horse or bird, will be most perfect according to its kind; and this may seem false but can really only be called well invented or monstrous. And sometimes it is more in accordance with reason to paint a monstrosity (for the variation and relaxation of the senses and in respect of mortal eyes, that sometimes desire to see that which they never see and think cannot exist) rather than the accustomed figure (admirable though it be) of men and animals; and from this follows the insatiable human desire, which sometimes more abhors a building with its columns, windows and doors, than another feigned and false *alla grottesca*, that has columns made of creatures growing out of stalks of flowers, with architraves and cornices of branches or myrtle and doorways of reeds and other things, that seem impossible and irrational; yet it may be very great, if done by one who understands.<sup>58</sup>

Although it is unrelated, Michelangelo's approval of the substitution of arms with wings in certain circumstances could almost be an appraisal of the so-called 'harpies' in the Boboli. Importantly, Michelangelo equates the idea of invention with the monstrous, as if they were interchangeable terms (this is probably also one of the senses in which Palissy uses the term 'monstrosity'). Such manifestations of poetic licence, however, require the 'proper' time and place, which implies that the artist's decision to paint a 'monstrosity' rather than an 'accustomed figure' should be dictated by a consciousness of what is appropriate in each situation.

Gardens were perhaps the *most* appropriate places for the display of invention, *fantasia*, and the monstrous during the Renaissance. Most were essentially private or, at best, only semi-public environments typically dominated by the pagan imagery of Classical Antiquity — especially that of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, which itself contains many examples of transformation and hybridization. Indeed, the *Metamorphoses* was the principal sourcebook of motifs and *topoi* for the Renaissance garden designer, despite Pope Paul IV's decision to consign it to the *Index of Prohibited Books* in 1559. The fact that the papal judgement had no perceivably adverse impact on the acceptability of Ovid in the garden can, to some extent, be explained through an appeal to the Renaissance aesthetic doctrine of decorum (*decoro*). According to Pirro Ligorio, for example, who

was involved in the design of the Villa d'Este garden at Tivoli: 'lascivious things should be used or placed in locations which were not always seen, since they are not worthy of being permitted in every location'.<sup>59</sup> His distinction does not mean that lascivious things are always indecorous, but rather, that they are indecorous in certain situations. Coffin has suggested that Pirro may have had the passage in Ludovico Dolce's dialogue in mind where Aretino claims that Giulio Romano's explicit engravings of sexual positions are not lacking in decorum because they were never intended for piazze or churches.<sup>60</sup> In any case, a private garden would have been the ideal site for both 'lascivious' and monstrous things. Arguably, it offered a greater degree of freedom, artistic as well as social, than most other sites of the period.

When he visited Bomarzo, the American literary critic Edmund Wilson described it as a discordant 'patch of ugliness and horror'.<sup>61</sup> His reaction recalls John Ruskin's famous denunciation of the grotesque. For Ruskin:

The architecture raised at Venice during this period is among the worst and basest ever built by the hands of men, being especially distinguished by a spirit of brutal mockery and insolent jest, which, exhausting itself in deformed and monstrous sculpture, can sometimes be hardly otherwise defined than as the perpetuation in stone of the ribaldries of drunkenness.<sup>62</sup>

Ruskin focuses his ensuing discussion of Venetian Renaissance architecture on the carved keystone of an arch on the western side of Santa Maria Formosa, which he describes as: 'A head, — huge, inhuman, and monstrous, — leering in bestial degradation, too foul to be either pictured or described, or to be beheld for more than an instant'.<sup>63</sup>

Needless to say, the 'Hell Mouth' at Bomarzo would almost certainly have appeared to Ruskin in the same light, as would many of the ornaments of the Renaissance garden. Wilson's and Ruskin's unstated criterion, against which, respectively, the Orsini garden and Venetian architecture appear as 'ugly', and even 'monstrous' is, of course, a received idea of the Classical.

