

“Finding Rome in Rome”: Reexamining Raphael’s Transformation Through His
Roles at the Villa Farnesina

Alexis Ruth Culotta

A dissertation
submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington

2014

Committee:

Stuart P. Lingo

Estelle Lingo

Ann C. Huppert

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

Art History

©Copyright 2014
Alexis Ruth Culotta

University of Washington

Abstract

“Finding Rome in Rome”: Reexamining Raphael’s Transformation Through His
Roles at the Villa Farnesina

Alexis Ruth Culotta

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:

Professor Stuart P. Lingo

Art History

As an iconic figure of the Renaissance, Raphael has been the subject of extensive scholarly study. His contributions to the Roman villa of Agostino Chigi, now known as the Villa Farnesina, however, have garnered minimal attention. This thesis aims to reevaluate Raphael’s contributions to the villa, as they represent some of his most diverse production, not only as artist but also as antiquarian, architect and theatrical scenographer. As this synthesis will reveal, these key evolutions within Raphael’s pursuits can be tied to his exchanges with Venetian painter Sebastiano del Piombo and painter/architect Baldassarre Peruzzi with whom Raphael worked while at the Farnesina. These exchanges will be considered through the emergent artistic application of co-opetition, a blend of competition and cooperation. It is through these interactions that Raphael’s work

at the Farnesina can be positioned as catalyst to his continued development beyond prominent artist into esteemed architect and archaeologist working in early *cinquecento* Rome. The aim of this study is not only to advance our knowledge of Raphael but also to better contextualize the dynamic atmosphere fostered within Chigi's grounds, giving better understanding of Peruzzi's and Sebastiano's contributions that resulted in the artistic and architectural landmark that was the sixteenth-century Villa Farnesina.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

List of Illustrations

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
	a. Review of the Scholarship	19
	b. Advancing the Discourse	26
II.	ROME AND <i>RENOVATIO</i>	31
	a. Conjuring the Classical	32
	b. Pope Julius II and <i>Renovatio</i>	40
	c. Raphael as “Renaissance Man”	45
	d. Imitation, Emulation, Competition, and the Conceptualization of Co-opetition	49
	e. Ascending the Social Ladder	66
III.	CHIGI AND HIS TRUE “RUS IN URBE”.....	68
	a. Chigi’s <i>Villa Suburbana</i>	73
	b. Picking Peruzzi and Emergent <i>All’Antica</i> Architecture	79
	c. “Not Built but Born . . .” - The Villa Emerges	90
	d. A Contrast to the Cancelleria	98
	e. The Antique Comes Alive - Panegyrics on the Farnesina	106
	f. Chigi’s Collection of Antiquities	126
IV.	“ <i>ET DE MIGLIORE PERFECTIONE SI E POSSIBILE</i> ”: RAPHAEL, RIVALRY, IN THE LOGGIA DI GALATEA	137
	a. A Venetian Arrives in Rome	145
	b. Raphael’s Response - A Clash of Temporalities	171
	c. The Competition Persists.....	185
V.	ARTIST AS ARCHITECT AND ARCHAEOLOGIST	188
	a. Blurry Beginnings	191
	b. Raphael’s Riverfront Casino	195
	c. The Novelty of the Nymphaea	204
	d. A Noteworthy Sketch “nel’orto d’agostin chigi”	211
	e. Gaining Insight on the Grotto	217
	f. The Stables	226

g. Moving Forward: From Santa Maria del Popolo to the Villa Madama	239
VI. RAPHAEL TRANSFORMED: LASTING IMPACT AND LAST DAYS AT THE FARNESINA.....	251
a. “Una Bottega Antiquariana di Sanzio”	253
b. Peruzzi, Performance, and Perspective	260
c. Raphael’s <i>Fire</i>	262
d. Perspective and Psyche	271
e. The Sala delle Prospettive and the Architecture of Painting	279
f. The Loggia di Amore e Psiche	295
g. Reconstructing the <i>Scaenae Frons</i>	302
VII. CONCLUSION	326
APPENDIX A: EXCERPTS FROM MAZZOCHI (1521) AND ALDROVANDI (1556)	339
APPENDIX B: PRINCIPAL MEASUREMENTS - VILLA FARNESINA	341
APPENDIX C: PRINCIPAL MEASUREMENTS – CHIGI’S STABLES	342
APPENDIX D: TABLE OF NICHOMACHUS	343
APPENDIX E: PROPORTIONAL RATIOS BETWEEN THE FARNESINA (PERUZZI) AND THE STABLES (RAPHAEL) WITH FIGURES	344
<i>Bibliography</i>	345
<i>Illustrations</i>	374

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is my pleasure and honor to thank all of those individuals who have devoted their time, expertise, and encouragement to this undertaking. Numerous thanks go to the members of my doctoral committee at the University of Washington: Professors Stuart Lingo, Estelle Lingo and Ann C. Huppert. I am particularly grateful to my advisor, Professor Stuart Lingo, who initially spurred me toward a closer examination of the Villa Farnesina during my first semester of study in Rome. It was his encouragement that served as the impetus for this research, and his ongoing insightful critiques and guidance to *approfondire* ideas and themes proved invaluable. Professor Huppert enriched this study with the infusion of her extensive knowledge of Renaissance architectural theory as well as the artist and architect Baldassarre Peruzzi, and Professor Estelle Lingo was equally crucial as she encouraged a vigorous reevaluation and refinement of my terms and arguments to reinforce the “big picture.” Thanks is also extended to Dr. Margaret Laird, whose suggestions early in my research helped me to develop key investigations into the role of antiquity at play in early sixteenth-century Rome, and also to Dr. Ingrid D. Rowland, whose thoughtful commentary on portions of my dissertation encouraged the pursuit of new avenues of examination.

Thanks go as well to the organizations and institutions that have supported my study. The University of Washington’s Gerberding Fellowship provided essential funding for my first period of study in Rome, and a subsequent generous teaching assistantship through the university allowed my continued study *in situ*. It was during this time abroad that I discovered the wealth of resources offered by Rome’s Archivio di Stato, Biblioteca dell’Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei e Corsiniana (current overseer of the Villa Farnesina) and Bibliothèque Française, all of which proved integral over repeated dives deep into their collections. Thanks must also be extended to the helpful team at the Metropolitan Museum of Art’s Drawings and Prints Study Room, who graciously allowed my endless poring over the anonymous French drawings of the Farnesina façade that are featured prominently in several of my dissertation’s arguments.

Most of all, my gratitude is extended to my family: to my husband, Aron, whose unwavering support and enthusiasm throughout this research has been both humbling and inspiring, and to my parents, David and Kristine Sexton, who encouraged me from my youngest years to follow my passions and to tackle any challenge that comes along the way. Thank you for everything.

DEDICATION

To my son, Luca, and my daughter, Livia, without whom completing this work would seem much less important. May it one day inspire you, wherever your passions may lie.

For now, let's go play.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Unless otherwise noted, the following images were procured from Artstor.com within their acceptable terms of use.

- Fig. 1 Baldassarre Peruzzi, Villa Farnesina, Trastevere, 1505-1511.
- Fig. 2 Raphael, *Triumph of Galatea*, circa 1512-1513.
- Fig. 3 Raphael and Workshop, The Loggia di Amore e Psiche, circa 1519.
- Fig. 4 Tower of Niccolò di Crescenzo, or Casa di Cola di Rienzo, Rome.
- Fig. 5 Palazzo della Cancelleria (originally Palazzo Riario), 1489-1513.
- Fig. 6 Map Reflecting Julius II's Principle Civic Planning Impacts
Nicholas Temple, *Renovatio Urbis* (NY: Routledge, 2011), 46.
- Fig. 7 Donato Bramante, Preparatory Plan of the Belvedere Courtyard,
Vatican Perspective View from the Stanze, circa 1506.
- Fig. 8 Raphael and Assistant, *Interior of the Pantheon*, circa 1506.
Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe degli Uffizi (UA 164A).
- Fig. 9 Giorgione and Titian, *Sleeping Venus*, 1510.
Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden.
- Fig. 10 Partial View of the Stanza della Segnatura (1508-1511) illustrating
the *School of Athens* and a portion of *Parnassus*, 1509-1511.
- Fig. 11 Raphael, *Parnassus*, 1510-1511, Stanza della Segnatura.
- Fig. 12 Detail, *School of Athens*, illustrating Raphael in the Guise of Apelles.
- Fig. 13 Detail, *Parnassus*, illustrating Raphael in the Guise of Poet
- Fig. 14 Raphael, *Self-Portrait*, 1504-1506.
Galleria della Uffizi.
- Fig. 15 Marcantonio Raimondi, *Apollo and the Muses on Parnassus*, 1514-
1520.
Metropolitan Museum of Art (Acc. No. 31.54.166).

- Fig. 16 Paul Letarouilly, *Villa Farnesina and Gardens*, 1860.
Edifices de Rome Modernes, ou Recueil des palais, maisons, églises, couvents, et autres monuments publics et particuliers les plus remarquables de la ville de Rome (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1982); David Coffin, *The Villa in the Life of Renaissance Rome* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979), 89.
- Fig. 17 Francesco di Giorgio Martini, Illustration from *Trattato di Architettura*, circa 1470.
Biblioteca Reale, Turin.
- Fig. 18 Baldassarre Peruzzi, *Rome: Reconstruction of the Septizonium and the Baths of Caracalla; Sketch of a Horse*, circa 1500.
F.P. Fiore and M. Tafuri, *Francesco di Giorgio architetto*, 337, XX.11; U 323 Ar.
- Fig. 19 Anonymous, "Palazzo delle Volte, Ancaiano, la Chiesa delle Palazzo delle Volte."
Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (Vatican), Manoscritti Chigiani, P VIII 17, n. 138.
- Fig. 20 Francesco di Giorgio Martini, Ground plan, Villa le Volte, 1605 (before restoration).
Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Chigi P. VIII 17; Baldassarre Peruzzi, 1481-1981: *Commemorazione V Centenario Della Nascita* (Sovicille: Comune di Sovicille, 1981), 40.
- Fig. 21 Baldassarre Peruzzi (?), Villa Le Volte, 1502-1505, Sovicille.
Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Manoscritti Chigiani, P VIII 17, n. 111.
- Fig. 22 Anonymous, French, *Villa Farnesina, North Façade, with Ornamental Detailing (Recto)*, early to mid-16th century.
Metropolitan Museum of Art (Acc. No. 49.92.53).
- Fig. 23 Anonymous, French, *Villa Farnesina, Plan and Moulding Profiles (Verso)*, early to mid-sixteenth century.
Metropolitan Museum of Art (Acc. No. 49.92.35).
- Fig. 24 Detail, Baldassarre Peruzzi, Farnesina Façade Spandrel Fresco
Christoph Luitpold Frommel, *Die Farnesina und Peruzzis Architectonisches Früwerk* (Berlin: DeGruyter, 1961), Tafel XI.
- Fig. 25 Peruzzi et al., Loggia di Galatea, circa 1510-1514, Villa Farnesina.
- Fig. 26 Illustration from *Hypnertomachia Poliphili*, 1499.
- Fig. 27 Garden of Cythera, illustration from *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*, 1499.

- Fig. 28 *L'Arrotino (The Blade Sharpener)*, 1st century BC after Greek original.
Galleria degli Uffizi.
- Fig. 29 *Pan and Daphnis*, Roman copy after Greek original.
Cesi/Ludovisi Collection, Palazzo Altemps (Museo Nazionale Romano).
- Fig. 30 Fountain of Venus, Southern (Porta Settimiana) Wall.
Marvin Pulvers, *Roman Fountains: 2000 Fountains in Rome: A Complete Collection* (Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 2002), n. 683a/b.
- Fig. 31 *Antinous (Farnese Antinous)*, Roman Copy of a Greek Original, 2nd century CE.
Naples Archaeological Museum.
- Fig. 32 *Boy Riding a Dolphin (Satyr Riding a Dolphin)*, Roman Copy of a Greek Original, 1st-2nd century CE.
Villa Borghese (inv. 777)
- Fig. 33 Lorenzetto, *Jonah*, 1519-1520.
Chigi Chapel, Santa Maria del Popolo.
- Fig. 34 *Psiche Accovacciata (Cowering Psyche)*, Roman copy after a Greek original.
Capitoline Museum, Rome.
- Fig. 35 Sarcophagus of the Muses, 280-290 CE
Mattei Collection, Palazzo Massimo alle Terme.
- Fig. 36 *Revelers Gathering Grapes Sarcophagus*, circa 225 CE
Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston.
- Fig. 37 Jean Jacques Boissard, *Codex Holmiensis*, fol. 38v, circa 1559
- Fig. 38 Sarcophagus Fountain, Villa Farnesina.
Marvin Pulvers, *Roman Fountains: 2000 Fountains in Rome: A Complete Collection* (Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 2002), 371 no. 682.
- Fig. 39 Florentine Draftsman[Giovanni Battista Cordiani da Sangallo ("Il Gobbo")?], *La Psiche nel Giardino di Agostino Chigi*, after 1521.
Graphische Sammlung, Albertina, Vienna.
- Fig. 40 Strigilated Sarcophagus (3rd-4th Century CE) and Triton Head (2nd Century CE) Fountain, Villa Farnesina.
C.L. Frommel, G. Caneva, and A. Angeli, *La Villa Farnesina a Roma = The Villa Farnesina in Rome*. *Mirabilia Italiae*, 12 (Modena: F.C. Panini, 2003) I: n. 23, 42.

- Fig. 41 *Triton*, Second-Century CE Fragment, Horti Lamiani Group. Capitoline Museum, Rome (MC1121).
- Fig. 42 *Erinni*, Second-Century CE Fragment of a Triton. Palazzo Altemps, Rome.
- Fig. 43 Raphael, *Jurisprudence*, 1511, Stanza della Segnatura.
- Fig. 44 Baldassarre Peruzzi, *Astrological Ceiling*, 1510-1511, Loggia di Galatea.
- Fig. 45 Pinturicchio, Piccolomini Library, 1502-1508.
- Fig. 46 Pinturicchio and Peruzzi, *The Coronation of Pius III*, 1503-1504. Piccolomini Library, Siena.
- Fig. 47 *The Three Graces*, Roman Copy after Greek Original. Piccolomini Library, Siena.
- Fig. 48 Raphael, *The Three Graces*, circa 1504. Musée Condé, Chantilly.
- Fig. 49 Baldassarre Peruzzi, *Venus in Capricorn*, 1509-1511. Loggia di Galatea, Villa Farnesina.
- Fig. 50 Sebastiano del Piombo, *Portrait of Ferry Carondelet and his Secretaries*, 1510-1512. Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid.
- Fig. 51 Sebastiano del Piombo, *Myth of Zephyr*, 1511. Loggia di Galatea, Villa Farnesina.
- Fig. 52 Sebastiano del Piombo, *Polyphemus*, circa 1512. Loggia di Galatea.
- Fig. 53 Sebastiano del Piombo, *Preparatory Sketch for Polyphemus*. Loggia di Galatea.
- Fig. 54 Sebastiano del Piombo, *Juno*, 1511. Lunette, Loggia di Galatea.
- Fig. 55 Michelangelo, Detail of *Ignudi* above *Joel*, 1508-1512. Sistine Chapel, Vatican City.

- Fig. 56 Sebastiano del Piombo, *Death of Adonis*, 1511-1512.
Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.
- Fig. 57 *Spinario (Boy with a Thorn)*, Roman copy after Greek Original.
Capitoline Museum, Rome.
- Fig. 58 *Nympha alla Spina*, Roman copy of a Hellenistic bronze, 2nd century BCE.
Galleria degli Uffizi (Bober and Rubenstein, *Renaissance Artists*, 97, no. 61).
- Fig. 59 Detail of Apollo, Raphael, *Parnassus*, circa 1510.
Stanza della Segnatura.
- Fig. 60 Giorgione (Giorgio da Castelfranco), *Tempesta (The Tempest)*, circa 1510.
Gallerie dell'Accademia, Venice.
- Fig. 61 Sandro Botticelli, *Birth of Venus*, 1486.
Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.
- Fig. 62 Michelangelo, *Taddei Tondo*, 1504-1506.
Royal Academy, London.
- Fig. 63 *Torso Belvedere*, Roman copy after original by Apollonius, 150 BC.
Museo Pio-Clemente, Vatican.
- Fig. 64 *Galatea*, reflecting *giornate* divisions of composition.
Tantillo, "Restauri alla Farnesina," 46, no. 9.
- Fig. 65 Raphael, *Sposalizio della Vergine (Marriage of the Virgin)*, 1500-1504.
Galleria di Brera, Milan.
- Fig. 66 Raphael, *Madonna d'Alba and the Madonna of the Stairs*, sketch, circa 1511.
Musée Wicar, Palais des Beaux Arts, Lille (456/7r).
- Fig. 67 Detail, Raphael, *Madonna d'Alba and the Madonna of the Stairs*.
- Fig. 68 Frommel's Ground plan of Farnesina Gardens Reflecting Riverfront Casino (Tiberloggia).
Frommel, *Die Farnesina*, 25.
- Fig. 69 Detail of Farnesina property, Émile Du Pérac, *Nova Urbis Romae Descriptio*, 1577.

- Fig. 70 Detail Reflecting Portion of Riverfront Casino, Antonio Tempesta, *Pianta di Roma*, 1593.
Christoph Luitpold Frommel, Stefano Ray, and Manfredo Tafuri, eds., *Raffaello Architetto* (Milan: Electa Editrice, 1984), 120.
- Fig. 71 Anonymous, *The Tiber Towards the Ponte Sisto*, mid-sixteenth century.
Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest.
- Fig. 72 Anonymous (Bramante?), Nymphaeum, 1510-1517, Villa Colonna, Genazzano.
Associazione Culturale Ninfea (<http://bit.ly/11fW1Ok>).
- Fig. 73 Plan of the Nymphaeum at Genazzano, 1510-1517.
C.L. Frommel, "Bramantes 'Ninfeo' in Genazzano," *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 22 (1969) 141.
- Fig. 74 Baldassarre Peruzzi, *Architectural Sketches*.
Galleria Uffizi, UA 529 Ar.
- Fig. 75 Frommel's Reconstruction of the Main Façade of the Nymphaeum, Villa Colonna, Genazzano, 1510-1517.
C.L. Frommel, "Bramantes 'Ninfeo' in Genazzano," *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 22 (1969), n. 20; 151.
- Fig. 76 Photo of the Casino del Bufalo, 19th century.
Museo di Roma (Christian, *Empire*, 181; Kultzen, *Dei Malereien*, 102).
- Fig. 77 Fountain Casino of the Giardino del Bufalo.
Enrico Maccari, *Graffiti e chiaroscuro esistenti nell'esterno delle case* (Rome: Salviucci, 1876), Plate 5.
- Fig. 78 Detail, Florentine Draftsman [Jacopo Sansovino or Giovanni Battista Cordiani da Sangallo ("Il Gobbo")?], *La Psiche nel Giardino di Agostino*, after 1521.
- Fig. 79 Francisco de Holanda, *The Grotto of Egeria*, circa 138-1541.
Spain Biblioteca Reale, El Escorial, inv. 28-1-20, fol. 33v.
Christian, *Empire*, no. 134, 182.
- Fig. 80 Author's Speculative Reconstruction of Raphael's Riverfront Casino.

- Fig. 81 Verso, Raphael, Studies of a Putto along with Ground Plans and Partial Elevations of the Chigi Stables.
Gabinetto dei Disegni, Galleria degli Uffizi (UA 1474E); Joannides, *The Drawings*, 294v, 206; Christoph Luitpold Frommel, Stefano Ray, and Manfredo Tafuri, *Raffaello Architetto* (Milan: Electa Editrice, 1984), 122.
- Fig. 82 Frommel's Reconstruction of Raphael's Stables, Western Façade, Villa Farnesina.
Frommel, *Die Farnesina*, 60.
- Fig. 83 Anonymous, French, *Pianta, Sezione, Prospetto e Dettaglio delle Stalle Chigi*, mid-16th century.
Metropolitan Museum of Art (Inv. No. 49.92.44v; 49.92.50r).
- Fig. 84 Anonymous, French, *Pianta e Sezione, Prospetto Trasversale delle Scuderie*, mid-16th century.
Metropolitan Museum of Art (Inv. No. 49.92.4v)
- Fig. 85 Author's triangulation map, overlaid on Temple's schematic triangulation.
Temple, Fig. 1.8, 19.
- Fig. 86 Giovanni Antonio Dosio, Palazzo Branconio dell'Aquila, sketch, late 16th century.
Gabinetto dei Disegni, Galleria degli Uffizi; Shearman, "Raphael as Architect," n. 8; 406.
- Fig. 87 Antonio da Sangallo the Younger, *Plan for the Villa Madama*, around 1518.
Gabinetto dei Disegni, Galleria degli Uffizi, A 314.
- Fig. 88 Raphael, sketch, *Nuptials of Alexander and Roxanne*, 1516-1517.
Albertina, Graphische Sammlung, Vienna (5118, SR 266, inv. 17634); Roger Jones and Nicholas Penny, *Raphael* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 180.
- Fig. 89 Raphael, *Incendio nel Borgo (Fire in the Borgo)*, Stanza dell'Incendio, Vatican, circa 1514.
- Fig. 90 Baldassarre Peruzzi, *Theatrical Perspective Drawing with Monuments of Rome*.
Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe degli Uffizi (no. 291A).
- Fig. 91 Raphael and Marcantonio Raimondi, *Judgment of Paris*, c. 1510-1520
Metropolitan Museum of Art (Inv. No. 19.74.1).

- Fig. 92 Raphael and Marcantonio Raimondi, *Quos Ego*, c. 1515-1516.
Ashmolean Museum (WA1862.5331).
- Fig. 93 Baldassarre Peruzzi, *Presentation of Mary at the Temple*, Santa Maria delle Pace, Rome.
- Fig. 94 Raphael and Peruzzi, *Volta Dorata*, 1516-1518.
Palazzo della Cancelleria, Rome.
- Fig. 95 Baldassarre Peruzzi and workshop, *Sala delle Prospettive*, 1516-1518, Villa Farnesina.
- Fig. 96 North Wall, *Sala delle Prospettive*, Villa Farnesina.
Gianfranco Malafarina, *La Villa Farnesina a Roma* (Modena: Franco Cosimo Panini, 2003), 68-69.
- Fig. 97 *Apollo and Daphne*, West Wall, *Sala delle Prospettive*, Villa Farnesina.
Nicole Dacos, "Peruzzi. Dalla Farnesina alla Cancelleria. Qualche proposta per la bottega della Pittore." In Marcello Fagiolo and Maria Luisa Madonna, eds., *Baldassarre Peruzzi: Pittura, scena, e architettura nel Cinquecento* (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1987), 481, attributed to Brescianino.
- Fig. 98 *Marforio*, colossal Roman statue, date unknown.
Museo Capitolino, Rome (Bober and Rubenstein, *Renaissance Artists*, 99, no. 64)
- Fig. 99 *Venus and Adonis*, North Wall, *Sala delle Prospettive*, Villa Farnesina.
Nicole Dacos, "Peruzzi," 474, attributed to Brescianino; Rosalia Varoli-Piazza, "Il fregio nella Sala delle Prospettive. Un'ipotesi per la bottega del Peruzzi." In Marcello Fagiolo and Maria Luisa Madonna, eds., *Baldassarre Peruzzi: Pittura, Scena, e Architettura nel Cinquecento* (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1987), 368, attributed to "Workshop of Peruzzi."
- Fig. 100 Baldassarre Peruzzi, *Study of a Seated Woman*.
The Walter Art Gallery inv. 1995.244.
- Fig. 101 *Muse*, date unknown.
Dresden: Sculpturensammlung (inv. Hm 2410: Cafà, "Divinità a pezzi," 697, no. 87).
- Fig. 102 *Crouching Venus*, Roman copy of Hellenistic bronze.
British Museum; Bober and Rubenstein, *Renaissance Artists*, 62, no. 18).
- Fig. 103 *Nymph, or Bathing Venus*, delle Valle Collection, Rome.
Nicole Dacos, "Peruzzi," 475.

- Fig. 104 Raphael, *David and Bathsheba*, from *Scenes from the Life of David*, 1518-1519.
Vatican Loggie.
- Fig. 105 *Triumph of Bacchus*, North Wall, Sala delle Prospettive, Villa Farnesina.
Rosalia Varoli-Piazza, "Il fregio nella Sala delle Prospettive. Un 'ipotesi per la bottega del Peruzzi," 369, attributed to "Workshop of Peruzzi."
- Fig. 106 Raphael, sketch, *The Triumph of Bacchus in India*, circa 1516.
Vienna, Graphische Sammlung Albertina, SR 522, inv. 444); Konrad Oberhuber, ed., *Roma e lo stile classico di Raffaello* (Milan: Electa Editrice, 1999), 142, no. 82.
- Fig. 107 *Pelops and Oneomachus*, North Wall, Sala delle Prospettive, Villa Farnesina.
Rosalia Varoli-Piazza, "Il fregio nella Sala delle Prospettive. Un 'ipotesi per la bottega del Peruzzi," 370, attributed to "Workshop of Peruzzi."
- Fig. 108 *Parnassus*, North Wall, Sala delle Prospettive, Villa Farnesina.
Rosalia Varoli-Piazza, "Il fregio nella Sala delle Prospettive. Un 'ipotesi per la bottega del Peruzzi," 371, attributed to "Workshop of Peruzzi."
- Fig. 109 *The Triumph of Venus*, North Wall, Sala delle Prospettive, Villa Farnesina
Rosalia Varoli-Piazza, "Il Fregio nella Sala delle Prospettive. Un 'Ipotesi per la Bottega del Peruzzi," 372, attributed to "Workshop of Peruzzi."
- Fig. 110 Raphael & Workshop, Lower Register, Loggia di Amore e Psiche, Villa Farnesina.
- Fig. 111 Raphael, *Sketch of Kneeling Nude Woman*
Chatsworth, Devonshire Collection; Joannides, n. 420; 239.
- Fig. 112 Giulio Bonasone, *Toilet of Psyche*, 16th century.
Metropolitan Museum of Art (Inv. No. 59.570.297).
- Fig. 113 Michel Coxie, *Psyche Inconsolable at the Flight of Cupid*, circa 1532-1535.
© Victoria & Albert Museum, London, DYCE. 1145.
- Fig. 114 Michel Coxie, *Psyche Imploring Her Pardon from Juno*, circa 1532-1535.
© Victoria & Albert Museum, London, DYCE. 1150.

- Fig. 115 Michel Coxie, *Psyche Prostrate Before Ceres*, circa 1532-1535.
© Victoria & Albert Museum, London, DYCE. 1151.
- Fig. 116 Raphael, *Two Female Figures*, 1517-1519.
Haarlem, Teylers Museum; Joannides, n. 412; 239.
- Fig. 117 Authors' Reconstruction of the Lower Register Wall and Lunette Panels.
- Fig. 118 Baldassarre Peruzzi (or copy after), *Sketch for Two Scenes of the Exterior Decoration*.
Paris, Louvre Cabinet des Dessins; C.L. Frommel, G. Caneva, and A. Angeli, *La Villa Farnesina a Roma = The Villa Farnesina in Rome*. *Mirabilia Italiae*, 12 (Modena: F.C. Panini, 2003) I: n. 90; 79.
- Fig. 119 Detail of Second Level Sketches, Anonymous, French, *Villa Farnesina, North Façade, with Ornamental Detailing (recto)*, early to mid-16th century.
- Fig. 120 Baldassarre Peruzzi, *Ulysses and the Proof of the Arch*, Study for the Façade of the House of Ulisse da Fano.
Oxford Ashmolean Museum, Parker 230, n. 461; Cristiano Tessari, *Baldassarre Peruzzi: il progetto dell'antico* (Milan: Electa, 1995), 36.
- Fig. 121 Authors' Reconstruction of Farnesina Entrance Façade.
- Fig. 122 Baldassarre Peruzzi, Preparatory Sketch, *Hercules and Cerberus*.
Ashmolean Museum (WA 1846.139).
- Fig. 123 Baldassarre Peruzzi, *Europa and the Bull*.
Tessari, n. 5.
- Fig. 124 Andrea Boscoli, *Gathering of Poets and Muses on Mount Helicon*, late 16th century.
Musée du Louvre, Paris (in. 6149).
- Fig. 125 Cherubino Alberti, *Gathering of Poets and Muses on Mount Parnassus*, late 16th-early 17th century.
Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (B229).
- Fig. 126 Detail of Second Level Central Bay Sketch, Anonymous, French, *Villa Farnesina, North Façade, with Ornamental Detailing (recto)*, early to mid-16th century.
- Fig. 127 The Arch of Titus, 82 CE.

Fig. 128 Giuliano da Sangallo, Courtyard of the Palazzo Scala, 1472-1473.

Fig. 129 Sodoma, *The Marriage of Alexander and Roxanne*, Villa Farnesina.
Gianfranco Malafarina, *La Villa Farnesina a Roma*, 75.

Fig. 130 Raphael & Workshop, *Le Nozze di Amore e Psiche* (*The Marriage of Cupid and Psyche*) and *Il Concilio degli Dei* (*The Council of the Gods*), Loggia di Amore e Psiche, Villa Farnesina.

Chapter One: Introduction

Raffaello Sanzio's rise to artistic success in Rome in the early years of the sixteenth century, combined with his early demise at the age of 37, transformed the artist into a mythic character who "[lived] as a prince and [died] as a god."¹ His seemingly effortless talent exemplified sixteenth-century writer and associate Baldassarre Castiglione's notion of *sprezzatura*, and scholars have since exalted Raphael's roles in projects across Rome as epitomizing early *cinquecento* artistic production. His work in the Vatican's *Stanza della Segnatura* has been lauded as "the apogee of High Renaissance painting in Rome,"² and his ideas for the unfinished Villa Madama on the suburban Monte Mario have been hailed as "the most ambitious villa-garden complex planned for post-classical Rome."³ Giorgio Vasari wrote the first extensive biography of Raphael only a few decades after the artist's death and contributed significantly to a fast-developing mythologization of the man: "for in truth we have from him art, colouring, and invention harmonized and brought to such a pitch of perfection as could scarcely be hoped for; nor may any intellect ever think to surpass him."⁴

¹ Rona Goffen, "Raphael's Designer Labels: From the Virgin Mary to La Fornarina," *Artibus et Historiae*, Vol. 24 (4) (2003), 123.

² Christiane L. Joost-Gaugier, *Raphael's Stanza della Segnatura* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 1.

³ David R. Coffin, "The Plans of the Villa Madama." *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 49 (2) (Jun., 1967), 111.

⁴ Giorgio Vasari, *Lives of the Painters, Sculptors and Architects*, trans. by Gaston du C. de Vere (NY: Alfred Knopf, 1996), 1: 746. As a general note, invocations of Vasari's words throughout the following text are not to be taken as absolute fact but rather ingested with caution, as it is well known that his accounts are, at times, embellished and, at others, fabricated, in an effort to suit his overarching premise. As Shearman highlights in his introduction to *Raphael in Early Modern Sources (1483-1602)* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003; 14-34), Raphael's biography has suffered from a great deal of forged documentation over subsequent generations. In light of this preponderance of forgeries, it would seem Vasari's deviations from the truth are minor; nevertheless, one must approach Vasari's claims with warranted circumspection.

