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fig. 1 Fra Filippo Lippi (Italian, ca. 1406–1469). Portrait of a Woman with a Man at a Casement, ca. 1440–44. Tempera on wood, 25 1/4 × 16 1/2 in. (64.1 × 41.9 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1889 (89.15.19)
Fra Filippo Lippi (ca. 1406–1469) painted *Portrait of a Woman with a Man at a Casement* about 1440–44 (fig. 1). A highly prized work in The Metropolitan Museum of Art, the panel is one of the oldest surviving independent portraits in Florentine art, and its innovations are as numerous as its interpretation is complex. By the time Lippi took on the commission, he was a worldly Carmelite friar and priest in his mid-thirties, living outside his monastery of Santa Maria del Carmine and competing in Florence as a professional painter. In this earliest-known Italian double portrait, he apposed conventional profile views of a male and a female sitter and located them in an interior provided with a window overlooking an inviting street scene featuring dwellings flanked by enclosed gardens. The illumination from the left underscores Lippi’s self-conscious artistry. By casting a shadow of the man’s profile on the back casement, he makes conspicuous
reference to Pliny the Elder’s account of the origin of painting, which the Roman writer situated in the tracing of a lover’s shadow on a wall. Although extensive commentary abounds on these and many other aspects of Lippi’s composition, there is one element that has been largely overlooked: the distinctive gesture of the man’s hands. This article proposes that the gesture is crucial to a full understanding of the work.

Lippi’s romantic allusion to Pliny is one among several cues to the nuptial theme of the painting, which has been interpreted variously as presenting a courting couple, a young bride and her spouse or other relative, or as celebrating the birth of a child. The woman’s sumptuous dress in the French fashion and her luxurious jewelry and finger rings conform to characteristic bridal gifts of the period. Pride in patrician lineage and its perpetuation through marriage are indicated by the coat of arms under the man’s hands. The insignia has been identified tentatively with the Scolari family of Florence and indicates that the painting possibly refers to the marriage of Lorenzo di Ranieri Scolari and Angiola di Bernardo Sapiti, or, as proposed more recently, to the wedding of Francesca di Matteo Scolari and Bonaccorso di Luca Pitti, which took place by October 1444. The chivalric motto Lealtà (loyalty), embroidered in gold and pearls on the woman’s sleeve, fits the amatory and genealogical themes, as does a verse in the Song of Songs (2:9) that has been proposed as the model for the man’s gaze through the casement. (The verse describes the male lover as “looking through the windows, looking through the lattices.”) The long Christian tradition of interpreting the erotic sacred poem as a celebration of the mystical marriage of Christ to either the Church, the human soul, or Mary establishes its nuptial associations.

Lippi’s double portrait has been viewed as depicting the literary motif of a lover gazing upon his beloved at a window, but since neither figure appears to look directly at the other, this interpretation is problematic. Recognizing that the woman and the man occupy different planes in the picture’s depth and that their gazes are on different horizontal levels and do not appear to meet, scholars have tried to explain the sitters’ spatial and psychological independence. Jeffrey Ruda suggested the painting might be a posthumous commemoration of the woman; Sixten Ringbom saw the influence of manuscript dedication pages, in which highborn subjects were traditionally portrayed enframed in windows; and Christina Neilson proposed that the figures’ nonmeeting eyes allude to the courtly concept of unrequited desire. Lippi was not always precise when directing his figures’ gazes, however—the object of their focus is sometimes hard to tell. Therefore it is uncertain whether the couple’s glances result from the innovative pairing of conventional profile portraits, the subjects of which typically stare straight ahead, or if the glances are meant to be perceived as somehow meeting in a modest and courtly way, perhaps with the aim of putting the bride on a chivalric pedestal. It is also possible that the figures’ gazes were intended not to meet.

The figural placement and ambiguity of the spatial construction, which provides no clear explanation for where the man stands and appears too cramped for either figure, must be intentional. Rather than providing a factual depiction of a constructable locale, Lippi merely suggests a domestic interior—the camera of the lady—for his setting. As Keith Christiansen has noted, the artist “subverts the geometry of perspectival space in favor of a subjective realm.” Moreover, by omitting physiognomic detail, Lippi generalized the sitters to a degree that diminishes their individuality and transforms them into idealized subjects who seem to participate in a symbolic drama approaching allegory. In
Megan Holmes’s words, “They present a visual discourse on female virtues valued by Florentine patrician society—beauty, piety, chastity, fidelity, fertility, and lofty social status.”

Christiansen proposed that Lippi adopted the boxlike space and sharply foreshortened perspective of his composition from representations of the Madonna and Child. More compelling is Luke Syson’s observation that the artist incorporated formal conventions of contemporary Annunciation scenes into the work.

Indeed, although its secular nature is clear, the painting shares a number of iconographic features with depictions of the Annunciation. While the religious scenes typically present the moment of divine impregnation, it seems reasonable to assume, based on the social expectations of the time, that Lippi’s young bride may aspire to become or may already be pregnant. In the manner of Lippi’s own closely contemporary Annunciation altarpieces in the Basilica di San Lorenzo, Florence, and the Galleria Nazionale d’Arte Antica in Rome (fig. 2), the Metropolitan Museum’s picture includes the inside-outside compositional structure of Mary’s private chamber, the bridal thalamus virginis. Like the Annunciation painting in Rome, it features a prominent female protagonist seen against an exterior setting. The Annunciation’s outdoor space is the frequently represented enclosed garden, symbolic of Mary’s chaste fertility, while the portrait presents an elevated view of a verdant street scene with walls and vegetation that suggest urban domestic gardens. In both, a subordinate male figure (the Latin word angelus is masculine) intrudes into the woman’s private space from the left but remains visually separated from her—by architectural or furnishing motifs.