It has already been suggested that the Renaissance garden owes little to the gardens of Classical Antiquity, if only for the sheer fact that almost nothing was known about them (besides a few ambiguous hints in Pliny and other writers). Obviously, however, aspects of the Renaissance garden did refer to Classical ideas, such as, for example, the nearly universal use of Ovidian themes and imagery. But even this is far from straightforward. Neither Eden nor Arcadia —



the prototypes for all subsequent idealizations of the garden in the Western tradition — are unproblematic ideals. Basil, for instance, described Adam's state in the Garden of Eden as 'apathetic' while Polybius considered Arcadia to be a poor, barren place and for Philostratus the Arcadians were 'acorn-eating swine'.<sup>64</sup> In the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid deliberately inverts the *locus amoenus* of Greek and Roman tradition, turning the landscape into a place of violence and destruction.<sup>65</sup> As complex, not to mention ambiguous, designed spaces, Renaissance gardens embody both concepts of the landscape, as idyll and its inverse. Marcello Fagiolo and Maria Luisa Madonna have argued, for example, that the Villa d'Este garden's meaning is associated with Typhon, 'this monster, whose countless voices sometimes resemble the gods and sometimes wild animals or the forces of nature, [and who] embodies the elemental power of disorder'.<sup>66</sup> Renaissance gardens are places of pleasure *and* peril.

In fact, the contradictions of the Renaissance garden are numerous. The 'Hell Mouth' at Bomarzo is simultaneously a terrifying animate cavern and a dining chamber. The Appennino at Pratolino is both a mountain and an abyss. The so-called 'harpies' in the Boboli are strange, hybrid creatures, fantastic artistic inventions that combine human and mythical features, but which resist firm identification. Taegio could not even decide what the garden was — a work of nature, a work of art, or a work of both, resulting in a 'third nature', that as he writes, 'I would not know how to name'.

The monsters of the Renaissance garden are signs of its complex, contradictory character, which extends to its very identity. Taegio's conclusion that the garden as a 'third nature' was somehow unnameable can be read as an implicit recognition of the impossibility of locating or 'fixing' the garden within prevailing epistemological and discursive structures. The intimate union of art and nature in the Renaissance garden, to the point where, in the best examples, the two could not be distinguished from one another, rendered the garden impossible to inscribe within a binary system in which the things of the world were understood as one or the other, but not both at once. This also applies to the grotesque, which as Wendy Frith has suggested in her work on West Wycombe, can 'refer to the mixing of high and low, and thus to the collapsing of culturally constructed binary oppositions and hierarchies'.<sup>67</sup>

Ovid's account of the fate of Hermaphroditus, which is often referred to in Renaissance treatises on medicine, abnormality and monstrosity, suggests something similar. He relates how the nymph Salmacis caught sight of Hermaphroditus bathing in her lake, and fell in love with him. Subsequently,

her prayers found favour with the gods: for, as they lay together, their bodies were united and from being two persons they became one. As when a gardener grafts a branch on to a tree, and sees the two unite as they grow, and come to maturity together, so when their limbs meet in that clinging embrace the nymph and the boy were no longer two, but a single form possessed of a dual nature, which could not be called male or female, but seemed to be at once both and neither.<sup>68</sup>

Ovid's metaphor for the union of male and female in a dual-sexed being is, perhaps not by chance, drawn from gardening. To describe the garden as a 'third nature', as Taegio does, is not so very different to describing it as 'a single form possessed of a dual nature, which could not be called male or female, but seemed to be at once both and neither'.

The contradictory and hybridized character of the garden, which is most clearly signified by its monsters, further problematizes the relationship of the Renaissance garden to the Classical. Bakhtin has argued that all grotesque images are, 'ambivalent and contradictory; they are ugly, monstrous, hideous from the point of view of "classic" aesthetics, that is, the aesthetics of the ready-made and the completed'.<sup>69</sup> The grotesque realism of some of the key images of Renaissance landscape design — the 'Hell Mouth' is exemplary — suggests that the reification in modern scholarship of a generalizing and ultimately insipid idea of the garden as a simplistic *locus amoenus*, has had the effect of suppressing its multiple levels of reference and meaning. The Renaissance garden surely becomes a more interesting place if its complex and grotesque character is restored. As Peter Stallybrass and Allon White have claimed of hybridization, which they define as 'a second and more complex form of the grotesque than the simply excluded "outside" or "low" to a given grid', the garden reframed in this way has the potential to produce 'new combinations and strange instabilities in a given semiotic system. It therefore generates the possibility of shifting *the very terms of the system itself*, by erasing and interrogating the relationships which constitute it'.<sup>70</sup> From this perspective, the Renaissance garden may begin to seem much more than a *locus amoenus*.