Contemporary advances in Renaissance scholarship have encouraged a reconsideration of Raphael's oeuvre, particularly in relation to his commissions for Siennese banker Agostino Chigi's Roman villa, known since the late sixteenth century as the Villa Farnesina (Fig. 1).⁵ Eighteenth-century chronicler Charles de Brosses suggested these commissions bore an "amore personale" for Raphael,⁶ yet much of the literature fails to adequately probe Raphael's work at this Tibertine oasis. His rendering of the *Triumph of Galatea* (Fig. 2) in the loggia of the same name has garnered study, but his decorative program in the adjacent Loggia di Amore e Psiche (Fig. 3) has often been discounted as the handiwork of his workshop.⁷ Furthermore, his role in the creation of the villa's stables and riverside loggia, his first forays into the field of architecture, has been relatively overlooked.⁸ Most importantly, no study to date has considered the impact that a synthetic study of these contributions could have on our understanding of Raphael, as the Farnesina was in some ways the laboratory in which he

⁵ One can look, for example, to the work of Alexander Nagel. His book, *Michelangelo and the Reform of Art* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), encouraged a total reconceptualization of the scholarly understanding of Michelangelo's artistic process and production.

⁶ As he recounts in *Viaggio in Italia*, De Brosses saw a particular passion in Raphael's work at the Farnesina, "più che il Vaticano e più che Montorio" (Charles de Brosses, *Viaggio in Italia: Lettere familiari* (Rome: Laterza, 1973), 420).

⁷ The recent work of Bette Talvacchia ("Raphael and his Collaborators: A Revolutionary Configuration," in Bette Talvacchia, *Raphael* (London: Phaidon, 2007) and Rosalia Varoli-Piazza (Rosalia Varoli-Piazza, *Raffaello: la loggia di Amore e Psiche alla Farnesina* (Milan: Silvana, 2002)), have reopened the examination of this pictorial program within the oeuvre of Raphael.

⁸ Stefano Ray's catalogue of Raphael's architectural works (*Raffaello architetto: Linguaggio artistico e ideologica nel Rinascimento Romano* (Rome: Laterza, 1974)) offers the most complete account of these two structures, but his entries reveal the difficulty in their examination. As he comments, "Il paradosso, innanzi tutto; la fama di Raffaello pittore è universale, mentre l'architetto è in sostanza uno sconosciuto." (Ray, "Il Volo di Icaro," in Christoph Frommel, Stefano Ray, Manfredo Tafuri, Howard Burns, and Arnold Nesselrath, eds., *Raffaello architetto* (Milan: Electra, 1984), 47).

pioneered a number of innovations, some still in development when his career was cut short with his sudden death in 1520.

The marginalization of Raphael's contributions to the Villa Farnesina has occurred through a confluence of factors. His contemporaneous papal commissions, such as those for the Vatican stanze, which are now recognized as some of his finest accomplishments, have overshadowed his work at the Villa Farnesina. Compounding the problem is that much of what Raphael contributed to this space has been lost. Architecturally, only fragments of one of his contributions still exist on the Farnesina grounds. This is a problem exacerbated by the fact that little documentary evidence of Raphael's plans for these two projects remains, making their discussion difficult. Artistically, successive restorations of the Loggia di Amore e Psiche have complicated determining exactly what Raphael, as opposed to his workshop or subsequent restorers, added. Finally, there is Chigi, the villa's larger-than-life patron, known as much for his ostentation as for his drive. Chigi and the stories of his boastful banquets and lavish shows of wealth have fed into a great deal of scholarship that offered remarkable insight into the life and psyche of one of the most influential figures in early sixteenth-century Rome. This spotlight on Chigi, however, left little room to adequately discuss the artistic masterminds at work, particularly Raphael.

Revisiting Raphael's role at the Villa Farnesina, however, provides remarkable insight into the artist's career. With contributions to the space spanning 1511-1519, much of Raphael's mature Roman period, his projects at the

Farnesina can be seen as signposts of his development, that is, essential landmarks in his evolution as artist, architect and archaeologist. The point of the following thus is not to attempt to establish these commissions as the most significant of his oeuvre, but rather to consider these projects as they were interwoven through a fascinating period of his career.

Rome itself during this time was experiencing a remarkably dynamic transformation. Pope Julius II's *renovatio urbis*, instigated shortly after his ascendance to the papacy in 1503, resulted in a "new aesthetic of *romanitas*,"⁹ a paradoxical civic renovation through antique revival that was carried forward by his successor, Pope Leo X.¹⁰ The outcome was a remarkably fluid environment that was, in the words of Kim Butler, "one rooted in the powerful image of a Rome reborn, at heart an intellectual ideal, but one that was swiftly appropriated in the service of a rhetoric of papal identity as well."¹¹ This atmosphere was particularly receptive to both the blurring of social and professional roles as well as the innovation resulting from that blurring, fostering an environment ripe for ingenuity.

⁹ Kim E. Butler, "Reddita Lux Est: Raphael and the Pursuit of Sacred Eloquence in Leonine Rome." In Stephen J. Campbell and Evelyn S. Welch, eds., *Artists at Court: Image-Making and Identity, 1300-1550* (2004), 135-142.

¹⁰ Indeed, Leo X carried forth the mantle of *renovatio* well. According to his biographer, Paolo Giovio: "Rome then flourished with outstanding talents and an abundance of everything, which explains why it was that Leo X – a pope of preeminent virtue and amplitude – was said to have founded after many centuries an age of gold" (Paolo Giovio, *De Vita Leonis Decimi Pont. Ma. Libri IIII* (Florence, 1551); T.C.P. Zimmerman, *Paolo Giovio: The Historian and the Crisis of Sixteenth-Century Italy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995), 23; Jill Burke, "Inventing the High Renaissance, from Winkelmann to Wikipedia: An Introductory Essay," in J. Burke, ed., *Rethinking the High Renaissance: The Culture of the Visual Arts in Early Sixteenth-Century Rome* (UK: Ashgate, 2012), 7).

¹¹ Butler, "Reddita Lux Est," 138.

During this time of rejuvenation, Raphael was similarly undergoing a transformation. Not only was he beginning an architectural career – his earliest sketches for his inaugural architectural commission, that for Chigi’s riverfront casino, date to 1511- but he was also adjusting his painterly style while pursuing the artistic and architectural potential of antiquity.¹² All these interests were inaugurated at the Villa Farnesina, brought to the forefront by his catalytic confrontations with both Sieneese architect Baldassarre Peruzzi and Venetian import Sebastiano del Piombo. The respective engagement Raphael shared with both of these individuals coincided with pivotal shifts in Raphael’s career as he expanded his realm of expertise.

This examination will trace the origins of this artistic dialogue, which can be said to originate in Peruzzi’s quotation of a shared Raphaelesque source in his design for the astrological ceiling of the Farnesina’s Loggia di Galatea in the early days of the 1510s. Raphael’s subsequent entry into artistic dialogue with Peruzzi coincided with an exchange established with newcomer Sebastiano in that same loggia. Scholarship has previously labeled this interaction, which developed into a career-spanning competition, between Raphael and Sebastiano as

¹² Gaspare Celio was the first to describe Raphael’s riverfront construction as a “casino” in his 1638 description of the Farnesina grounds (Gaspare Celio, *Memoria dei nomi dell’artefici delle pitture, che sono in alcune chiese, facciate, e palazzi di Roma* (Naples, 1638; reprinted Milan, 1967) 16). The following will reintroduce Celio’s naming of this structure as “casino,” in part to distinguish this riverfront space from, and thus avoid confusion with, the garden Loggia of Galatea and also to more accurately describe the space.

paragonistic,¹³ but missing in this prior analysis is an adequate examination of exactly what sort of competition is occurring in this exchange.

The *paragone* is, at its root, a quest for superiority. Though first described in the writings of Leonardo da Vinci as the superiority of painting over the sister arts of music, poetry and sculpture, it is modern literature, specifically first appearing in a nineteenth-century edition of Leonardo's writings, that interpreted this exchange as *paragone*, with an emphasis on competition.¹⁴ Since then, in its most general, contemporary sense, it has been applied to confrontations between media, between technique, and between time periods, the basic goal being one of competition, setting two works against each other with the outcome being the determination of one surpassing the other. And, in essence, the notion of competition was nevertheless foundational to Renaissance ideology – that is, the notion that the revival of antiquity was not just to equal it but rather to surpass it. Returning to the exchange between Raphael and Sebastiano, there is undoubtedly an inherent goal to outdo. There is, however, seemingly an additional dimension emerging in this exchange, on the part of Raphael, that is not captured in the traditional conceptualization of competition.

¹³ Costanza Barbieri, "The Competition between Raphael and Michelangelo and Sebastiano's Role In It." In M.B. Hall, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Raphael* (2008). NY; Cambridge, pp. 141-166; Rona Goffen, 2002, *Renaissance Rivals: Michelangelo, Leonardo, Raphael, Titian*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

¹⁴ Guglielmo Manzi was the first to apply the term *paragone* to Leonardo's treatise on painting (*Trattato della pittura di Lionardo da Vinci novamente dato in luce, con la vita dll'istesso autore, scritta da Raffaelle du Fresne* (Rome, 1817); identified in: Irma A. Richter, *Paragone: A Comparison of the Arts* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1949); Claire J. Farago, *Leonardo da Vinci's Paragone: A Critical Interpretation with a New Edition of the Text in the Codex Urbinas* (NY: E.J. Brill, 1992), 8.

The intensity with which Raphael responded to Sebastiano's work, and at the same time responded to the work of others as well as that of the ancients, resulted in a reevaluation of his artistic approach resulting in, among other elements, a deliberate pursuit of *all'antica* motifs. In this instance, "competition" is not sufficient to fully encapsulate the magnitude of this interaction. Raphael was not merely responding artistically to Sebastiano but instead producing a commentary that advanced the emerging field of *all'antica* painting altogether. Thus, while it is true that Sebastiano and Raphael were competitors, this more global transformational outcome in the Loggia di Galatea implies more was at stake in their interaction and gives credence to the application of a new terminology to describe this exchange, that of "co-opetition."

The Concept of Co-opetition: From Game Theory to Art

John von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern's landmark 1944 publication, *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*,¹⁵ not only introduced the world to the economic field of Game Theory, but it also proposed the principle of co-opetition. Originally suggested as a method of interaction between businesses, the theory suggests that when two competitive entities share congruent interests, working together to develop those shared characteristics will most likely allow those two entities to achieve a greater outcome or higher valuation than if they

¹⁵ John Von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern, *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, reprinted 1953).

did not cooperate within those shared parameters. An example of this, as borrowed from Adam Brandenburger and Barry Nalebuff, is the seemingly paradoxical collaborations between major museums, such as New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Museum of Modern Art, and the American Museum of Natural History. Each institution is intrinsically motivated to draw visitors away from the other. By working together on a joint advertising campaign, however, such as one that encourages a vacation to New York for example, all three museums prosper more than they would have had they not pooled their efforts.¹⁶ In other words, while the three players in this scenario are competitors, were they to collaborate they could accelerate their success to a greater degree than would have been possible on their own.

The idea behind co-opetition – in short, a merger of competition and collaboration or cooperation – has played a central role in economic research of the past half-century, but its applications have yet to reach the field of art history. In this reassessment of Raphael's work at the Villa Farnesina, one of the tandem goals will be to introduce such terminology as a means of describing artistic interactions within multimedia or large-scale commissions that transcend traditional competition to result in a greater global professional achievement. Increasingly across Raphael's varied commissions at the Farnesina, competition with his colleagues became progressively tempered with collaboration. This element of collaboration was relatively imperceptible in the initial exchange with

¹⁶ Adam Brandenburger and Barry Nalebuff. *Co-opetition: A Revolutionary Mindset that Combines Competition and Cooperation: The Game Theory Strategy That's Changing the Game of Business*. New York: Currency Doubleday, 1998), 29.

Sebastiano in the early 1510s. Considering Raphael's *Galatea*, however, as it will be in the following pages, within the context of having been created both as part of Peruzzi's overarching fictive architectural schemata for the room and also as visual allusion to other aspects of the villa's decorative program, reveals an element of collaboration. This collaborative element subsequently grows, culminating in his ultimate exchange with Peruzzi in the later years of the same decade. In this final commission, Raphael negotiated designs for a visual program that would both serve his narrative in the Loggia di Amore e Psiche while also play into Peruzzi's visual program adorning the Farnesina's *scaenae frons*. This working together of Raphael and Peruzzi, in essence two competitors, to achieve this impressively decorated façade, reveals perhaps the most concrete example of co-opetition as it pertains to this thesis. The significance of this co-opetitive moment is deepened upon consideration that both Raphael's and Peruzzi's respective designs were executed for the most part by artists from their workshops, both of which were ostensibly designed after a co-opetitive model.

Thus, in some senses, the notion of co-opetition shadows Raphael's entire experience at the Farnesina. Just as his competition with Sebastiano resulted in his watershed *Galatea*, his subsequent architectural commissions at the Farnesina, the designs for which Christoph Luitpold Frommel characterized as Raphael's presentation pieces as an architect,¹⁷ initiated a long-term collaborative exchange

¹⁷ According to Frommel, though the aged Bramante had already envisioned the young Raphael as an ideal successor, Raphael crafted his architectural contributions to the Villa Farnesina carefully to secure his selection as Bramante's successor: "Queste commesse gli giunsero tanto à proposito, quasi fosse stato Raffaello stesso a suggerirle al Chigi. Bramante era infatti vecchio e malato e già allora

with Peruzzi. More friendly than fierce, this interaction again transcended the bounds of mere competition to instead represent a powerful collaborative exchange that further fueled Raphael's pursuit of both architecture and archaeology. The pinnacle of this exploration would come with Raphael's appointment as Pope Leo X's *capomaestro* of architecture for the continued redesign of Saint Peter's¹⁸ as well as his assumption of the post of *Commissario dell'Antichità* both in 1514, yet in the years prior to these papal appointments Raphael still had yet to prove himself architecturally. He had become a painter of architecture with his work in the Vatican stanze, but his designs for Chigi's stables and riverside loggia were his first for actual structures, marking the beginning of his architectural career.

Raphael's exchange with Peruzzi is evidenced by the echoes of Peruzzi's architectural approach throughout what is known of Raphael's two initial projects. From this perspective, exchange with Peruzzi can be seen as both formative to Raphael's developing architectural approach and also foreshadowing an extended conceptual dialogue between the two that would

vedeva nel giovane discepolo il proprio successore piu dotato. E per Raffaello non c'era prospettiva piu augurabile di quello di essere nominato primo architetto papale, che non solo aveva il compito di seguire tutti gli edifici vaticani allora in costruzione e che, oltre alla responsabilità della conservazione della Roma antica, aveva l'incarico di supervisore dei progetti urbanistici della nuova Roma, ma era altresì chiamato a controllare la maggioranza dei progetti pittorici e scultorei del pontefice." (Christoph Luitpold Frommel, "Raffaello e la sua carriera architettonica," in Christoph Frommel, Stefano Ray, Manfredo Tafuri, Howard Burns, and Arnold Nesselrath, eds., *Raffaello architetto* (Milan: Electra, 1984), 20).

¹⁸ Referred to by Talvacchia as "a series of false starts and piecemeal production," (*Raphael*, 143) the rebuilding of Saint Peter's had been under Bramante's charge for some years. Raphael began to shadow Bramante in his work in 1513, leading to Bramante's recommendation of his distant relative to be his successor. Raphael presented his designs for Saint Peter's to Pope Leo X in 1514-1515 (the general ground plan of which was documented by Serlio in his *Seven Books of Architecture*), with successive variations presented over the subsequent years, none of which materialized before Raphael's death.

culminate in the most clearly co-opetitive engagement in their final Farnesina commissions. Raphael's influence on Peruzzi's pictorial style, for example, can be witnessed in his frescoes in the Sala delle Prospettive, which, in turn, can be linked to Raphael's simultaneous design for the Loggia di Amore e Psiche. The capstone to this exchange was their undoubtedly collaborative efforts in designing the visual program for the villa's *scaenae frons* entrance façade. Pulled from the precepts of Vitruvius, the ancient *scaenae frons* created at the Farnesina represented a crossroads of architecture, archaeology and artistic scenography, areas in which both Raphael and Peruzzi excelled. Whether either master could have completed this capstone component independently is debatable. The fact, however, that the two artists chose to collaborate, and in doing so produced one of the earliest fully-frescoed façades in *cinquecento* Rome, borrowing for the first time since antiquity the ancient proportions for a *scaenae frons* no less, speaks to the potential of the co-opetitive model as applied to Renaissance artistic production.

Thus, revisiting Raphael's work at the Villa Farnesina bears merit in several respects. First, it offers an opportunity to expand the scholarly discussion of the nature of interactions between artists with the added valence of co-opetition. By introducing this terminology, this examination allows for a nuanced review of the engagement between Raphael and Sebastiano as well as between Raphael and Peruzzi, interactions that bookend Raphael's time both in Rome and at the Farnesina. As such, this approach carries forward the

arguments so aptly presented currently in the literature on Raphael and competition by Constanza Barbieri and Rona Goffen,¹⁹ who stress the dynamic rivalries between the artistic masters working in early *cinquecento* Rome. In fact, short of Michelangelo, the assembly of artists employed at Chigi's villa represented the preeminent Roman artists of the period, including Sebastiano del Piombo, Giovanni Antonio Bazzi (better known as Il Sodoma), and Peruzzi,²⁰ all of whom had also worked with Raphael in some capacity in the Vatican stanze.

Second, the pursuit of this premise offers the first combined synthesis of Raphael's contributions to the villa, yielding a beneficial addition to the body of scholarship on the influential artist by presenting a novel navigation of his Roman artistic production and evolution. As this synthesis will reveal, Raphael's time at the villa, interwoven through the better part of a decade, represents important milestones of his artistic, architectural, and archaeological development. These professional evolutions can be tied in some respect to his interactions at the Farnesina and thus foreshadow his moments of artistic acclaim attained elsewhere around Rome. Overarching is the emphasis on Raphael's willingness to experiment and to collaborate with new approaches, pulling new

¹⁹ Constanza Barbieri, "The Competition between Raphael and Michelangelo and Sebastiano's Role In It." In M.B. Hall, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Raphael* (2008). NY; Cambridge, pp. 141-166; Rona Goffen, 2002, *Renaissance Rivals: Michelangelo, Leonardo, Raphael, Titian*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

²⁰ Interestingly, Mark Wilson Jones has praised Peruzzi's work on the Villa Farnesina as one of the greatest achievements of his career, yet Frommel hypothesizes that, at the time of the villa's design, Pope Julius II called on Raphael for his architectural assistance as he was displeased with Peruzzi's progress: "la costruzione delle scuderie – pare – fu sollecitata dallo stesso Giulio II (morto nel febbraio 1513), insoddisfatto della Farnesina del Peruzzi sulla nuova via della Lungara." (Frommel, "Raffaello e la sua carriera architettonica," 20; Mark Wilson Jones, "Palazzo Massimo and Baldassarre Peruzzi's Approach to Architectural Design." *Architectural History*, Vol. 31 (1998), 59-106).

ideas from competing sources into his projects that resulted in revolutionary works. Thus, as this examination intends to illustrate, Raphael's work at the Villa Farnesina is some of his most essential, as it can be read ultimately as the expression of Rome's monumental influence on an impressionable artist. This study will yield an effective synthesis of current scholarship on Raphael as well as on the Farnesina, a complex whose study has been so overshadowed by that of its illustrious patron and whose footprint has been so ravaged by time that its full significance still remains elusive.

The aim of this examination is not to reinforce the cultic celebrity with which Raphael has already been enshrouded. Rather, pivotal to this thesis is a combined assessment of Raphael's achievements at the Villa Farnesina, a space wherein Raphael engaged with a microcosm of competition and collaboration and was resultantly permanently transformed. The following chapters are organized to lead the reader through the numerous factors impacting Raphael's work at Chigi's villa. Following this chapter, the second begins at the macrocosmic level to construct the contextual groundwork. It offers an overview of Rome in the early years of the sixteenth century in an effort to illustrate the dynamic atmosphere into which Raphael plunged and from which he emerged wholly transformed. This environment, spawned by, among other factors, the ambitious *renovatio* of Pope Julius II, fostered the ideal environs in which Raphael could explore his multifarious interests as he expanded upon his own conceptions of being an artist. This artistic development is showcased in a new

interpretation of a yet-unidentified portrait in *Parnassus*, which will be presented in the following pages as a declaration of Raphael's conceptualization of himself as both poet and painter.

Whereas Chapter Two conjures the atmosphere of Rome at the turn of the century as well as Raphael's navigation therein, Chapter Three delves into the man who made the Villa Farnesina a reality, Agostino Chigi. A close confidante of Julius II, Chigi enjoyed a unique status in Rome, a position upon which he capitalized both in business dealings and in the design and ornamentation of his riverside dwelling. His *villa suburbana* is one of the most remarkable of its day, both in its challenge to contemporaneous conventions of domestic architecture in its blurring of business and pleasure and also in its groundbreaking exploration of *all'antica* themes in architectural, interior, and landscape design.

This chapter will also provide background on the developing field of architecture and on Chigi's architect, Peruzzi. As will be shown, Peruzzi's plans for the structure can be traced to his previous work with mentor Francesco di Giorgio Martini on the Sieneese Villa Le Volte, commissioned by Chigi's father, Mariano. The aim of this tracing of architectural lineage is to reinforce Peruzzi's ingenuity of expression in blending the training of Francesco di Giorgio with the leading treatises of Vitruvius and Alberti as well as his own architectural manipulations and innovations. Doing so establishes the innovative atmosphere Peruzzi's villa design encouraged within the Farnesina complex. This, in many ways, foreshadows the subsequent instances of ingenuity that would highlight

Raphael's experience there, particularly in his collaborative and competitive engagements with Peruzzi himself.

Chapter Four travels into the villa's interior, beginning with Peruzzi's work on the astrological ceiling of the Loggia di Galatea. As will be discussed, Peruzzi, as he had done with the villa's architectural design, continued to innovate, constructing a considerably complex narrative as part of an overall vision for the room's decorative program. Here again Peruzzi borrows from his work at the Villa Le Volte, yet included in this quotation is evidence of Peruzzi's visual engagement with both Raphael and the antique, a brief hint of the forthcoming exchange that would ensue between them.

With Peruzzi having effectively set a tone of innovation within this loggia's suite of imagery, discussion then moves to the arrival of Venetian painter Sebastiano del Piombo in 1511, just shortly preceding his pairing (or sparring) with Raphael for the pendant pieces of *Polyphemus* and *Galatea*. It will be argued that Sebastiano was aware of the visual discourse at stake in the loggia, not only in the form of a confrontation of styles between Venetian and Roman painting but also in the individual exchange between Peruzzi, Sebastiano and eventually Raphael. This contemplation is evidenced in nearly simultaneous commissions completed by Sebastiano, which provide crucial contextual evidence leading up to his development of *Polyphemus*. This is an image that scholarship has already pinpointed as an essential confrontation between Sebastiano and Raphael that encouraged their career-spanning competition. The

argument made here, however, is that this instance of interaction was also foundational for co-opetition, as it coincided with the essential turning point in Raphael's artistic production not only in his approach to painting but also in his diversification into a variety of professional roles. In other words, Raphael's response to Sebastiano's visual provocation is not merely to compete with the Venetian. Rather, Raphael assembles a variety of visual references borrowed from artists past and contemporaneous to create an image that simultaneously works with Sebastiano's painting while also standing independently from it as a key moment in the evolution of *all'antica* painting. This preliminary blend of competition and collaboration would develop into the essence of co-opetition.

Co-opetition continued to bear resonance within Raphael's subsequent work at the villa and his exchange with Peruzzi. As Chapter Five discusses, at approximately the same time that Raphael completed his *Galatea* he began work on his first architectural commissions, those for Chigi's riverfront casino and stables. His treatment of these structures, as will be argued, shared, if not borrowed, Peruzzi's architectural approach. Beginning with a tracing of Raphael's burgeoning interests in the fields of architecture and archaeology, the chapter proceeds by piecing together what fragmentary evidence remains of these two structures. Discussion of what is known of the riverfront casino is unfortunately brief, as the only evidence of its existence is conveyed through vague textual descriptions. Significant effort will be made, however, to propose some qualified hypothetical solutions as to how this structure functioned, using a

combination of existing evidence, logistical practicalities, and comparisons to contemporary structures of a similar nature. Within this hypothetical assembly of the riverfront casino, the argument will be made that the structure itself included one of the first revivals of the ancient nymphaeum, a testament to both Raphael's burgeoning interest in archaeology as well as his collaborative efforts with Peruzzi in creating an entertainment space that simultaneously accommodated the pragmatic necessities of aquatic engineering for the villa's garden water features.

The stables, though also demolished (save for a small corner of brick that still stands at the intersection of the Via della Lungara and the Via di Buon Pastore), nevertheless enjoyed much greater documentation that allows for a more concrete analysis. What emerges is a sense of Raphael's simultaneous yet paradoxical adherence to and rebellion from architectural conventions through the juxtaposition of Vitruvian and Albertian architectural precepts, not that unlike Peruzzi's revolutionary treatment of the villa itself. Thus, the discussion of these structures aims to illustrate how closely Raphael's architectural styling paralleled that of Peruzzi, suggesting a level of exchange between the two particularly in the case of the riverfront casino and nymphaeum complex. While this exchange does not present a clear-cut case of co-opetition, it nevertheless establishes a collaborative dynamic between Peruzzi and Raphael that would become essential in the years following in the co-opetitive visual exchange

between the two artists' final fresco commissions at the Villa Farnesina, as discussed in the subsequent chapter.

Chapter Six reflects upon the lasting impact of these exchanges on Raphael's art, architecture and archaeology. Emerging from these exchanges in 1513 having finished three of the four projects he would complete for the villa, Raphael's outlook had notably changed. This chapter will track some of these more global impacts on his career while also coming full circle by returning to Raphael's final project at the villa, that for the design of the Loggia di Amore e Psiche, completed in tandem with Peruzzi's Sala delle Prospettive on the *piano nobile*. A close analysis of these two spaces, which offered commentary on the multiple topics of painting, architecture, perspective, and theater, reveal the dialogue between Raphael and Peruzzi.

Extending this discussion, the effort will be made to return in closing to the intended design of the *scaenae frons* entrance façade. The *scaenae frons* is an element often overlooked in scholarly discussions of the Farnesina's design, yet it is arguably one of its most significant aspects, not only for its revival of Vitruvian conventions but also for the careful interaction it would have required between Raphael and Peruzzi. As this chapter will reveal, had this co-opetitive visual program been achieved in its entirety before Raphael's death, it would have been a crowning achievement for both Raphael and Peruzzi. In closing, the intent is to leave the reader with a greater understanding of the atmosphere of Rome in the

early *cinquecento*, the dynamic artistic and architectural vision for the Villa Farnesina, and Raphael's role throughout.

Review of the Scholarship

This examination is indebted to a large body of scholarship that has come before it. The inspiration for such an integrated analysis stemmed initially from numerous and varied analyses of Agostino Chigi and his enigmatic Villa Farnesina, most notably Ingrid Rowland's extensive research on Chigi and his role in sixteenth-century Rome. Her translated and annotated compendium of *The Correspondence of Agostino Chigi* (2001) offers an unfiltered look into the psyche of one of the most influential yet enigmatic men of the day, down to his culinary preferences.²¹ Complementing this resource were Rowland's numerous articles on Chigi and his villa, chiefly among them two: "Render Unto Caesar the Things Which are Caesar's: Humanism and the Arts in the Patronage of Agostino Chigi" (1986)²², and the more recent "Il Giardino *Trans Tiberium* di Agostino

²¹ References to food weave throughout his letters, a prime example being the recurring appearance of *raveggiolo*, a type of ricotta indigenous to Tuscany that Chigi greatly enjoyed. He even mentions it at the close of an otherwise dramatic letter to letter to his father, Mariano, regarding negotiations with Duke Borgia in November 1499, "per qualche giorno come è piaciuto a su signoria e altro non dirò se non che mi mandate di ravagiuli." As Rowland commented, "it is characteristic of Chigi that in the midst of this talk of life-or-death negotiations, he should turn his mind with equal vehemence to food, Sieneese food in particular." (Ingrid D. Rowland, *The Correspondence of Agostino Chigi* (Vatican: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 2001), 6).

²² Ingrid D. Rowland, "Render Unto Caesar the Things Which are Caesar's: Humanism and the Arts in the Patronage of Agostino Chigi." *Renaissance Quarterly*, 39 (4) (Winter, 1986), 673-730.

Chigi" (2005)²³, both of which convey a remarkable sense of just how dynamic a complex this *villa suburbana* would have been in its heyday. Added to this is Mary Quinlan-McGrath's unpublished dissertation (1983), which offers the most complete translation and interpretation of Egidio Gallo's and Blosio Palladio's sixteenth-century poems on the Farnesina.²⁴ Also essential is Christoph Luitpold Frommel's extensive work on the villa, most recently encapsulated in his edited volume, *La Villa Farnesina a Roma* (2003), which offers a refreshed interpretation of his past analysis of the villa, important cues for the research initiated herein, and a stunning visual account of the villa itself, including numerous views not accessible to the public.²⁵

Of additional importance was the literature that reconstructs the cultural atmosphere of turn-of-the-sixteenth-century Rome, an era whose dynamism is attested to by a wide range of scholarship. Here again Rowland played a pivotal role with her book, *The Culture of the High Renaissance* (1998), which offers a rich overview of the intellectual environment of early *cinquecento* Rome. Amplifying Rowland's discussion of the growing levels of intellectualism during the period are the scholarly examinations of the contemporaneous (and coinciding)

²³ Ingrid D. Rowland, "Il Giardino *Trans Tiberium* di Agostino Chigi." In C. Benocci, ed., *I Giardini Chigi tra Siena e Roma dal Cinquecento agli Inizi dell'Ottocento* (Siena: Fondazione Monte dei Paschi, 2005), 57-72, 421.

²⁴ Mary Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa of Agostino Chigi: The Poems and the Paintings" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1983). Quinlan-McGrath offers the complete translation of each poem in the subsequent publications: "Aegidius Gallus, De Viridario Agustini Chigii Vera Libellus. Introduction, Latin Text and English Translation." *Humanistica Lovaniensia – Journal of Neo-Latin Studies*, Vol. 38 (1989), and "Blosius Palladius, *Suburbanum Agustini Chisii*. Introduction, Latin Text and English Translation." *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, Vol 39 (1990).

²⁵ Christoph Luitpold Frommel, Giulia Caneva, and Alessandro Angeli. *La Villa Farnesina a Roma = The Villa Farnesina in Rome*. *Mirabilia Italiae*, 12 (Modena: F.C. Panini, 2003), 2 vols.

reception of antiquity.²⁶ Roberto Weiss' *The Renaissance Discovery of Classical Antiquity* (1969)²⁷ and the proceedings published in *Classical Influences on European Culture* (1974)²⁸ outline the revelations of the ancient world that permeated Raphael's Rome. In addition, Phyllis Pray Bober offers a practical handbook of materials unearthed and subsequently used by Renaissance artists (*Renaissance Artists and Antique Sculpture: A Handbook of Sources*, 1986).²⁹ Leonard Barkan's *Unearthing the Past* (1999) highlights the potential, and sometimes problematic, Renaissance interpretation of these antiquities.³⁰

Complementing this retrospective interpretation of these artifacts are the various sixteenth-century sources and inventories that offer key glimpses into the collection of antiquities Chigi had amassed within the Farnesina complex. The post-mortem inventory conducted by Chigi's secretary, Cornelio Benigno, and his associate, Filippo Sergardi (late 1520) provided identification of several important antiquities in Chigi's possession.³¹ Added to this list were ancient objects alluded to in the accounts of Jacopo Mazzochi (1521)³², Pietro Arentino

²⁶ Ingrid D. Rowland, *The Culture of the High Renaissance: Ancients and Moderns in Sixteenth-Century Rome* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

²⁷ Roberto Weiss, *The Renaissance Discovery of Classical Antiquity*. (Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1969).