Syson aptly recognized the male figure in the Metropolitan’s portrait as a “quasi-Gabriel”: like the announcing angel, he is secondary to the elaborately dressed young woman, but he is instrumental in the narrative. Examination of the painting with infrared reflectography shows that this figure was planned from the beginning to have an interlocutory role. His function, like the winged messenger’s, was to be signaled by a dynamic gesture that, in the man’s case, Lippi moved from its initial placement just below the chin to its final location on the coat of arms. That the painter carefully rethought and adjusted each figure’s hands in the double portrait underscores the importance they had for him. The woman’s hands have been described as fitting to her air of “demure self-possession,” while the male’s more active and distinctive gesture, located so prominently on the coat of arms, has been characterized variously as “authoritative,” “resting,” and “gesticulating.”

Ringbom asserted that within the tradition of manuscript dedication pages, the architectural framing around the man would indicate that he is of higher social standing than the woman, and thus that his gesture signifies command rather than love. Two years later, Dieter Jansen took the opposite view. He identified the young woman as a duchess and suggested that, with the gift of this painting, the lower-status male was conferring upon her a pictorial homage or secular votive offering.

Although Jansen failed to win support for his identification of the sitters, he did recognize the visual importance of the man’s hands and correctly characterized them as Hörnern (homed hands). However, since he understood horned hands solely as a derisive symbol of marital infidelity, or cuckoldry, he felt it necessary to dismiss his initial identification of the gesture as wholly inappropriate for a marriage picture and instead pursued a complicated, unpersuasive interpretation.

The male subject’s right hand does present a discreet version of the ancient mano cornuta, or horned-hand gesture, with the index and little fingers extended and the middle and ring fingers bent down (fig. 3). The fingers of the left hand are posed in similar fashion, but with the thumb showing and the tips of the middle and ring fingers resting on the heraldic shield. Still widely used today as a symbol with multiple meanings, the mano cornuta dates from ancient times, as attested by its appearance in Greek, Etruscan, and Roman art.

Quintilian, in his Institutio Oratoria (11.3.93) of the late first century A.D., described a rhetorical gesture with the same finger configuration. He wrote that, when used by speakers pleading a case, it produced a more vehement effect than the more common gesture made by pressing the ring finger under the thumb and extending the other three fingers. While the orator asserted that every gesture “obeys the impulse of the mind” and “that there are many things which [a gesture] can express without the assistance of words,” he did not explain why the two-finger gesture was more assertive than the three-finger one, or why he considered the two-finger version inappropriate for use in the introductions of speeches and in statements of fact. Presumably, Quintilian’s audience was familiar with the mano cornuta and the connotations that would have made it appropriate in one context and not in another—meanings most likely drawn from the gesture’s use in everyday life. Thomas Richter suggested in his study of the two-finger gesture in Roman art that it was precisely the rhetorical gesture’s close resemblance to the apotropaic corna (horns) that made it both more emphatic and less

**fig. 3** The mano cornuta, or horned-hand gesture
useful, since the horned hand’s function of warding off evil made it more appropriate for use in sepulchral art, where it appeared most frequently.33

Like horns in general, what is now called the mano cornuta, or le corna, had erotic associations and may have developed from images of phallic horns in Greek and Roman art.34 As an emblem of fertility, the male member was one of the most powerful apotropaic motifs in antiquity for warding off the danger of the evil eye—the envious gaze that was believed to cause harm. Representations of the phallus and other defensive symbols, such as the Medusa head, were commonly employed in Roman times on rings and amulet pendants, as tintinnabula in houses, and on doorjamb carvings.35 Indeed, the evil eye, or oculus fascinus, refers to an eye “that has the power of bewitching or enchanting persons glanced at.”36 But the Latin word fascinus had a double meaning: it could signify a malicious fascination or the penis itself. The proper name Fascinus was given to the spirit of the phallus, while a fascinum could be a spell, the male member, or a phallic-shaped protective amulet.37

By the sixth century B.C., the related mano cornuta was employed by the Etruscans as a prophylactic in tomb art and on cinerary urns (fig. 4).38 It was possibly used for a similar purpose in theatrical performances in ancient Rome.39 A first-century design of a satyr waving his horned hand inspired a similar motif on the Martelli Mirror, attributed to the goldsmith Caradosso and probably produced in Mantua or Milan about 1500 (see fig. 13).40 The satyr design must have enjoyed popularity in antiquity, since it survived into the Renaissance and beyond in various media, as exemplified by a carved gem formerly in Florence, a metal relief, and a terracotta lamp now in the Ashmolean Museum of Art and Archaeology, University of Oxford (fig. 5).41

