

Candidate 2 evidence

23. Source C reveals to a moderate extent the interests of 15th century humanists, covering their intellectual, classical and modern

interests. However the source omits the activities of humanists in government who did more than praise and the development of a more philosophical Neo-Platonism from the classical texts.

As described by Hale with his image of the vital 'Scholar's Lamp', humanism was first and foremost intellectual. Source C describes the 'intellectual elite' who translated classical texts and embraced 'all fields of knowledge'. The multi-faceted nature of humanist interests is important as it sparked humanist education in all areas. As

well as teaching rhetoric, humanists like Da Feltre and Da Verona were described by Plumb as crucial to the intellectual development of Renaissance Italian states. Educating the elite, as Source C says of every city made sure that (as Cole observed) the next generation of rulers were humanists. This was the main interest of 15th century humanists - intellectual pursuits and academic gain. Secondly, the source describes how humanists engaged in classical revival, translating and distributing Latin and Greek texts to give a

greater understanding of the past. Knox describes how humanists 'broke the theological tradition' and 'viewed the past from a classical' standpoint, such as Bruni's humanist 'History of the Florentine People'. This revival of classical antiquity was another key interest. Third, source C explores the way humanists then applied classical knowledge to the present, believing their time to be a 'renewal of classical cities'. However the source does not mention how this knowledge was not just used to 'praise[d] their own time'. Through teaching rhetoric

and persuasion as the source describes, humanists influenced rulers. They also directly contributed to governance such as Ficino in Florence. Machiavelli and Guiccardini as well as Castiglione were humanists who were not just interested in the academic value of classical texts, but also wanted to change the present. Based on Neo-Platonist ideals of a multi-talented Renaissance Man, humanists of the 15th century did not remain purely academic, but instead developed their own philosophies and ideas, inspired by but not identical to

those of the classical past, therefore Source C explores and explains the initial interests of 15th century humanity, but does not go far enough to fully explain civic humanism and involvement in government or Neo-Platonist ideology.

24. Source D is useful to a large extent as evidence of princely priorities during the Renaissance, showing the use of art to build a city's reputation. Federico da Montefeltro is a very useful source, since he was ruling Urbino at the time. This gives him direct insight into court

○ although only from one court, and
so not necessarily useful in terms
of Milan or Mantua or other

life, and specifically the priorities
of princes since he was one
of his priorities, to some extent
shown in the source, are therefore
direct evidence. However, the
nature of the source as a
letter to one specific person
limits it; Federico is only
discussing architecture and
given the letter is written to
an architect will probably
exaggerate his concern for
that area. As a result, the
author of the source makes
it useful but the purpose of
the letter itself means it is
limited evidence of broader
priorities.

The source reveals three

main elements of priorities in princely courts. First, the way Federico valued multi-talented people. Stating that there are certain skills 'worthy of honor and praise' is evidence of the individually-focused Italian princes, who surrounded themselves with people who had those skills. Federico himself tried to emulate different skills, initially a mercenary condottieri but then when he became duke expanding his interests into academia and the arts. The first major limitation in the content of the source is that it only discusses

artistic skills. As well as the liberal arts, military prowess was highly valued from by the fact that Montefeltro as well as the Gonzagas of Mantua and the Sforzas of Milan all had power from military force. Therefore the source gives a slightly skewed view of courtly priorities.

Second, Federico expresses his keen interest in the classical past, and renewing Urbino's status the way it was then. This interest was common across the princely court and further in Renaissance times, and so the source is useful

evidence of how Italian princes prioritised regaining classical splendour. In Mantua in particular, there was a humanist and classically oriented focus, with the Gonzaga family funding humanist scholars and a school run by the humanist Da Feltré.

The third point from the source is about the role of art in regaining that splendour. Federico suggests that architecture is the key and making his city attractive will regain its status. He does not, however, mention

the personal impact of this. Described by Cole as 'regularly presented as diplomatic gifts', as in the princely courts also had a political function. Mateer argues that in Mantua the Gonzagas gained legitimacy through appealing culture (through art) and strategic marriages. The same can be said for Federico, and another limitation of the source is that he would never advertise his priorities as being about his own weaknesses. In order to appear legitimate when he gained

power by force, Federico had to seem in control. Therefore the source presents useful evidence about the role of classical antiquity and architecture, but only focus on those narrow areas. Some of Federico's other priorities, similar to other princes in Milan and Mantua, would never be admitted by him, and so due to the biased nature of the source itself the evidence presented is somewhat limited.

Especially to an architect he wanted to work for him