²⁸ R.R. Bolgar, *Classical Influences on European Culture, A.D. 1500-1700: Proceedings of an International Conference Held at King's College, Cambridge, April 1974* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1976).

²⁹ Phyllis Pray Bober and Ruth Rubenstein, *Renaissance Artists and Antique Sculpture: A Handbook of Sources*. Second revised edition (London: Miller, 1987).

³⁰ Leonard Barkan, *Unearthing the Past: Archaeology and Aesthetics in the Making of Renaissance Culture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999).

³¹ This inventory was republished in full in: Roberto Bartalini, "Due Episodi del Mecenate di Agostino Chigi e le Antichità della Farnesina." *Prospettiva* 67 (1992), 25-34. As of 2014, Costanza Barbieri is conducting a more comprehensive review of this document.

³² Jacopo Mazzochi, *Epigrammatica antiquae urbis* (Rome: Mazzochi, 1521).

(1537), Ulisse Aldrovandi (1556),³³ and Paolo Alessandro Maffei and Domenico de Rossi (1704).³⁴ Assisting in the interpretation of these various accounts was Kathleen Wren Christian's *Empire Without End: Antiquities Collections in Renaissance Rome, c. 1350-1527* (2010), a useful sourcebook for contemporaneous Roman antique collections.³⁵

The effort to situate Raphael within this intellectual environment required reviewing an equally vast field of scholarship. Among these sources, essential was Vincenzo Golzio's *Raffaello nei Documenti, nelle Testimonianze dei Contemporanei e nella Letteratura del Suo Secolo* (1936)³⁶, a requisite source for documentation of Raphael's life. John Shearman's subsequent *Raphael in Early Modern Sources* (2003)³⁷ expanded Golzio's compendium while critically separating fact from fiction throughout Raphael's occasionally murky biography. Roger Jones and Nicholas Penny's *Raphael* (1983) proffers an overview of Raphael's career, while Bette Talvacchia's *Raphael* (2007) provides insightful updates to his *oeuvre*, including new consideration of Chigi's Loggia di Amore e Psiche after years of scholarly marginalization. Marcia B. Hall's edited *Cambridge Companion to Raphael* (2005)³⁸ also extends invaluable insights to Raphael's career, particularly Costanza Barbieri's essay in the same volume on the role of

³³ Ulisse Aldrovandi, *Delle statue antiche di Roma* (Rome: 1556).

³⁴ Domenico de Rossi and Paolo Alessandro Maffei, *Raccolta di statue antiche e moderne* (Rome: 1704).

³⁵ Kathleen Christian, *Empire Without End: Antiquities Collections in Renaissance Rome, c. 1350-1527* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), 63-91.

³⁶ Vincenzo Golzio, *Raffaello nei documenti nelle testimonianze dei contemporanei e nella letteratura del suo secolo* (Città del Vaticano: Pontificia Insigne Accademia Artistica dei Virtuosi al Pantheon, 1936).

³⁷ John K.G. Shearman, *Raphael in Early Modern Sources* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003).

³⁸ M.B. Hall, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Raphael* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

competition in Raphael's production.³⁹ Barbieri's writing complements Rona Goffen's essential *Renaissance Rivals: Michelangelo, Leonardo, Raphael and Titian* (2002). Also important in Hall's volume was Ingrid Rowland's summation of Raphael's works in the Vatican stanze that builds on the original examination of the stanze by John Shearman (*The Vatican Stanze: Functions and Decorations*, 1972).⁴⁰ Added to this was Christiane Joost-Gaugier's *Raphael's Stanza della Segnatura: Meaning and Invention* (2002), which situates Raphael's pictorial programs within the context of an intellectual and artistic crossroads for the young artist.⁴¹

As this examination turned toward the field of architecture, Stefano Ray's original *Raffaello architetto: linguaggio artistico e ideologica nel Rinascimento romano* (1976)⁴² and his subsequent collaboration with Christoph Luitpold Frommel, *Raffaello Architetto* (1984)⁴³, offer perhaps the most complete published account of Raphael's architectural projects, including Raphael's designs for both the stables and the riverside loggia of the Villa Farnesina. Furthering this discussion was Ingrid Rowland's publication on Raphael's explorations of ancient architecture ("Raphael, Angelo Colocci, and the Genesis of the Architectural Orders," in M.

³⁹ Barbieri, "The Competition."

⁴⁰ John K.G. Shearman, *The Vatican Stanze: Functions and Decoration* (London: Oxford University Press, 1971).

⁴¹ Christiane L. Joost-Gaugier, *Raphael's Stanza della Segnatura: Meaning and Invention* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

⁴² Stefano Ray, *Raffaello architetto: linguaggio artistico e ideologica nel Rinascimento Romano* (Rome: Laterza, 1974).

⁴³ Christoph Luitpold Frommel, Stefano Ray, Manfredo Tafuri, Howard Burns, and Arnold Nesselrath, *Raffaello Architetto* (Milan: Electra, 1984).

Cole's *Sixteenth Century Italian Art*, 2006, first published in *The Art Bulletin* in 1994).⁴⁴

The necessary companions for a study of Raphael's architectural pursuits were the writings of Vitruvius, as relayed to modern interpreters through Rowland, Thomas Noble Howe and Michael Dewar's *Vitruvius: Ten Books on Architecture* (1999)⁴⁵ and Leon Battista Alberti, as translated in Joseph Rykwert's *On the Art of Building in Ten Books* (1988)⁴⁶, as both Vitruvius and Alberti transformed the field of architecture that dawned at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Also informative was the architectural treatise of Sebastiano Serlio, as reflected in *The Five Books of Architecture* (1982)⁴⁷ and Myra Nan Rosenfeld's *Sebastiano Serlio on Domestic Architecture* (1978)⁴⁸, as Serlio was a contemporary of Raphael and student of Peruzzi, thereby arguably conveying in essence in publication what both masters never had the opportunity to.

The literature on Peruzzi, of which there is relatively little, was nevertheless greatly helpful. From an architectural perspective, Ann C. Huppert's numerous insightful publications on the architectural master, along with Mark Wilson Jones's seminal article "Palazzo Massimo and Baldassarre

⁴⁴ Ingrid D. Rowland, "Raphael, Angelo Colocci and the Genesis of the Architectural Orders." *The Art Bulletin*, 76 (1)(March, 1994), 81-104.

⁴⁵ Michael Dewar and Thomas Noble Howe, *Vitruvius: Ten Books on Architecture* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

⁴⁶ *On the Art of Building in Ten Books*, trans. by J. Rykwert, N. Leach and R. Tavernor (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992).

⁴⁷ Sebastiano Serlio, *The Five Books of Architecture* (New York: Dover Publications, 1982).

⁴⁸ Myra Nan Rosenfeld, *Sebastiano Serlio on Domestic Architecture: Different Dwellings from the Meanest Hovel to the Most Ornate Palace: the Sixteenth-Century Manuscript of Book VI in the Avery Library of Columbia University* (New York: Architectural History Foundation, 1978).

Peruzzi's Approach to Architectural Design" (1988), offered essential examinations of Peruzzi's aims. Jones' study was particularly relevant, as it highlighted Peruzzi's reliance on Vitruvian proportions in his Villa Farnesina design and provided the basis for further probing into Peruzzi's revival of the *scaenae frons* for the villa's northern façade. From an artistic perspective, Quinlan-McGrath's 1983 dissertation again proved essential in her interpretation of Peruzzi's astrological ceiling within the Loggia di Galatea, while the work of Cieri⁴⁹ and, more recently Valeria Cafà and Anka Zeifer (both 2010)⁵⁰ provided a backbone for this examination's interpretation of both the Sala delle Prospettive and some of the *sgraffito* once emblazoned on the Farnesina entrance façade.

One final related scholarly trend is the study of *all'antica* explorations. Of particular note is Malcolm Bull's *The Mirror of the Gods* (2005), which examines the revival of antique themes in sixteenth century artistic programs.⁵¹ Also important was Luba Freedman's *Classical Myths in Italian Renaissance Painting* (2011), which offered inestimable contributions to the scholarship both on the pictorial program of the Villa Farnesina and on the intellectual pursuits of *all'antica* themes at the turn of the century.⁵² Finally, the recent release of David

⁴⁹ Claudia Cieri, "Sala delle Prospettive: Via, Storia e Funzione della Sala." In Sergio Rossi and Luciana Cassanelli, eds., *Di Luoghi di Raffaello a Roma* (Rome: Multigrafica Editrice, 1983), 66-73.

⁵⁰ Valeria Cafà, "Divinità a pezzi: Prove di restauro di scultura antica nei disegni di Baldassarre Peruzzi," (697-702 and 697-701) and Anka Ziefer, "*Marte e Venere sorpresi da Vulcano*: la fortuna iconografica di un affresco perduto di Baldassarre Peruzzi per la Villa Farnesina a Roma," (207-231) in Maria Beltramini and Caroline Elam, eds., *Some degree of happiness: Studi di storia dell'architettura in onore di Howard Burns* (Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore, 2010).

⁵¹ Malcolm Bull, *Mirror of the Gods: How Renaissance Artists Rediscovered the Pagan Gods* (NY: Oxford University Press, 2005).

⁵² Luba Freedman, *Classical Myths in Italian Renaissance Painting* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

Rijser's *Raphael's Poetics: Art and Poetry in High Renaissance Rome* (2012) proved auspicious, as his insightful discussion of Raphael proves an ideal entrée into many of the arguments laid out in the following pages.⁵³

Advancing the Discourse

Building on this vast body of literature, the chief contribution of this dissertation is to provide the first holistic examination of Raphael's artistic, architectural, and antiquarian work at the Farnesina and how this interplay of pursuits can shed light on his entire Roman artistic production. While past scholarship has delved more generally into Raphael's career and the multifaceted Farnesina complex independent of one another, no known study to date has centered so specifically on the crossroads of the two. A fitting example is Rosalia Varoli-Piazza's recent work (2002), which, while offering a penetrating look into the history and importance of the Farnesina's Loggia di Amore e Psiche, nevertheless in some senses keeps Raphael at bay and overlooks any potential parallels between this space and his other commissions on the property.⁵⁴ Another example is that of Jürg Meyer zur Capellen's 2001 catalogue of Raphael's painting, wherein he mentions "a decisive orientation towards a

⁵³ David Rijser, *Raphael's Poetics: Art and Poetry in High Renaissance Rome* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2012).

⁵⁴ Rosalia Varoli-Piazza, ed., *Raffaello: La Loggia di Amore e Psiche alle Farnesina*. (Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 2002).

new, formal language *all'antica* . . . dated to about 1514"⁵⁵ in Raphael's oeuvre yet he draws no connection between this shift and Raphael's *Galatea*.

Such categorical isolation has been the trend in Raphael scholarship for some time. The literature of Raphael's cataloguers, such as Meyer zur Capellen, reveals to us "Raphael the Painter"; Frommel and Ray provide us with an image of "Raphael the Architect;" and Shearman and Nesselrath convey "Raphael the Archaeologist," yet few seek to transcend these categories for an incisive, cross-media analysis of Raphael's approach. The only scholar to truly attempt such a bridge is Rowland.⁵⁶ In some part this examination is an extension of her approach, applying it to a previously unconsidered ensemble of Raphael's works that can be seen to provide an isolated summation of Raphael's development as artist, architect and antiquarian.

Pursuing this course, this examination also offers the opportunity to look more directly at Raphael's engagements with both Sebastiano and Peruzzi, which results in two important contributions. First, looking to their work within the context of this relationship with Raphael adds to our understanding, albeit at a more topical level, of both Sebastiano and Peruzzi. Second, these engagements reveal an ideal opportunity to introduce the notion of co-opetition. Balancing competition and collaboration was essential to Raphael's artistic production;

⁵⁵ Jürg Meyer zur Capellen and Stefan B. Polter, *Raphael: A Critical Catalogue of His Paintings* (Landshut: Arcos, 2001), 2:11. He goes on to pinpoint this transition as occurring between Raphael's work in the Stanza d'Eliodoro and the Stanza dell'Incendio, without taking into consideration his concurrent projects at the Farnesina.

⁵⁶ Exemplified in: Ingrid Rowland, "Raphael, Angelo Colocci and the Genesis of the Architectural Orders," *The Art Bulletin*, 76 (1)(March, 1994), 81-104.

indeed, it seems not coincidental that he would establish one of the early sixteenth-century's most flourishing workshops designed, as mentioned previously and as discussed in Chapter Six, around a co-opetitive model. Thus, while this terminology bears the potential for expansion across art historical discourse, it is particularly appropriate for this discussion as it allows a nuanced analysis of Raphael's artistic production as well as, in some respects, that of both Sebastiano and Peruzzi.

Finally, while great effort has been expended to lift the heavy veil of Chigian lore from the Farnesina to examine the artists themselves at work there, this dissertation should nevertheless contribute to the advancing field of Farnesina studies as well, offering several potential pieces of the enigmatic puzzle that the Farnesina remains today. One such puzzle piece provided by this analysis is a reinterpretation of the famed riverfront casino and grotto that takes into consideration the vague descriptions of this space, the generalized terrain along the Tiber, the ongoing desire to conjure an *all'antica* atmosphere throughout the Farnesina grounds, and the practical necessity of water flowing into the garden to supply both irrigation and functional fountains made possible by Peruzzi's ingenious engineering and elaborate cisterns under the villa itself. This analysis suggests that the casino was a single or double level, three- to five-bay structure, at the center of which would have been a nymphaeum, either as niche fountain or designed as a more elaborate full-scale grotto that potential included an opening in the floor that revealed the waters of the Tiber River

below. As will be argued, this design would, on a practical level, have masked the source of water entering the villa's cistern network. Simultaneously, however, this structure would have served both an aesthetically pleasing and *all'antica* purpose, adding to the lavish entertainment spaces that Chigi often flaunted while also representing one of the earliest revivals of the ancient nymphaeum.

Another contribution is the continued development of a catalog of Chigi's collection of antiquities. This examination advances the work of Bober (1986) and Christian (2010) by adding to the inventory of Chigi's artifacts while also considering how some of these pieces functioned within the villa grounds. Using contemporary accounts, as well as the ancient objects still *in situ*, brings us closer to understanding both the size and scope of Chigi's collection but also how these objects contributed to the overall Farnesina *all'antica* atmosphere.

A final contribution is the advanced reconstruction of the visual program once intended for the Farnesina's entrance façade. Had it been completed as envisioned, this space would have easily been the watershed for such exterior decorations for generations. The death of patron and painter, however, in 1520, prohibited its completion, and the ravages of a northern exposure have all but erased Peruzzi's façade frescoes. This analysis advances the scholarship that aims to reassemble this façade by identifying new potential visual sources, including the reinterpretation of a Peruzzi sketch misidentified by Frommel (2003). In addition, this study offers the first consideration of how Raphael's envisioned

panels and lunettes on the lower level of the Loggia di Amore e Psiche, both visible from the theatrical forecourt, would have worked in conjunction with Peruzzi's façade frescoes. This builds upon Quinlan-McGrath's (1983) work reassembling these lower loggia panels by carrying the imagery outside and thus juxtaposing it with that of Peruzzi, an allusion, as it will be argued, to the collaborative relationship Raphael shared with Peruzzi during their final Farnesina days.

Chapter Two: Rome and *Renovatio*

“[Julius] found a plebeian, haggard and filthy town and turned it into a clean and proper city, worthy of the Roman name.”

-Tommaso Inghirami, Eulogy for Pope Julius II¹

As Marcia Hall comments in her introduction to *The Cambridge Companion to Raphael*, “The Rome in which Raphael arrived in 1508 was already a massive construction site.”² The construction of which Hall speaks is quite literal, as by this date Rome was in the midst of the massive *renovatio*, or renovation, encouraged by Pope Julius II. At the same time, however, Roman culture was also undergoing reconstruction of a more metaphorical kind as it experienced the building of a new set of social constructs and values. It was this new cultural mindset, for example, that allowed imports such as Agostino Chigi to so skillfully insert himself into Roman society. It was this same advancing ideology that allowed Raphael’s enterprising personality not only to rapidly ascend to artistic celebrity but also to pursue significant innovations in art and architecture during his brief career.

¹ Renato Lefevre, *Palazzo Chigi* (Rome: Editalia, 1973), 10.

² Marcia B. Hall, “Introduction,” In M.B. Hall, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Raphael* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 4.

Conjuring the Classical

The grandiose renovation that Pope Julius II envisioned for Rome was an attempt to restore a city that had been struggling, in essence, since the fifth-century fall of the Roman Empire. By the eleventh century it had rebounded to fill a portion of the ancient civic footprint into an area known as the *abitato*, or “inhabited” area, stretching from present-day Trastevere on the western bank of the Tiber River to the Quirinal on the eastern bank.³ Two centuries later, however, the *abitato* tallied only 35,000 inhabitants, so small a number that, as historian Robert Brentano commented, “if this estimate is even close to correct, all the Romans of Rome could have sat down in the Colosseum.”⁴ This bustling town center, its skyline punctuated by baronial towers, was as much the center of commerce as it was the center of crime, disease, and ongoing skirmishes between land barons and the *Popolo Romano*, or general population of Rome.⁵

³ As Krautheimer elaborates upon the scope of this neighborhood: “The three areas built up in the earlier Middle Ages east and west of the river grew into a coherent and, it would seem, densely populated town. In Trastevere minor churches, convents, and housing, heavily built up already by the early eleventh century, edged north to S. Maria and Porta Settimiana. The Tiber Island became a fortified link between Trastevere and the east bank. There the two early-developed areas, the Ripa spreading from the river’s edge to the northern foot of the Capitol and the area from around the Pantheon to Piazza Navona, were fused and jointly pushed westward to fill the entire river bend. At the same time, the town spread northward far into the Campo Marzio and eastward to the foot of the Quirinal and what became the Trevi Fountain. At the edge of the *abitato*, the Borgo and St. Peter’s to the west and the Capitol to the east became new foci of the Roman townscape.” (Richard Krautheimer, *Rome: Profile of a City 312-1308*. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980), 271). Interestingly, this centrally oriented district maintained this general outline until the dawn of the Renaissance years later.

⁴ Robert Brentano, *Rome Before Avignon: A Social History of Thirteenth Century Rome* (New York: Basic Books, 1914); Linda Pellechia, “The Contested City: Urban Form in Early Sixteenth-Century Rome.” In M.B. Hall, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Raphael* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 59-94.

⁵ The Pope himself was not safe within the streets of the *abitato*. As Linda Pellechia has commented, not only was the Pope accosted by a roving band of starving men but also, in 1504, a Papal envoy was murdered while attempting to arrest a fugitive holed up in the Orsini *monte* (Pellechia, “The Contested City,” 67).

Later in the thirteenth-century Pope Boniface VIII sought a wholly new conception of Rome as the “New Jerusalem,” the eventual center of Christendom, and “the preeminent site of Christian communion.”⁶ He commenced this figurative renewal with the declaration of 1300 as the first Jubilee Year, but when Boniface VIII’s successor, Clement V, moved the papacy to Avignon in 1309, Rome was still in a state of disrepair.⁷ Though the process of papal reinvigoration languished for a number of years, hope was renewed upon the reunion of the Papacy in 1420, following the conclusion of the Great Schism and Pope Martin V’s coinciding campaign of *Renovatio Romae* to rebuild the city.⁸

Once underway, Martin V’s monumental revitalization provided an unprecedented opportunity for archaeological excavation. When materials could not be gathered from ancient remnants above ground (though many were), license was given to excavate, which, in the words of Ian Campbell, gave “lots of opportunities to stare down holes,”⁹ and began a cultural love affair with all things antique. A preponderance of excavations yielded by century’s end some of the first important archaeological finds, such as the massive *Tiber* in the 1440s or the fragments of the colossal sculpture of *Constantine the Great* in 1486. As this

⁶ Meredith J. Gill, “The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.” In M.B. Hall, ed., *Artistic Centers of the Renaissance: Rome* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 27.

⁷ As Meredith Gill comments, “the contrast between the dismal facts of the physical landscape and the elevated status of the city’s myths could not have been greater. . . . the devastated terrain of Rome seemed to echo the vicissitudes of human civilization itself” (“The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries,” 27).

⁸ Ian Campbell, “Rescue Archaeology in the Renaissance,” in Ilaria Bignamini, ed., *Archives & Excavations: Essays on the History of Archaeological Excavations in Rome and Southern Italy from the Renaissance to the Nineteenth Century*, (London: British School at Rome, 2004), 14.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 14.

push for renovation continued, and as more of the ancient world was unearthed, the role of antiquity in Roman society took on greater importance.

While Rome's engagement with remnants of the antique world was renewed, it was by no means new. Petrarch's associate Giovanni Dondi, for example, was one of the first to chronicle Rome's monuments in 1375.¹⁰ Furthermore, noble Roman families of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries already sensed the historical weight of antique inscriptions and fragments and thus appropriated them into their dwellings to imply an impressive (albeit often fabricated) historical lineage.¹¹ A prime example of this was the home of Niccolò di Crescenzo (Fig. 4), near the Ponte Rotto, which exhibited "the most extensive array of *spolia* known from [the twelfth century]" and was designed in such a way to mimic not only other baronial fortresses but also the remains of the adjacent ancient Temple of Portunus.¹²

Ancient objects increasingly became more than a link to the Eternal City's past grandeur; they also gave hope that such glory could be rekindled. As more antique artifacts were unearthed – sixteenth-century antiquarian Pirro Ligorio described Rome as having "two populations, the one of living men and the other

¹⁰ Ibid., 13.

¹¹ See Kathleen Christian's chapter, "Fictive Genealogies and Ancestral Collections in Fifteenth-Century Rome," (Kathleen Christian, *Empire Without End*, 63-91).

¹² This tradition continued well into the fifteenth century, with a fantastic counterpoint to the Crescenzi home being the residence of Lorenzo Manlio who, after "adopting" a noble lineage (and subsequently changing his name to "Manlius"), built in 1476 on the Piazza Guidea a house replete with fragments of antique and modern reliefs and inscriptions. As Christian comments: "with this immense bulletin board of *spolia* Manlius heralded his recent reinvention as a *nobilis vir*." (Christian, *Empire*, 65; 76).

of marble statues”¹³ - contemporary understanding of the non-linearity of time began to blur the lines between ancient and modern. As Leonard Barkan suggests: “the unearthed object becomes the place of exchange not only between words and pictures but also between antiquity and modern times.”¹⁴ This “raising of the dead”¹⁵ resulted in a fluid environment in which antique artifacts and fragments could be repurposed with multiple resonances, transcending time periods.

Alexander Nagel and Christopher Wood have termed this transcendence “anachronic,” in an effort to expand the understanding of the impact such complex chronology bore for *quattrocento* and *cinquecento* viewers.”¹⁶ Nagel and Wood argue for a “clash of temporalities” at the turn of the century, wherein “patrons and artist and beholders all agree to see the artifacts . . . as traces of historical moments.”¹⁷ They situate antique objects as negotiations between epochs, wherein the antique is understood as both old and new. This anachronic aspect works both ways, and so at the same time those objects newly made could be seen as old.

¹³ Erna Mandowsky and Charles Mitchell, *Pirro Ligorio's Roman Antiquities: The Drawings in MS XIII. B 7 in the National Library of Naples* (London: Warburg Institute, University of London, 1963), 49-50; Barkan, *Unearthing the Past*, 63.

¹⁴ Barkan, *Unearthing the Past*, 4.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 61.

¹⁶ Nagel and Wood, “Towards a new model of Renaissance Anachronism.” *Art Bulletin* 87 (2005), 403-32; Nagel and Wood offer a more complete discussion in their subsequent book, *Anachronic Renaissance*. (New York: Zone Books, 2010).

¹⁷ Nagel and Wood, “Towards a New Model,” 404.

This blurring of time created a rich network of associations among antique objects.¹⁸ One such example cited by Nagel and Wood is the treatment of the Baptistery of Florence. Though built in the eleventh century, the Baptistery was, by as early as the thirteenth century, considered an ancient structure and was labeled by Vasari in the sixteenth century as an “antichissimo tempio.” This misdating, ascribed by Nagel and Wood as “a crucial clue to the way scholars and artists thought about old buildings,”¹⁹ occurred in Rome as well, a salient example being the contemporaneous treatment of the Torre delle Milizie. Completed in the thirteenth century, the tower nevertheless was categorized as ancient, even earning the moniker “Nero’s Tower” as an allusion to it being the spot where the maniacal first-century Emperor watched his city burn.²⁰

At the same time, the Torre delle Milizie also reflects another version of this temporal stitching. Not only was it referred to as an antique structure as early as the century following its construction, but it was also built on top of the remains of the ancient Roman Imperial Fora, again blurring temporal lines. The reverse of Crescenzo’s previously mentioned spoliated abode, wherein the antique was built into the structure, here the modern structure envelops the antique. Such rooting in antiquity became increasingly popular by the early years

¹⁸ As Nagel and Wood comment, “artifacts and monuments. . . [were] stitched through time, pulling together different points in the temporal fabric until they met (Ibid., 408).

¹⁹ Ibid., 411.

²⁰ As James Packer recounts, this area above Trajan’s forum was actually originally occupied by Byzantine troops in the sixth century, hence the militaristic connections. By the end of the twelfth century, the remnants of the Byzantine compound had been replaced with a palace that included a tower, albeit a much more delicate structure. By 1280, senator Pandolfo della Subura had encased this tower with the more fortified one visible today. (James E. Packer, “Report from Rome: The Imperial Fora, A Retrospective.” *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. 101 (2) (Apr., 1997), 320-321).

of the *cinquecento*. Wealthy Romans scrutinized the location and design of their palaces to seek any and all ways to amplify their connection with the ancient world as if to have been cultivated from ancient roots. In the 1480s Cardinal Raffaello Riario, for example, deliberately chose a location for his palazzo (now known as the Palazzo della Cancelleria)(Fig. 5) that bore both historical and religious significance: not only was it sited in close proximity to the ancient Theater of Pompey, it also was the rumored location of the palace of Pope Saint Damasus (366-384 CE).²¹ This interest in building on top of and on to created new demand for *all'antica* architecture, that which channeled the principles of the ancient while also contributing to the developing professional definition of “architect.”

Simultaneous with such architectural integration with the past was the rise in garden collections of antiquities, a *locus amoenus*, or pleasurable locale, which in itself was an act of historical reconstruction.²² These gardens, or *vigne*, became a showcase through which important individuals could display not only the wealth of their collection but also their knowledge of antiquity. A prime example is the *vigna* of Pomponio Leto. Having founded an academy in the 1460s

²¹ Paolo Giovio, *Pauli Iovii novocomensis episcopi nucerini Elogia virorum literis illustrium, quotquot vel nostra vel avorum memoria vixere* (Basel: Petri Pernae typographie, 1577), 79; Packer, “Report from Rome,” 308; Christian, *Empire*, 142. The Theater of Pompey, while known to Renaissance audiences through Vitruvius, was nevertheless wholly subsumed by Medieval Roman construction and was not to be “unearthed” until the nineteenth century. For more on the theater, see: Hugh Denard, “Virtuality and Performativity: Recreating Rome’s Theatre of Pompey,” *PAJ: A Journal of Performance and Art*, 24 (1) (Jan., 2002), 25-43.

²² As Leonard Barkan comments: “the whole project of making is in response to broken bodies. . . [it] is, in however limited a way, an activity of reconstruction. The same can be said for . . . collecting and displaying a whole garden full of fragments, even when no individual restoration takes place.” (Barkan, *Unearthing the Past*, 209).

to study Rome's ruins, Leto eventually built a home in the footprint of the Baths of Constantine on the Quirinal Hill.²³ The shrunken state of the city's population afforded Leto ample land for an adjacent garden, filled with exotic birds and foliage and cultivated "according to the principles of Cato, Columella, and Varro."²⁴ Dotted throughout was an extensive collection of fragmentary ancient inscriptions, more of which were plastered into the walls of a central atrium for both appreciation and preservation. As Kathleen Christian comments, "at a time when inscriptions were still melted down in the kilns, building them into his house was a strong statement of the need to protect them from destruction and human invention, not only in Leto's own lifetime but over the *long durée*."²⁵ Other members of Roman humanist culture subsequently followed suit.

Cardinal Oliviero Carafa, for example, whose antiquarian inclinations had yielded his installation of the speaking statue, *Pasquino*, along the foundation of his rented *cinquecento* palace, also populated a suburban refuge on the Quirinal with antiquities. Carafa's villa and accompanying *vigna* grouped ancient inscriptions with statuary, such as an antique sculpture of *Flora* paired with a paraphrased excerpt from Francesco Colonna's *Hypernotomachia Poliphili*, to enhance an antiquarian atmosphere.²⁶ The same was conjured at the del Bufalo dwelling, built adjacent to the home and *vigna* of Angelo Colocci along the

²³ Christian, *Empire*, 129-131; Sara Magister, "Pomponio Leto collezionista di antichità: Note sulle tradizione manoscritta di una raccolta epigrafia nella Roma del tardo Quattrocento." *Xenia antiqua*, 7 (1998): 167-196.

²⁴ Christian, *Empire*, 130.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 132.

²⁶ Katherine M. Bentz, "Cardinal Cesi and His Garden: Antiquities, Landscape and Social Identity in Early Modern Rome." (Ph.D. Diss., The Pennsylvania State University, 2003), 3; Christian, *Empire*, 290-291.

footprint of the Aqua Virgo, south of the Piazza di Spagna.²⁷ The del Bufalo garden was hailed by the 1520s as “one of the city’s most impressive and scenographic arrangements of antiquities” and included a casino elaborately frescoed by Polidoro da Caravaggio and Maturino with scenes from Ovid’s *Metamorphosis*.²⁸

As more antiquities were unearthed toward the end of the fifteenth century, such private collections grew and antique artifacts became signifiers of status.²⁹ Such status also relied, however, on the stitching together of history – often at the cost of artistic misattribution.³⁰ The most desirable antiques were those that bore the signature of famous ancient artists, but as the most valuable antique works became concentrated in the wealthiest collections, this construction of pedigree became a reflection upon the owner himself. In other words, the owner was only as important as his most prized antique object,

²⁷ Bentz, 3; Rolf Kultzen, “Die Malerei Polodoros da Caravaggio im Giardino del Bufalo in Rom, *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz*, 9 (2) (Feb. 1960), 119.

²⁸ Christian, *Empire*, 281.

²⁹ As Christian posits, “in these years freestanding statues – the sort of *opera nobilia* that Pliny had singled out for special praise – took pride of place in settings that were more elaborate and artful (*Empire*, 151).

³⁰ Such pressure to establish a pristine artistic pedigree led to deliberate misattributions, as exemplified in the popular fragmentary relief known as *The Bed of Polyclitus*. For example, Alexander Nagel proposes: “the subject of [*The Bed of Polyclitus*] was not known [in the early sixteenth century], but its imminent thematic qualities . . . exerted fascination over the artists of the day. Michelangelo evidently found in the figure of sleep . . . a number of thematic associations. . . . Rosso [Fiorentino also] adopted the model in his panel [*Dead Christ with Angels*]” (Alexander Nagel, *Michelangelo and the Reform of Art*. NY: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 154-155.). Attributed incorrectly during the Renaissance to Greek sculptor Polyclitus, *The Bed of Polyclitus* proved problematic because, as Leonard Barkan comments, “no one in post-classical times has ever been very certain what this is a picture of.” (*Unearthing the Past*, 248.) This may also explain why, as Barkan recounts, when the *Tiber* was uncovered, it drew a great deal of attention, only to be reburied shortly thereafter. And, when the *Apollo Belvedere* was unearthed, evidence suggests it received little notice. Its exact date and location of discovery lost to history, *Apollo Belvedere* received its first mention in 1490 as part of the future Pope Julius II’s holding at San Pietro in Vincoli (Bober, *Renaissance Artists*, 71; Barkan, *Unearthing the Past*, 1; Christian, *Empire*, 152).

allowing the status antiquities to blur with their owners. Thus another valence can be ascribed to the growing *quattrocento* importance of antiquity: not only were these objects signposts of the past, but they also landmarks of the present, both signifying and signified by their owners.