The rhetorical lineage of the horned-hand gesture and its reputed magical potency for repelling evil and promoting well-being apparently led to its adoption as a gesture of blessing, divine protection, and approbation in Byzantine religious liturgy and Byzantine-influenced art.42 In these contexts, it has sometimes been called the Syrian blessing.43 The mano cornuta appeared in religious settings from the sixth century at the latest, as seen in The Hand of God Blessing the Offerings of Abel and Melchisedec (fig. 6) and The Evangelist Luke, mosaics at San Vitale in Ravenna.44 In numerous works, the gesture is used by Saint John the Baptist as he points to Christ, echoing the emphatic effect of the mano cornuta in Roman oratory (fig. 7). The gesture in the Saint John images suggests approbation and blessing and, in the example illustrated here (John originally pointed to a Madonna and Child, now missing), also draws attention to the words Ecce Agnus Dei (Behold the Lamb of God) written on the Baptist’s scroll.

The mano cornuta was employed in secular productions also. On the nine silver David Plates from Cyprus that were presumably produced at the court of the emperor Heraclius in Constantinople in the early seventh century, the gesture carries a variety
of nuanced meanings. The plate depicting the Marriage of David and Michal (fig. 8), which Lippi could not have known, anticipates the Renaissance painter’s use of the horned hand in a nuptial context. There, in a joyful setting with musicians, the figure of King Saul directs the gesture toward his daughter Michal, who joins her right hand with David’s in the ceremonial dextrarum iunctio (clasping of right hands) modeled on Roman imperial weddings depicted on coins and medallions. The use of the gesture by the bride’s father in a marriage ritual bespeaks blessing and protection directed her way, yet the phallic symbolism of the mano cornuta is in play, too. After defeating Goliath, David was ordered to bring King Saul the foreskins of one hundred dead Philistines in order to win the hand of Michal; the young warrior brought two hundred instead. The plate’s amatory iconography includes the musicians’ flutes—wind instruments with ancient associations of passion, sexuality, and inebriation.

By the later Middle Ages, the phallic symbolism of the mano cornuta was apparent even in artworks made for Christian religious contexts. The biblical Ham, for instance, was occasionally portrayed using the emphatic gesture to mock his father’s nudity in scenes of the Drunkenness of Noah, such as those in the twelfth-century mosaics of the Palatine Chapel in Palermo (fig. 9) and the frescoes of Saint-Savin-sur-Gartempe. In Palermo, Ham’s actions are accompanied by the nonbiblical inscription HIC OSTENDIT CHAM VERENDA PATRIS EBRII FRATRIBUS (Here Cham shows off to his brothers the private parts of his drunken father), anticipating the taunting tone of sixteenth-century cuckoldry scenes.

The horned-hand gesture depicted in the Metropolitan Museum picture is the first-known early-modern pictorial presentation of the mano cornuta in a secular setting. The bridal-chamber context suggests that Lippi was aware of the gesture’s dual prophylactic and erotic associations. Horn-related metaphors were part of ancient sexual vocabulary passed down through the ages and current in Italy in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Verbal metaphors and humor involving horns, particularly in connection with cuckoldry, were common from Boccaccio onward. Vespasiano da Bisticci recounted in his life of Cosimo de’ Medici that
While verbal and visual references to horns and the horned hand were often featured in popular and humorous treatments of the relations between the sexes and marital infidelity, the appearance of the mano cornuta in Lippi’s painting demonstrates the survival of the gesture’s earlier, more positive associations with protection against the evil eye. Throughout the Mediterranean world, the power of the jealous gaze to bewitch and cause harm was as much feared in the early modern era as it was in antiquity. The evil eye is present in both the Old and New Testaments, was discussed by the early Church Fathers, and was dreaded throughout the Middle Ages, inspiring remedies to counteract its baleful effects. By some accounts, belief in the evil eye was universal in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Italy.
fig. 9  The Drunkenness of Noah. Byzantine, mid–12th century. Mosaic. Palatine Chapel, Palermo

fig. 10  The King of the Goats: A Satire on Cuckolds. Florentine, ca. 1470–90. Engraving, 7 × 9 7/8 in. (178 × 25 cm). Albertina, Vienna (DG1935/485)
Lippi’s familiarity with the mano cornuta and the contemporary faith in its power to avert malign forces is attested by his use of it in a second, more conspicuous, and personal portrait. In the frescoes he painted in the cathedral of Spoleto—his last work, nearly completed before he died—Lippi portrayed himself standing at the foot of the Virgin’s bier in the scene of the Dormition and Assumption of the Virgin (fig. 11). Ruda rightly pointed out that the artist’s image there functions as both a visible signature and a kind of a donor portrait, indicating his pride of authorship. Yet even though Lippi’s self-portrait is fully frontal and his figure nearly as prominent as that of the recumbent Virgin, his gaze, far from exhibiting confident artistic pride, is emphatically averted to his right, precluding eye contact with spectators in the nave before him. He grasps his Carmelite habit with his right hand, using a mano cornuta gesture aimed downward, like a suspended amulet, and points to it with his left index finger so that no viewer should miss it. It is not known from whose gaze Lippi sought protection, but it can be assumed that there were artists who envied his success. Documentation exists of one such painter, Domenico Veneziano, who decades earlier, in 1438, had asked Lippi’s patron Piero di Cosimo de’ Medici for a portion of one of Lippi’s commissions.

