

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-03392-3 - The Italian Garden: Art, Design and Culture

Edited by John Dixon Hunt

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

MAKING AND WRITING THE ITALIAN GARDEN

JOHN DIXON HUNT

The twentieth-century English reader and amateur has always been well served by publications on Italian gardens. A glance at some of these books can identify the main elements of a modern concern with Italian gardens. To begin in 1903, Edith Wharton's *Italian Villas and their Gardens* sought to identify an ideal scenery that was at once social and spiritual; her impressionistic word-pictures reflected a long ekphrastic tradition in viewing gardens, yet her publishers buttressed those endeavours with photographs and 'evocative' modern paintings by Maxfield Parrish. *Italian Gardens of the Renaissance* (1925), by G. A. Jellicoe and J. C. Shepherd, brought into play sober architectural analysis, along with surveys, elevations and stolid photographic documentation. Georgina Masson's *Italian Gardens* (1961) probably introduced more armchair and later actual travellers to the pleasures and significance of her subject than any other author; there has been little to compare with her learned, intimate and enthusiastic experience of the gardens she rediscovered, researched, described and photographed herself. Most recently and following in an American academic tradition of scholarship in this field (where the names of David R. Coffin and Elisabeth B. MacDougall are clearly prominent) has come Claudia Lazzaro's *The Italian Renaissance Garden* (1990); here conventions of art history collaborate with the publishing resources (including the work of a distinguished professional photographer) that so many books on gardens now seem to elicit.

A study of Lazzaro's documentation will reveal how far research on Italian gardens has come during the twentieth century. And notably it discloses the ever increasing contribution of Italian scholars to their own garden history, the beginnings of which may be dated to Luigi Dami's book, *Il giardino italiano* (1924) and the 1931 *Catalogo della Mostra del Giardino Italiano*, held in Florence.

The advance in Italian garden history studies is not simply the huge increase in both its participants and in the documentation that now exists to sustain their description and analysis, but in positioning garden enthusiasm firmly in academic territory; the two are, of course, closely connected. Though there are many students of gardens and

gardening who decry 'academic' approaches, the territory of garden history has been much augmented and refined precisely by archival research and conceptual inquiry, both of which are pursued (though not exclusively) in the modern academy. These chapters also draw (though again not exclusively) upon the academic study of gardens. And they demonstrate the range, variety and versatility of approaches that characterise scholarly garden history now – this volume's necessarily composite structure making more visible than books by single authors the essential polysemy that lies at the heart of garden-making and thus of writing about gardens.

None of the authors here was specifically invited to address the historiography of gardens. Yet inevitably this theme shows through almost all of their chapters or is even addressed directly in passing. Garden history is interdisciplinary and international; the borders of its contributing disciplines are porous, and its specialists, wherever they start (architecture or landscape architecture, literary, economic or art history, urban studies or medicine), learn to transgress the traditional boundaries of study. The sites of gardens – though inevitably grounded in one place – attract designers and craftsmen, involve plant materials and borrow stylistic modes from a much wider world. And when the object of study is also a territory like Italy, subdivided until very late in its history by many authorities and jurisdictions and subjected to an exceptional variety of foreign influences, the study of its gardens takes on a virtually international scope. Add finally that the Italian Renaissance garden has proved the *fons et origo* of the landscape architecture of all other western nations, then the internationalism of its students (including contributors to this volume) is not surprising.

Certain other historiographical concerns recur through these chapters in large part owing to the kinds of questions that contributors choose to pose. The origins of the garden – upon which the first and penultimate chapters especially focus, befitting international medievalism on the one hand and Sicilian multiculturalism on the other – is a topic that has elicited excellent work elsewhere from Robin Osborne and Massimo Venturi Ferriolo.¹ Any search for garden origins, as those two scholars have shown, must mingle regard for etymology and acute interrogation of all sorts of texts (not simply literary ones) with more conventional archaeological inquiry. And the scrutiny of texts requires a sophisticated response to different rhetorical conventions – estate inventories, for example, do not rely upon the same linguistic registers as do love poems, yet neither is necessarily to be privileged over the other as evidence in garden history.