As the new century dawned, the resonances of antiquity only intensified. This escalation was due in great part to the election of Giuliano della Rovere as Pope Julius II, a paradoxical figure who came to be known as much for his militarism as for his cultivation of antique intellectualism. When he ascended the Papacy on the first of November 1503, he envisioned Rome as a gleaming beacon of Western civilization. In actuality, however, the city was still struggling.

Pope Julius II and Renovatio

At the turn of the sixteenth century, Rome was still in a dire state, with a dwindling population and a damaged economy. As Ingrid Rowland commented:

The third-century fortification walls built by Emperor Aurelian, designed to protect an ancient metropolis of one million, marched like its ruined aqueducts across largely empty land, where people farmed and tended their herds beneath the ruins of ancient baths, villas, palaces, and temples. The city looked anything but eternal; time had treated it with cruel disdain.³¹

In addition to its decrepit physical state, Rome's economy was failing as well, leaving little hope amongst the remaining citizens for its resurrection as a great city.

³¹ Ingrid D. Rowland, *The Roman Garden of Agostino Chigi: The Thirteenth Lecture Held in Memory of Horst Gerson (1907-1978) in the aula of the University of Groningen on the 17th of November 2005* (Groningen: Gerson, 2005), 5.

Upon ascendance to the Papacy, however, Julius II would change such views. Known as a *papa terrible* for his tendency towards military force and for his grand plan to conquer the Italian peninsula in the name of the Catholic Church, Pope Julius II sought to renovate Rome to renew its former glory.³² This emphasis on renewal was at the same time, as both Charles Stinger and Christopher Hibbert have discussed, intended to reinforce the glory and power of the Catholic church.³³ In an effort to establish this power amongst Romans, Julius II vigorously combatted the crime that plagued his streets. To quell the powerful land barons, whose territorial control of the city had contributed significantly to heightened violent outbreaks, Julius denied them the ability to join the Cardinalate, which as a result prevented them from ascending the Papacy and thereby eliminated baronial attempts to use such an exalted office as a platform for further attacks on rival familial *monti*.³⁴ Julius II also evicted those members of baronial families from their paid role as Papal guardians, replacing them with the Swiss Guard.³⁵

³² Rowland, *The Roman Garden*, 5. Julius's militaristic tendency led to both the creation in 1506 of the Swiss Guard and was bolstered and his storied retort to Michelangelo while designing his Bolognese likeness in bronze, "give me a sword; I'm not a man of letters." As Nesselrath points out, Julius' campaigns, such as that which established the requirement of "two-thirds majority of the college of cardinals for all major decisions," were not all militaristic nor self-aggrandizing; indeed, as Nesselrath concludes, "[Julius II] hardly comes over as an autocrat or a second Julius Caesar." (Arnold Nesselrath, "Raphael and Pope Julius II," in Hugo Chapman, Tom Henry, Carol Piazotta, Arnold Nesselrath and Nicholas Penny, *Raphael: from Urbino to Rome* (London: National Gallery, 2004), 281). So intent on restoring the glory of Rome and taking control of the Italian peninsula, Julius II worked tirelessly to rid Italy of its foreign invaders, and he selected his name in direct reference to the ancient Roman (Pellechia, "The Contested City," 61).

³³ Charles L. Stinger, *The Renaissance in Rome* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998), 11-12; Christopher Hibbert, *Rome: The Biography of a City*. (Penguin Books, 1996), 140-141.

³⁴ Pellechia, "The Contested City," 67.

³⁵ Ibid.

At the same time, Julius set out on a massive campaign of beautification.³⁶ In addition to rebuilding St. Peter's Basilica and renovating the Vatican Apartments and the Sistine Chapel, Julius II designed the axial street routes along the Tiber River (Fig. 6).³⁷ Creating "a fusion of the utopian and the practical,"³⁸ Julius II envisioned two streets that flanked the Tiber River on the west and east banks. Within this scheme, the middle tine of his trident would be the river, a navigable waterway that separated business from pleasure.

Had his full plan been realized, the Via della Lungara and the Via Giulia would have served as main thoroughfares along the Tiber's western and eastern banks and would have joined into a circular route connected, to the south, by the Ponte Sisto and, to the north, by the planned Ponte Giulia. Both of these bridges shared, or were to share, roots with ancient Roman versions. Pope Sixtus IV had (re)built the Ponte Sisto in 1475 to incorporate the remnants of the second-century CE Pons Aurelius, while the new Ponte Giulia, following the approximate footprint of the modern Ponte Vittorio Emanuele II, would have shared foundations with the first-century CE Pons Triumphalis.³⁹ This would have effectively connected the Via Giulia directly to the Vatican, yet without it there existed a decided disconnection between this eastern main road and its

³⁶ As Stinger asserts: "no Renaissance pope before him left a greater imprint on the face of Rome." (Stinger, 11).

³⁷ The two streets created in this plan were the Via Giulia on the right bank of the river and the Via Della Lungara on the left bank, both of which begin at the Ponte Sisto (built by Pope Sixtus V, Pope Julius II's uncle) and run parallel to each other and head northwest in the direction of Vatican City. The third element in this tripartite plan was the Tiber River itself, which was intended as a water route for boat and ferry traffic.

³⁸ Pellechia, "The Contested City," 64.

³⁹ For illustration of this tentative location, see Pellechia's overlaid illustration on Giambattista Nolli's 1748 map of Rome (Pellechia, "The Contested City," 65).

papal destination.⁴⁰ Thus, though what remains today is “a severed limb of a once organic plan,”⁴¹ Julius II’s ultimate goal was to create a new civic center that consolidated all major city functions into a closed circuit around the Tiber River adjacent to the Vatican. Julius II intended to designate the Via Giulia as the newly consolidated administrative and legal center of the city. Included in this plan was Bramante’s monumental Palazzo dei Tribunali, an impressive Hall of Justice that was to become the main law courts of Rome but which never fully materialized.

Julius II’s vision for Rome’s future was intrinsically rooted in the city’s ancient past, a return encouraged by intellectuals since the prior century. As Rowland posits, “the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century thinkers who hailed a rebirth of ancient values in their own time did so knowing that their own era was irrevocably distinct from antiquity; . . . at the same time, the shapers of that modern world also felt the need to have it incorporate the best elements of their forbearers’ existence.”⁴² In the midst of his renovations to the Vatican Apartments, Julius II called upon his architect, Donato Bramante, to create a series of garden terraces that would connect the papal palace to the nearby Villa

⁴⁰ It was not until the late nineteenth-century construction of the Ponte Vittorio Emmanuele II that the absence of the Ponte Giulia was remedied. Part of Julius II’s inspiration for such a plan also had a familial connection. His uncle, Sixtus IV, had built the Ponte Sisto in the wake of the horrific collapse of the Ponte Sant’Angelo in 1450 under the wake of a pilgrim stampede. By adding the Ponte Giulia, Julius thereby would have guaranteed that the two most essential bridges in his new center of Rome would served as permanent commemoration of the delle Rovere lineage. Julius II’s concurrent goal was also to centralize commerce. Originally, he had laid out the Via della Lungara as stretching all the way to the southern Ripa port of Rome, the main source of food supplied to the city, thus transforming the Via della Lungara into an arterial route essential to Rome’s sustenance (Pellechia, “The Contested City,” 66). Had this materialized, Chigi’s selected locale would have been all the more significant.

⁴¹ Ibid., 66.

⁴² Ingrid D. Rowland, *The Culture of the High Renaissance*, 1.

Belvedere (Fig. 7). A veritable *vigna* writ large, this plan included a courtyard designed to showcase the Pope's impressive collection of antiquities. As Francis Haskell describes it, "[upon entering] the court, the sixteenth-century visitor would have seen first the rows of orange trees. . . .it was in this cool, fresh and orange-scented atmosphere that the visitor was able to view the great sculptures placed in elaborately painted and decorated niches."⁴³ Julius II's first major sculptural addition to this courtyard was the *Laocoön* in 1506, found in the vineyard of a Roman nobleman. Considered by Pliny as one of the prized treasures of the Roman Emperor Nero,⁴⁴ the *Laocoön* was soon joined by other impressive works, including the *Venus Felix* in 1509, the *Apollo (Belvedere)* in 1511, and the *Sleeping Nymph* in 1512. In no time, Julius II's courtyard collection was renowned across Europe.

Julius II's ambitious renovation plans for the city inspired by antiquity further fueled the fervor over the ancient world that had developed the century before. The multiple valences the antique held – at once both a symbol of the old Rome and a herald of the new; a resonance of the Pagan world in the midst of the Christian – seemed to become even more significant. *All'antica* style pervaded artistic and architectural commissions more so than it ever had before, encouraging artists to seek increasingly novel applications of the antique in their works. The scope of such analysis would grow during the reign of the subsequent Pope, Leo X, following Julius II's death in 1513. Leo made every

⁴³ Francis Haskell and Nicholas Penny, *Taste and the Antique: The Lure of Classical Sculpture, 1500-1900* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), 7.

⁴⁴ Christian, *Empire*, 163.

effort to promote such in-depth study of the antique world, going so far as to initiate a full mapping of antique Rome, with significant structures revealed within their original context. The significance of the antique, however, had already been ingrained in the artists and architects working in Julius II's day, particularly those, like Raphael, involved in his building projects for Rome.

Raphael as "Renaissance" Man

The early years of the sixteenth century found Raphael experiencing growing acclaim in Florence.⁴⁵ He had completed several successful compositions of the *Madonna and Child*, the pinnacle of which was the *Madonna del Cardellino* commissioned by Lorenzo Nasi, and continued his ascent by accepting his first large-scale commission, that for the altarpiece of the Dei family chapel in Santo Spirito, in 1507.⁴⁶ A few months following, however, Raphael

⁴⁵ Scholarship bookends Raphael's "Florentine Period" as the years 1504-1508, but Talvacchia reinforces the fact that this portion of Raphael's career was so defined for the technical, rather than geographic, influence. In other words, she suggests the influence of Florence on Raphael was not so much working in Florence, as he was not a permanent fixture there during those years, but rather it was his absorption of a Florentine approach to painting. As Talvacchia comments: "the so-called 'Florentine Period' is better understood as a time when Raphael systematically acquired advanced techniques and opened himself to new models, rather than being defined as a stable geographical change of residence during a fixed period" (*Raphael*, 52). Raphael's digestion of the techniques of Leonardo da Vinci and Michelangelo during this period foreshadows the collaborative, and co-competitive, *esprit* he would espouse in Rome. Interestingly, Talvacchia notes an amicable exchange between Raphael and Michelangelo in Florence: "some of Raphael's extant drawings show that he was given access to unfinished projects such as the [Battle of Cascina] cartoon and the unfinished sculpture of Saint Matthew. The initial openness of the senior artist to his younger colleague was to disappear in Rome, transmuted into an attitude of embittered resentment" (*Raphael*, 56). Considering Michelangelo's later alliance, however tenuous, with Sebastiano del Piombo, one must wonder what soured the relationship between the two masters between Florence and Rome.

⁴⁶ Talvacchia, *Raphael*, 75. So intent was Raphael to secure such a commission he was rumored to have asked his uncle to request a letter of recommendation from Giovanni della Rovere, the brother of

suddenly quit Florence permanently for Rome, leaving the Dei altarpiece, the *Madonna del Baldacchino*, incomplete.⁴⁷

He was no doubt aware of flurry of artistic and architectural activity underway as part of Pope Julius II's *renovatio*, so when Donato Bramante, architect to the Pope and rumored relative of Raphael, suggested that he come to Rome, Raphael acquiesced. As Bette Talvacchia commented, "having barely conquered a consistent group of patrons in a prime centre of art, his attention was already focused on the ultimate challenge – entry into the circle of papal patronage in the Vatican."⁴⁸

Raphael's urgent desire to move to Rome could, however, have been prompted by his prior fascination with the city.⁴⁹ Though consensus proposes Raphael's initial visit to Rome to have coincided with his relocation there in 1508, John Shearman argues for at least two separate visits, one in 1502 and another in 1506, before Raphael relocated permanently to the city.⁵⁰ In his analysis, Shearman relies on sketches attributed to Raphael appearing in the *Codex Escorialensis*, produced in Florence around 1508, as well as documentary evidence, including a review of the facts of the well-known letter drafts to Pope Leo X authored by Baldassarre Castiglione and an architect, presumably

Pope Julius II. As Talvacchia comments, "Raphael [expressed] his confidence that the letter will be forthcoming upon his request, yet unfortunately no trace of it remains, nor did Raphael ever receive a fresco commission in Florence." (Talvacchia, *Raphael*, 55)

⁴⁷ Sheryl Reiss, "Raphael and His Patrons: From the Court of Urbino to the Curia and Rome, in M.B. Hall, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Raphael* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 47).

⁴⁸ Talvacchia, *Raphael*, 80.

⁴⁹ John Shearman, "Raphael, Rome, and the Codex Escorialensis," *Master Drawings*, Vol. 15 (2) (Summer 1977), 107-146.

⁵⁰ Shearman, "Raphael, Rome and the Codex Escorialensis," 107-146.

Raphael.⁵¹ Raphael's particular rendition of the Pantheon (now catalogued as Uffizi 164A) (Fig. 8) urged Shearman to suggest that it could have only been completed *in situ*. Thus, Shearman suggests that Raphael most likely visited Rome prior to his permanent relocation there in 1508.⁵²

The persuasiveness of Shearman's argument seems to have waned since publication, considering the reversion of most scholars to the traditional dating of Raphael's Roman arrival. It is nevertheless worth rekindling, however, for several reasons. First, it helps to explain Raphael's desire for a Roman career, perhaps because of the artistic ingenuity or the lure of the antique world, as seen in his sketches, he had experienced there. And, more pragmatically, earlier visits to Rome might have allowed Raphael the opportunity to associate with and learn from Bramante, just as Raphael had done with Leonardo and Michelangelo in Florence. This would have also given Bramante the opportunity to witness the young artist's skill, thereby making his beckoning of Raphael more plausible. Regardless of the exact date of his arrival in Rome, however, Raphael's rapid ascent to artistic fame in 1508 is without question.

⁵¹ Hermann Egger asserts that this book was published with the circle of Domenico Ghirlandaio, a point John Shearman echoes (Hermann Egger, Christian Hülsen, and Adolf Michaelis. 1906. *Codex Escorialensis: ein Skizzenbuch aus der Werkstatt Domenico Ghirlandaios [1449-1494]*. Vienna, 1906; Shearman, "Raphael, Rome," 108). Shearman's argument stands in opposition to the commonly-held contention that Raphael had not been to Rome prior to 1508, with sketches such as these explained as merely being Raphael's copies from other sketches (such is the argument of Christoph Luitpold Frommel: "Verso il 1506-1508 disegnò una veduta dell'interno del Pantheon; ma non è stato accertato se ritrasse il monumento dal vero, come suppone Shearman, o – come invece più probabile – utilizzando lo stesso modello, ora perduto, che usò anche il disegnatore del Codex Escorialensis." (Frommel, "Raffaello e la sua carriera architettonica," 17).

⁵² As Shearman comments, the first datable document announcing Raphael's presence in Rome dates from 1509. It is a contract for Raphael's payment for work completed in the Stanza della Segnatura (Shearman, "Raphael, Rome and the Codex Escorialensis," 131; Shearman, *Raphael in Early Modern Sources*, 1509/1, 122).

He seamlessly entered the papal circle of patronage by joining in Julius II's ambitious plans to renovate his new-selected suite within the Vatican. Having moved out of the traditional papal apartment, perhaps out of dislike for the pictorial program already installed by his despised predecessor Alexander VI Borgia, Julius II selected new rooms on the floor above.⁵³ Julius II first assigned the renovation project to the aging Perugino, whose quick decline of the commission led the Pope to Luca Signorelli; Julius II soon realized however that the scope of work to be completed required far more than one artist.⁵⁴ He thus amassed a team of painters, including Raphael,⁵⁵ to embark on this space's renovation. To be hired for such a commission was an honor, but it by no means quelled the competition between artists trying to establish themselves. As Rowland comments, "painters like Sodoma, Baldassarre Peruzzi, Timoteo Viti, and Lorenzo Lotto were painting in the rooms to either side of [Raphael], all of them newly discovered talents eager to prove themselves in this exalted setting."⁵⁶ Indeed, Raphael's initial contract, identical to that of Sodoma and Flemish artist Johannes Ruysch, called for fifty ducats worth of painting.

⁵³ Joost-Gaugier, 9.

⁵⁴ For Perugino's role, please see: Talvacchia, *Raphael*, 84; Joost-Gaugier, 10; For the transfer of commission to Signorelli, please see: Nesselrath, "Raphael and Pope Julius II," 281-282.

⁵⁵ Talvacchia suggests several elements that may have encouraged Raphael's addition to the project: the recommendation of Bramante, Julius' architect and fellow native of Urbino; Raphael's connections with Pinturicchio, one of the Pope's favorite artists, based on the designs for Siena's Piccolomini Library; and perhaps Perugino, whom, Talvacchia asserts, "is another factor in the web of contacts that smoothed the way for the young artist's arrival in Rome and facilitated his introduction into the papal court for immediate entry into the highest levels of commission on offer." (Talvacchia, *Raphael*, 86).

⁵⁶ Ingrid Rowland, "The Vatican Stanze." In M.B. Hall, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Raphael* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 97. Mary Quinlan-McGrath suggests that Sodoma's employment by the Pope was orchestrated by none other than Chigi's brother: "when Il Sodoma was introduced to the papal court in Rome it was Sigismondo, probably acting on Chigi's behalf, who arranged the entrée" (Mary Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 38).

Nesselrath surmised that this initial hire was not as designer but rather as contract painter, yet he soon transcended this role, as evidenced by his eventual receipt of twice the initial contract payment.⁵⁷ Surrounded with these talents, Raphael nevertheless became the Pope's preferred artist in seemingly no time at all.⁵⁸

Imitation, Emulation, Competition, and the Conceptualization of Co-opetition

Raphael's pursuit of artistic supremacy over the elite artists working in Rome was by no means the first instance of such competition within his career. On the contrary, the gist of his artistic production leading up to his pivotal commissions in the stanze bore visual reference to other artistic masters, varying in degree from imitation to competition. Vasari mentions that in Raphael's youth he "imitated the style of his master Pietro Perugino," and, once having surpassed him, desired "to imitate the style of said Leonardo," to whom "Raphael did come

⁵⁷ Nesselrath suggests that Raphael was a close associate of Signorelli's ("Raphael and Pope Julius II", 282) and thus perhaps used this connection, in addition to his ties to Bramante, to secure his preliminary role in the Vatican commission. A testament to the challenge of joining this team is the fact that even with two personal connections and a letter of recommendation from Piero Soderini (Vincenzo Golzio, *Raffaello nei documenti*, 19; Shearman, *Raphael in Early Modern Sources*, 113) Raphael was still only able to secure initially the most menial of painterly positions.

⁵⁸ Indeed, as Arnold Nesselrath comments, though Raphael's original contract stipulated payment equivalent to Sodoma and Ruysch of 50 ducats, in the end "Raphael was paid 100 ducats in his first installment, twice as much as Sodoma and Ruysch. He received the money on 13 January 1509, which suggests by then he had finished a significant part of the decoration in the Segnatura. He had also been given responsibility for painting the entire apartment, since Julius sent away all other artists working in the stanze." ("Raphael and Pope Julius II," 285; payment reiterated in: Shearman, *Raphael in Early Modern Sources*, 122). In less than two years (October 1511) Julius II also bestows upon the young artist the post of *Scriptor Brevium* (Sherman, *Raphael in Early Modern Sources*, 1511/3, 150-152). Frommel suggests that this appointment was in part a perk for Raphael's completion of the *Disputa* (Frommel, *Die Farnesina*, 116).

close. . . rather more successfully than any other painter, and above all in the grace of colors.”⁵⁹ Raphael executed these imitations, as Goffen interpreted Vasari’s words, “seemingly without animosity – despite Michelangelo’s accusations – and without the concomitant anxiety of influence.”⁶⁰ Inherent in this imitation, or *imitatio*, however, was, according to Goffen, an air of rivalry.

A prime illustration of this early competition can be seen with a comparison of Raphael’s *Sposalizio* (1504) to Perugino’s rendition of the theme (1499-1503). Raphael’s version presents a clear challenge that, according to Goffen, “redefined the relationship, [*declared*] his rivalry with Perugino – and [*asserted*] victory over him.”⁶¹ The confrontation between the two works, which are strikingly similar in composition,⁶² was only the first instance of such imitation in Raphael’s career. Whereas his imitation of Perugino resulted in near identical works, his subsequent engagements with intra-artist competitions relied more on emulation, borrowing specific elements rather than an entire compositional format.

The intricacies of imitation and emulation have long been a source of scholarly inquiry. Origins of this examination can be traced to the early years of

⁵⁹ Vasari, *Lives*, 743; André Chastel, “Raffaello e Leonardo,” in Micaela Sambucco Hamoud and Maria Letizia Strocchi, ed., *Studi su Raffaello: Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Studi (Urbino-Firenze, 1984)* (Urbino, 1987), I: 335-343.

⁶⁰ Goffen, *Renaissance Rivals*, 172.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 173.

⁶² This similarity was no doubt due to the requests of the respective patrons. As Goffen continues, “indeed, the close similarity suggests that Raphael was instructed by his patrons to make his altarpiece conform to Perugino’s and presumably to outdo it” (Goffen, *Renaissance Rivals*, 176). For more on the competition between Perugino and Raphael, particularly Perugino’s patron’s request that his *Assumption* altarpiece of 1512 surpass Raphael’s *Coronation of the Virgin* for the Oddi Family of Perugia (1502-1504), please see: Patricia Rubin, “Il Contribuo di Raffaello allo sviluppo della Pala d’Altare Rinascimentale,” *Arte Cristiana*, 737-738 (March-June, 1990), 173-74.

the *cinquecento*, which Thomas M. Greene characterizes as bearing witness to “the most vigorous and sustained debate over the proper modes and goals of imitation ever witnessed on the European continent.”⁶³ The context of this sixteenth-century study of imitation was a literary one, as Greene highlights the writings of Pico della Mirandola and Pietro Bembo as representing two relatively polarizing approaches to literary imitation and the associated *emulatio*. Pico della Mirandola advocated for the study of a wide variety of sources, which allowed for imitation through the recombination of literary elements from these sources into a new work.⁶⁴ Bembo, however, argued that such seamless recombination was implausible, writing: “the activity of imitating is nothing other than translating the likeness of some other’s style into one’s own writings and to cultivate that very temperament present in him whom you have chosen as a master.”⁶⁵ In short, while Pico considered imitation as a means of invention, Bembo saw it as, to quote Greene, “a deformation of a concept” from greater to lesser artist.⁶⁶

In more recent scholarship, John Shearman revived the discussion of Imitation and Emulation from an art historical perspective and, in doing so, seemingly adopted a perspective similar to that of Pico della Mirandola.⁶⁷ The process of emulation, or sophisticated imitation, as Shearman calls it, became

⁶³ Thomas M. Greene, *The Light In Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), 171.

⁶⁴ Greene, 172-174.

⁶⁵ Pietro Bembo, *Prose della volgar lingua*, ed. M. Marti (Padua: Liviana, 1955), 15; Greene, 174.

⁶⁶ Greene, 174.

⁶⁷ Shearman, *Only Connect*, 232.

essential to Raphael's career, as it involved the artful extraction of recognizable visual references from other sources and the recombination of those references in a new context. His preliminary efforts to this end can be seen in his portraits, *Agnolo Doni* and *Maddalena Strozzi Doni* (1506), wherein he alluded to elements of Leonardo's *La Gioconda* to reinforce the impact of these portraits.

The atmosphere of Rome encouraged continued competitive discourse upon Raphael's arrival. Indeed, the revival of the ancients and all things *all'antica* was itself an act of imitation and rivalry, a desire to recreate the past as it had been while also improving upon it. Thus, in some respects Shearman's notion of emulation laid the groundwork for the emergent idea of co-opetition. In summary, Shearman identifies "Imitation" and "Emulation," or Imitation with intent, as a key source of creativity in Renaissance artistic practice with roots again in antiquity and inextricably linked to the study of sources.⁶⁸ If Emulation, following Shearman's definition, is deliberate imitation of a visual source arising out of competition, then co-opetition, the same process only tempered with collaboration, seems the next step forward.

Shearman himself invoked ideas that could be characterized as co-opetition through a series of further comparisons, particularly if one returns to Shearman's illustration of these concepts using Diego Velazquez's *Rokeby Venus* (1648-1649) and its connections with Titian's earlier *Venus, Cupid and The Mirror*

⁶⁸ "One of the most 'Renaissance' things about Imitation was that it was well known to have been an enterprise operating effectively and complexly within the classics of the ancient world: Virgil visibly imitating Homer was only the most obvious case that came to the surface" (Shearman, *Only Connect*, 232).

(*Mellon Venus*) (1555).⁶⁹ In Titian's composition, Venus gazes into a mirror, the reflection of which the viewer cannot see. Velasquez's Venus, however, is only revealed to the viewer through this mirror, her visage otherwise obscured by the reclining posture she assumes. For Shearman, Velasquez's version, in the act of emulating a composition like Titian's *Venus*, asks rhetorically if "the face that we see in the mirror is the same as that of the unreflected Venus, or whether it is less idealized and more portrait-like."⁷⁰ If the engagement between the Velasquez and Titian paintings is indeed an act of Emulation, then the incorporation of Shearman's third image, Paolo Veronese's *Venus at Her Toilette* (1582), though not chronologically consecutive, expands the discussion to include co-opetition. Veronese's painting shares with the viewer two Venuses, one who gazes into the mirror and the other reflected from it. In doing so, Veronese's *Venus* allows the viewer dual/dueling depictions of Venus that compete with one another for the viewer's attention at the same time that they rely upon one another to convey a full image of the goddess. This competitive collaboration is the essence behind co-opetition. That is, co-opetition transcends Shearman's notion of Emulation when the recombination of recognizable visual elements allows the recombinatory artist to surpass the visual power of previous works. This was exactly the feat that Raphael would achieve in the years to come in Rome, the foreshadowing of which occurred in his early days in the Vatican stanze.

⁶⁹ Shearman, *Only Connect*, 227-232.

⁷⁰ Shearman, *Only Connect*, 229.

Stephen J. Campbell's concept of artistic "grafting," which he that he sees evident in the work of Titian and the Venetian *poesie* painting tradition, also could be construed as relating to the emerging notion of co-opetition. Campbell argues that Titian's description of his later paintings as *poesie* was in an effort to "[ground them] in a process of making – and in making meaning, "a direct reference to the act of writing poetry, which is, in essence, an act of joining diverse elements into a cohesive whole, or verse, through allusion, simile and metaphor.⁷¹ In creating paintings through a similar process of grafting elements together, Campbell suggests the effect can be a "discontinuity or irresolution in the composition . . . complicating not only the understanding of the subject but also the nature of our affective response."⁷² To illustrate this point, Campbell turns to Titian's Dresden *Sleeping Venus* (1510)(Fig. 9), a work whose compositional disconnection led its earliest commentator, Marcantonio Michiel, to proclaim it was the work of both Giorgione, in the figure, and Titian, in the background landscape.⁷³

Campbell describes the deliberate disjunctions between figure and landscape that nevertheless play off of each other – he cites, for example, Venus's

⁷¹ Stephen J. Campbell, "Naturalism and the Venetian 'Poesia': Grafting, Metaphor, and Embodiment in Giorgione, Titian, and the Campagnolas" in Alexander Nagel and Lorenzo Pericolo, eds., *Subject as Aporia in Early Modern Art* (VT: Ashgate, 2010), 115.

⁷² Campbell, "Naturalism," 115-116.

⁷³ "In casa de M. Ieronimo Marcello A S. Tomado, 1525: la tela della Venere nuda, che dorme in uno paese, con Cupidine, fu de mano de Zorzo da Castelfranco; ma lo paese e Cupidine furono finite da Tiziano" (Marcantonio Michiel, *Notizie d'opere di disegno nella prima metà del secolo XVI, esistenti in Padova, Cremona, Milano, Pavia, Bergamo, Crema e Venezia. Scritta da un anonimo di quell tempo. Pubblicata e illustrata da D. Iacopo Morelli* (Bassano, 1800), 66. This *Sleeping Venus* could have served well Shearman's earlier discussion on Imitation and Emulation, as the compositional parallels between it and Velasquez's *Rokeby Venus* are even more pronounced.

curves being echoed in the rolling background hills – implying the combined efforts of Giorgione and Titian to create visual metaphors as found in a poem. This poetical grafting, which Campbell describes as “an active employment of a poetic principle of bringing things together in metaphoric combination, of discovering connection by artistic means,”⁷⁴ is in many respects quite similar to the concept of co-opetition as it emphasizes the distinct approaches of two artists as they come together in a shared work. The key distinction, however, to be struck between Campbell’s graft and co-opetition is the overall role of the viewer in the work’s interpretation.

In Campbell’s grafted *poesie* there is a continued sensorial divide between the elements of the painting, wherein “optic and haptic are both set up as dichotomous parameters of the painting’s organization, amounting at times to a pronounced sense of tension.”⁷⁵ The result, as seen in works such as the *Sleeping Venus*, is a composition that simultaneously visually engages but also limits. The viewer is drawn toward the reclining nude figure, who has been artfully propped to fully reveal herself to the viewer. At the same time, however, she is inaccessible. Her closed eyes and arm framing her head create distance that is amplified by the landscape on to which she has been grafted that give her an air of artificiality, or unrealness. Thus, while we can see she is seemingly close enough to touch, she is nevertheless eternally out of reach.

⁷⁴ Campbell, “Naturalism,” 119.

⁷⁵ Campbell, “Naturalism,” 127.

Co-opetition, however, while performing a similar graft nevertheless seeks a more seamless merger of elements, preventing the dynamics of competition and collaboration from interfering with the clarity of a composition's overall message. The quotation of a work or an idea can serve as an act of artistic commentary, but it is not intended to disrupt a reading the overall work. Perhaps the true distinction, then, to be struck between Campbell's graft and co-opetition is the scope of the project at hand. The nuanced meeting of individual approaches in the metaphorical constructs of a singular canvas could yield such distinguishing dichotomies, such as seen in the *Sleeping Venus*, and thereby blur a straightforward interpretation of the composition. When artists perform similar grafts on a larger scale, for example Peruzzi's and Raphael's later tandem designs contributed to the Farnesina's *scaenae frons* façade, individual confrontations are subdued in favor of meeting an overall visual message.

Regardless, incorporating Campbell's concept of "grafting" in a discussion of Raphael's transition to working in Rome is important in several respects. First, the general similarities between co-opetition and Campbell's notion of grafting suggest the pursuit of a refined conceptualization of co-opetition is merited. Second, that Campbell identifies this grafting in Venetian works as early as 1510, roughly the same time as Raphael begins similar explorations in recombination, suggests that a new thinking about the process of painting was emerging virtually simultaneously in Venice and Rome, with Raphael at the forefront with his early work in the Vatican stanze.