From the wary look on Lippi’s face in his self-portrait, there may have been others, too, who wished him harm. He was a difficult personality and transgressive in both his business and amorous affairs. Stories about Lippi’s enemies must have come down to Giorgio Vasari, who suggested in both the 1550 and 1568 editions of his biography of the artist that Lippi was fatally poisoned by angry relatives of a woman he had seduced.

The horned-hand gesture in the Museum’s panel is more discreet than the one in Lippi’s self-portrait, yet its placement on the coat of arms draws attention to it. Although no known Renaissance text describes the mano cornuta and its meanings, Andrea de Jorio’s early nineteenth-century analysis of contemporary usage of horn gestures and the persistence of their ancient connotations—in particular, their protective function—is a useful interpretive guide.

According to de Jorio, waving with the horned-hand gesture, perhaps in the manner of the satyr on the ancient oil lamp (fig. 5), was considered a defense against a generalized threat of “fascination” from an unknown source. The gesture could also be directed toward a threatened individual and even point to specific parts of the body of a person in danger of bewitchment.

The male figure in Lippi’s painting enters the woman’s private space and faces in her general direction without meeting her gaze, perhaps, as in Lippi’s self-portrait in Spoleto, to avoid the harm that eye contact might cause. He gesticulates, pointing at the level of the woman’s chest and waist in the manner of King Saul on the David Plate (fig. 8). Displayed conspicuously to ward off danger, the gesture blesses and protects the family lineage, symbolized by the heraldic arms, and the continuity of that lineage, as embodied by the beautiful young woman who is the focus of the man’s action. Simultaneously, the sexual associations of the horned hand invoke the masculine generative force necessary for a fertile union and energize the space itself as a site of procreation within the honorable and chaste context of marriage.

Young women, pregnant mothers, children, male potency, engaged couples, and newlyweds were from ancient times considered to be most vulnerable to attacks of fascination by envious and malicious glances and to require defensive words, rituals, amulets, or gestures to avoid injury. The poet Angelo Poliziano conveyed his contemporaries’ anxiety over Envy’s demonic power when in 1473 he wrote that Invidia/Nemesis cast a “fierce look” on the beautiful, soon-to-be-married Florentine maiden Albiera degli Albizzi before calling...
upon Fever to infect her with the illness that carried her away at the age of fifteen. Lippi depicted a similarly youthful figure with beautiful features and sumptuous attire—attributes likely to attract admiration but also capable of arousing envy. Together, the woman’s traits make her an ideal bride of the time and worthy of such a splendid portrayal. As the verdant streetscape suggests, the young woman’s fertility and the fecundity promised by the meeting of the female and male life forces invoked in the painting are at the heart of the work’s message.

Great importance was placed on marriage and fertility in the generations following the Black Death, when the population of Florence declined from about 120,000 in the 1330s to an estimated 37,000 by the late 1420s. It is not surprising that a nuptial portrait of a young woman from this time should feature a discreetly phallic gesture intended as a defense against evil. Ancient popular beliefs in the power of phallic images to ward off “fascination” by the evil eye and to ensure fertility had been passed down to the Renaissance by multiple sources, including Saint Augustine’s City of God (7.21), in which the author, aiming to deride the nature mysteries of Liber Pater, the Roman Bacchus, quoted the Roman scholar Marcus Terentius Varro:

> It was obligatory for the most respected mother of a family to place a crown on this disreputable organ in full view of the public. This was how Liber had to be placated to ensure successful germination of seed; this was how the Evil Eye (fascinatio) had to be repelled from the fields.

Pagan fertility practices such as the one described above persisted in the Christian Middle Ages. During this period, high infant and maternal mortality was combated with relief carvings of male and female genitalia on civic fountains, such as those from the thirteenth-century in Siena and Massa Marittima. Still visible on the walls of Massa Marittima’s Fonte dell’ Abbondanza is a painting from that time showing young maidens gathering phallus-shaped fruits from the branches of a fertility tree. The encouragement of procreation implicit in these works also lies behind diverse fertility-related motifs in early fifteenth-century Florentine domestic art, among them, male infants urinating on poppy-seed pods and idealized, nearly nude figures of young men and women painted on the undersides of the lids of cassoni (marriage chests) (fig. 12). Throughout fifteenth-century Italy, infants and even images of the Christ Child were provided with sacred and profane magical objects, including branches of red coral, much as, according to Pliny, infants and young children in ancient Rome had been adorned with necklaces bearing phallic-shaped amulets or branches of coral to protect them from the evil eye.