The neglect of the Renaissance garden's monsters may, in addition, be yet another consequence of the influence that the Petrarchan idea of the 'pure radiance of the past' exerted on the twentieth century, an idea that, as Peter Gay has argued, was powerfully articulated by German-speaking art historians at a time when culture, in general, seemed to have lost its way.<sup>71</sup> As Gay puts it:

[Aby] Warburg's celebrated formula that Athens must be recovered over and over again from the hands of Alexandria was more than an art historian's prescription



for the understanding of the Renaissance, with its painful struggles with alchemy and astrology; it was a philosopher's prescription for life in a world threatened by unreason.<sup>72</sup>

It was suggested earlier that twentieth-century Fascist ideology has had a surprising influence on garden history, and that the clichéd modern view of the Renaissance garden as a representation of the triumph of art over nature finds little justification in the historical record. The modern lack of attention to the 'monstrosity', as Palissy put it, of the Renaissance garden — in favour of an almost exclusive emphasis on the garden as a *locus amoenus*, sanitized Arcadian realm, or ideal place apart — may be a consequence of equally wishful thinking; of a desire, or legitimate need, to represent the Renaissance as an ideal cultural moment in a dystopian present. Both are projections, however forgivable in the latter case, from the twentieth century. Both are, more unexpectedly perhaps, implicated in the ideology of Fascism: the one an implicit, though unconscious endorsement, the other an explicit rejection, but both essentially modern.

Finally, the obscurity, or near complete absence of Classical models for landscape design in the Renaissance should be regarded as liberating in effect.

With only the slightest hints to go on, sixteenth-century designers, and designers manqué such as Colonna, developed a garden type that is an authentic product of the Renaissance but involved little revival or 'rebirth'. There was no elaborate system of rules governing landscape design, as there was for architecture for instance, which followed Vitruvius. If there had been, it is unlikely that there would ever have been a *Sacro Bosco*. The giant at Pratolino and Colonna's elegiac fabrications of the ancient world belong in the same category as the Orsini monsters: they are works of the imagination, informed by an antiquarian spirit, but essentially without precedent.

### Acknowledgements

I am grateful to the Australian Academy of the Humanities and Monash University for their financial support of my research.

Monash University

### NOTES

1. Mikhail Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World*, translated by Hélène Iswolsky (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1984), p. 325.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 331.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 325.
4. See Wolfgang Kayser, *The Grottesque in Art and Literature*, translated by Ulrich Weisstein (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963), p. 20.
5. Paul Barolsky mentions Rabelais in relation to Giambologna's *Appennino* in his *Michelangelo's Nose: A Myth and its Maker* (University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1990), as does Horst Bredekamp in his exhaustive *Vicino Orsini e il Sacro Bosco di Bomarzo* (Rome: Edizioni dell'Elefante, 1989), but the comments of both on the subject are very brief.
6. Bakhtin, *Rabelais*, p. 26.
7. The open mouth also appears in strictly architectural contexts at, for example, the Palazzo Zuccari, Rome (a door and a window), the Palazzo Thiene, Vicenza (a fireplace), and the Villa della Tore, Valpolicella (another fireplace).
8. See Michael Niedermeier, *Erotik in der Garten-Kunst* (Leipzig: Editions Leipzig, 1995), p. 201, for Lauremberg and an illustration of the parterre. The erotic, or merely genital, is a longstanding theme of the garden. Gervase Jackson-Stops has, for instance, noted that the cave below the Temple of Venus at Sir Francis Dashwood's West Wycombe 'seems to have been a very literal interpretation of the *mons veneris*, with the entrance representing a vagina, and the curving walls spread-open legs'. See his *An English Arcadia, 1600–1990* (London: The National Trust, 1992), p. 94. See also Wendy Frith, 'Sexuality and Politics in the Gardens at West Wycombe and Medmenham Abbey', in *Bourgeois and Aristocratic Encounters in Garden Art, 1550–1850*, edited by Michel Conan (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 2002), pp. 285–309. See also, less credibly perhaps, Edmund Wilson's comments on the meaning of the reference to Vicino Orsini's 'wood' inscribed at Bomarzo. *The Devils and Canon Barham: Ten Essays on Poets, Novelists, and Monsters* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1973), p. 208.
9. See, especially, Natalie Zemon Davis, 'Women on Top', in her *Society and Culture in Early Modern France* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1975), pp. 124–151.
10. Michael Holquist, for example, argues in his prologue to Hélène Iswolsky's translation of Bakhtin's book that the concept of 'grotesque realism' is a 'point-by-point inversion of the categories used in the thirties to define Socialist Realism'. *Rabelais*, p. xvii.
11. *Ibid.*, pp. 317–318.