Alongside Sodoma,⁷⁶ Raphael was first tasked to work within the Stanza della Segnatura (Fig. 10), designed to function as the Pope's private library.⁷⁷ Ingrid Rowland paints a vibrant image of what this working environment was like, given the added presence of the Pope's private librarian, Tommaso Inghirami:

The thirty-eight-year-old Inghirami's presence in the little Stanza could not have gone unnoticed; he was immensely fat, with a booming voice that could be heard, if need be, from one end of Saint Peter's basilica to the other. With a scholar's memory for stories and an actor's delight in retelling them, he loved to talk, and he loved the company of handsome young men, as Raphael certainly was in 1508. Inghirami's duties as librarian must have included reading aloud to Pope Julius, which would make the Stanza della Segnatura a louder, livelier place than the idea of a private library might normally imply.⁷⁸

Raphael thrived in this occasionally boisterous environment, completing two of the Stanza della Segnatura's monumental lunette frescoes within the first year of work (1508-1509).⁷⁹ The first scene completed was *La Disputa del Sacramento*

⁷⁶Sodoma was commissioned to work on the stanze in a letter dated the 13th of October 1508 following endorsement by Agostino Chigi's brother, Sigismondo: "Die XIII Octobris 1508. Magnificus dominus Sigismundus Chisius promisit quod magister Iohannes Antonius de Bazis de Vercellis pictor in Urbe pignet in cameris S.D.N. papae superioibus tantam operam quod extimabitur factam per 50. Ducators der carlinis x per ducatem." (Shearman, *Raphael in Early Modern Sources*, 125; Andrée Hayum, *Giovanni Antonio Bazzi – "Il Sodoma"* (NY: Garland Publishing, 1976), 17-18); Sodoma was soon after joined by Flemish painter Johannes Ruysch (contracted in a letter dated October 14th, 1508), and Lorenzo Lotto (in a contract dated March 9th, 1509).

⁷⁷ As Bette Talvacchia recounts, "it seems that in the first instance Raphael was fit into this structure as a team player in collaboration with Sodoma, who was at work on the ceiling of what we call the Stanza della Segnatura. Although we do not know the details, it is clear that Raphael quickly supplanted Sodoma." (Talvacchia, "Raphael's Workshop and the Development of a Managerial Style," in M.B. Hall, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Raphael* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 172). Andrée Hayum counters this statement, however, by suggesting "it seems that [*Sodoma*] worked only on the Papal commission: the ceiling of the Stanza della Segnatura. . . . [*which*] came to an abrupt halt when the young Raphael was called in to complete the room. . . . it is not sure that Raphael actually overlapped with Sodoma while the latter was at work in the room." (Hayum, *Giovanni Antonio Bazzi*, 17-18).

⁷⁸ Rowland, "The Vatican Stanze," 98.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

(directly translated as *Debate on the Sacrament*, but, as Rowland suggests, better understood by its earlier name, *The Triumph of Theology*).⁸⁰ Distinctly divided into the terrestrial and celestial realms, *La Disputa* features as its focal point a gilded monstrance atop a decorated altar, anchoring the vertical alignment with the Holy Trinity. The terrestrial register reveals portraits of important figures to theological history, beginning with the founders of the Western Church enthroned closest to the altar and including a portrait of Julius II in the guise of Saint Gregory the Great and Egidio da Viterbo, close papal associate and contributor to the Stanza's overall visual program, depicted as Saint Augustine.⁸¹ Portraits continue to radiate to the extremities of the composition, from Dante mingling among the right-hand figural cluster to a portrait of Bramante in the left lower foreground, below what is assumed a reference to the emerging Saint Peter's depicted in the distance.⁸² Though teeming with portraits, *La Disputa* succeeds in sending a singular message of the power and importance of the principles of Christian faith.⁸³

Subsequently Raphael completed the *School of Athens*, directly opposite *La Disputa* and thus juxtaposing philosophy with theology and revealing Raphael's rapidly accelerating interest in the antique. Designed, according to Rowland, to

⁸⁰ Ibid., 99.

⁸¹ As Rowland comments: "the black-bearded Augustine seems to bear the features of the man whom Julius had newly appointed as prior general of the Augustinian order: Egidio da Viterbo, a famous preacher, a promoter of Greek Neo-Platonism and Hebrew Cabala, and one of the pope's closest associates" (Ibid., 99-100).

⁸² "[Here] Raphael has conveyed something of Bramante's prickly, nonconformist characters in this active, contorted figure" (Ibid., 100).

⁸³ As Rowland summarizes: "Raphael's design is a triumph of another kind, of ingenuity: in graphic form, he lays out the basic articles of Christian faith while suggesting at the same time that his art can communicate only an approximate idea of that faith's true glory" (Ibid., 99).

“reveal the Christian truth in ancient wisdom,”⁸⁴ the *School of Athens* echoed poet Battista Casali’s proclamation of Rome as the “new Athens” in 1508 by presenting a veritable stage play of philosophers throughout history.⁸⁵ Plato and Socrates appear at center, surrounded by a plethora of great thinkers. Tommaso Inghirami, for example, appears as Epicurus in the lower left, his figure obscured behind a marble pedestal; Michelangelo broods in the central foreground as Heraclitus; and Raphael includes a self-portrait at the lower right-hand corner of the composition, gazing intently out at the viewer amidst a figural group otherwise wholly engaged within the scene.⁸⁶

What truly sets *The School of Athens* apart from *La Disputa* is Raphael’s inclusion of an ornately articulated architectural backdrop. In place of the simplified landscape seen in *La Disputa*, Raphael here framed his gathering of philosophical figures within an architectural artifice not only derived directly from antique sources but also echoing contemporaneous plans for Saint Peter’s. In this regard, according to Nesselrath, the *School of Athens* represented in many respects “the most complete idea Julius II would ever have had of how his new basilica, finished long after his death, would eventually look.”⁸⁷ Thus, though its central aim was to reinforce ecclesiastical principles, the *School of Athens* also revealed Raphael’s burgeoning study of antiquity and architecture. Though these

⁸⁴ Ibid., 104.

⁸⁵ John O’Malley, “The Vatican Library and the School of Athens, a Text of Battista Casali, 1508. *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, Vol. 7 (1977), 271-287; Rowland, “The Vatican Stanze,” 103. As Rowland summarizes this gathering, “from the sublime heights of Platonic theology to the personal foibles of ancient philosophers and contemporary artists, Raphael’s *School of Athens* presents a portrait of Rome in the time of Julius II.” (Ibid., 107).

⁸⁶ Ibid., 105-107.

⁸⁷ Nesselrath, “Raphael and Pope Julius II,” 284.

two interests would become central elements of his later career, Raphael's initial efforts in these two compositions were sufficient to secure a sole commission from the Pope to complete the remaining papal chambers.⁸⁸

By 1511, Raphael had completed the third fresco, that of *Parnassus* (Fig. 11). This frescoed lunette was a testament to what Raphael, among others, considered the "most divinely inspired"⁸⁹ of literary forms, poetry, and it served a fitting counterpoint to the adjacent *School of Athens*. In point of fact, taken together, the *School of Athens* and *Parnassus* became a veritable portrait of contemporary Rome through an ancient lens. *Parnassus'* central figure of Apollo was echoed in the monumental statue of the god inset in the left-hand niche within the *School of Athens* and revealed a similar melding of past and contemporary figures through the guises of poetry. Amidst the Nine Muses and ancient Roman poets appear contemporary humanist scholars, including Jacopo Sannazaro and Tommaso Inghirami.

Just as the *School of Athens* invoked classical (and contemporary) architecture, Raphael's *Parnassus* deliberately recalls ancient sculpture, an observation few have noted. His central figure of Apollo, for example, could be seen as quoting the *Belvedere Torso*, or it could reflect study of the *Jupiter Enthroned* (*Jupiter Ciampolini*), drawings of which have been firmly attributed to Raphael's hand.⁹⁰ In addition, his depiction of the Muse Calliope to Apollo's right

⁸⁸ Rowland, "The Vatican Stanze," 99.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 106.

⁹⁰ Bober suggests the *Torso Belvedere* was part of the Colonna collection on the Quirinal prior to its appropriation into the Vatican collection sometime between 1515, when a sketch identifies it as being

bears direct quotation from the *Sleeping Ariadne, or Cleopatra*.⁹¹ Both *Ariadne* and the *Torso Belvedere* would eventually make their way into Julius II's collection of antiquities and thus would add to the allusory significance of their inclusion in Raphael's fresco, though neither of these pieces was yet installed within the Vatican walls at the time the pictorial program was conceived. Thus, Raphael's incorporation of these antique quotations can be seen not as a further indication of papal propaganda but rather as signifying his already advancing study of antiquity.

Though one wall (*Jurisprudence*) of the Stanza della Segnatura remained to be finished, the completion of *Parnassus* and its engagement with the *School of Athens* nevertheless sufficed to reveal Raphael's transformative approach to painting. On the one hand, these works represented a powerful visual allegory for the Pope, alluding to Raphael's ability to translate visual schema into metaphorical message. The root subjects of these four scenes – Theology, Philosophy, Poetry, and Law, respectively – and their paired ceiling

located “in mo(n)te cavallo,” and 1532-1535, when Martin van Heemskerck sketched it as part of the Vatican Belvedere (M. van Heemskerck, *Die römischen Skizzenbücher von Marten van Heemskerke*, I: f. 63; Bober and Rubenstein, *Renaissance Artists*, 167). K.T. Parker attributed two views of the *Belvedere Torso* to Raphael's school (*Catalogue of the Collection of Drawings in the Ashmolean Museum, Volume II: The Italian Schools* (UK: Oxford University Press, 1956), no. 625). Bober identifies the *Jupiter Enthroned* as part of the Ciampolini collection in the early sixteenth century however cannot pinpoint a more exact date or discovery location; Shearman notes Raphael's capture of the *Jupiter Ciampolini*, in the collection of Giovanni Ciampolini until his death in 1518, in sketched form. It also appeared in two of his contemporary paintings, the previously mentioned *Madonna del Baldacchino* (1508) and the *Madonna del Pesce* (circa 1514) (Bober, *Renaissance Artists*, 51-52, no. 1; Shearman, “Raphael, Rome,” 130, no. 6).

⁹¹ The *Sleeping Ariadne* was a part of the Maffei collection in Rome prior to its appropriation into that of Julius II in 1512; H.H. Brummer suggests that Raphael, like the Maffei family, was an associate of humanist circles and thus most likely drew from this sculpture prior to its installation in the Stanza della Cleopatra at the Vatican in 1512. (*The Statue Court in the Vatican Belvedere* (Stockholm: 1971, 154); Bober, *Renaissance Artists*, 114, no. 79).

personifications – those of *Apollo and Marsyas*, the *Fall of Man*, the *Judgment of Solomon*, and *Astrology*⁹² - all worked to translate “the pontiff’s conception of Christian power and papal grandeur into art that was totally new in its approach and advanced in its style” with the aid of Tommaso Inghirami.⁹³ Inghirami’s knowledge of humanist scholarship both engaged Raphael – indeed, the two became good friends – and undoubtedly encouraged Raphael’s intellectual thinking and creative practice.⁹⁴

Raphael’s designs for the Stanza della Segnatura blended his burgeoning interest in both humanist ideology and antiquarianism with imagery in support of the Church. Christiane Joost-Gaugier nods to Raphael’s abilities to craft pictorial allusions to Papal propaganda as seen through the lens of both humanist themes and his “new reverence for antiquity, now expressed in the rich conflation of setting and subject, . . . and the complex orchestration of theme and space, projects the entirely new ambition that became his in Rome.”⁹⁵ This adoption of antique themes was, at the same time, a break with them. For as

⁹² This final scene has been alternately identified as *Astronomy* or *Urania* (Joost-Gaugier, *Raphael’s Stanza*, 11).

⁹³ Talvacchia, *Raphael*, 86. As Christiane Joost-Gaugier argues: “highly-intellectualized in terms of its visual imagery and aspiration, . . . [The Stanza della Segnatura’s visual program] reflects the Florentine background, Roman education, Ciceronian interests, and lively spirit of Tommaso Inghirami. . . . thus is the cultural and religious authority of the papacy expressed in a most witty and enigmatic metaphor, through which the rays of the splendid papal heraldry spread their sunlike influence from the center of the ceiling over the chamber” (Joost-Gaugier, 157-158).

⁹⁴ As Rowland comments: “[Pope Julius II] may have told Michelangelo that he was not a scholar, and unlike Inghirami he hated to speak in public, but he was nonetheless a man in love with ideas. So, to their mutual good fortune, was [Raphael]” (Rowland, “The Vatican Stanze,” 98). A testament to Raphael’s ongoing creative contemplations as to how to conjure these frescoes can be seen in his sketches for *La Disputa*. As Paul Joannides comments: “That the *Disputa* drawings make use of the full range of media, with the exception of red chalk, is perhaps an indication of Raphael’s uncertainties at the beginning of the work” (Paul Joannides, *The Drawings of Raphael: with a Complete Catalogue* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), 19).

⁹⁵ Joost-Gaugier, 162.

much as it was a comment on the art of the past, so too did it comment on the art and architecture of contemporary Rome. The architectural framework of the *School of Athens* bears hints of Bramante's designs for the crossing of Saint Peter's, and the triumphal arch at the furthest recesses of the scene belies Raphael's already burgeoning interest in architecture. And his carefully conjured *Parnassus*, replete with portraits of his contemporaries, also asserts his status as a blossoming intellect as he navigated the bounds between painting and poetry.⁹⁶

Raphael's imprint in the Stanza della Segnatura is made all the more significant given the fact that he seems to have included self-portraits both in the *School of Athens* and also arguably in *Parnassus*. Scholars have identified his self-portrait in the guise of Apelles in the lower right register of the *School of Athens* (Fig. 12), nestled between Baldassarre Castiglione in the guise of Strabo, the Greek geographer, and fellow painter Sodoma depicted as Protogenes. Here, Raphael is one of the few figures to stare directly out of the composition as if to engage directly with his audience, who might question the appearance of painters in a scene otherwise teeming with philosophers.

Though overlooked in previous scholarship, a similar portrait in *Parnassus* shares this direct gaze, that of a laurel-crowned figure nestled between the muse Melpomene and poet Virgil in the upper left portion of the scene (Fig. 13). Save for this figure, whom most accounts gloss over, all others in *Parnassus* have been identified. A comparison of this visage, however, with that of Raphael

⁹⁶ A prime illustration of this meander between painting and poetry is his inclusion of a preparatory sketch for *Parnassus* next to several early sonnets he wrote between 1509-1510 (Shearman, *Raphael in Early Modern Sources*, 130).

in the *School of Athens*, as well as with that in his self-portrait of 1504-1506 (Fig. 14), reveals strikingly similar features, from the gentle cleft in his chin to his aquiline nose.

Strengthening the identification of this figure as a self-portrait is the anonymous sketch held by the Ashmolean of Raphael's initial designs for *Parnassus*, in which this figure is conspicuously omitted.⁹⁷ It is also missing from Marcantonio Raimondi's engraving after a drawing of *Parnassus* (Fig. 15).⁹⁸ Furthermore, in the documented preparatory sketches for these poet portraits, yet again this mysterious figure remains absent.⁹⁹ The repeated omission of this figure, particularly from Raphael's own preparatory drawings, suggests that this final portrait head was a relatively late inclusion, perhaps designed as much to fill a notable void in the composition as to applaud his own accomplishments. Such a theory is supported by John Shearman's observation of the *putti* overhead, all of which hold laurel crowns to "reinforce the idea of inspiration in action, of *poesia* in the making."¹⁰⁰ In other words, simultaneous with Raphael's

⁹⁷ As illustrated in: Joannides, *The Drawings*, plate 21, 84.

⁹⁸ Marcantonio Raimondi, *Apollo and the Muses on Parnassus*, 1514-1520, Metropolitan Museum of Art 17.37.150).

⁹⁹ Joannides, *The Drawings*, 241v, 192.

¹⁰⁰ John Shearman, Raphael's Unexecuted Projects for the Stanze," in G. Kauffmann et al., eds., *Walter Friedlaender zum 90. Geburtstag: Ein Festgabe seiner europäischen Schüler, Freund und Veherer* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1965), 159. The fact that Raphael actually wrote poems on preparatory sketches for *Parnassus* (please see note 149), a composition that bore such figurative ties to poetry, suggests greater scholarly inquiry into Raphael's thinking on the parallels between painting and poetry is merited. On the one hand, it seems one can draw additional parallels between Raphael's artistic production and Campbell's previously mentioned argument for the Venetian *poesie* painting tradition as one emphasizing a grafting of divergent ideas. On the other hand, Raphael's early interest in the ties between word and image as witnessed in these Segnatura sketches could be seen as a precursor to his later *Quos Ego* (1515-1516), which continued Raphael's commentary on the relation of painting to poetry, and capped by his subsequent theatrical scenographic designs, the culmination of which were his intended scenes for the Farnesina *scaenae frons* façade.

conjuring of the painted poetry with *Parnassus* is his conception of self as the painter poet realized most literally with this self-portrait.

If this unidentified figure is indeed Raphael, then the paired paintings of the *School of Athens* and *Parnassus* become as much an exultation of the Painter, that is of the profession as well as Raphael himself, as they are of the Papacy. That Raphael would depict himself as both philosopher and poet was indicative of his innovative spirit. He found inspiration not through singular art forms but rather considering parallels across them, in part because he found such essential connections between them. As Rowland comments, “this fundamental sense of the unity of human creative force explains why, in the end, Raphael refused to specialize as an artist, why he dabbled as a poet, and why he ultimately found himself deeply embroiled in archaeology for its own sake.”¹⁰¹ This introspection launched a remarkably experimental stage in Raphael’s career. In addition to establishing his reputation in Rome in the early years of the 1510s, Raphael’s work in the Vatican Stanza della Segnatura revealed a new mode of artistic production, one that exalted the exploration of blending diverse themes and messages into a dynamic pictorial program. This approach would become even more pronounced in his subsequent designs, both for the Pope, in Raphael’s scenes for the Stanza dell’Incendio, and for outside patrons like Agostino Chigi.

¹⁰¹ Ingrid D. Rowland, “Raphael, Angelo Colocci”, 82.

Ascending the Social Ladder

Raphael merged seamlessly into Roman culture, learning quickly the power – and profitability – of social stature.¹⁰² Raphael spent increasing amounts of time with humanist associates when not overtaxing himself with an inordinate number of artistic commissions. Partially remedying this overextension was his development of a thriving workshop, or as Rowland puts it, “a large-scale cultural operation,” that arose out of equal parts self-promotion, innovation, and the desire to disseminate his ideas to an audience wider than he could accommodate himself.¹⁰³

At the root of this workshop mentality, however, was Raphael’s uniquely Roman style, that which was identified by, according to Kim Butler, the dual themes of “*rimembrare*, bringing together scattered limbs in an invocation of poetic memory and the rhetorical trope of *prosopopoeia*, calling absence into presence.”¹⁰⁴ For Butler, this encapsulation refers specifically to Raphael’s efforts to recall ancient Rome, the “reassembling” of antiquity in map form tasked by Pope Leo X.

¹⁰² As Ingrid Rowland has commented: “That Raphael respected money himself can be shown beyond doubt by his *modus vivendi*: he chose his company carefully, making stylish outings to the countryside with Pietro Bembo and other humanists, flirting with marriage to the cardinal’s niece, painting pictures for kings, and investing in real estate along the via Giulia and in the Borgo. . . like many of his well-placed friends in Rome, the artist had become a speculator almost as a matter of personality” (Ibid., 80).

¹⁰³ As Rowland posits, “in one sense, the Raphael workshop can be seen in modern terms as a corporation with a distinct marketing strategy, but more essential to the real meaning of his enterprise is the way in which in the terms of his own age, it channeled Raphael’s own creativity and made it available to an immense public” (Ibid., 81).

¹⁰⁴ Butler, “Reddita et Lux,” 138-139.

This notion of *rimembrare* and reassembly, however, can be applied more universally to Raphael's Roman period. For his workshop, this was the act of recalling the style of the absent Raphael such that his hand was almost present in the room. For Raphael himself, it was much more metaphorical, as he pulled together what were the "scattered limbs" of painting – the elements of poetry, music, or even philosophy – to redefine the role of painter and develop a new aesthetic of *romanitas* on many levels, all of which are interwoven at the Villa Farnesina.

Accounting Chapter Three: Chigi and His True “*Rus in Urbe*”

Roma fu una piazza ideale per il lavoro bancario: si spendeva molto, non si produceva nulla e, quindi, se facevano debiti.

- Stefano Siglienti, *Il Magnifico Agostino Chigi* (1970)

Rome, in many respects, was a *piazza ideale* for an individual like Agostino Chigi, as both city and patron were working to “re-invent” themselves. For Chigi, the challenge was to transform from Sienese foreigner into Roman intellectual. Under its new sixteenth-century promoter Pope Julius II, Rome’s task was to transform into the “Eternal City” through a paradoxical revival of the ancient world. To channel the ancients in a new Rome, however, was not an inexpensive task. When Julius II took the Papacy, the coffers of the Church had been nearly emptied.¹ Fortunately, Julius had Agostino Chigi, a banker whose financial backing was essential to the Pope’s *renovatio*.

Born in Siena in 1466 to Mariano Chigi and Margarita Baldi,² Agostino entered a long lineage of affluent Sienese bankers that had already established a presence in Rome by 1440.³ Indeed, the papacies of both Pius II Piccolomini (1458-64) and the short-lived Pius III Todeschini Piccolomini (September 22 – October 18, 1503) substantiated the connection between Siena and the papacy,

¹ Pellechia, “The Contested City,” 67.

² Rudolfo Lanciani, *The Golden Days of the Renaissance in Rome: From the Pontificate of Julius II to that of Paul III*. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin & Co., 1906), 275.

³ Agostino’s grandfather, also Agostino, had begun a banking branch in Rome in the mid-fifteenth century. (Rowland, *The Culture of the High Renaissance*, 73).

allowing Siennese bankers to become numerous and powerful within Rome.⁴ The Siennese were, in fact, only a fraction of the “policromo mosaico”⁵ of the population of Rome and were moving to Rome not only for the banking industry but also for other artisanal industries that were then flourishing in the city.⁶ Thus, as Irene Fosi posits, “The Renaissance in Rome was, above all, the rebirth of the foreigner, who arrived, settled down, and stayed permanently in the papal city.”⁷ Among this *mélange* of foreigners, the Siennese were a strong presence, so much so that they had established *La Confraternità di Santa Caterina* (The Confraternity of St. Catherine) in Rome in 1462 as an homage to their native Siena.⁸

Chigi himself began his banking career working for the Ghinucci bank of Siena before moving to Rome in 1487 to open his own bank at the remarkably young age of 21.⁹ His financial success grew exponentially, allowing his purchase of the major alum mines at Porto Ercole for use in his trading business.¹⁰

⁴ “La presenza senese a Roma non inizia certo con il pontificato di Pio II, sebbene con papa Piccolomini sia senza dubbio divenuta in poco tempo più numerosa e potente.” (Irene Fosi, “Fra Siena e Roma: Famiglie, mercanti, pontefici fra il Cinquecento e il Seicento,” in Carla Benocci, ed., *I giardini Chigi tra Siena e Roma dal Cinquecento agli inizi dell'Ottocento* (Siena: Fondazione Monte dei Paschi, 2005), 13).

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ “All’inizio del Cinquecento non erano insomma solo i grandi banchieri come Chigi, Spannocchi, Accarigi, ma anche artigiani – bandierai, sarti, merciai, falegnami, ‘tagliatori di tavoli’ – che trovarono nella città del papa le condizioni favorevoli per impiantare attività spesso condotte insieme ad altri componenti la famiglia, come dimostrata ricca documentazione notarile romana.” (Fosi, 13-14).

⁷ “Il Rinascimento a Roma è, infatti, soprattutto il Rinascimento degli ‘stranieri’ che arrivano, si insediano, vivono e spesso restano per sempre nella città della papa” (Fosi, 13-14).

⁸ For a more in-depth examination of this confraternity, please refer to Fosi, “Fra Siena e Roma.”

⁹ Rowland, *The Culture of the High Renaissance*, 73.

¹⁰ By purchasing this port town in southern Tuscany, Chigi was able to extend his trade across the Mediterranean. His trade routes were so vast that he earned the moniker “the Great Merchant of Christendom” from the Sultan in Constantinople (Anthony Majanlahti, *The Families Who Made Rome: A History and Guide*. (London: Chatto & Windus, 2005), 321.) According to Frommel, Chigi’s

Meanwhile, as Chigi secured the family's status as banking barons, two of his brothers, Angelo and Lorenzo, fortified the familial connection to the Pope. Sent to Rome following Agostino's installation there both to help in the Banco Chigi and to acquire the requisite humanist education in letters and the classics, Lorenzo and Angelo both acquired the curial office of *scriptor*, "a common first step for an aspiring court humanist,"¹¹ under the eye of Pope Alexander VI Borgia (1492-1503).¹²

Agostino's first allegiance with the Papacy occurred in his lease of the papal alum mines in Tolfa in 1501. This was part of a grand scheme to gain control over all the alum mines of Italy, which began with a joint lease between Chigi and Giulio and Antonio Spannocchi (heirs to Ambrogio Spannocchi, former head of the Apostolic Court).¹³ While Chigi's monopoly of the alum mines was never realized, his joint lease agreement with the Spannocchi brothers proved personally lucrative when the brothers were later driven to bankruptcy. The brothers had borne the financial burden for the coronation expenses for Pope Pius III Piccolomini, as was customary, with full intention to be paid back over the course of their Pope's reign. The Pope's sudden death only twenty-six days

investment in the alum mining industry was "la vera base della sua futura ricchezza," as attested to by the fact that his original investment of 34,000 ducats in 1500 had multiplied to a value of 300,000 ducats by the time of his death twenty years later (Christoph Luitpold Frommel, "La Villa Farnesina," in C.L. Frommel, G. Caneva, and A. Angeli, *La villa Farnesina a Roma = The villa Farnesina in Rome. Mirabilia Italiae*, 12 (Modena: F.C. Panini, 2003), 2: 10).

¹¹ Rowland, *The Correspondence*, 8.

¹² Unfortunately, Lorenzo Chigi met his demise when the lightning from a thunderstorm on June 29th, 1500, caused the roof of the Apostolic Palace to collapse (Pope Alexander VI was left with only a head wound). He was later buried in St. Peter's. (Rowland, *The Correspondence*, 14; Sigismondo Tizio, *Historiae Senenses*, Cod. Chigi G.II.36, fol. 322r).

¹³ Ingrid D. Rowland, "Render Unto Caesar the Things Which are Caesar's: Humanism and the Arts in the Patronage of Agostino Chigi." *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 39 (4) (Winter, 1986), 678-679.

after coronation, however, dashed any hopes of repayment, particularly because Pope Pius' follower, Pope Julius II, was Genoese.

When this development ruined the Spannocchi, Chigi emerged financially reinforced, and this security grew in step with his increasing fidelity to the Pope.¹⁴ This financial allegiance between Pope Julius II and Chigi quickly evolved into one of close friendship, so close in fact that when Julius II fell ill on a sojourn to Bologna in 1506, Chigi remained at his bedside until his condition improved.¹⁵ This bond at times gave Chigi the upper hand, in negotiations of both business and pleasure. Julius II went so far as to adopt Agostino and his brother, Sigismondo, into the family of the della Rovere, an honor symbolized, among other instances, in the prose of Blosio Palladio's epigram, *Suburbanum Augustini Chigii* (1512).¹⁶

The symbolic adoption of Chigi into the della Rovere family was paired with financial gifts. For example, Chigi emerged from six months of negotiations for the Pope in Venice following the collapse of the League of Cambrai with 30,000 ducats worth of jewelry from the Treasury of San Marco.¹⁷ In addition, as

¹⁴ As Ingrid Rowland suggests, "Pope Julius, whose election had been effected through egregious simony, had no doubt availed himself of Agostino's monies during the conclave, and thus the banker's career continued unscathed, enriching not only the Chigi family finances but also the coffers of the Holy See" (Rowland, "Render Unto Caesar," 680). Rowland's summation of Pope Julius II's election is reinforced by Nesselrath, who points out that the conclave to elect Giuliano della Rovere was the shortest in Papal history. (Nesselrath, "Raphael and Pope Julius II," 281).

¹⁵ Giuseppe Cugnoni, *Agostino Chigi il Magnifico* (Rome: A cura della Società Romana di Storia Patria, 1878), 36-37; Tizio, B.A.V. cod. Chigi, G. II:37, fol. 25; Rowland, "Render Unto Caesar," 681.

¹⁶ Palladio not only includes the della Rovere name in the title of his epigram, but he also refers to the villa within the text as "the Suburban Estate of Agostino Chigi della Rovere of Siena." (Mary Quinlan-McGrath, "Blosius Palladius, *Suburbanum Augustini Chisii*. Introduction, Latin Text and English Translation." *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, Vol 39 (1990), 116).

¹⁷ "Dopo aver firmato la costituzione di una nuova Lega Santa contro Francia e Impero, tornò a Roma nel Agosto del 1511, carico di 30,000 ducati in gioielli dal Tesoro di San Marco, accompagnato

Anthony Majanlahti comments, “Julius’ bellicose projects required a large outlay of cash, which Agostino supplied, and for several years the banker held the papal tiara itself as surety for Julius’ loans.”¹⁸ Chigi’s financial control over and his close ties to the Pope allowed Chigi a unique position in sixteenth-century Rome, one that no doubt contributed to the expressive nature of his artistic and architectural patronage. As Rowland comments, “ [Chigi] approached his enterprise as a patron with the same qualities he had brought to his financial empire: a comprehensive vision of where it would lead, a practical appreciation of how best to exploit it, and the unfaltering self-assurance necessary to propel such effort to fruition.”¹⁹ Such an outlook was no doubt already in mind when Chigi began considering designs for his villa.

Added to this vision was Chigi’s penchant for showmanship. What he lacked in humanistic intellect he more than made up for in self-promotion. He was known to parade around Rome, for example, on a Turkish horse given to him by an Eastern sultan, who exalted Chigi as “a great Christian merchant.”²⁰ Tied to his horse were saddlebags he claimed were filled with gold, though they

dall’artista veneziano Sebastiano Luciani, dalla giovanissima concubina veneziana Francesca Ordeaschi, e forse dallo stampatore Greco Zacharias Kallierges.” (Ingrid Rowland, “Il Giardino *Trans Tiberium* di Agostino Chigi,” in C. Benocci, ed., *I Giardini Chigi Tra Siena e Rome: Dal Cinquecento agli Inizi dell’Ottocento* (Siena: Fondazione Monte dei Paschi, 2005), 61).

¹⁸ Majanlahti, 322. Agostino’s influence over Julius II is also intimated with the suggestion that Agostino initiated the Pope’s campaign to Venice in 1511 to negotiate with the Venetians regarding the war for the League of Cambrai. For additional discussion of Chigi’s role in negotiations, please refer to Felix Gilbert’s chapter, “Chigi in Venice: The Crisis of the Spring of 1511,” in *The Pope, His Banker, and Venice* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980), 15-36.

¹⁹ Rowland, “Render Unto Caesar,” 681.