The content of Portrait of a Woman with a Man at a Case­ment is essentially the same as that of the late fifteenth-century Martelli Mirror case, mentioned above, the rich iconographic program of which is relevant to this discussion (fig. 13). Themes of love and courtship have dominated mirror decoration throughout history, and the imagery of the Martelli Mirror case, long recognized as symbolizing fecundity and procreation, is consistent with this tradition. The iconography, inspired by classical art and mythology, has been most comprehensively explicated by John Pope-Hennessy and Dieter Blume. The relief features an elderly satyr facing a younger nymph before a setting suggestive of Bacchic nature mysteries. (Its elements include arching branches heavily laden with grapevines and a walled garden protected by an ithyphallic Priapus herm.) As full participants in the rites of Bacchus, the ancient sylvan divinity, both figures
wear ivy crowns and goatskin garments, and each is accompanied by a thyrsus staff. The nymph expresses milk from her exposed breast into a rhyton-shaped vessel while the satyr looks upward, extending a cup toward the nymph with his right hand and waving his left hand, with its conspicuous mano cornuta gesture. The iconography is succinctly summed up in the Latin inscription NATURE FOVET QUAE NECESRITAS URGET (Nature supports what necessity demands) on the tabula ansata (tablet) at the bottom of the composition. According to both Pope-Hennessy and Blume, the female and male figures personify Nature and Necessity, respectively. The lactating nymph is a visual metaphor for the nurturing role of Natura as a cosmic power. The satyr, whose advanced age reveals him to be Silenus, tutor of Bacchus, symbolizes instinctual lust and male sexuality as well as knowledge of the hidden secrets of nature. Together, the figures personify the necessary compulsion for reproduction embodied in the workings of natural law.

While the mano cornuta in the Martelli Mirror is part of a more stylistically and thematically evolved iconographic program than the one in Lippi’s painting, the gesture serves the same purpose in both works: to celebrate and protect from the evil eye the reproductive powers of the figures represented. But whereas the danger is only implied by the male subject’s hands in Lippi’s work, it is palpable on the mirror case. Unrecognized until now, Invidia is personified by the hideous, raging figure located just above the inscribed tablet, where she appears emaciated, glaring with angry eyes, and crowned with snake-like, disheveled hair. Her features conform closely to those assigned to Envy and her Greek male counterpart Phthonos in ancient literary narratives, notably Ovid’s vivid account of the hag and her foul lair in the Metamorphoses (2.760–805). Of all the vices, Invidia was the one most closely identified with witches.

Caradosso’s menacing creature was more immediately inspired by visual sources, such as two glowering portrayals of Invidia by Andrea Mantegna. In the artist’s engraving Battle of the Sea Gods, from the 1480s (fig. 14), the screaming crone with withered breasts stands at the left and directs her fierce gaze to the right, her wild hair bound by a fillet, as on Caradosso’s mirror case. About a quarter century later, Mantegna imagined a more frontal and fully clothed version of the figure in his drawing The Calumny of Apelles (fig. 15), a design that was soon disseminated in an engraving by Girolamo Mocetto.

Inspired by such renderings, Caradosso distilled his Invidia on the mirror case into an iconic figure embodying a terrifying presence. Moreover, his image functions in two seemingly contradictory ways, for it not only embodies the self-destructive nature of Envy and the danger of the evil eye but also serves as an amulet that neutralizes their threats. Invidia’s presence and role closely parallel those of the Gorgon head mounted at the top of the mirror case. There, as a well-established model for the staring Invidia, Medusa’s decapitated visage rages with open mouth, furrowed brow, and streaming hair. In classical antiquity the Gorgonion, or Gorgon image, was thought to be the
fig. 14 Andrea Mantegna (Italian, 1430/31–1506). Battle of the Sea Gods (left portion of a frieze), ca. 1485–88. Engraving, 10 7/8 × 16 7/8 in. (27.6 × 42.9 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund, 1918 (18.12)

most effective amulet against fascination. While a direct glimpse of Medusa’s face was believed to petrify beholders and spread contagion, her mask or other likeness was considered a defense against her destructive powers, epitomizing the principle of fighting fire with fire. In the Martelli Mirror, the satyr’s mano cornuta and the heads of Invidia and the Gorgon are apotropaic images intended to oppose the power of the malocchio (evil eye). Together, they provided a powerful magical defense against the demonic forces of envy whenever the mirror’s owner chose to observe her own beauty in its reflective surface.

As argued in this article, the symbolic content of Fra Filippo Lippi’s Portrait of a Woman with a Man at a Casement is remarkably similar to, if iconographically less explicit than, that of the Martelli Mirror. Both works celebrate human fertility and reproduction and register the need to protect this fecundity from dangers believed to threaten it. The two compositions’ parallel content and the precedent in the David Plate support the interpretation of the Metropolitan Museum’s panel presented here. Lippi, rather than employing an overt allegory of natural philosophy featuring classically inspired mythological characters, merged the particular and the allegorical by idealizing his young Florentine sitters. Instead of an elaborate, humanist-inspired Latin inscription suited to a learned iconographic program, Lippi incorporated the single, vernacular word Lealtà and subtly exploited conventions of marriage portraiture to reinforce his theme of love and lineage. To embody human fertility and natural fecundity, he depicted not a lusty satyr and bare-breasted wood nymph, but a beautiful young woman dressed in her wedding finery, perhaps already married and possibly pregnant yet modest, framed against a view of a verdant, everyday street scene. To ward off the risk posed by a demonic gaze, Lippi inserted a discreet form of the protective and generative mano cornuta. He placed it at a critical juncture between the two protagonists so that it would not be missed as the animating fulcrum on which the full range of the painting’s meanings pivot. As another of Lippi’s innovations in this remarkable picture, the central importance of the gesture is finally evident.
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NOTES