The possible sources for garden history are as unpredictable as infinite, especially if we know how to make them yield their material. I was once told by an eminent Italian archivist that the city archives held nothing that pertained to garden history; yet a

¹ Osborne, 'Classical Greek gardens: between farm and paradise', *Garden History. Issues, Approaches, Methods*, ed. John Dixon Hunt (Washington, D.C., 1992), pp. 373–91; and Ferriolo, *Nel grembo della vita* (Milan, 1989) and his 'Homer's garden', *Journal of Garden History*, 9 (1989), pp. 86–94.

cursory viewing even of the documents already photographed revealed dozens of legal papers (wills, property conveyances) with garden plans drawn into them. If readers of this volume review the kind of materials referenced by the authors they will find – just to start with – that garden-making and garden experience make their presence felt through a whole spectrum of social and cultural history: instructional manuals for hunting, pharmaceutical and medical treatises, agriculture practice and theory, the records of what we today call public works administration, military logistics, freemasonry, museology, political journalism, not to mention Petrarch's garden notes, Claude Lorrain's paintings and Goethe's journal.

If the study of origins of gardens requires an adequate dialogue between written records of all sorts and surviving artifacts, gardens themselves generally deserve to be studied at the intersection between physical place and metaphysical idea. This is only in part a reworking of the old formula about form and function; a garden's functions may not only involve the growing of food, social uses, political prestige and power; we must study how the physical facts of a garden intersect with a whole gamut of less tangible but no less instrumental concerns. We learn about these often through accounts – visual as well as verbal (paintings, say, as well as poems) – of the contemporary experiences of gardens. Mental archetypes and rhetorical conventions may frustrate our using texts to establish exactly what a garden was like on the ground; but they yield much enlightenment as to how gardens were considered, which in turn fruitfully conditions how we examine all sorts of evidence about them. Rhetorical topoi can, in fact, connect with topography, as the gardenist term *topiary* and its etymology may remind us.

Historiography also raises questions of presentation. The tone and mode of the contributors here will probably yield few surprises: exposition, documentation (in even its most residual form, inventory), argumentation. *The Italian Garden* does not participate in any experimental mingling of history with fiction, as did *Reading the French Garden* by Denise and Jean-Pierre Le Dantec (its original French title, *Le roman du jardin français*, stresses the authors' imaginative enterprise more clearly).² Yet careful consideration of some chapters here will suggest that garden history, because relatively new and still searching for its proper modes, does in fact lend itself necessarily to less conventional approaches. The slippage from geomorphological or territorial analysis to symbolic frameworks, from health to hermeneutics, or conversely from poetic trope to practical treatise is crucial and endemic to the subject. So many gardens survive only in fragments of evidence, a fistful of sometimes tangible and physical clues, of hints sometimes shadowy and allusive, that a collage approach may best give access to them. Thus more than one chapter here deliberately builds up its narrative of gardens through a careful montage of fragments, the shards of many cultures, many viewpoints.

A model for this syncretic approach was suggested in the mid-sixteenth century by

² The English translation by Jessica Levine was published by the MIT Press in 1990; the original French edition by Plon in 1987.

two Italian humanists writing about the newly flourishing garden art. Both Bartolomeo Taegio, whose treatise on villa life is discussed in the chapter by Iris Lauterbach in this volume, and Jacopo Bonfadio³ called gardens a ‘third nature’. This coinage – for they were both conscious of it as a neologism – probably refers to a phrase of Cicero’s in his *De natura deorum* by which he designates the cultural landscape of fields, roads, harbours and so on; his ‘alteram naturam’ or second nature of course presupposes a first (the territory of the gods, the world unmediated by humans).

Taegio and Bonfadio were concerned to situate the newly revived art of fine gardening not only in the almost obligatory classical and mythical traditions, but within a cultural history that interpreted gardens as the culmination (third) of a series of human interventions in the land. For them garden art was derived from agrarian practice – as many modern Italian gardening terms continue to affirm – and its achievements were best seen in relation to the contexts out of which they had grown (second and first natures). It is not, certainly, a startlingly original concept: Petrarch had clearly anticipated the idea of a series of interventions in the land, regarding gardens as the culminating treatment of a territory. But the idea of *terza natura* can help us to study gardens as the outgrowth of a complicated relationship with the social, political and cultural fabric, the other natures. This is particularly useful when gardens are within the ‘second nature’ of urban developments, as is the case with a surprising number in the following chapters. It also distracts us from any tendency to adjudicate gardens as affirmations of *either art or nature*, a sterile option that settled like a blight over Europe after the ‘invention’ of the English landscape garden.

The history of gardens is ultimately a question of what meanings we look for. As one of the most complex and valued of human creations – like men and women, gardens are a mix of nature and culture – gardens mean many things to many people at any one time and place, just as they generally have been created (compiled is almost a better word) by collective endeavour. Gardens are rarely – like a sonnet or a miniature – the work of one person, and therefore they conserve the traces of multiple motives and ambitions and effects.