²⁰ Pellechia, “The Contested City,” 78; Christoph Luitpold Frommel, *Der Römische Palastbau der Hochrenaissance*, Vol. 2 (Tübingen: Wasmuth, 1973) 150, doc. no. 12; Jacques LeSaige and H.R. Duthilloeul, *Voyage des Jacques le Saige de Douai à Rome, Notre-Dame-de-Lorette, Venise, Jérusalem, et autres Saints Lieux* (Douai: Adam d’Aubers, 1851).

were actually filled with flour. This element of showmanship would be embodied in his villa, a space that initiated a collapse of time and a competition between art forms to yield a truly unique product of *cinquecento* Rome.

Chigi's Villa Suburbana

"What she now saw was a park planted with big tall trees and a spring of crystal-clear water. In the very centre of the garden, by the outflow of the spring, a palace had been built, not by human hands but by a divine craftsman. Directly you entered you knew that you were looking at the pleasure-house of some god – so splendid and delightful it was."

- Apuleius, *The Story of Cupid and Psyche, The Golden Ass*²¹

"Here Venus and the graces, and gentle cupids linger. Let this be the true home of Spring."

- Blosio Palladio, *Suburbanum Augustini Chisii*²²

Having purchased a parcel of overgrown land²³ sandwiched between the Tiber and Pope Julius' new Via della Lungara on the left bank in 1505,²⁴ Chigi set out to build a pleasure residence, a place of business, and a venue for a bevy of

²¹ Apuleius, *The Story of Cupid and Psyche from the Golden Ass*. trans. by E.J. Kenny. (NY: Penguin Classics, 2006).

²² "Heic venus et charites, placidique morantur amores. Haec Veris sit vera domus." (Mary Quinlan-McGrath, "Blosius Palladius," 1: 239-240, 128-129).

²³ According to both Frommel and Alessandro Cremona, there was even a small, rustic, unfinished dwelling on the property: "Domina Faustina, moglie di Puccio di Pietro fiorentino, vendette ad Agostino una 'proprietà fruttifera, alberata, con orti, con pozzo, e con una casa di tre camere con tetti di paglia chiusi e una stalla al piano, e con una loggia o portico e una sala iniziati ma non finite.' (Alessandro Cremona, *Felices Procerium Villulae: Il giardino della Farnesina dai Chigi all'Accademia dei Lincei* (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 2010), 519; Frommel, *Die Farnesina*, 193-194; Archivio Stato di Napoli, Archivio Farnese, 1850, IV). Frommel reports Chigi's purchase of this plot for a sum of 530 ducats (Frommel, "La Villa," 17).

²⁴ Pellechia, "The Contested City," 77.

entertainments: relaxation, horse training, poetry reading, and theater.²⁵ The design and layout of Chigi's construction mimicked that of a vacation retreat most commonly found outside the city, yet at the same time this villa also served as a main seat for management of Chigi's business pursuits. Thus, this villa was at both an escape from and a functioning component within Roman civic functions, the first of several significant dualities established on Chigi's grounds. From the location Chigi selected for his villa to the carefully crafted botanical and architectural spaces, the elements employed externally provide a convenient foreshadowing of a villa created, as Ingrid Rowland has suggested, "to present, and in part explain, a complex man to a society that had no category to accommodate him other than the category he was engaged in creating for himself."²⁶ Chigi's suburban villa complex, strategically placed along the left bank of the Tiber River (Fig. 16), was an intriguing manipulation of domestic architecture, encapsulated within a *villa suburbana*, a suburban home paradoxically "situated outside the city wall but fully urban in its function,"²⁷ benefiting from both its urban and suburban qualities.

²⁵ Following this purchase and through the construction process, Chigi continued to live in the original Banco Chigi structure on the Via dei Banchi, adjacent to the Palazzo Gaddi-Strozzi. He most likely lived on the Via dei Banchi until the Farnesina was habitable (approximately 1511). This structure actually remained in the hands of his father, and thus Chigi made little effort to upgrade the property. As Frommel surmises: "la grande casa non entrò mai in suo possesso e così spiega anche perché non l'abbia sostituita con un palazzo di rappresentanza come gli Alberini o i Gaddi, quando nel 1509 Giulio II cominciò a ristrutturare il quartiere" (Frommel, "La Villa," 13).

²⁶ Rowland, *The Roman Garden*, 12.

²⁷ Majanlahti, 684. As Alessandro Tagliolini commented, the villa "rappresentò un eccellente esempio di villa suburbana, tanto da mentare le modi di Vasari che lo giudicò 'condotto con quella grazia che oggi si vede, non murato ma veramente nato'. . . . Il luogo suggerito doveva essere ragionevolmente distante dalla città in modo da garantire i benefici della vita in campagna e sufficientemente vicino da consentire i vantaggi della vita pubblica" (Alessandro Tagliolini, *I giardini di Roma: Folclore, poesia*

Chigi's selected parcel of land along the Via della Lungara was not only invested with an underground foundation of ancient Roman ruins but it also placed him squarely within Julius II's planned new civic center of Rome.²⁸ As such, Chigi distanced himself from the traditional banker's neighborhood of the Campus Martius (on the opposite side of the Tiber).²⁹ Chigi situated his complex atop the submerged foundation of one of the ancient Roman villas that once lined the Via Septimiana, the ancient predecessor to the Via della Lungara.³⁰ At the same time he rooted himself in history,³¹ however, Chigi placed himself not

e storia della città attraverso l'evoluzione delle isole verdi, la riscoperta di una rinascimentale bellezza in un'ideale sintesi tra natura e arte (Rome: Newton Compton, 1980), 108).

²⁸ This is not to imply that Chigi knew the exact ancient structures that were submerged beneath his riverside property, but rather that there was a general conception of the "ancient" Rome buried beneath the *cinquecento* Rome.

²⁹ The neighborhood relegated to the bankers of Rome was directly across the *Pons Aelius* from the Vatican, connected by the Via Papalis. (Rowland, *The Culture*, 8). This bridge collapsed in the Jubilee year under Pope Nicholas V under the weight of pilgrims trekking to St. Peter's, and was thus rebuilt as Ponte Sant'Angelo (Gill, "The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries," 28).

³⁰ Rowland has speculated on the extent to which Chigi was aware of the antique ruins submerged beneath his property. Building on the suppositions of Phyllis Pray Bober and Ruth Rubenstein (*Renaissance Artist and Antique Sculpture: A Handbook of Sources* (London: Miller, 1987), Rowland goes so far to suggest that Chigi (or at least Peruzzi) knew of the presence of the ancient Villa Farnesina, discovered beneath Chigi's plot in the nineteenth century. Any knowledge of these ancient structures seems highly unlikely, however, and any ancient bearings still above ground would have been removed before Chigi's arrival, as Sixtus IV ordered their removal along with the widening of the Via della Lungara in 1475 in preparation for the Jubilee (Nicholas Temple, *Renovatio Urbis: Architecture, Urbanism, and Ceremony in the Rome of Julius II*. (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2011) 126). The ancient wine dock (Cellae Vinariae Vove et Arruntiana, CIL VI. 8826) also underneath Chigi's property was not discovered until the 1878-1879 construction of the current Tiber embankments (Samuel Ball Platner, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (London: Oxford University Press, 1929), 109). For recent analysis of these ancient monuments, please see: Mariette de Vos, "I monumenti rinvenuti nel giardino della villa rinascimentale di Agostino Chigi: la villa romana della Farnesina," in C.L. Frommel, G. Caneva, and A. Angeli, *La villa Farnesina a Roma = The villa Farnesina in Rome*. *Mirabilia Italiae*, 12 (Modena: F.C. Panini, 2003), 2: 155-162).

³¹ As a foreigner, creating a metaphorical connection with ancient Rome was arguably more significant for Chigi than other contemporary noblemen. As Rowland has commented, "In his native Siena, for a variety of historical reasons, the line between merchants and landed gentry was not drawn as finely as elsewhere in Italy, so that within the Sienese Republic, the Chigi family unquestionably belonged to the aristocracy. Agostino himself would insist upon this fact throughout his life by using the title *Patritius Senensis*, but he was never able to add on a coveted *Patritius Romanus*." (Ingrid D. Rowland, "Cultural Introduction to Renaissance Rome," in M.B. Hall, ed., *Artistic Centers of the Italian Renaissance: Rome* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 11). This desire on Chigi's part

only in close proximity to Saint Peter's and thus Pope Julius II but he was also at the heart of Julius' grand vision. As Nicholas Temple argues, Julius II hoped the Via della Lungara would undergo an even more massive transformation than its cross-Tiber counterpart the Via Giulia. Indeed, the Pope planned to lengthen the Via della Lungara at least as far as the harbor of the Ripa Grande, with Nicholas Temple suggesting its culmination at the Pyramid of Gaius Cestius over a mile to the southeast.³²

As such, the Via della Lungara would have become an arterial route equal to the Via Giulia as intended, if not more personally associated with the Pope's activities. Temple suggests that Julius envisioned the Via della Lungara, once connected to Via Portuense and the Via Aurelia, as the essential trade route from Rome's major ports of Fiumicino and Civitavecchia as well as a military thoroughfare for his numerous campaigns across the peninsula.³³ Added to these uses was that for pilgrimage, as the Via della Lungara was positioned to become as Temple calls it the "sacred way" to the Vatican. Had its full length to the Pyramid of Gaius Cestius been achieved, the Via della Lungara would, in Temple's words, "have formalized the pilgrimage route between the sites of burial and martyrdom of the two most venerated saints in Rome – Peter and

to establish Roman status was strengthened with Chigi's lack of a nobleman's education, as well as his lack of interest in classical literature and language. Another explanation for this selection of land is that Chigi was trying to reflect his Sienese heritage. As Rowland suggests, "the Tiber had acted in ancient times as the traditional boundary between Rome and Tuscany, so that Agostino, as a good Tuscan, could pretend that his new house stood on his own native soil." (Rowland, "Cultural Introduction," 15).

³² Temple, 151-153.

³³ Temple continues by suggesting that "at a larger geographical level [the Via della Lungara] would support the more pressing threat of Ottoman invasion by sea by forging links with ports" (Temple, 153).

Paul.”³⁴ Temple also asserts that the Pope saw the Via della Lungara as a personal passage for his travels between the Vatican and his papal hunting lodge at Magliana, with the street being referred to in documentation from the 1520s as the “via Julia,” in an effort to differentiate it from the “Via Magistralis,” now known as the Via Giulia.³⁵ In short, Pope Julius II intended the Via della Lungara to be one of the most trafficked and celebrated avenues in the new Rome, and thus Chigi’s selection of a plot of land along this route seems all the more significant, as its mere presence would immediately become a landmark for Romans, from pilgrims to Pope alike.

One must ponder the intended symbolic significance of Chigi’s geographical alliance with this ceremonial and celebrated route that simultaneously distanced him from the traditional banker’s neighborhood. This separation could have been deliberate, in an effort to suggest Chigi’s superiority over other bankers, yet it also could have been an unintended byproduct of Chigi’s overarching desire to reinforce his close allegiance to Pope Julius II and the della Rovere family. Regardless of the exact factors in Chigi’s selection of this location, he nevertheless embarked on a design that upheld Julius II’s wish to create a “city within a city, a garden city along the Tiber,”³⁶ a riparian oasis that was to transform the river itself “into a third, graceful thoroughfare, a haven for boaters and amateur fishermen. . . .an idyllic marriage of land and water.”³⁷

³⁴ Temple, 153.

³⁵ Temple, 156.

³⁶ Rowland, *The Culture*, 178.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 178-179.

Amplifying this tripartite scheme, Julius II envisioned the Via della Lungara as “dedicated primarily to the culture of the villa,” juxtaposed with the legal and commercial culture that dominated its parallel counterpart across the Tiber.³⁸ Buying in to Julius’ cultural vision, Chigi transformed his own property into a veritable garden oasis. Lavish and expansive, Chigi’s grounds reflected, as Elsa Gerlini posits, the harmonious “unity of gardening and horticulture,”³⁹ navigable by a verdant pergolated walkway flanked by alternating apple and cedar trees and rare exotic plants.⁴⁰

Chigi approached the design of his villa as a paradoxical conflation of contemporary notions of domestic and professional space. It was a true *rus in urbe*,⁴¹ or literally “country in the city,” that merged the traditional pleasure house with a place of business. Stretching from the Porta Settimiana to the south to the Via Buon Pastore to the north, and enclosed on the west by the Via della Lungara and on the east by the Tiber, Chigi’s residence was originally surrounded by expansive vineyards, a fruit orchard, and a mix of local and exotic plants. Thus, at its very outset, Chigi’s villa was an oasis, isolated from its urban surroundings by a cushion of extensive garden greenery. As such it would have fallen in line brilliantly with Julius’ intentions, its lush ruggedness a fitting

³⁸ Such a transformation must have made quite an impact, considering the state of the street prior to Julius II’s intervention. Originally named the Via Santa, the street that first occupied the Via della Lungara’s current path had been plagued with the dumping of garbage. This, combined with its frequent flooding from the swelling Tiber, created an unsightly backwater. (Pellechia, “The Contested City,” 76).

³⁹ “[Il giardino] si univano il giardinaggio e l’orticoltura” (Elsa Gerlini, *Giardino e architettura nella Farnesina*. (Rome: Reale Istituto di Studi Romani, 1942), 4).

⁴⁰ “Accanto a pergolati si ergevano padiglioni di verdura, e meli e cedri erano alternati alle aiuole fiorite” (Gerlini, *Giardino e architettura*, 4).

⁴¹ Borrowed from Alberti; Pellechia, “The Contested City,” 77.

juxtaposition against the stern severity of the Palazzo dei Tribunali planned for the adjacent side of the river.

Near the center of this oasis rose the lavish, ornate villa where business intermingled with pleasure. To design and build this magnificent structure, Chigi employed the little-known Sienese architect Baldassarre Peruzzi who, albeit a neophyte to such grand architectural commissions, nevertheless represented the new generation of architects soon to dominate Rome.

Picking Peruzzi and Emergent All'Antica Architecture

Considered the lesser colleague of other sixteenth-century Roman architects such as Donato Bramante and Antonio da Sangallo the Younger, Peruzzi has suffered the disservice of a woefully incomplete biography.⁴² Very little is known about Peruzzi in general, contributing to what Ann Huppert calls “an air of mystery [surrounding] all aspects of the life and work of the architect and artist.”⁴³ One can surmise, however, that after training in Siena he departed for Rome around 1503 in an effort to officially launch his architectural career.⁴⁴ At the time, Roman fascination with all things antique had attained an unprecedented fervor. Accordingly, in addition to the increasing incorporation of

⁴² Colin Rowe and Leon Satkowski, *Italian Architecture of the Sixteenth Century* (NY: Princeton Architectural Press, 2002), 136.

⁴³ As Huppert continues: “Born in 1481, even his place of birth is a point of contention, . . . [however] the artist signed himself Baldassarre of Siena, his place of baptism.” (Huppert, “The Archaeology”, 1).

⁴⁴ Frommel suggests that a main inspiration for Peruzzi’s move to Rome was his desire to study and sketch antiquities. (Christoph Luitpold Frommel, *The Architecture of the Italian Renaissance* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2007), 146).

ancient fragments and the emulation of ancient epigrams, the profession of architecture was yet emerging, envisioned through the lens of Vitruvian architectural theory.

In addition to the increased use of fragments from antiquity over the course of the fifteenth century, perhaps the greatest contribution of the revival of the antique world was its impact on architectural practice. It was during the mid- to late fifteenth century that, as Georgia Clarke posits, “a direct connection between architectural forms and design and an interest in the classical past can be clearly determined.”⁴⁵ The fifteenth century witnessed not only the emergence of a profession of “architect”⁴⁶ but also the rebirth of the ancient architectural treatise, which became fodder for a new generation of writing.⁴⁷ The only surviving ancient architectural source was Vitruvius, and thus his first-century BCE principles as outlined in *De Architectura Libri Decem* (*Ten Books on Architecture*) became the sourcebook of ancient architectural practices for fifteenth century.

As digestion of Vitruvian thought progressed into the early sixteenth century, it coincided with a rise of the illustrated architectural manual, a repository of sketches and dimensions culled from antique remnants. As Colin Rowe and Leon Satkowski comment, “[*In the cinquecento*] ancient ruins were no

⁴⁵ Clarke, Georgia, *Roman House – Renaissance Palaces: Inventing Antiquity in Fifteenth Century Italy* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 3.

⁴⁶ Günther, Hubertus, “The Renaissance of Antiquity,” in H.A. Millon and V.M. Lampugnani, eds., *The Renaissance from Brunelleschi to Michelangelo: The Representation of Architecture* (NY: Rizzoli, 1997), 265.

⁴⁷ As Huppert comments, “Vitruvius’ treatise had little influence during antiquity,” relegating it to minimal dissemination, however it did survive in print through the Middle Ages. (Huppert, “The Archaeology,” 25).

longer the exclusive purview of Humanist writers or the readers of their texts, which often lacked illustrations. . . . Instead, the architect now needed examples from antiquity that could be recast for contemporary needs.”⁴⁸ The metamorphosis of the architectural manual into a visual format, however, was perhaps for practical reasons. While Vitruvius was the watershed text on ancient architectural precepts, his writings were often confusing. As Huppert posits, “Vitruvius’s text was venerated for its antiquity but this by no means ensured its comprehensibility.”⁴⁹ Even for those schooled in Latin, such as Leon Battista Alberti, Vitruvius’ convoluted translations and turns-of-phrase proved confounding. As Huppert continues, “[*Vitruvius’s*] treatise was difficult to understand, due not only to corruptions of the original text but also because of Vitruvius’s language and terminology. . . . The absence of illustrations also contributed to the difficulty: Vitruvius had said that drawings would accompany the text but none have survived.”⁵⁰ Alberti tried to work around these missing illustrations, even choosing deliberately to exclude a section devoted to ancient architecture in his treatise, *De Re Aedificatoria*. The result was, as Richard Betts posits, a “fragmentary, impressionistic account of ancient architecture [*that*] belongs more to the art of rhetoric than to archaeology or architecture.”⁵¹ Others, such as Giuliano da Sangallo and Francesco di Giorgio Martini, attempted illustrated editions (Fig. 17), by seeking out ancient architectural remains to

⁴⁸ Rowe and Satkowski, 128.

⁴⁹ Huppert, “The Archaeology,” 26.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 27.

⁵¹ Betts, 251.

sketch. This was in an effort not only to capture what was left of antiquity in sixteenth century Rome,⁵² but also to grasp the concepts and designs outlined by Vitruvius and subsequently disseminate these illustrations along with the text to make a comprehensible manual of architectural principles.

Both illustrated treatises remained unpublished and suffered from obstacles similar to those faced by Alberti.⁵³ As Betts comments, “Even when he did not have to imagine the forms of a building, as in the Pantheon, Francesco di Giorgio made them conform to his own ideas. He recommends that the height of the church at the crossing should be between two and three times its width, so he added an extra attic to the interior elevation of the Pantheon to make it appear as an authorizing precedent for his own theory.”⁵⁴ Regardless of the foibles of these individual approaches, the exponential growth in interest in Vitruvius fed into a flurry of *all’antica* architectural design across the Italian peninsula in the closing years of the fifteenth century.

⁵² Part of the motivation for some architects and artists to engage in such extensive sketching was to chronicle the ever-deteriorating remnants of what once was the glory of Rome. As Huppert comments, “Raphael’s emotional response to his endeavor [*of sketching the remains of antiquity*] was a mixture of awe at the grandeur of ancient Rome and immense sadness at ‘seeing the Cadaver of this our great city, what was the queen of the world so miserably tattered.’ (Francesco P. di Teodoro, *Raffaello, Baldassar Castiglione e la Lettera a Leone X* (Bologna: Nuova, Alfa, 1994), 115). Raphael conveyed the urgent need to stem the ongoing destruction of the ancient remains by human as well as natural forces, but he was also optimistic that the pope might equal and even exceed the achievements of the past.” (Huppert, “The Archaeology,” 30-31).

⁵³ The first illustrated edition of Vitruvius’ *Ten Books* in Italian was not published until 1521 by Cesare Cesariano (Cesare Cesariano, *Di Lucio Vitruuio Pollione de architectura libri dece traducti de latino in vulgare affigurati: coñmentati: & con mirando ordine insigniti*. (Como: Gotardo da Ponte, 1521)).

⁵⁴ Betts, 253; Huppert echoes a similar sentiment: “simply documenting the existing state of the monument was not his objective. Rather, as Francesco di Giorgio stated elsewhere in his treatise, [it was] the art of *disegno* and *invenzione*.” (“The Archaeology,” 39).

Having trained with Francesco di Giorgio Martini, Baldassarre Peruzzi thus shared in his teacher's fascination with the antique.⁵⁵ This interest is illustrated in what can be ascertained of Peruzzi's presumably early sketches, such as those depicting portions of the Baths of Caracalla (U323Ar and Av; Fig. 18) that foreshadowed his unique approach to architecture and *all'antica* motifs.⁵⁶ As Huppert points out in Peruzzi's sketches from the Flavian amphitheater, when juxtaposed against drawings of the same subject included in the Codex Escorialensis, his drawings "emphasize his analysis of the architectural elements. . . suggesting a fragmentary quality; rather than disjointed, however, together they create a comprehensive portrayal."⁵⁷ This same quality is evident in the sketches from the Baths of Caracalla as well, particularly in the *recto* page. Here Peruzzi juxtaposed portions of the bath complex's ground plan with a sketch of a

⁵⁵ As Francesco Paolo Fiore comments, there is no documentary proof that Peruzzi was a student of Francesco di Giorgio, yet: "il legame tra le opera anche tarde di Baldassarre e le origini martiniane è tanto evidente da indicare che un influsso profondo prese corpo almeno attraverso la conoscenza o esercizi di copia dei *Trattati [di architettura civile e militare]* o di disegni e attraverso la pratica architettonica almeno di maestri della sua scuola" ("La Villa Chigi a 'Le Volte' e il linguaggio architettonico peruzziano nella tradizione di Francesco di Giorgio," in M. Fagiolo and M. L. Madonna, eds., *Baldassarre Peruzzi: Pitture, scena e architettura nel Cinquecento* (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1987), 149).

⁵⁶ While the dating of Peruzzi's sketches is often problematic, Howard Burns suggests with some confidence that this sketch and its corresponding *verso* bear the hallmarks of the "grafia giovanile e piuttosto compatta" of Peruzzi, dating it to the closing years of the fifteenth century. (Howard Burns, "I disegni di Francesco di Giorgio agli Uffizi di Firenze." In F.P. Fiore and M. Tafuri, eds., *Francesco di Giorgio architetto* (Milan: Electa, 1993), 337).

⁵⁷ This comes, with many thanks to Ann, from the advance text of: Ann C. Huppert, "The Lessons of Rome," *Becoming an Architect in Renaissance Italy: Art, Science and the Career of Baldassarre Peruzzi* (London and New Haven: Yale University Press, forthcoming 2015), no page number available.

rearing horse, thereby leaving his study of the ancient structure incomplete yet perhaps conflating what he saw as the most significant elements of the design.⁵⁸

The emphasis on the individual elements of these structures, individually fragmentary yet taken in sum comprehensive, revealed Peruzzi's training as a painter. At the same time, however, his sketches could not be construed as painterly. As Huppert points out, "Peruzzi's drawings would have been far less useful for an artist seeking authentic ruins to fill an image. . . . were Peruzzi's images to have served as models of this sort, one would have to imagine that their subsequent application would be in 'real' buildings, . . . rather than in 'painted' architectural representations of buildings made for a general audience."⁵⁹ In some respects this distinction would come full circle in Peruzzi's career. Later, he would work in theatrical backdrop design, wherein this assemblage of antique architectural motifs would translate into fictive cityscapes. In the early years of his career, however, Peruzzi's novel approach to architectural draftsmanship would carry over into his earliest commissions, particularly those for Chigi.

Though Peruzzi was positioned to become a vanguard of a new sort of architecture, at the time he earned Chigi's commissions, success as an architect was achieved not solely through novelty. During Peruzzi's early days in Rome, it was the case that the exponential increase in scale of early sixteenth century

⁵⁸ Indeed, Burns links this small sketch to Peruzzi by way of its similarity to another series of animal studies credited to his hand: "il cavallo assomiglia a quello disegnato da Peruzzi nell'U 336Av. . . . che hanno stretti paralleli in schizzi che, sono senza dubbio di Peruzzi." (Burns, "I disegni," 337, 354).

⁵⁹ Huppert, "The Lessons of Rome," no page number available.

construction meant an architect's reputation was increasingly defined by the caliber and scale of his commissioned architectural projects. At the time of his selection for the construction of the Villa Farnesina Peruzzi, though prolific in architectural sketch production,⁶⁰ had completed few architectural commissions. Though now widely accepted as one of the preeminent architects of his day, Peruzzi's oeuvre was perhaps incomplete at the time of his death – indeed, his career capstone, the Palazzo Massimo, was yet unfinished at his death in January 1536.⁶¹ Thus one must wonder why Chigi selected the green twenty-four year-old to construct “clearly the most splendid and luxurious”⁶² suburban villa in Rome, particularly when other more qualified, or prestigious, architects were working in Rome. He could have chosen, for example, Donato Bramante, a devoté of Vitruvius whom Frommel labeled the antique's “foremost propagator”⁶³ working in Rome at the time. Instead he chose a more obscure architect, and while one can never ascertain his exact rationale, one can hypothesize his reasoning.

⁶⁰ As Rowe and Satkowski comment, “a gifted architectural draftsman whose architectural plans cleverly disguised the difficulties posed by irregular sites and preexisting construction, Peruzzi's greatest ideas often remained on paper. The true measures of Peruzzi's professionalism, then, are his evocative architectural drawings and the full range of his varied endeavors – building design, military architecture, stage design, hydraulic engineering, metallurgy, and architectural theory” (139).

⁶¹ Jones, “Palazzo Massimo,” 59. This is not to say that Peruzzi did not complete other projects during his lifetime; on the contrary, his work to refortify Siena while serving as the city's *capomaestro* of architecture (1527-1535) and his architectural contributions at Carpi could be proposed as additional landmarks of Peruzzi's career. This statement is only to point out that Peruzzi was not as monumentally prolific as his sixteenth century contemporaries.

⁶² Rowe and Satkowski, 140.

⁶³ Christoph Luitpold Frommel, “Bramante and the Origins of the ‘High Renaissance,’” in J. Burke, ed., *Rethinking the Renaissance: The Culture of the Visual Arts in Early Sixteenth-Century Rome* (UK: Ashgate, 2012), 160.

Peruzzi's selection for the commission could, in part, have been due to his native link to Siena. This cultural connection seems plausible, in light of Chigi's allegiance to the city and his concurrent desires to carve out his own noble identity within Rome. By selecting an architect well-versed in Tuscan or Siennese architectural conventions, Chigi continued to reinforce his Siennese, or foreign, identity. Doing so within a Roman locale would then translate into a statement of civic pride, bringing the country villa to the urban city but also as merging Siennese tradition with Roman convention.⁶⁴ Frommel suggests the potential for this "l'orgoglio senese," adding that Chigi might have banked on the fact that his neophyte architect could always consult with other architects, such as Bramante, if necessary.⁶⁵

Chigi might also have selected Peruzzi out of a matter of convenience. Between his concurrent work on the Palazzo Caprini and his plans for the Vatican, Bramante was undoubtedly scarcely available, and thus Chigi might have wished to attain a more accessible architect. Furthermore, Chigi had most likely already met Peruzzi while he was working on a villa for Chigi's family, the

⁶⁴ Supporting this notion is Chigi's other patronage of the arts in Siena, including playwrights Niccolò Campani, known as Lo Strascino, and Ser Lionardo di Ser Ambrogio, referred to as Il Mescolino, both of whom brought theatrical productions to Rome to perform for Chigi and his coterie (Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 100).

⁶⁵ "Quindi anche l'orgoglio senese potrebbe aver spinto Chigi a preferirgli il discepolo del famoso Francesco di Giorgio, dopo avergli permesso un minuzioso studio dell'arte antica e contemporanea. Grazie all' 'famigliarità,' apprezzata dal Vasari, committente e architetto furono in grado di concertare con accuratezza le proprie idee, studiare le poche ville degne di essere imitate, ricercare prototipi antichi e consultare addirittura Bramante, Giuliano da Sangallo e Giulio II in persona" (Frommel, "La Villa," 17).

Villa Le Volte, near Siena.⁶⁶ A project initially begun by Francesco di Giorgio in the closing years of the fifteenth century, the Villa le Volte was most likely completed by Peruzzi following di Giorgio's death in 1502 and thus served as the project immediately preceding Peruzzi's work on the Farnesina.⁶⁷ Having already achieved his acquaintance, Chigi might have thought it simpler to employ him yet again in Rome, or perhaps, being a savvy financier, Chigi had struck a deal with Peruzzi to design and build a second dwelling. While some matters of convenience may have played into Chigi's decision, the sheer fact that Chigi's status in Rome allowed him access to some of the greatest talents of the day suggests that he saw great potential in Peruzzi. In this regard, Peruzzi's efforts within Chigi's father's villa in Siena served an effective calling card, as it seems to have secured Chigi's ongoing patronage.⁶⁸

⁶⁶ As strengthened by Chigi's commission of Bramante for a triumphal arch to celebrate Julius II's *processo*, during the course of which Frommel suggests: "alla decorazione di quest'arco potrebbe aver collaborato anche il giovane Peruzzi." (Frommel, "La Villa," 13).

⁶⁷ Francesco Paolo Fiore, "Villa Chigi a Le Volte," in F.P. Fiore and M. Tafuri, eds., *Francesco di Giorgio architetto* (Milan: Electa, 1993), 322. This attribution of the project is echoed by Cristiano Tessari: "la capacità di esprimere architettonicamente la dialettica fra modello teorico e realtà del *fare* che l'edificio dimostra, oltre ai riferimenti ad altre su opera, rende più che probabile l'attribuzione a Francesco di Giorgio del progetto della villa" (*Baldassarre Peruzzi: il progetto dell'antico* (Milan: Electa, 1995), 23). Mariano Chigi commissioned this dwelling (Rowland ("Cultural Introduction," 15), yet the dedication that appears on the building's façade, "Sigismund Chisius Hoc Curarum Refugium Extruxit A.D. MDV," refers to Agostino's brother Sigismondo. Both Emanuele Repetti (1846) and the fifth centennial catalogue of Peruzzi's work (1981) attempted to clear this discrepancy by suggesting that the dedication followed Sigismondo's commission of the left wing of the villa, however Fiore's conclusion (1993) that Sigismondo completed the villa following his father's death is also plausible. (Emanuele Repetti, *Dizionario geografico fisico storico della Toscana: Contenente la descrizione di tutti i luoghi del Granducato, Ducato di Lucca, Garfagnana e Lunigiana*. 6. Appendice (1846), 798; *Baldassarre Peruzzi, 1481-1981: Commemorazione V centenario della nascita* (Sovicille: Comune di Sovicille, 1981) 38-40; Fiore, "Villa Chigi," 318).

⁶⁸ Frommel proposes that a nearly simultaneous commission from Chigi, that for the Church of Santa Maria (della Sughera) in Tolfa, was "progettata probabilmente anch'essa da Peruzzi" (Frommel, "La Villa," 14).