4 Pliny the Elder, Natural History 35.5; see Rubin 2011, p. 17.
7 Holmes 1999, p. 129; Brown 2001, p. 106; Christiansen 2005, p. 150; Edwards 2008, p. 255; and, most recently, Katalin Prajda (2013, pp. 76, 78), who states: “Although the male sitter rests his hands on the coat of arms, his gesture may well symbolize that a Pitti has gained access to the Scollarì family’s noble lineage.” Since there is no indication of Pitti heraldry in the painting, Prajda’s proposal that the extremely rich and powerful Medici supporter Luca di Bonaccorso Pitti may have commissioned the painting to celebrate the wedding of his son Bonaccorso to Francesca Scollarì is doubtful. Keith Christiansen (2011, p. 98) argues persuasively against the alternative proposed by Dieter Jansen (1987–88, p. 97).
8 For the motto Lealtà, see Christiansen 2011, p. 96. For the male figure’s association with the Song of Songs, see Baldwin 1986b, pp. 7–12.
9 For Song of Songs interpretations, see Astell 1990, pp. 1–27.
11 Holmes 1999, p. 115; Christiansen 2005, p. 150; Christiansen 2011, p. 98.
13 Observed by Alison Luchs, email to the author, August 30, 2014. See also Baldwin 1986b, pp. 8–11. For nuances of meaning of gazing couples in portrait sculpture, see Luchs 1995, pp. 82–87.
14 For discussions of the constructed space and its problems, see Christiansen 2011, p. 96.
15 Christiansen 2005, p. 152.
17 Christiansen 2011, p. 96.
19 Woods-Marsden (2001, pp. 65–66) describes the young woman as a newlywed, “no longer a virgin, she has not yet been categorized as a matron.”
20 Syson 2006, p. 98.
21 Ibid.
22 Brown 2001, p. 106; Christiansen 2011, p. 98.
23 Christiansen 2011, p. 98.
24 Ibid.: “the artist carefully rethought the placement of the woman’s hands, one over the other, to achieve an effect of demure self-possession, as was thought befitting a woman.”
25 The pose of the man’s hands is characterized as “authoritative” in Ruda 1993, p. 385, no. 16; as “resting” in Brown 2001, p. 106; and as “gesticulating” in Edwards 2008, p. 255.
28 For arguments against Jansen’s identification of the sitters, see Christiansen 2011, p. 96. For his identification of the horned-hands gesture, see Jansen 1987–88, pp. 107–9.
30 Given the marital context of the Metropolitan’s painting, similar gestures employed earlier for numerical and alphabetic systems do not appear relevant here. See Kusukawa 2000, pp. 28–33, and Alföldi-Rosenbaum 1971.
31 According to Gerald Wainwright (1961), the gesture first appeared in ancient Egypt. See also Gravel 1995, p. 109; de Grummond 1996, p. 358, fig. 26; and especially Elliott 2015 and Elliott 2016, pp. 183–88. The gesture appeared as early as 520 B.C. in the Tomb of the Lionesses in Tarquinia, where its ritual function is not fully understood; see Pallottino 1955, p. 134 and fig. 14. The gesture occurs on approximately ten percent of the nearly six hundred Etruscan recumbent effigy urns catalogued by Mauro Cristofani and Gabriele Cateni (1975–86), much more commonly with depictions of males than females. The entry for every urn with the gesture includes a description of the recumbent figure’s horned hands as some variation on “le dite piegate nel gesto apotropaco” (the fingers bent in the apotropaic gesture).
32 Quintilian 1968, vol. 4, pp. 279, 293.
35 Johns 1982, pp. 61–63; Dunbabin and Dickie 1983, p. 31. M. Smith 2002, p. 98. See also Hammond and Scullard 1970, p. 466: “The most common magical gesture [to avert the evil eye] was to hold the hand so as to imitate the pudenda of one or the other sex.” For the Medusa head, see Siebers 1983, pp. 11, and Elliott 2016, pp. 244–48. For a horn-shaped phallic amulet, see Engemann 1980, pl. 4, c. d.
36 Gordon 1937, p. 290.
37 Callisen 1937, p. 453; Siebers 1983, p. 99; Gravel 1995, p. 129. Pliny the Elder (Natural History 28.39) records that phallic amulets were placed on babies and hung underneath the chariots of triumphant generals to protect them from envy (invidia). Ogden 2002, p. 225.
38 See discussion of Cristofani and Cateni in note 31 above. For the Etruscan urn in Volterra, see de Grummond 1996, p. 358, fig. 26. Leonard Moss and Stephen Cappannari (1976, p. 5) assert: “Forces of evil continued to plague one after death, and counter-magic against the evil eye was invoked by horning the fingers of the figurines sculpted on the sarcophagi and cinerary urns.”
39 For a fresco from Herculaneum showing an actor displaying the gesture, see Webster 1995, vol. 2, p. 410, no. SNP 5b; Savere se 2007, p. 86; and Pisani Sartorio 2010, p. 230, fig. 17. Eric Csapo (1993, pp. 51–56) raises questions about the conservation and interpretation of the fresco, including the presence of the mano cornuta gesture.
40 Pope-Hennessy 1964, p. 327. For further information on the Martelli Mirror, see https://renbronze.com/2015/01/06/martelli-mirror/.
41 For the cornelian formerly in Florence, see Furtwängler 1900, vol. 2, p. 196, no. 34, and pl. xii, no. 34. For an ancient metal relief with similar design, see Bayardi 1767, p. 416, pl. V. For the Roman terracotta lamp in the Ashmolean Museum of Art and Archaeology, University of Oxford (AN1893.278) (fig. 5), see Fortnum 1894, p. 99, and Leino 2013, pp. 156–57.
42 For the gesture’s use in ancient and medieval art as a sign for speech and for pointing to something, see Engemann 1980, pp. 490–98. Quintilian’s two major gestures for emphasizing points in a speech (11.3.92 and .93) became Christian gestures of blessing: the three-finger gesture remains the blessing gesture of the Greek Orthodox Church. See Pasquinelli 2005, p. 226. For a discussion of when the two-finger gesture used in oratory became a sign of blessing, see Richter 2003, pp. 10, 25, and 151–52.