12. Ibid., p. 318, n. 6.
13. The phrase is Claudia Lazzaro's. See her *The Italian Renaissance Garden: From the Conventions of Planting, Design, and Ornament to the Grand Gardens of Sixteenth-Century Italy* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1990), p. 150.
14. There was, in addition, a chamber for a small orchestra located in the head. My thanks to John Dixon Hunt for this point.
15. Bakhtin, *Rabelais*, p. 339.
16. For the sources, see Lazzaro, *Renaissance Garden*, pp. 148–149.
17. Charles Seymour Jr., *Michelangelo's David* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1967), p. 34.
18. For a discussion of these sources, see Raffaella Fabiani Giannetto, *Medici Gardens: From Making to Design* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008).
19. This was also noted by Roswitha Stewering in her 'The Relationship Between World, Landscape and Polia in the *Hyperotomachia Poliphili*', *Word & Image*, 14/1, January–June 1998, pp. 3–4.
20. Francesco Colonna, *Hyperotomachia Poliphili: The Strife of Love in a Dream*, translated by Joscelyn Godwin (London: Thames & Hudson, 1999), pp. 35–36.
21. Juhani Pallasmaa, *The Eyes of the Skin: Architecture and the Senses* (London: Academy Editions, 1996), p. 48.
22. In his *The Villa d'Este at Tivoli* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960), p. 40, David Coffin notes that: 'During the deadly hot Roman summers the gardens of the Villa d'Este were to bathe all one's senses, visual, aural, and tactile, with the refreshment of water'. See also his brief comments on p. 39.
23. Cited in Anatole Tchikine, 'Giochi d'acqua: Water Effects in Renaissance and Baroque Italy', *Studies in the History of Gardens and Designed Landscapes*, 30/1, January–March 2010, p. 63.
24. Ibid., p. 66.
25. Giorgio Vasari, *The Lives of the Painters, Sculptors and Architects*, Vol. 3, edited by William Gaunt (London: Dent, 1963), p. 172. See Tchikine, 'Giochi d'acqua', for numerous other examples.
26. See Webster Smith, 'Pratolino', *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 20/4, p. 167.
27. Michel Eyquem de Montaigne, *Montaigne's Travel Journal*, translated by Donald M. Frame (San Francisco: North Point Press, 1983), p. 64.
28. For Bosse, see Elizabeth Hyde, *Cultivated Power: Flowers, Culture, and Politics in the Reign of Louis XIV* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), p. 9.
29. Vasari, *Lives*, Vol. 3, p. 170.
30. Bakhtin, *Rabelais*, pp. 370–371.
31. According to Vasari: 'From the mouth of Antaeus water issues in a great quantity, instead of his spirit'. *Lives*, Vol. 3, p. 173.
32. Discussed in David Coffin, 'Pirro Ligorio on the Nobility of the Arts', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 27, 1964, p. 199.
33. Tchikine, 'Giochi d'acqua', p. 63.
34. Noted in J. Scott, *Salvator Rosa: His Life and Times* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995), p. 50. (The text was written under a pseudonym — Perlone Zipole, which is an anagram of Lorenzo Lippi.)
35. *The Meaning of Gardens*, edited by Mark Francis and Randolph T. Hester, Jr. (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1990), p. 4.
36. See Lazzaro, *Renaissance Garden*, p. 27.
37. Coffin, *Villa d'Este*, p. 38.
38. Claudia Lazzaro, 'Gendered Nature and its Representation in Sixteenth-Century Garden Sculpture', in *Looking at Italian Renaissance Sculpture*, edited by Sarah Blake McHam (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 249. See also her 'Politicizing a National Garden Tradition: The Italianness of the Italian Garden', in *Donatello Among the Blackshirts: History and Modernity in the Visual Culture of Fascist Italy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005), pp. 157–169.
39. Lazzaro, 'Gendered Nature', p. 249.
40. R. W. Darré, 'Marriage Laws and the Principles of Breeding', in *Nazi Ideology before 1933*, ed. Barbara Miller Lane and Leila J. Rupp (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1978), p. 115. Discussed in Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and Ambivalence* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991), p. 27.
41. For Bonfadio and the concept of the 'three natures' in general, see John Dixon Hunt's publications: 'Paragone in Paradise: Translating the Garden', *Comparative Criticism*, 18, 1996, pp. 55–70, and *Greater Perfections: The Practice of Garden Theory* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), pp. 53–54. See also my forthcoming chapters on 'Design' and 'Meaning' in *A Cultural History of Gardens*, Vol. 3, edited by Elizabeth Hyde (Oxford and New York: Berg, 2011).
42. See Lazzaro, *Renaissance Garden*, p. 9.
43. Ibid., p. 61.
44. Carlo Ginzburg, 'Montaigne, Cannibals and Grottoes', *History and Anthropology*, 6/2–3, 1993, p. 135.
45. Quoted in ibid., p. 130.
46. Georges Canguilhem, 'Monstrosity and the Monstrous', in *The Body: A Reader*, edited by Mariam Fraser and Monica Greco (London and New York: Routledge, 2005), p. 192.
47. Ibid., p. 187.
48. Ibid. Canguilhem's point recalls Bakhtin's claim that in grotesque realism, 'all that is bodily becomes grandiose, exaggerated, immeasurable'. Bakhtin, *Rabelais*, p. 19.
49. Canguilhem, 'Monstrosity', p. 187.
50. Ibid., p. 188.
51. Quoted in Lorraine Daston and Katherine Park, *Wonders and the Order of Nature, 1150–1750* (New York: Zone Books, 2001), p. 177.
52. Paré's treatise has been translated into English by Janis L. Pallister as *On Monsters and Marvels* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1982). See pp. 3–4 for the 'causes'.
53. Jean Céard, *La Nature et les prodiges* (Geneva: Droz, 1977).
54. Paré, *On Monsters*, p. 107, and p. 125.
55. The best discussion of the concept of *fantasia* in cinquecento art theory, is in David Summers, *Michelangelo and the Language of Art* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), p. 103ff.