Built between 1502-1505 on a wooded property in Sovicille, (Fig. 19), the Villa Le Volte is a simple, two-storied structure with minimal adornment, save for the paired pilasters and archways that decorate an inner loggia, created between the two wing extensions, and the Corinthian pilasters that demarcate the corners of the building. The façade of the Villa Le Volte consists of projecting wings on either end, extending out to create a quasi-enclosed courtyard in front of the open portico entryway, borrowed from the Vitruvian prescriptions and a frequent feature of Francesco di Giorgio's plans.⁶⁹

For as much as the style of Francesco di Giorgio and a shared study of Vitruvius is revealed in the villa's design, one can also sense Peruzzi's design novelty by bringing to life the technique of recombining *all'antica* motifs into a unified whole. As Cristiano Tessari comments, Peruzzi "completed the Villa le Volte by including antique elements that mitigate the austere language of [Francesco di Giorgio] Martini, and seemingly reflect the mediating resolve to underline the layout of the façade with the eye of a painter."⁷⁰ Added to this manipulation of di Giorgio's architectural language is a hint of Peruzzi's individual innovative spirit. First, the design of the villa bears a notable asymmetry, both in its ground plan and its façade (Figs. 20 and 21). The villa's right wing is noticeably smaller than its left, an unusual feature that several

⁶⁹ Fiore, "Villa Chigi," 318; Fiore, "La Villa Chigi," 140; Giulia Ceriani Sebregondi, *Architettura e committenza a Siena nel Cinquecento: L'attività di Baldassarre Peruzzi e la storia di Palazzo Francesconi* (Siena: Aska Edizione, 2011), 110).

⁷⁰ "Nel completamento della villa 'alle Volte,' dunque, l'inserimento di elementi antichizzanti che mitigano l'austerità del linguaggio martiniano, sembra riflettere il tentativo di risolvere mediante sottolineature visive gli impaginati dell'facciate, attuato con un'ottica da pittore' (Tessari, 25).

scholars have argued suggests the left wing was actually once a freestanding structure to which Francesco di Giorgio and Peruzzi added.⁷¹ The entryways on both southern and western facades are also asymmetrically oriented. This instance of asymmetry, however, creates an essential axuality within the structure, as it allows the vestibule entrance on the western façade to align with the entrance of the opposite wing, onto the sala da pranzo. Fiore suggests this axuality was further reinforced by the original presence of a stairway adjacent to the southern side of western vestibule entrance, a key access point to the villa's upper level.⁷² From Fiore's perspective, this aligns the Villa Le Volte's designs with Alberti's conceptualization of how the entryway, vestibule and portico should function within a villa's footprint.⁷³ Indeed, as Alberti recounts, "the portico and vestibule are dignified by the entrance. . . . [and] the atrium, salon and so one should relate in the same way to the house as do the forum and public square to the city: . . . [they] should be prominent, with easy access to other members. It is here that stairways and passageways begin, and here that

⁷¹ "L'impostazione generale della facciata è disarticolata e presenta degli interspazi, tra le finestre, eccessivamente ampi o ridotti al minimo in prossimità delle lesene. Il portone incorniciato da bugne lisce è al cornice del primo ordine che è doppia solo in questo prospetto, possono indurre a ipotizzare che questo nucleo (l'ala sinistra) fosse state preesistente. Lo stesso solecismo di non inquadrare l'arco con l'ordine puo essere motivato da una definizione delle altezze determinate dal volume di un edificio gia esistente, oppure come afferma Spagnesi perché la ripresa del l'arco inquadrato dall'ordine fu introdotto da Bramante e perciò appreso da Peruzzi durante il seguente soggiorno romano" (*Baldassarre Peruzzi, 1481-1981: Commemorazione V Centenario Della Nascita*, 40). The suggestion that Peruzzi built on to a preexisting structure was first argued in: Francesco Paolo Fiore, "Il rilievo della villa Chigi a 'Le Volte' presso Siena: il contributo storico-critico di una lettera del manufatto nell'ottica del restauro," *Ricerche di Storia dell'Arte*, 16 (1982), 75-82.

⁷² This stairway was lost in the seventeenth-century renovations, but its existence is attested to by the presence of tiny windows along the western façade, "per illuminare la nuova scala, che un tempo avrebbe preso luce dal cortile, da dove sarebbe salita la prima rampa rettilinea" (Fiore, "Villa Chigi," 321).

⁷³ *Ibid.*

visitors are greeted and made welcome.”⁷⁴ This infusion of Albertian precepts implies the extent to which Peruzzi was experimenting with architectural principles, which he would carry forth at Chigi’s villa in Rome.

“Not Built but Born . . .”⁷⁵ – The Villa Emerges

Peruzzi’s plan for the Villa Farnesina along the bank of the Tiber adopted the same U-shaped structure as seen in the Villa Le Volte, with wings emerging from the north facade. Here the entryways are positioned on the northern and southern facades, allowing for what Mark Wilson Jones terms a “harmonious balance between elegant symmetry and relaxed planning, between architectural and painted decoration” (Figs. 22 and 23).⁷⁶ Overall, the design of the villa, like that of the Villa Le Volte, revealed a blend of the teachings of Francesco di Giorgio and Alberti along with those of Vitruvius.⁷⁷

Entering the villa complex from the Via della Lungara into a forecourt, one would see to the south the main northern Farnesina façade entrance, including the Loggia di Amore e Psiche, which served as the original entrance to

⁷⁴ Alberti, *On the Art of Building*, 5: 119.

⁷⁵ Vasari, *Lives*, 2: 810-811.

⁷⁶ Jones, “Palazzo Massimo,” 59. While the entrances to the villa proper are found symmetrically aligned on the northern and southern facades, the street entrance along the eastern side of the property on the Via della Lungara would have been reminiscent of the vestibule entrance at the Villa le Volte.

⁷⁷ Tessari notes the placement of the inner staircase as a direct quotation of Francesco di Giorgio’s approach: “Nel primo ambiente, asimmetrico rispetto alla loggia seguente, la scala di collegamento con il piano superiore è situata ortogonalmente all'estremità sinistra dell'ingresso, secondo l'uso antico che Francesco di Giorgio si era premurato di motivare” (Tessari, 27).

the villa (Fig. 16, with north lying to the left of the image).⁷⁸ To the north, following 1513-1514, one would have viewed Raphael's stables (to which discussion will turn in subsequent pages), their western and northern facades incorporated into the wall enclosing Chigi's complex. One could progress through this forecourt toward the gardens via an archway that punctuated the wall extending northward from the eastern boundary of the villa and that connected to a critical juncture of garden pathways.

The nexus of this intersection was an axial walkway that extended from the northernmost boundary of Chigi's property to its southernmost reaches, effectively parallel to the Tiber River. Going straight, or eastward, along these paths, one would arrive at the riverfront casino and the shores of the Tiber River. Turning right, or southward, would instead aim in the direction of the nearby Porta Settimiana (Figs. 16 or 68). One would assume, given the axuality of this central walkway, that the villa would sit at its conclusion, allowing one's progression through the grounds to the culminating spectacle of the villa's façade. This, however, was not the case. This central path passed alongside the villa, meeting the open the Loggia di Galatea on the eastern side and continuing past the forecourt of the southern façade to meet a new path network running through a continuation of the garden.⁷⁹

⁷⁸ As David Coffin points out, "Sixteenth century maps of Rome indicate that this north loggia formed the entrance to the villa since the main gate in the wall enclosing the *vigna* along the Via della Lungara was toward the north of the villa." (Coffin, *The Villa*, 91)

⁷⁹ This is the same orientation of the gardens seen at the Villa Le Volte that worked, according to Fiore, to reinforce the north-south axuality of the grounds and villa (Fiore, "La Villa Chigi," 141).

Relying on what Jones refers to as “an eminently satisfying mathematical sequence”⁸⁰ along with round dimensions, Peruzzi’s villa design was guided by the basic ratio of one to two. This relationship began with the footprint of the villa, assuming a height of 80 *palmi* and a width of 160 *palmi*, and was carried through the elements of the façade as well as the interior organization.⁸¹ The adherence to such a clear ratio not only ensured proportional concordance, but it also aligned with the Vitruvian declaration of the perfection of the numbers six and ten and how they combine to form “the most perfect number,” 16.⁸² Combinations and multiples of six and ten were considered ideal, and Peruzzi’s establishment of the Farnesina’s width at 160 *palmi* (16 x 10) was a careful, even perfect, calculation. An analysis of the measurements recorded for the villa reveals Peruzzi’s adherence to the Vitruvian proportions with only minimal deviation (Appendix A).

In addition to echoing Vitruvius in his proportional lay out of the Farnesina, Peruzzi also continued his piecemeal quotation of antique sources in his designs, merging a variety of sources and elements. Tessari suggests, for instance, that the rhythmic order of the Doric columniation and pilasters bears visual similarity to Rome’s Tabularium or the Temple of Hercules at Cori, while the projecting parapets in front of the windows of both facades was an element

⁸⁰ Jones, “Palazzo Massimo,” 60.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Vitruvius, 3:1, 47; Rowland and Howe, 48.

motivated by Peruzzi's understanding of the aedicules of the Markets of Trajan, suggesting Peruzzi's likely study of these monuments.⁸³

Perhaps Peruzzi's most significant *all'antica* element included in the Farnesina was his design for the main entrance façade, which followed Vitruvian prescriptions for the ancient *scaenae frons*, or theater. Vitruvius bases his plan for a theater around a circle whose bisecting diameter represents the outer boundary of the proscenium, dividing stage from orchestra. The semicircle that thus extends beyond this proscenium's edge translates into the curvature of the orchestra and the ascending rows of seats behind. The other circle half dictates the layout of the five ground bays of the *scaenae frons*. Vitruvius labeled the middle of these five bays the *valvae regiae*, or principal door, flanked on either side with *valvae hospitaliae*, auxiliary doors for the egress of actors. The final two bays capping either end of this ground-level arrangement were to be fitted with *periaktoi*, rotating triangular structures with three faces upon which scenery could be depicted and thus easily changed.⁸⁴

Peruzzi's façade components complied nearly exactly with Vitruvius' suggested proportions. If the distance between the wings is considered the equivalent of a theater's diameter, which in the case of the Farnesina measures

⁸³ “Nel dimensionamento dell'ordine dorico che ritma sui due livelli le facciate della villa, l'aumento dei moduli nel fusto delle paraste può essere riferito tanto ad esempi antichi quali il tabularium or il tempio di Ercole a Cori, quanto all'analoga soluzione bramantesca per l'esterno del coro di San Pietro. Mentre alla aperture effettuate dallo stesso maestro urbinate negli spazi fra i triglifi di palazzo Caprini per illuminarne i mezzanini possono essere ricondotte le finestrelle quadrate che vengono inserite nel fregio sottostante il cornicione a mensole e dentelli, posto a coronamento dell'edificio. Così per i parapetti-balcone costituiti da un risalto nella muratura in corrispondenza delle finestre, il motivo delle edicole nell'esda dei mercati Traiane trova nelle finestre della Cancelleria la sua precedente interpretazione” (Tessari, 27-28).

⁸⁴ Vitruvius, 5:6, 68-69.

112 *palmi*, the Farnesina's socle and pedestal base, equivalent to Vitruvius's *podium* and *pulpitum*, measure roughly 9.5 *palmi*, or one-twelfth the diameter. The first level pilasters total 28.05 *palmi*, or one-quarter the diameter, and the *epistyle*, or architrave, equals 5.61 *palmi*, or one-fifth the lower pilaster's height. The same trend continues for the second level elements: the *pluteus*, or attic, measures 4.17 *palmi*, a slight deviation from the Vitruvian precept of 4.67 *palmi*, or a half of a foot, and the second level pilasters measure 21.68 *palmi*.

The width of these five bays should, according to Vitruvius, equal the length of the circle's diameter, which becomes the essential measure for the component parts of the *scaenae frons*. Vitruvius commands that the stage platform, or *pulpitum*, be no more than five feet above ground, on top of which should rest a podium equal to one-twelfth the circular diameter and corresponding columns, or pilasters, amounting to one-quarter the length of the diameter.⁸⁵ The *epistyles* should measure one-fifth the height of the columns, and the *pluteus* should measure one-half the podium height. The second level of the *scaenae frons* should be adjusted proportionally to correspond with the first level, including columns measuring three-quarters the lower column height, or three-sixteenths of the original circle diameter and a *pluteus* one-half that of the first level, or one-quarter the podium height.⁸⁶

The second level *epistyle* is indeed the main deviation from Vitruvian proportions, measuring, according to Jones, 9.93 *palmi*, more than double

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

Vitruvius's proposed 4.2 *palmi*.⁸⁷ Jones suggests this deviation was to "fit the scale of the whole building" as well as to accommodate the attic level windows and accompanying frieze,⁸⁸ which in some sense was nonetheless still in accordance with Vitruvius, who implied that the architect is allowed license to adjust these proportions "according to the nature of the site or the size of the project."⁸⁹

Save for this *epistyle*, Peruzzi's façade components complied exactly with Vitruvius' suggested proportions, including pedestals and an entablature measuring, respectively, one-third and one-fifth the height of the façade columns, an upper story with pedestals half as tall as those on the lower level, and columns and an entablature three-quarters as tall as their counterparts below.⁹⁰ This careful translation of the ancient theater design contributed to a mounting sense of theatricality, not only with the literal presence of the stage by also by foreshadowing the elaborate scenes witnessed within the villa.⁹¹

⁸⁷ Jones, "Palazzo Massimo," 82.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 60.

⁸⁹ Vitruvius, 5:6, 69.

⁹⁰ Jones, "Palazzo Massimo," 60.

⁹¹ As Coffin comments, "In late fifteenth-century Rome, theatrical performances had generally been held in the courts of urban palaces. . . . the forecourt and podium of the Farnesina would . . . enhance the association of the architecture of the building with the ancient *scaenae frons*." Interestingly, Peruzzi, in addition to his numerous architectural sketches, also quite often sketched set designs for theatrical productions (Rowe and Satkowski, 139), a point to which discussion will return in Chapter Six. An intriguing consideration for the Farnesina's *scaenae frons* is the notion of the theatrical garden space, which became quite popular in the fifteenth-century Italian villa. The presence of such a space at the Villa Farnesina is echoed in Gerlini's analysis: "È anche da sottolineare che l'impostazione della Loggia di Psiche, con i due avancorpi protesi e il sedile sullo zoccolo della facciata, indica la concezione di uno spazio antistante destinato a rappresentazioni teatrali." (*La Villa Farnesina alla in Roma*. (Rome: La Libreria dello Stato, 1949), 21). These garden theaters, however, were often designed as wholly green spaces, and so the moving of the "stage," so to speak, from the confines of the garden to the façade of the villa seems quite significant, and perhaps an avenue for future

Peruzzi's accurate rendition of the ancient *scaenae frons* also marked a watershed moment for both the developing field of *all'antica* architecture and his burgeoning career as an architect. Jones ascribes Peruzzi's inclusion as arguably "the first instance of the literal appreciation of Vitruvius' recommendations regarding the *scaenae frons*,"⁹² marking a pivotal moment of synthesis in the course of his *all'antica* studies.

And, again as exhibited at the Villa le Volte, melded with these ancient and contemporary quotations are also elements indicating Peruzzi's innovation. As David Coffin comments, "the plan of the villa is not rigidly symmetrical in its internal organization, . . . but the design is rather ingenious in achieving a classic

examination, as it blends further the boundaries between fantasy and reality that are already intertwined in the Villa Farnesina's design.

⁹² Jones, "Palazzo Massimo," 60. Indeed, Peruzzi's adherence to Vitruvian prescriptions was, by all accounts, unprecedented in Renaissance Rome. In 1473, Cardinals Pietro Riario and Giuliano della Rovere, future Pope Julius II, had, through the largess of their uncle Pope Sixtus IV, constructed a temporary theater structure that joined their two palazzi adjacent to the Church of Santissima Apostoli on the Quirinal. Built for the celebration of the impending marriage of Eleonora of Aragon and Ercole d'Este, this structure served as the locale for both banquets and plays. It was, however dismantled following the retinue's departure and never attempted to Vitruvian proportions. (For more on this temporary construction, see: Meg Licht, "Elysium: A Prelude to Renaissance Theater," *Renaissance Quarterly*, 49 (1) (Spring, 1996), 1-29). Riario's nephew, Raffaello, soon after began construction on his own palazzo, known today as the Palazzo della Cancelleria, that was adjacent to the Campo dei Fiori and was the closest contemporary structure to contemplate the inclusion of a theatrical zone. Riario was an advocate for theatrical arts, so much so that architect Giovanni Sulpizio da Veroli, in dedicating his translation of Vitruvius to Riario in 1486-1487, stressed Riario's passion for theater. Indeed, early on in the building phases Riario had conferred with Veroli about the potential construction of an actual theatrical space within the palazzo itself, yet this space was never realized. Part of Riario's motivation in selecting the location for his palazzo was its proximity to the footprint of the ancient Theater of Pompey, the structure upon which Vitruvius based his precepts for theater design. By the sixteenth century, however, the Theater of Pompey had been completely subsumed beneath the dwellings of the *centro storico*. The Orsini family had amalgamated the various structures into a baronial fortress atop the theater's footprint in the 13th century, and only small remains of the theater, in the form of inscribed blocks, were unearthed over the subsequent three centuries. (For more on the history of the Theater of Pompey's excavations see: Hugh Denard, "Virtuality and Performativity: Recreating Rome's Theatre of Pompey," *PAJ: A Journal of Performance and Art*, 24 (1) (Jan., 2002), 27 (25-43) and Maria C Gagliardo and James E. Packer, "A New Look at Pompey's Theater: History, Documentation, and recent Excavation," *American Journal of Archaeology*, 110 (1) (Jan., 2006), 93-122). This ancient prototype, whose design has emerged through predominantly twentieth-century excavations, reinforces just how remarkable Peruzzi's revival was.

balance in its massing, while satisfying a specific functional organization through the disposition of its rooms.”⁹³ Indeed, as Jones points out, the interior rooms assume square and rectangular dimensions adhering to clear ratios of 5:4 and 6:5. In addition, the main window and door openings maintain the previously mentioned ratio of 1:2 in that they are double squares.⁹⁴

Peruzzi also imbued this layout with the Albertian sensibilities seen at the Villa le Volte, an aspect Jones did not explore in his analysis. With Alberti’s portico, vestibule, and entryway here collapsed into one space, one can see Peruzzi’s adherence to Alberti’s advice that “the portico and vestibule [should be] dignified by the entrance.”⁹⁵ This entrance, in turn, “may be dignified by . . . the quality of its workmanship, “a factor Peruzzi accounted for in the elaborate visual program he planned for the façade. With figures in chiaroscuro filling the spandrels between the columns along the loggia (Fig. 24), the original façade would have greeted visitors with a veritable theater of frescoed figures, an element discussed in greater length in Chapter Six.⁹⁶ Between the extended arms

⁹³ Coffin, *The Villa*, 93.

⁹⁴ Jones, *Palazzo Massimo*, 60.

⁹⁵ Alberti, *On the Art of Building*, 5: 119.

⁹⁶ Rowe and Satkowski, 140. As Gerlini comments in regard to these frescoes, “Ne sono rimaste sulla facciata Est pallide tracce di volti affini alle Sibille che lo stesso artista dipinse in S. Pietro in Montorio.” (Gerlini, *La Villa Farnesina*, 28). The stuccoed main entrance façade of the villa was originally frescoed, with accent spandrel frescoes also carrying around to the eastern and presumably the western facades. The best-preserved examples of these spandrel figures remain on the eastern façade, however faint. Frommel tallies the exterior visual program thus: “qui Peruzzi avrebbe dipinto e fatto dipingere 56 riquadri con figure in grandezza naturale di scene mitologiche, oltre a 112 panischi, maschere e putti laterali e a 24 *Allegorie* nei pennachi delle arcate” (Frommel, “La Villa,” 79). No evidence exists to suggest that the southern façade was frescoed nor intended to be frescoed. Rowland potentially explains this absence of fresco work on the southern façade as a deliberate reference to the austere ancient house of Augustus’ daughter, Julia, whose foundations have since been excavated beneath Chigi’s villa. It seems unlikely, however, that anyone in the early sixteenth century who have known of the existence of this ancient structure, as accounts of ancient Roman ruins as recent as

of this decorative splendor extended the podium of the *scaenae frons*. This dramatic stage space, set in front of a lavishly frescoed façade, would set the stage, so to speak, for a visitor's entrance into the villa, not only by continuing an ambiance of fantasy and theatricality, but also as a preparation for the lavish performance of the story of Cupid and Psyche that awaited them in the entry Loggia di Amore e Psiche. In some regard, then, Peruzzi's design of the Farnesina, in as much as it was an exploration of architectural principles, also encouraged a similar contemplation on the part of the visitor that was complemented through the villa's visual program, the subject of later pages.

A Contrast to the Cancelleria

The novelty of Peruzzi's Farnesina design can perhaps best be illustrated through comparison with the relatively contemporary Palazzo della Cancelleria, located on the eastern side of the Tiber River and built for Cardinal Raffaello Riario soon after his appointment as *camerlengo* in early 1483.⁹⁷ The circles in

Rodolfo Lanciani's 1897 writing no mention of the ancient Villa Farnesina (Rodolfo Lanciani, *The Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome* (NY: Benjamin Blom, 1897). Nevertheless, it is plausible that each façade was deliberately designed differently to emphasize the difference in atmosphere from either side, which is an interesting notion to consider given the self-construction Chigi employed in every other aspect of the villa. Decoration on the south façade was kept to a minimum, relegated to the attic story frieze of detailed *putti* wrapping the villa with garlands: "L'édificio è serrato, in alto, da un ricco cornicione con un fregio sentito in funzione architettonica; l'ornamentazione è infatti ampliata fino a contenere i riquadri delle ultime finestre. Fregio certamente presupposto dal Peruzzi, ma del quale è improbabile che egli abbia un particolare disegno: del resto fu posto in opera assai tardi, poiché è elencato in uno degli ultimi conti (1521) per pagamento di lavori. (Elsa Gerlini, *La Villa Farnesina*, 21-28).

⁹⁷ As Georgia Clarke comments: "the palace was probably begun at some point after 1483 and before 1495 (date of inscription on the main façade) – maybe 1488/90. Documentary evidence shows that some rooms were already being decorated in 1496; work on the courtyard was taking place from a

which Riario moved kept him abreast of humanist theory – so much so that architect Giovanni Sulpizio da Veroli dedicated his translation of Vitruvius to Riario in 1486-1487 – and so it is fitting that his residence that would mark an important moment in *all'antica* architectural evolution.

This introduction of classicizing forms in this late fifteenth century palazzo design represents a transfer from Florence to Rome as well as a departure from Roman tradition.⁹⁸ Palazzo architecture in Florence, as epitomized with structures such as the Palazzo Medici (1444-1484), Palazzo Strozzi (1489-1538) or Palazzo Rucellai (circa 1446-1461), had come to be defined through a “monumentality of individual elements.”⁹⁹ For the earliest of these structures, the Palazzo Medici, this monumentality was initially emphasized through the fortress-like façade rustication culminating in a dramatic Corinthian cornice.¹⁰⁰

In the case of the subsequent Palazzo Rucellai, however, its designer Alberti decisively shifted how this monumentality was conveyed.¹⁰¹ Here,

least 1496 and on the main façade in 1496-98; there was a break in 1499 and then resumption of major construction in 1500 and 1501, before the palace was completed in 1502-1503.” (Clarke, 211).

⁹⁸ Georgia Clarke reiterates the significance of this Florentine infusion in Rome, characterizing it as “a radical change in Rome from the previously established fifteenth-century form for cardinals’ palaces [which] usually had stucco-covered facades, [and] which might well be decorated with *sgraffitto*, divided by travertine string courses into three clear storeys”(Clarke, 212).

⁹⁹ Jacob Burkhardt, *The Architecture of the Italian Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 41.

¹⁰⁰ Burkhardt, *The Architecture*, 43.

¹⁰¹ For more debate as to the significance of the Palazzo Rucellai in the evolution of palazzo architecture, please see: Charles Randall Mack, “The Rucellai Palace: Some New Proposals,” *The Art Bulletin*, 56 (4) (Dec., 1974), 517-529; and the response: Kurt W. Fortser, “Discussion: The Palazzo Rucellai and Questions of Typology in the Development of Renaissance Architecture,” *The Art Bulletin*, 58 (1) (Mar., 1976), 109-113. Thought Foster challenges many of Mack’s original declarations, he agrees that the Rucellai’s façade is perhaps its most influential feature: “beyond its façade, the Rucellai residence is architecturally unimportant” (111). Interestingly, Giovanni Rucellai’s

Alberti replaced the blocky rustication seen in the Palazzo Medici with a refined monumentality, including a clear delineation of façade elements and a stress on the architectural orders. He was also careful to include quotations from the ancient Septizonium on Rome's Palatine Hill with the visual implication of a colonnade through incised pilasters.¹⁰² His choice to refer visually to this ancient structure was in part due to its contemporaneous interpretation as an example of an ancient Roman palace façade, which Vitruvius declared took the form of the *scaenae frons*, or ancient theater.¹⁰³ This *all'antica* borrowing from an ancient structure thus reinforced Palazzo Rucellai's grandeur while also charting a new course for the expectations of the Renaissance palazzo façade. In other words, Alberti's Palazzo Rucellai can be seen as shifting Renaissance domestic architecture from the realm of medieval rustication to *all'antica* classicism.

It is this burgeoning tradition that Riario's Palazzo della Cancelleria adopted, exhibiting a "strict separation of stone detail and wall-treatment, so that the plinth, windows, doors, mouldings and quoins, entirely of stone, stand out as emphatically defined sculptural features."¹⁰⁴ And, again like the Palazzo Rucellai, the refined austerity of the Cancelleria façade was tempered, upon entrance into the palazzo, by a central interior *cortile*. Envisioned by Cardinal

selection of Alberti as his chief architect was not that unlike Chigi's selection of Peruzzi; at the time, Alberti was relatively unknown compared to Michelozzo di Bartolomeo, responsible for the Palazzo Medici. Robert Tavernor suggests that Rucellai's motivation might have been to distance himself from the Medici name: "perhaps Alberti was chosen because he was an independent man of vision not affiliated to the Medici or to any other potential challenger in Florence" (Robert Tavernor, *On Alberti and the Art of Building* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 80).

¹⁰² Tavernor, 91.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ Burckhardt, *The Architecture*, 143.

Riario as an “enterprise with ‘forethought, eurhythmy, and symmetry,’”¹⁰⁵ the *cortile* was divided vertically by level with a two story colonnade of Doric columns adorning both the ground and second level loggias and corresponding Corinthian pilasters adorning the enclosed upper story.¹⁰⁶

Building on these Florentine architectural traditions, the layout and design of Riario’s palazzo nevertheless bore some distinctly Roman elements as well, so much so that Georgia Clarke argues that “‘almost every . . . detail’ [of the *Cancelleria*] had an ancient origin.”¹⁰⁷ Even the plot of land selected by the cardinal bore both historical and religious significance. Not only was this spot near the ancient Theater of Pompey, it also was the rumored location of the palace of Pope Saint Damasus (366-384 CE),¹⁰⁸ and thus the façade of his palazzo deliberately subsumed the travertine façade of Riario’s titular church, San Lorenzo in Damaso.¹⁰⁹ In addition to location, the design of the structure itself was intended to be reminiscent of the Forum of the Emperor Nerva near the Forum of Augustus, a connection made clear in a drawing included in the

¹⁰⁵ Rowland, *The Culture*, 38.

¹⁰⁶ Burckhardt, *The Architecture*, 144.

¹⁰⁷ Clarke, 212.

¹⁰⁸ Rowland, *The Culture*, 38. As Rowland continued: “Riario’s plans for his new residence changed over the twenty-five years of its construction, but they always included incorporating the church, installing an audience hall (all that remained of Sulpizio’s hopes for a theater), and erecting a façade that for its time was megalomaniacal in its scale” (*The Culture*, 38; Simonetta Valtieri, “La Fabbrica del palazzo del Cardinale Raffaele Riario (La Cancelleria),” *Quaderni dell’Istituto di Storia dell’Architettura*, 174 (1983), 3-26; Enzo Bentivoglio, “Nel Cantiere del Palazzo del Cardinale Raffaele Riario (La Cancelleria): Organizzazione, materiali, maestranze, personaggi,” *Quaderni dell’Istituto di Storia dell’Architettura*, 174 (1983), 27-34).

¹⁰⁹ In doing so, Georgia Clarke posits, “the cardinal thus asserted his position in Rome by the construction of a splendid structure that had a long an expensive travertine façade that not only covered his palace but subsumed S. Lorenzo as well” (Clarke, 211).

sixteenth-century Codex Corner.¹¹⁰ And it was physically made from antiquity as well, with the Colosseum, the Baths of Diocletian, the Quirinal Temple, the Forum Temple of Castor and Pollux, and the Arch of Gordian at the Porta Nomentana all serving as the quarries for its stone and decoration.¹¹¹

Cardinal Riario had hoped that the austere façade would not only be imposing but also would be seen as emulating the ancient theatrical structure, similar to the Theater of Pompey or the larger Colosseum.¹¹² Indeed, early in the building phases Riario had conferred with Veroli about the potential construction of a theatrical space within the palazzo itself.¹¹³ This space as envisioned by Riario was never realized, and it is significant to note that the omission of pilasters along the ground level bay of the Cancelleria's façade works against its efforts to allude to the *scaenae frons* as directly as its precedent, Alberti's Palazzo Rucellai, did. The conception behind Riario's palazzo nevertheless signaled the official arrival of *all'antica* architecture to Rome. It worked to conjure the antique on several levels, from the metaphorical

¹¹⁰ Clarke, 213.

¹¹¹ Ibid., 213-214.

¹¹² Rowland, *The Culture*, 38.

¹¹³ Ibid., 34. This theater project was abandoned, however, and in its stead a temporary stage was erected in the piazza in front of the palazzo in 1468 for a theatrical recitation by humanist Tommaso Inghirami to inaugurate the construction. This emphasis on recreating an ancient theatrical structure was not intended solely as an emulation of the past. Rather, as Rowland has commented, "the new building's magnificence, as well as its choice of layout of rooms, served to implant the idea that one important function of a great Roman palazzo was to act as a kind of theater for its patron." (Ibid., 39). Such a performative quality is echoed by sixteenth-century author Paolo Cortesi when discussing the design of this palazzo: "When Rafaele Riario . . . had drawn up the plans for his magnificent house by the Theater of Pompey according to the principles of good design, he often said that he wished he had built a more spacious audience hall, in order to have more time to develop an impression of his visitors from watching the way they moved as they approached him (Paolo Cortesi, *Tres libri De cardinalatu at Julium Secundum Pont[ifem] per Paulum Cortesium Protonotarium Apostolicum*. Castel Cortesi: Symeon Nardi, 1510). Thus, Riario's palazzo itself became a theater, whose design emulated the ancient Roman version yet transformed into a private showcase for the Riario.

connections with the ancient world below to the emulation of an ancient structure and the physical appropriation of ancient materials to complete its construction. In doing so, the Palazzo della Cancelleria transformed antiquity from physical artifact – that is, the tangible fragments collected since the century before – into a conceptual idea, a metaphorical connection that would be essential in the *all'antica* progression of Peruzzi's work at the Villa Farnesina.