44 For The Evangelist Luke, see Elworthy 1895, p. 156, figs. 113, 114, and Deichmann 1958, pl. 333.

45 Spier 2007, p. 285, nos. 84A, 84B. For various meanings of the gesture on the plates, see Markow 1988, pp. 2–7.

46 Wander 1973, p. 102, and fig. 18; Markow 1988, p. 5; Spier 2007, p. 285.

47 Deborah Markow (1988, p. 5) interprets the scene as part of Saul’s scheming against David; Ruth Leader (2000, p. 424) argues against such a political interpretation. Josef Engemann (1980, p. 496) interprets the gesture as indicating speech exclusively.

48 1 Kings 18:27: “And after a few days David rose up, and went with the men that were under him, and he slew of the Philistines two hundred men, and brought their foreskins and numbered them out to the king that he might be his son-in-law. Saul therefore gave him Michal his daughter to wife.” Perhaps the two bags in the foreground refer to David’s achievement. For other interpretations, see Leader 2000, p. 415.

49 Winternitz 1967.

50 For the Palatine Chapel mosaic, see Brenk 2010, plates vol. 1, p. 342, pl. 416. For the frescoes of Saint-Savin, see Gaillard 1944, pl. VI. For the works’ derisory content, see also Kötting 1978, col. 900.


52 For medieval humor related to cuckoldry, see Millington and Sinclair 1992. Boccaccio’s first use of sexual metaphor in the Decameron involves horns: the beautiful protagonist Alatiel discovers “con che corno gli uomini cozzano” (the kind of horn that men do their butting with), cited in Barolini 2006, p. 446n18.

53 Cited in Hind 1938–48, vol. 1, p. 73.

54 Ibid., vol. 1, p. 73, and vol. 2, pl. 108.


56 Stewart 1978, pp. 71–75, figs. 43–44, and p. 176, nos. 92, 93, 95.

57 Many accounts of the evil eye are known from Greek and Roman literature. See Seligmann 1910, vol. 1, p. 30; Dunbabin and Dickie 1983, pp. 10–13; Elliott 2015; and Elliott 2016. For visual evidence of fear of the evil eye in both pagan and Christian late antiquity, see Engemann 1975.


62 I thank Jerry de Jaager for calling to my attention Lippi’s gesture in the fresco. Holmes (1999, p. 273n185) had noticed that “this gesture can also be read as an inverted two-finger sign of the ‘corne.’” In addition, Megan Holmes suggests that Lippi points to his right hand as a proud sign of artistic authorship. Eckart Marchand (2004, p. 221) interpreted the horned-hand gesture as protective toward the Virgin Mary.

63 Ruda 1993, p. 29.


66 De Jorio’s La mimica degli antichi investigata nel gestire napole- tano, first published in 1832, was translated with introduction and notes by Adam Kendon in 2000. De Jorio (2000, pp. 142–48) also discusses the use of the mano cornuta in relation to conjugal infidelity, pride, phallic associations, and protection against evil spells in general. In the absence of evidence showing that the mano cornuta was not intended to avert the evil eye in the Renaissance, there is little reason to discount de Jorio’s interpretation. For recent support of de Jorio’s understanding of ancient horn-related gestures as apotropaic and of the persistence of such meanings over time, see Corbeil 2004, pp. 42, 49n32; and Röhrich 1967, pp. 20–24. Relying exclusively on Quintilian’s rhetorical context for the gesture, Josef Engemann (1975) denied for antiquity and the Early Christian period the apotropaic or derivisive significance of the horned-hand gesture, asserting that essentially every ancient and early-medieval use of the horned hand could be interpreted as indicating either speech or a pointing to something (“Rede” or “Hinweis”). Engemann rejected the possibility that the gesture’s meaning is altered by context and suggested that the prophylactic interpretation is a projection onto antiquity and the Middle Ages by de Jorio and all later scholars who accept his interpretations. Markow (1988) questioned Engemann’s conclusions and, using some of the examples he included, suggested that the gesture could convey specific meanings beyond speech and directional indication. John Elliott (2016, pp. 187–88) also contests Engemann.

67 De Jorio 2000, pp. 147–51. The existence in Roman images of a satry “waving the horned hand lends visual evidence supporting de Jorio’s arguments for the continuity of the ancient gesture and its meanings. See note 41 above.