It is the historian’s business to relate these many motives and meanings both to each other and back to the physical site. Evidently, therefore, there are manifold ways in which that relation will be executed, ways that are best determined by the place and date of the object to be studied. And in the elaborate patchwork that was the Italian peninsula before (and maybe even since) its unification, gardens were eloquent about their specific locality. Yet they were also hugely attentive to their specific moment in the *longue durée* of gardening in the Italian peninsula, what northern Europeans called the ‘garden of the world’.

³ I have discussed Bonfadio and his famous letter on the scenery of the Italian lakes in an essay, ‘Paragone in paradise: translating the garden’, to appear in the yearbook, *Comparative Criticism*, 18 (1996). For an account of the continuing aptness of the idea of three natures see my ‘Il giardino europeo barocco: più barocco del barocco’, in *Il Giardino delle Muse. Arti e artifici nel barocco europeo*, ed. M. A. Giusti and A. Tagliolini (Florence, 1995), pp. 5–17.

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-03392-3 - The Italian Garden: Art, Design and Culture
Edited by John Dixon Hunt
Excerpt
[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

5

Hence our decision to explore the current state of Italian garden history via chapters that focus for the most part upon one time and place and also upon different kinds of place at different times – public and private, urban and suburban, palace, villa-farm and cottage. There were inevitably many more moments, many more modes, and even many more territories that could be represented: Italy is, after all, a world of gardens.

CHAPTER I

**GARDENS IN ITALIAN LITERATURE DURING THE
 THIRTEENTH AND FOURTEENTH CENTURIES**

LUCIA BATTAGLIA RICCI★

... in veritate / io senza me grand'ora dimorai / in non provata mai felicitate.

Dreamt of or real, evoked by the magic of literary writing or evocatively depicted by painters and miniaturists, gardens invaded the artistic and literary imagination between the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, as well as becoming increasingly commonplace inside the turreted cities. This was not, however, a univocal or easily classified cultural phenomenon: even in medieval times the garden preserved that polysemy derived from having been 'germinated' in the most ancient civilisations and having passed through virtually the entire history of western man.¹ Nourished by biblical culture and patristic interpretations, classical texts and Romance literature, able to measure up to both the present and the past, and to influence it by suggesting (or imposing) precise formal models, this genuine symbolic commonplace of western culture lent itself to the assumption of sometimes opposing connotations and attributes that cannot be resolved, neither diachronically nor, generally speaking, with reference to the writer's or artist's taste: in fact, the same author sometimes uses drastically different, not to say decidedly antithetical, variations. If anything, it is dominated by stimuli of an ideological character or the specific conventions of individual genres.

Maria Corti recently wrote that 'in the universe of artistic invention ... a fact presupposes a long history and the long history requires that fact.'² It is impossible to understand the individual occurrences of the garden topos in Italian literature between the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries without 'presupposing' its millenary history: but this diachronous perspective also confirms that the medieval segment of its history contains remarkably innovative 'developments', occasioned by both great literary

*Translated by Lucinda Byatt.

¹ For a reconstruction of the origins of the idea of the garden see M. Venturi Ferriolo, *Nel grembo della vita* (Milan, 1989), with earlier bibliography. Essential reading for the period in question is G. Venturi, "'Picta poësis": ricerche sulla poesia e il giardino dalle origini al Seicento', *Storia d'Italia, Annali* (Turin, 1982), vol.v, pp. 663ff.

² M. Corti, *Percorsi dell'invenzione. Il linguaggio poetico e Dante* (Turin, 1993), p. 22.

figures and anonymous intellectuals, which subsequently exerted a significant effect on its millenary history. An attempt to reconstruct these ‘developments’ – or at least those which appear to be most culturally relevant – may therefore enable us to acquire a fuller understanding of the polyhedric nature of the topos in question and the segment of cultural history thus implicated.

First, it is worth drawing attention to a methodological point. In this study it did not seem appropriate to respect the traditional boundaries between disciplines, in a period marked by such strong ties between art and literature. On the one hand, it was intellectuals and men of letters who planned the figurative works and wrote their accompanying texts, in the same way as artists focused in iconographical terms on significant segments of the imaginary world and guided the reading of the books they illustrated. On the other, the limits between the various Romance literatures were extremely ‘mobile’ owing to the widespread use of multilingualism and the diffusion of translations and vernacular editions; so the decision to restrict the study to the literary output in vernacular Italian during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries would mean omitting vital information for the reconstruction of the mental library of the individuals who composed the literary texts and those who utilised them. For this reason, my analysis starts with the works of international culture which were widely represented in libraries belonging to Italian courtly and bourgeois elites, and it takes account of contemporary figurative tradition as it appeared in both monumental and book form.