56. See Rensselaer Lee, 'Ut Pictura Poesis: The Humanistic Theory of Painting', *Art Bulletin*, xxii/4, December 1940, pp. 197–229, for the classic account of Horace's much-quoted dictum.
57. Quoted and translated in John F. Moffitt, 'An Exemplary Humanist Hybrid: Vasari's "Fraude" with Reference to Bronzino's "Sphinx"', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 49/2, Summer 1996, p. 316.
58. Quoted and translated in Summers, *Michelangelo*, pp. 135–136.
59. Coffin, 'Nobility', p. 200.
60. Ibid.
61. Edmund Wilson, *The Devils*, p. 203.
62. John Ruskin, *The Stones of Venice* (London: Collins, 1960), p. 236. See Paulette Singley, 'Devouring Architecture', *Assemblage*, 32, April 1997, pp. 108–125, for a useful discussion of this passage.
63. Ruskin, *Stones*, p. 238.
64. For Basil's view, see John Prest, *The Garden of Eden: The Botanic Garden and the Recreation of Paradise* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), p. 18. For Polybius and Philostratus, see Erwin Panofsky, 'Et in Arcadia Ego: Poussin and the Elegiac Tradition', in *Meaning in the Visual Arts* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1955), p. 343.
65. The Classical literary ideal of the *locus amoenus* is familiar from the works of Homer, Theocritus and Virgil. The notion became a standard *topos* of Renaissance evocations of real and ideal gardens, much used for example by Bartolomeo Taegio in his *La villa. Un dialogo* (1559). See Raffaella Fabiani Giannetto, 'Writing the Garden in the Age of Humanism: Petrarch and Boccaccio', *Studies in the History of Gardens and Designed Landscapes*, 23/3, 2003, pp. 213–257. For Taegio, see Thomas Edward Beck, 'A Critical Edition of Bartolomeo Taegio's "La Villa"', PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2001. Beck's study will be published in 2011 in the University of Pennsylvania Press series *Penn Studies in Landscape Architecture*.
66. Isabella Barisi, Marcello Fagiolo and Maria Luisa Madonna, *Villa d'Este* (Rome: De Luca Editori d'Arte, 2003), p. 92.
67. Frith, 'Sexuality and Politics', p. 304.
68. *Metamorphoses*, 4, pp. 373–379.
69. Bakhtin, *Rabelais*, p. 25.
70. Peter Stallybrass and Allon White, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (London: Methuen, 1986), p. 58.
71. Discussed by Erwin Panofsky in *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art* (London: Paladin, 1970), p. 10.
72. Peter Gay, *Weimar Culture: The Outsider as Insider* (London: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 33.