68 Suggested by Alison Luchs, email to the author, August 30, 2014.


70 The allegory of Albiera’s death was the focus of the elegy Poîziano wrote for her betrothed, Sigismondo della Stufa. See the poet’s “Epicedio di Albiera degli Albizi, Promessa Sposa di Sigismondo della Stufa, Rapita da Morte Prematura,” in Bausì 2006, pp. 474–505; see also Luchs 2012. For the “fierce look,” see Bausì 2006, p. 482, lines 89–90: “Vertit in hanc torvos Rhamnusia luminis orbes.” For the identification of Nemesis with Invidia, see Perosa 1946, pp. 81–83.

71 Holmes (1999, p. 129) suggested that the vegetation visible through the window behind the woman symbolizes fertility.

72 Musacchio 1999, p. 32.


74 Hoch 2006, p. 477. For the prevalence of protective sexual and scatological motifs in the Middle Ages, see Mellinkoff 2004, passim.
75 Hoch 2006, p. 477.
76 Pope-Hennessy and Christiansen 1980, p. 9; Baskins et al. 2008, p. 25, and fig. 14; Bayer 2008, pp. 157–59, nos. 71, 72; Musacchio 2008, pp. 38, 44. For the continued use in the Renaissance of phallic imagery to avert the power of the evil eye, see Tal 2006, pp. 139–44.
77 Pliny, *Natural History* 28.39 and 32.11, describes the ancient Roman custom. For protecting children, see Lykiardopoulos 1981, p. 226. For devotional and apotropaic objects including coral, see Aronberg Lavin and Redleaf 1995, p. 13n7; Musacchio 1999, pp. 131–33; and Musacchio 2006, pp. 139–51.
79 For the tradition of amatory themes on mirror cases, see Randall 1997, pp. 70–74. For an early fertility interpretation of the Martelli relief, see Fortnum 1894, p. 99.
81 For the role of Bacchus in ancient fertility belief, see Augustine, *City of God* 7.16: “Liber and Ceres are responsible for seeds, the former in charge of the male, the latter of the female seeds; or else Liber is in command of the liquid part, Ceres of the dry element, in the seeds. . . .”; 7.21: “Liber is the god whom they have put in command of liquid seeds—not only the liquors derived from fruits, among which wine holds, one may say, the primacy, but also the seeds of animals.”
82 Pope-Hennessey (1964, pp. 325–27) describes the satyr’s gesture without naming it the *mano cornuta*, but suggests that the gesture and the satyr’s gaze toward Priapus together indicate that the satyr represents Necessitas. Blume 1985, pp. 182 and 447, no. 146, and Blume 1987, p. 260, name the gesture *le corna* and state that it has a phallic and sexual meaning. Blume (1985, p. 194n50) says that the gesture is used to ward off evil in southern Italy to this day, but appears to dismiss its protective function in the Martelli Mirror case because, according to Ernesto de Martino, the modern concept of Jettatura is a post-Renaissance phenomenon. The discussion of the evil eye in de Martino (1959) 2013, pp. 130–80, seems more concerned with post-Enlightenment attitudes about the individual responsible for the evil eye (the Jettatore) than with any real differences in the casting of the evil eye itself (the Jettatura) and the effects on its victims.
84 Pope-Hennessey 1964, pp. 327–28; Blume 1985, pp. 182 and 447. In his *Saturnalia* (1.19.16–18), Macrobius had already included Necessitas as one of four forces involved with cosmic and human generation. See Nitzsche 1975, pp. 28, 157n23. Bernard Silvestris called Natura the mater generationis in his *Cosmographia* of about 1150; for Jean de Meun, in his part of the *Roman de la Rose*, “Nature, deputy and minister of god, acts then as an intermediary between the eternal and the mutable: she translates the commands of the stars into actions and brings all things to birth.” Nitzsche 1975, pp. 83, 118.
85 Pope-Hennessey 1964, p. 327) described the figure as the mask of an old woman; Blume (1985, p. 447) raised the possibility that she might exemplify the medieval tradition of personifying Natura as an older woman. Phyllis Bober (2000, p. 235) described her as a female head rather than a mask.
86 Shiae 2010, p. 129. See also Dunbabin and Dickie 1983, pp. 16–18.
87 Tal 2006, p. 169.
89 For the Mantegna and Mocetto interpretations of Lucian’s story, see Cast 1981, pp. 55–67, pls. 3, 6. Mantegna transformed the male figure of Phthonos in Lucian’s Greek account, as portrayed by Botticelli, into the Latin female Invidia. See ibid., p. 66n13 and fig. 6. For Invidia wearing a tunic more closed at the neck, Mantegna could have been inspired by Giotto’s depiction of Invidia in the Arena Chapel (Derbes and Sandona 2004, pl. 23).
90 While not as iconic as the image of Envy on the Martelli Mirror case, the engraved *Allegories of Envy* from Venice(?) of about 1470 and by Cristofano Robetta from about 1500–1510 show personifications that are more directly frontal. See Hind 1938–48, vol. 1, p. 250, no. 3, and p. 206, no. 31. For more on Invidia and depictions in sixteenth-century Italy, see G. Smith 1981, pp. 251–59.
91 Siebers 1983, pp. 7–11.
92 Ibid.
93 Ibid.
94 The herm of Priapus, the guardian of gardens (*custos hortorum*), could also be considered an apotropaic image.
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