THE ‘COURTLY’ GARDEN: A PLACE OF DELIGHT AND LOVE

The *Triumph of Death* in the Campo Santo in Pisa, painted some time around the 1340s, contains a scene which we must suppose was extremely common for the period: a happy gathering of youths in a garden occupied in forms of entertainment typical of courtly life: amorous meetings, playing and listening to music, falconry, pleasant discourse.³ The image marvellously sums up a series of motifs made widespread by books popular with Romance culture which had become the ideal reference models for the everyday life of the rising classes: first and foremost, the *Roman de la Rose*, started by Guillaume de Lorris around 1230 and completed several decades later by Jean de Meun, with its famous and unusually lengthy description of Deduit’s garden.⁴ This later served to codify – at both a literary and figurative level, given that the work was probably conceived from the outset as a book *à figures* and characterised by a normally illustrated manuscript tradition⁵ – not only the structure and vegetable, animal, human and architectural elements of the courtly garden, but also its function as the ‘appointed

³ For a full description of the fresco and the problems concerning its dating and interpretation, see L. Battaglia Ricci, *Ragionare nel giardino. Boccaccio e il ciclo pittorico del ‘Trionfo della Morte’* (Rome, 1987). ⁴ Lines 629ff.

⁵ G. Contini, ‘Un nodo della cultura medievale: la serie “Roman de la rose” – “Fiore” – “Divina Commedia”’, in idem, *Un’idea di Dante. Saggi danteschi* (Turin, 1976), pp. 274–9. See also J. V. Fleming, *The ‘Roman de la Rose’. A Study in Allegory and Iconography*, (Princeton, 1969), p. 112, as well as his contribution to *Mediaeval Gardens*, ed. Elisabeth B. MacDougall, Dunbarton Oaks Colloquium on the History of Language Architecture, 1X (Washington, D.C., 1986).

setting' for amorous encounters. In the *Roman* the garden, a square area protected by high walls, is a real *hortus conclusus* which the young visitor, the protagonist of the oneiric episode narrated in the book, expressly identifies with earthly paradise; moreover, the narrator carefully describes its various components: the flower garden, the grove, the fountain protected by the tree, the rose garden. Here, among the plants, water and animals, we find the happy band of Dedit's young friends intent on courtly pastimes and here, at the beginning of May, the Dreamer experiences an allegorical love affair in which the components of the garden play an essential role: the fountain—which represents the eyes of the woman he loves—and obviously the rose—which represents the woman, or, according to C. S. Lewis, the woman's love.⁶ Another prime model constituted the landscapes described by Andreas Capellanus as the appointed settings for the 'apparitions' of the court of love: the 'locus amoenus et delectabilis . . . herbosus et nemoris undique vallatus arboribus' across whose meadows the dead souls processed in the wake of the God of Love;⁷ and, above all, the 'garden of love', the delightful place inhabited by the court of love full of wonderful lawns—'undique . . . omnium generum pomiferis et odoriferis circumclusus arboribus', distinguished by the presence of a 'mirae altitudinis arbor universorum abundanter proferens fructus' and a spring which welled out of the tree's roots.⁸ But Guillaume's invention must have been decisive, in view of the work's remarkable success, in the codification of the topical scenario of amorous adventures and pleasant episodes of communal life at court during medieval times and in the Romance era. Therefore, in addition to models taken from reality, a high wall or a more or less dense circuit of trees ('signs' of its separation from the world), a flower-strewn lawn and birdsong ('signs' of its *amoenitas*), a fountain and a tree ('signs', together with the wall, of its edenic nature) were sufficient to evoke this garden formed through the cooperation of rhetorical conventions and mental archetypes from widely varying cultural areas.⁹ We are dealing with a system which was codified to such an extent that often, metonymically, a single element was sufficient to evoke it.

⁶ C. S. Lewis, *The Allegory of Love. A Study in Medieval Tradition* (New York, 1958); Ital. trans.: *L'allegoria d'amore. Saggio sulla tradizione medievale* (Turin, 1969), p. 112.

⁷ A. Cappellano, *De Amore*, ed. G. Ruffini (Milan, 1980), pp. 83–9.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 89ff. For a recent definition of the 'garden of love' see P. Trannoy, 'Le jardin d'amour dans le "De Amore" d'André Le Chapelain', in *Vergers et jardins dans l'Univers Medieval* (Senefiance n.28) (Aix-en-Provence, 1990), pp. 373–88.

⁹ The courtly garden emerged from the coalescence of two biblical models: that of the Garden of Eden described in the book of Genesis (2, 8–15), with exegetical and descriptive integrations, in particular the apocryphal Apocalypse of Saint Paul, known in medieval times as *Visio Pauli* (see P. Orvieto, 'Boccaccio o l'allegoria d'amore', *Interpres*, 2 (1979), pp. 62–3), and the mystical model evoked in *Canticus canticorum* using the classical topos of the *locus amoenus* (there is an extensive bibliography on this, but I only cite those works which have made an effective contribution to this chapter: F. Faral, *Recherches sur les sources latines des contes et romans courtois* (Paris, 1913); E. R. Curtius, *Letteratura europea e medioevo latino*, ed. R. Antonelli (Florence, 1992), pp. 207–26; Trans. of *European Literature and the Latin Middle Age* (1953); D. Thoss, *Studien zum locus amoenus im Mittelalter* (Vienna–Stuttgart, 1972, etc.), which was widespread also in medieval rhetoric (E. Faral, *Les arts poétiques du XIIe et du XIIIe siècles* (Paris, 1958), pp. 148ff, p. 152 etc.), and the eastern-style model of the Roman garden (see P. Grimal, *Les jardins romains* (Paris, 1969), pp. 6ff). The real gardens adjoining palaces and monastic gardens also played an active role as not merely mental referents: see the various studies on this aspect in *Vergers et jardins, passim*.

The chivalrous romances written in French during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and avidly read by Italian readers from all social backgrounds are witness to the remarkable success of this ‘complex’ topos; a decisive role in the latter’s formation was certainly played by the singular convergence of indications given by treatise writers and commentators on ancient texts with the text and mystical exegesis of *Canticus canticorum*. In the wake of the ‘interpretatio per etymologiam’ it was agreed to identify the *locus amoenus* as the place destined—and indeed propitious—for love,¹⁰ and this coalesced with the *Canticus*, which addressed an evocative series of pregnant images to a lay audience, ranging from the image of the garden as the *hortus conclusus* to the identification of the woman with the garden and its various components.¹¹ The chivalrous romances thus contributed to assigning the garden a precise role within this system of appointed ‘places’ which is the hallmark of this literary genre and rotates around the topical opposition of court vs. forest.¹² Here, more often than not the garden was the place appointed for amorous encounters. At the court of Cornwall Tristan and Isolde met in the garden outside King Mark’s palace;¹³ Guinevere first kissed Lancelot under the trees ‘on the lawn with shrubs’—which the author retrospectively calls a ‘garden’.¹⁴ It was in the garden which Morgana ordered to be planted outside the room in which Lancelot was imprisoned that, at the beginning of May, in the midst of the luxuriant new growth of flowers and greenery and to the sound of birdsong, the Knight saw the rosebud which he fully identified with Guinevere and, making a superhuman effort, succeeded in picking and so freeing himself.¹⁵ Likewise, in a splendid garden-cum-earthly paradise of a magical nature a woman dreamt that she could keep the man she loved within her power by confining him to a golden segregation which, for him, was a painful separation from the world of the court and adventure.¹⁶ In the same way, the ‘wise damsel’s abode’ became a gilded prison: the beautiful palace surrounded by gardens with ‘many wonderful rivers to fish and many water meadows with animals for hunting’, built in the desert as a place destined for love, was also used by Tristan and Isolde in *Tristano Riccardiano*, a version of

¹⁰ ‘Amoena loca dicta: quod amorem praestant jocunda viridia’, in Papias, *Elementarium doctrinae rudimentum*, cited by D’Arco S. Avalle, *Ai luoghi di delizia pieni. Saggio sulla lirica italiana del XIII secolo* (Milan-Naples, 1977), p. 109, to which readers are referred. Other equally famous classic gardens of love are present: Tibullus, *Elegiae*, 1, iii, 59–64 and Claudianus, *Epithalamium de Nuptiis Honorii et Mariae*, pp. 49ff.

¹¹ This marks the start of the association, both metaphorical and not, of the woman-garden (woman-fountain, woman-wall, woman-flower and the like) destined to play such an important role in poetry during the early centuries. One need only reflect on Cavalcanti’s well-known incipit: *Avete ‘n vo’ li fior’ e la verdura*. On the *Cantico* see Venturi Ferriolo, *Nel grembo, passim*; on the *Cantico* and the early lyrics, Avalle, *Ai luoghi*, pp. 109ff.

¹² E. Köhler, *L’avventura cavalleresca. Ideale e realtà nei poemi della Tavola Rotonda* (Bologna, 1985), *passim*. Trans. of *Ideal und Wirklichkeit in der hofischen Epik* (Tubingen, 1956).

¹³ On the structures and typical settings of the court of King Mark, see V. Bertolucci, ‘La corte e le sue immagini nel “Tristan” di Béroul’, in idem, *Morfologie del testo medievale* (Bologna, 1989), p. 22. The motif spread from literary works to figurative art and even to the so-called minor arts, for example, the casket in the Bargello Museum, Florence (Carrand Collection, no. 123). ¹⁴ *Lancelot*, ed. A. Micha (Paris-Geneva, 1978–83), vol. VIII, p. 119.

¹⁵ On the rose–Guinevere exchange and the entire episode of Lancelot as Morgana’s prisoner (*Lancelot*, ed. Micha, vol. v, pp. 60–1), see Bertolucci, ‘Amor dipinto. Icone della rivelazione amorosa nel “Lancelot en prose”’, in *Morfologie*, pp. 35ff.

¹⁶ Chretien de Troyes, *Eréc e Enide*, in *Romanzi*, ed. C. Pellegrini (Florence, 1962), pp. 93ff.

the well-known French romance in Tuscan vernacular.¹⁷ This culminated in the significant process documented by Boccaccio whereby the translation of the *Chastelaine de Vergy* into Tuscan vernacular—a romance in which the garden once again served as the place set aside for the amorous encounters of a couple fated to meet a tragic end—was re-entitled the *Dama del Verzù*: the ‘Lady of the Garden’.¹⁸

Having been transmitted by both the *Roman de la Rose* and the chivalrous romances with their figurative appendages, the springtime image of a garden,¹⁹ understood as the specialised setting for amorous encounters and, more generally, for the happy gatherings of young people—an image which was inevitably closely related to Provençal lyrics—became one of the most fertile and idealised commonplaces of early Italian literature. It was the image used by Monte Andrea to express his wish:

Ch’io nel giardino
 aulente e fino
 dalo matino
 istesse dal’un chanto
 (laov’è quello dolze fiore,
 fresco ed amoroso,
 ch’a tutora per amore
 a me fa stare gioioso)²⁰

It was the image chosen by the *Compiuta Donzella* when she compared her sad personal state to the collective joy of falling in love in springtime:

A la stagion che ’l mondo foglia e fiora
 aresce gioia a tut[t]i fin’amanti:
 vanno insieme a li giardini alora
 che gli auscelletti fanno dolci canti;
 la franca gente tutta s’innamora.²¹

It was the image evoked by Paolo Lanfranchi from Pistoia in one of his ‘noble and gentle imaginings’, when he dreamt that he found himself with his lady

in un giardin, baciare e abraciare,
 remos[s]a ciascun altra villania.²²

Finally, Lapo Gianni depicted gardens as part of the enchanted landscape of a *plazer*, together with his beloved and the delightful appendages of courtly life:²³

¹⁷ *Tristano Riccardiano*, critical edition by E.G. Parodi, ed. M.-J. Heijkant (Parma, 1991), fos. LXXXIII–LXXXVI.

¹⁸ Boccaccio refers to ‘cantare’ in the conclusion of the third day of the *Decameron*. The text of the novella can now be read in *La Castellana di Vergy*, ed. G. Angeli (Rome, 1991).

¹⁹ On the springtime connotation of the ‘weather’ in the garden, see Venturi, “‘Picta poësis’”, p. 668.

²⁰ *Oj dolze Amore*, in *Avalle, Ai luoghi*, pp. 205–8.

²¹ *Poeti del duecento*, ed. G. Contini (Milan–Naples, 1960) vol. 1, p. 434. ²² *Ibid.*, p. 354.

²³ The sonnet *Di giugno* by Folgore de San Gimignano is similar (in *Poeti del duecento*, vol. 11, p. 411): see Venturi, “‘Picta poësis’”, p. 682, note 39.