If one considers these fifteenth century architectural elements of the Palazzo Riario as Roman convention, one can see readily the Villa Farnesina as a further sixteenth-century evolution of these forms. The Cancelleria's imposing ashlar façade, for example, is replaced in the case of the Farnesina with a stucco one, and it would seem that the contrast in atmosphere created between the Cancelleria's stony façade and its welcoming inner *cortile* is exaggerated at the Farnesina not only with its dual façades, one severe and the other once remarkably ornate, but also with the breakdown of boundaries between the inner and outer spaces with the open-air loggias that made up the main entrance and eastern side of the villa.¹¹⁴ Moreover, while the Cancelleria attempts allusions to a theater for the patron's entertainment, the Farnesina includes a space designed specifically after an ancient theater. Theatricality grows exponentially across the entire compound, as its surrounding gardens filled with antiquities became its

¹¹⁴ It is true that this atmospheric contrast is in part due to the architectural distinctions between villa and palazzo, as the enclosed courtyard is a more traditional feature of palace architecture. Nevertheless, the U-shaped formation of the Farnesina's main northern façade undeniably recalls a palazzo-like *cortile*, particularly given the function of the space as a theater, thus invoking the theatrical concept of the metaphorical "fourth wall" that would figuratively enclose this space, as well as the actual forecourt wall that literally enclosed the outer perimeter of this space.

own theater of the ancients and the villa' interior became an artful performance wherein art, architecture, and archaeology all came together.

Thus, in his designs for Farnesina, Peruzzi maintained adherence to Vitruvian tenets while also pushing boundaries, experimenting with the incorporation of Albertian concepts while also transforming ancient principles for contemporary needs. In some regards his amalgamation of ancient ideals with contemporary architectural concepts is not that unlike what Raphael would achieve in fresco in his forthcoming depiction of *Galatea*. Furthermore, Peruzzi's artful incorporation of Sieneese architecture further reinforced both Chigi's solid presence in Rome and his ties to Tuscany. This rich melding of heritage is enhanced in consideration of Mary Quinlan-McGrath's interpretation of the Farnesina's inaugural construction date as April 22, 1506, an auspicious day with ties to the birthdate of Rome.¹¹⁵ This inaugural date, in combination with the ancient structures beneath, creates an indelible link to the foundations of Rome, yet the architectural decisions made within the villa emulate Sieneese

¹¹⁵ As Quinlan-McGrath recounts: "A triple conjunction of Sun, Moon and Venus while the Moon is exalted is a rare occurrence. In the fifty-five years that Chigi lived it happened only twice," including April 22nd, 1506 and thus giving the inauguration date of the villa a celestial significance (Mary Quinlan-McGrath, "A Proposal for the Foundation Date of the Villa Farnesina." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, (1986), 248). Quinlan-McGrath also mentions past discrepancies over the date of Rome's birthday as being either the 21st or 22nd of April, referring to Paolo Marsi's comment in regard to an excerpt from Ovid's *Fasti* dealing with the Palilia: "there are some who want it to be the 22nd of April" ("sunt tamen qui volunt xxii die Aprilis esse") (*P. Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum libri: diligenti emendatione typis impresse aptissimisque figuris ornate*. Venice: A. Paganini, 1527). Quinlan-McGrath qualifies this by adding: "Marsi himself evidently regards this as a mistake based on the fact that Plutarch describes the date as the day before XI Kal. Maii: this, he says, has been taken to mean X Kal. (20 April) whereas it should actually be XII Kal. (22 April) since the days are counted backwards from the Kalends" ("A Proposal," 248).

predecessors; thus, in a sense, Chigi is figuratively implanting Siennese conventions into the foundations of ancient Rome.

Peruzzi's design also contributed to the seamless flow between untamed nature and domesticated living space, between artifice and actuality, between fantasy and reality. The open-air Loggia di Psiche e Amore, used as the entryway for greeting both business and pleasure parties, was intended to regale its visitors with the illuminating tales of Psyche in the mortal and immortal realms, scenes of visual splendor designed to captivate one's attention. Visitors on business would depart this loggia to the west into a *salone*, to the right, known as the Sala del Fregio, which served as Chigi's office.¹¹⁶ Here the visual splendor of the entrance loggia was met with relative visual austerity. The only adornment included was the frescoed frieze that encircled the upper register of the room, adjusting the timbre appropriately for the sobriety of business dealings. If one's visit were for pleasure, however, one would head instead left, to the east, into what was originally a second open-air loggia, the Loggia di Galatea (Fig. 25), that opened unto the expansive gardens along the river¹¹⁷ Thus, for the majority of the entertaining space of the ground floor, a visitor could vacillate between the contrasts of nature and order, of fantasy and reality, "the symbiotic effect between architecture and the garden."¹¹⁸ In this space, the seamless merger of

¹¹⁶ This central room was later renovated when the entrance to the villa was moved to the opposite side of the building, and thus was converted into access to stairwells to the second floor. (Coffin, 91)

¹¹⁷ This loggia was enclosed in 1650 (Gerlini, *La Villa Farnesina*, 21); Coffin, *The Villa*, 91.

¹¹⁸ "L'effetto di simbiosi tra architettura e il giardino si attuava anche nella facciata Est dove in origine le arcate della Loggia di Galatea erano aperte (furono chiuse, come si è detto sopra, nel 1650)" (Gerlini, *La Villa Farnesina*, 21).

loggia and garden allowed the fantasy created in the villa landscape to carry over into the heavily decorated loggias, allowing the fantastical narratives within to come alive.

The Farnesina and its lavish grounds thus marked a significant departure from sixteenth-century Roman civic architecture typical of wealthy merchants, both in location and in design. Building on this disconnection from conventional civic architecture, Chigi relied upon Peruzzi to design a villa that also merged the urban and the suburban by merging fantasy and antiquity with contemporary business matters. For as much these elements of design enlighten us about Chigi, they are also essential to establishing the contextual dynamic into which Raphael entered upon receipt of the commission for *Galatea*. Nearing the completion of his dynamic pictorial program for the Vatican stanze and inspired by his time there, Raphael entered the Villa Farnesina primed for a period of artistic exploration. He was spurred on by the artistic challenge presented to him, resulting in a series of commissions remarkably indicative of the artist himself. As such, the Villa Farnesina becomes almost as much an encapsulation of Raphael as it does of its illustrious patron Chigi.

The Antique Comes Alive - Panegyrics on the Farnesina

Two encomiums published by Egidio Gallo and Blosio Palladio in the Farnesina's (and by association Chigi's) honor between 1511-1512 convey the

overall success of the Farnesina's conjuring of an *all'antica* atmosphere. Translated from the Latin by Quinlan-McGrath over thirty years ago,¹¹⁹ a relatively detailed review of them here seems fitting, as these two pieces illuminate an essential contextual basis for the *all'antica* atmosphere encouraged at the villa and sustained through the contributions of Raphael and his colleagues there.

As Quinlan-McGrath comments, the aim of these poets, the first of which was Egidio Gallo, "was not easy, for in his best antique manner he was to praise the specifics of a Renaissance Roman villa which was still incomplete, as well as eulogize its exacting patron."¹²⁰ Nevertheless, Gallo, as well as Palladio, succeeded in producing an eloquent verse that not only lauded Chigi's efforts but also conveyed through their pages the antique oasis that the Farnesina represented. Gallo's *De Viridario Augustini Chigii Vera Libellus* likens the idyllic oasis Chigi created to a haven for the mythical Venus, who leaves her native Cyprus to dwell in the splendor of Chigi's gardens. Gallo's poetic conceptualization, wherein the goddess Venus herself cannot discern between Chigi's earthly garden and her immortal dwelling, parallels heavily the *Epithalamium of Honorius and Maria*, a lyrical ode crafted by the Roman poet

¹¹⁹ First appearing in the appendices of: Mary Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa of Agostino Chigi: The Poems and the Paintings" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1983). As Quinlan-McGrath comments: "previous scholars have considered them primary documents, and as such, a limited number of lines have been extracted from them to support specific points on the architecture or the paintings," (Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 6) a statement that stands largely true still today.

¹²⁰ Quinlan-McGrath, "Aegidius Gallus," 1.

Claudian in the fourth century CE.¹²¹ And Palladio, while crafting imagery of Chigi's space, borrows directly from the poets Statius and Martial, both writing in the first century CE; he paraphrases sections of their poetry quite closely in an effort to have it appear that Chigi's gardens were modeled quite directly from antique sources, a part of the overall ancient atmosphere Chigi desired.¹²²

Consisting of five books, Gallo's *De viridario Augustini Chigii vera libellus* served the main purpose of dedicating the villa to Venus.¹²³ Within it he recounts the journey of Venus to the Farnesina estate, a voyage interspersed with references to the ancient world; he provides descriptions of the Farnesina grounds veiled in hyperbole; and he alludes to literature both ancient and contemporary.¹²⁴ While his narrative is at times difficult to follow – as Quinlan-

¹²¹ David Coffin posits that Gallo's *De Viridario Augustini Chigii* serves as "a literary equivalent of the pictorial self-image" that is "modeled on the poem by the ancient Roman Claudian entitled the *Epithalamium of Honorius and Maria*." (David Coffin, *Magnificent Buildings, Splendid Gardens* (NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008), 92). While Coffin goes on to suggest that this epithalamic reference is due to Chigi's then-impending marriage, it is significant to note here as the reference to Venus contributes to the fantastical nature of the villa complex. For full text of Claudian's epithalamium, please see: Claudian, *Claudian*, ed. by Maurize Platnauer (London: W. Heinemann, 1922).

¹²² As Quinlan-McGrath comments, "Martial's picture of villa life, a serene overview of the marketplace, gives Blossius a classical precedent and excuse for dwelling at length on an overview of the ancient Roman ruins which can be viewed from Chigi's estates. This was a topic dear to his patron, and to the other members of the Roman Academy." (Quinlan-McGrath, "Blossius Palladius," 102). Quinlan-McGrath continues: "Chigi . . . had his private apartments in the northeast corner of the *piano nobile* (following the analysis of G. Cugnoni, "Agostino Chigi," 497-506 and Christoph Luitpold Frommel, *Die Farnesina und Peruzzis architektonisches Friiwerk* (Berlin: DeGruyter, 1961), 46-53.) [These chambers allowed] access to the rooftop loggia [*now lost*], from which one could survey the antiquities and vineyards, the city and the country. . . . The key to these emphases probably is found in Chigi's desire to create the true descendant of an antique villa" (Quinlan-McGrath, "Blossius Palladius," 103-104). As for Statius, Quinlan-McGrath posits that "[Palladio] seems to have internalized *Silva* I. iii so thoroughly that we could almost agree with his own suggestion that Statius is the real author of the suburbanum." (Quinlan-McGrath, "Blossius Palladius," 99).

¹²³ Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 12.

¹²⁴ As Frommel comments: "Come già nella *Cytherea* pubblicata nel 1509 egli si ispirò al *De rerum natura* di Lucrezio, ai *Fasti* di Ovidio e alle *Silvae* di Stazio, mettendo al centro della sulla opera la *Venus Creatrix* e il suo culto." (Frommel, "La Villa," 19). In addition to referencing Ovid, among other ancient authors, Quinlan-McGrath also points to Gallo's allusions to the work of the recently

McGrath puts it, throughout “antiquarianism triumphs over clear simplicity” - she goes on to posit that, “upon close study one realizes that [Egidio], often when he appears most obscure, has nevertheless given us a great deal of information on his subject.”¹²⁵ Indeed, the first four books, though based in mythological realms, can be understood to allude to Chigi’s property, and the fifth and final book, wherein Venus finally arrives in Rome, offers a lucid description of the Farnesina grounds as they stood at the time of Gallo’s writing.

Opening his first book with the proclamation, “let me here relate how much spring the Estates have, what they promise of the Sunny season, and what comforts [sic] there are, here where the Chigian Hero builds them,¹²⁶” Gallo goes on to hail the end of Martius, a month named for warring Mars.¹²⁷ Coincidentally this marks the return of Venus to Rome with the beginning of Aprilis, the advent of Spring, and the Veneralia, the cultic veneration of the goddess Venus.¹²⁸ Gallo continues by relaying the sacred rites of the cult of Venus,¹²⁹ placing such

deceased Pomponio Leto: “the posthumously published P. Laetus *De antiquitatibus urbis Romae libellus* (Rome, 1515), provides a good guide to [Egidio’s] sometimes obscure descriptions of the ruins which Venus surveys upon her arrival in Rome.” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 5).

¹²⁵ Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 6.

¹²⁶ “Quantum habeant veris: Quid polliceantur Aprici /Temporis, hi igitur referam et solatia quae sint / Hic uber molitu Viridaria Chigius Heros” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 1: 5-7, 17).

¹²⁷ Frommel suggests that this allusion to Mars was in fact a reference to Pope Julius II’s recent military campaigns that had ended in 1511 (Frommel, “La Villa, 19).

¹²⁸ “[Mars], Powerful in war, who had given the sacred origins to the Roman race, had by now fulfilled his own time, being the First in the Romulean Year; by now it was fitting that the Bull put forth his horns and bring forth the wreaths [sic] in the hoped for spring, and the fragrant Garlands with blooming flower”(“Qui sacra Romane dederat primordia genti /Iam sua Romuleo Primus compleverat AnnoTempora Bellipotens: extrendere iam sua Taurum /Cornua: et potato producer vere decebat /Serta: et odoriferas viridanti flor Corollas”) (Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 1:11-16, 17).

¹²⁹ “First Venus must be undressed, and she must be bathed with pure water. . . .one group takes down the garlands and the dry myrtle leaves put on under the previous year; others remove the adornments from her neck; . . . and the altars having been lit, smoke with incense under the vaulted roof,” all in

importance on their recounting that Quinlan-McGrath surmises that the reenactments of these rituals, either mentally or physically, “were performed at the villa or by villa courtiers, in much the same way that, into the modern era, universities or learned societies commemorated antique rites.”¹³⁰

Having established this joyous celebration in honor of Venus’s return, Gallo continues in Book Two with Venus’ return to earth in Cupid’s chariot and her subsequent arrival on Cythera.¹³¹ At the close of the book, Mars questions Venus’s departure,¹³² to which Venus replies, “We are going to ancient Cyprus, and to the Idalian grove with its greening bud.”¹³³ As she prepares, Gallo alludes to the metaphorical connection between Cythera and Rome with Mars’ parting words: “‘I want,’ he said, ‘the Roman people to be strong and stable under your

hopes of an abundant year: “oh sacred Venus, . . . as you are now wreathed with radiant color, . . . grant what we ask supplicatingly, grant that the whole year may proceed, fertile with delights, just as you inaugurate it” (“Excipe sacra Venus . . . /Ut tu purpureo nunc es redimita colore: . . . Suppliciter da quod petimus: da totus ut annus /Daelicii faecundus eat velut incipis illum” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 2: 173-177, 27.) These acts were borrowed from Ovid’s *Fasti*, 4:133-150.

Quinlan-McGrath also cites Gallo’s reference to a more obscure cult of a Cypriot Venus, as outlined in Macrobius’ *Saturnalia* 3.8.2 (Quinlan-McGrath, “The Villa,” 24).

¹³⁰ Quinlan-McGrath, “The Villa,” 18. Gallo’s opening book not only establishes an undeniable *all’antica* tone, but it also ties in the contemporary themes of Roman *renovatio*. In addition to suggested allusions to Julius II’s recent military campaigns (please see note 283), Frommel also suggests “Gallo alludes also . . . to the Roman nostalgia for . . . a return to the Golden Age, of peace, of muses, of love and an awakening of nature (Frommel, “La Villa,” 19).

¹³¹ “Here a shady grove, and everywhere hemmed in by green trees, are the woods sacred to Venus (“Hic neum umbriferum: et viridantibus undique septum /Arboribus, Veneri sacrum nemus”)(Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 2:143-144, 39).

¹³² “Whither do you betake yourself, . . . the only pleasure to a warlike Mars in the midst of his weapons? (“Quo te diva rapis, . . . /Unaque belligero Marti per taela voluptas”)(Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 2:227-229, 43).

¹³³ “Tendimus antiquam Cyprum: Idaliumque virenti /Flore nemus” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 2: 230-231, 45).

leadership, and this empire to be established firmly for an eternal age, by her virtue, under just laws.”¹³⁴

With Venus’ voyage underway, Gallo’s next book carries her through the astrological “starry home of Taurus,”¹³⁵ and toward the Kingdom of Neptune, whence she is spotted by Triton, Neptune’s son, who rushes to his father to warn him.¹³⁶ As Triton approaches, Gallo delves into a description of the sea god’s palace, which bears similarity to design elements of Chigi’s villa. “Before the very palace of the King is a paved street, and it has pebbles laid level, [making it] durable,”¹³⁷ Gallo writes of the approach to the palace, the arrival at which he marvels at the theatrical forecourt space: “. . . what a noble threshold give access to those going in; the first place after the entrance shows a forecourt worthy of Theater, and the benches are carved out of many kinds of fish.”¹³⁸ While no mention of benches fashioned after fish has been made in Farnesina scholarship, Gallo’s description alludes to Peruzzi’s forecourt design as following ancient specifications for that which is to accompany a *scaenae frons*, and his reference to

¹³⁴ “Firmam, ait, et stabilem Romanam te duce gentem /Esse volo: Atque hoc aeterno firmarier aevo /Imperium: virture sua, sub legibus aequis” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 2: 236-238, 45).

¹³⁵ “Intratura domum Tauri Venus” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 3:7, 45).

¹³⁶ “Then from the top of the water Triton recognized the trumpet players of Venus, and he saw Venus on top of the Chariot, and straightway plunged his head under the waves. To his astonished Father he goes . . .” (“Has igitur summon cognovits ab aequore Triton /Esse tubas Veneris: Veneremque in vertice Currus /Vidit: et extemplo subter caput abdidit undis” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 3:131-133, 51).

¹³⁷ “Facta magisteriis, ante ipsa palatial Regis /Strata via est: et habet silices durabilis aequas” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 3:254-255, 59).

¹³⁸ As Quinlan-McGrath comments: “this interesting parallel between Neptune’s palace and Chigi’s is due in part to the flattery of the poet. However, Chigi, lord of the Port of Ercole (Hercules), shipping magnate with the villa on the Tiber, clearly associated himself with the King of the Sea” (Quinlan-McGrath, “The Villa,” 211); “. . . quan nobile limen eunti: /Primus ab ingressu locus atria digna Theatro /Pandit, et ex multo caelata sedilia pisce” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 3: 259-261, 59).

the “noble threshold” only further supports Peruzzi’s incorporation of Albertian principles within a Vitruvian structure.

In Book Four, Venus beckons the gods and goddess of the deep sea to join her on her return to earth.¹³⁹ With a blow to his conch shell, Triton calls forth Venus’ entourage, including Galatea, “wickedly ravaged beneath the wild wave [and mourning] her lover Acis with perpetual tears, whom the right hand of Polyphemus slew, since Acis had been preferred to him, and who was changed into the liquid fountain bearing his name.”¹⁴⁰ At the fourth book’s close, Venus finally makes her triumphal landing on Cythera and begins surveying Rome,¹⁴¹ “the realm of Latium, and the high Capitoline, and the magnificent palace brought about by great Julius.”¹⁴²

Gallo reveals in Book Five that it was during this auspicious arrival of Venus in Rome that Chigi constructed his villa: “[Chigi] himself, as he labors with a great amount of care, and troubled, acts day and night for the people, so he places a villa, which may sometimes offer joys when cares have been cast aside. . . .here he, the best, sits among the well cultivated faces of men, setting out

¹³⁹ “Hail, oh peaceful Waters, the first beginnings of things, This is the new light and you call Venus back to earth, the one who is going to make the happy omen both for nature and the year” (“Salvete: o placidae rerum primordial Lymphae: . . . /Haec nova lux et vos Venerem revocatis in orbem: /Facturam auspiciam foelix et rebus et anno”) (Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 4: 45 and 60-61, 63).

¹⁴⁰ “Quam sequitur Galatea fero male pressa sub aestu /Perpetuis Acim lachrimis quae plorat amantem, /Quem sibi praelatum Poliphaemi dextra peremit /Mutatumque suo in liquidum de nomine fontem” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 4:125-129, 67).

¹⁴¹ “The Chariot, radiant with the sublime goddess, enters. And in the middle of the wood the Cyprian goddess is set down with a gentle glide; the presence of Spring is always in attendance upon her” (“Ingreditur radians sublimi numine Currus. /Et medio nemoris leni dea Cypria lapsu /Ponitur: huic astat semper praesentia Veris”) (Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 4:296-298, 77).

¹⁴² “Nunc ubi nostra cohors umbrosis dedita silvis: /Et genio incumbit: tacito mecum ire volatu /Te cupio in Latii regnum, Capitoliaque alta, /Maximaque a magno deducta palatial Iulo” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 4:326-328, 79).

both the frugal feasts and the thrifty cups, the joy of Bacchus, swimming in pure gold.”¹⁴³ Thus it is Chigi’s villa that proves to be Venus’ final destination:

“Scarcely now where they passing over the walls of the Septimian Gate, when Venus saw the walls and towers . . . heaped up to the stars. . . . ‘How my Chigi raises up the Airy fortresses, how, pleasing to the People, and to the fatherland, he raises the work that will be famous forever, and by these deeds he commends his name to the Heavens!’”¹⁴⁴ For all the previous verse, it is perhaps his subsequent several paragraphs that offer the clearest image of the Farnesina, describing the general plan of the villa, including the theatrical forecourt, while also narrating a stroll to the riverfront casino.

Beginning from the *scaenae frons* forecourt, where “even the Stage is ready, the Theaters having just been established, whether the play to be put on be comic or Tragic,”¹⁴⁵ Gallo’s prose then moves to the villa’s interior, where he remarks upon “the curved Vault with hanging stars covers everywhere the central Hall,” no doubt in reference to Peruzzi’s astrological ceiling in the Loggia di Galatea. “Round about there are gilded [statues of (?)] eminent ones; and round about under the barbarian gold are Chambers, fit for a Roman prince,” he continues, but what is most striking are the open loggias of the northern and eastern façades, “the art of painting decorat[ing] both with various figures, such as Rome

¹⁴³ “Ipse sibi, ut magna curarum mole laborat /Et populo vexatus agit noctesque diesque . . . /Hic inter bene culta virum sedet optimus ora: /Frugalesque dapes: frugalia pocula: Bacchi /Laetitiam apponens, puroque natantis in auro” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 5:28-29 and 39-41, 85).

¹⁴⁴ “Vix iam Septimiae superabant moenia Portae: /. . . .Ut meus Aerias extollit Chigius arces, /Ut /Populo, ut patriae gratus memorabile in aevum /Tollit opus: factisque suum dat in Ethera nomen” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 5: 77 and 85-88, 88-89).

¹⁴⁵ “Hic etiam prompta est positus modo, Scaena Theatris” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 88; 5: 97, with side notation to include “Scaena pro comediis vel tragoediis,” 89).

never had, or great Mycenae. And these would like to have their own Poems in resounding verse.” Gallo then takes the reader into the lower level of the villa, describing Venus’s voyage “into the deepest bowels of the earth, where here and there under the gleaming vault the many [cellars] lie, preserving fine breezes against the [summer] heat; cool waters would be enclosed by these, in these the best but potent wines of Bacchus would set aside their heats.” From the cellars Gallo moves to the riverfront casino, which he positioned as a twin-portico structure emerging from the Tiber riverbed that was “spacious with many an arch, and many columns,” and complemented with a subterranean cave, “worked by art, improved with the help of a chisel; either it is a grotto, or that which the Gods decided to be the spot among the bowels of the Earth, where they could occasionally set aside their weighty cares on coming from pure ether.” He closes his description of the casino thus:

[The fish], wondering whether the Nymphs flock together with tremulous leap, straightway hide themselves in the first mouth of the pond. Within are seats pleasing to the Gods, more pleasing to the Nymphs in which they enjoy residing with busy song. Here even an ample vent is placed in the height of the vault, through which Favonius may add his tranquil winds, so that at the same time he may mix the breezes with the pure air.¹⁴⁶

Having summarized the villa grounds, Gallo begins the conclusion of his prose with the lofty claim as uttered by Venus: “pray, what Villa, what field, which shore, what vale, and fertile Hill in the Sunny weather, to what plain surrounded by a pure spring . . . seemed to you could have been placed anywhere with a

¹⁴⁶ Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 5:100-147, 89-91.

better gulf, with a better husbandman, either by the talents of men, or by the ray of the one who is powerful in all the ranks of the stars? . . . Therefore make for yourself here the eternal seat of things, so that in all possible weather it may have scented Meadows and that the place may be to all the most secure reason for repose."¹⁴⁷

Throughout this description of Chigi's grounds, one can get a sense of that which is present versus that which is imagined. Gallo's clear description of the villa's architecture, for example, along with his reference to the established theater suggests that Peruzzi's work on both the villa and the forecourt was most likely complete. While the construction of the riverfront casino had yet to begin, the detail Gallo provides of its designs suggests he may have had access to a plan for the structure and the accompanying underground grotto. Gallo's reference to the cellars also brings to light the subterranean level of Chigi's villa, which contained the kitchen, a large pantry for storing for wine and oils, and a cistern that, according to Frommel, still contains fresh water today.¹⁴⁸

Lacking detail is Gallo's discussion of both Chigi's collection of antiquities, relegated in his account to "gilded statues of eminent ones," and of the interior decorative program, save for his reference to Peruzzi's astrological ceiling. These indeterminacies were necessary, as the interior visual program had

¹⁴⁷ "Quaenam Villa tibi? quis ager? quae littoral? quaenam /Vallis, et Aprico faecundus tempore Collis? /Aut quae planicies puro circumdata fonte //(Quem natura facit) seu magno flumine abundans, /Visa tibi meliore sinu, meliore colono /Ingeniisve hominum, radiove potentis in omni /Astrorum serie, quavis potuisse locari? / . . .Hic ergo aeternam rerum tibi confice sedem: /Ut sit odoratis quocunque in tempore Pratis /Et cuicunque locus tutissima causa quietis" (Quinlan-McGrath, "Aegidius Gallus," 5:157-163 and 177-179, 91- 93).

¹⁴⁸ Frommel, "La Villa," 33-34.

for the most part yet to begin. Nevertheless, Gallo's declaration that the interior program "would like to have [its] own Poems in resounding verse" is most intriguing in several respects. First, it alludes to the classical *topos* of poetry as eternal, a characteristic to which Gallo refers to only lines after he mentions the paintings ("Here moreover they observe what is to be by remarkable verse for eternity")¹⁴⁹ and reinforces the role of this poem (along with Palladio's subsequent contribution) as inextricably linked to the intended eternality of Chigi's villa. As Quinlan-McGrath posits:

Most of the revered monuments of antiquity were long since powder in the streets of Rome. . . . but the Renaissance knew the great villas, . . . to say nothing of the theaters, the temples and the fora, through the literary records which antiquity had left to them. . . . Therefore, in a real sense, these poems were thought of as a part of the concrete villa, for they were to be its final reflection.¹⁵⁰

By invoking this reference in relation to the interior paintings, Gallo implies that they too will enjoy an eternal existence, a fate in which most artists would relish. At the same time, Gallo revives the parallels of painting and poetry, captured in the well-known idiom *ut pictura poesis* that would play so heavily in Raphael's artistic production.

Blosio Palladio's subsequent poem, *Suburnanum Agustini Chisii* lacked the ancient pomp of Gallo's writing that Quinlan-McGrath suggested could have "easily been converted into a piece for the Renaissance stage."¹⁵¹ It nevertheless was also modeled after the writings of antiquity. Paralleling the writing of first-

¹⁴⁹ "Hic tamen aeterno quod sit memorabile versu /Conspiciunt: avidoque haec omnia lumine lustrant" (Quinlan-McGrath, "Blosius Palladius," 5: 130-131, 91).

¹⁵⁰ Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 5.

¹⁵¹ Quinlan-McGrath, "Blosius Palladius," 93.

century CE Roman poet Papinius Statius, Palladio assumes a more simple, albeit equally striking, narrative. As Quinlan-McGrath comments, “given his extraordinary classical learning, the faithfulness with which he followed a chosen antique model, the simplicity of his plot, and the high premiums placed upon improvisation in the Cinquecento, one can almost imagine that this thirty-two page piece was tossed off in a sitting. *Sprezzatura* [sic] is its aim and its distinction.”¹⁵²

Opening his prose with the exclamation, “behold the high ornament of Italy, Agostino, raised the delightful gardens, of such a kind that no age of man has ever produced,”¹⁵³ Palladio continues documenting Chigi’s grounds, beginning with geographical location (“girt about here by the Tiber, thereby Janus, enclosed everywhere by Rome”)¹⁵⁴ and expanding into a description of the villa. “Here are the hands and skills of the ancients,” Palladio proclaims, “for as to the things that gleam through the porticoes, and through all the rooms; the exceptional painter is thought either to have painted living things, or to have animated painted figures; for he gave nearly speaking and breathing colors, though nature stood in his way.”¹⁵⁵ Palladio’s exultation of the painted

¹⁵² Quinlan-McGrath, “Blosius Palladius,” 94. “Ecce altum Italiae decu Agusutinus amoenos/ Quales nulla etas hominum tulit, extruit hortos.” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Blosius Palladius,” I: 5-6, 117).

¹⁵³ “Ecce altum Italiae decu Agusutinus amoenos/ Quales nulla etas hominum tulit, extruit hortos.” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Blosius Palladius,” I: 5-6, 117).

¹⁵⁴ “Hinc Tybri, hinc Iano septum, septum undique roma” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Blosius Palladius,” I: 34, 117).

¹⁵⁵ “Hic artes veterumque manus, . . . Nam que porticibus, et cuncta per atria fulgent:/ Aut vivas pinxisse, aut pictas animasse figuras/ Creditur eximius pictor: Qui pene loquentes/ Spirantesque dedit natura obstante colores” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Blosius Palladius,” I: 45-50 119).

decoration continues, as he establishes it as rivaling that of the ancients¹⁵⁶ and marvels, “at that which lies hidden under it, and the story which is weighted with a hidden sense.”¹⁵⁷

This “hidden” narrative to which Palladio refers perhaps is that within Peruzzi’s astrological ceiling, completed by 1511 and embedded with references to Chigi’s astrological birthdate. It could, however, also allude to the burgeoning competition between Sebastiano and Raphael. Palladio references only two works in particular, the first being that of Sebastiano’s lunette of *Juno*, part of the lunette cycle of the Loggia di Galatea completed in 1511, whom Palladio describes “born aloft as though by real peacocks.”¹⁵⁸ The second is a reference to the depiction of Venus, who “stands out here, risen from the sea, and is carried on her shell up under the stars.”¹⁵⁹ Palladio could have been referring to Peruzzi’s rendition of Venus in a vault octagon within the astrological ceiling wherein she is paired with Cupid and Saturn in an allusion to the zodiacal sign of Pisces. If this was indeed the depiction to which Palladio referred, though, it seems unusual that he would exclude mention of her compatriots and include reference to her shell and her marine origins, both elements missing from this vault decoration.

¹⁵⁶ “Let the work of the ancients cede rightly the Cnidian painting, and Rhodes, and the line which was drawn with great care” (“Cedat opus merito veterum: Cnydiaeque tabellae, /Et Rhodus, et multa que ducta est linea cura” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Blosius Palladius,” I: 59-60, 119).

¹⁵⁷ “At miratus opus, volo iam mirere, sub illo/ Quod latet, et tecto premitur que fabula sensu” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Blosius Palladius,” I: 61-62, 119).

¹⁵⁸ “Heic Iuno ut veris vehitur Pavonibus” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Blosius Palladius,” I: 63, 119).

¹⁵⁹ “Extat/ Heic Venus orta mari, et concha sub syder fertur” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Blosius Palladius,” I: 63-64, 119).

Rather, his deliberate mention of Venus' shell and her rising from the sea seems to be a direct quotation from Raphael's *Galatea*, completed around 1512, a point reinforced by the commonly accepted belief that Raphael's scene depicts the apotheosis of Galatea and the fact that Sebastiano's depiction of *Juno* is the lunette directly above Raphael's work. He caps his discussion of these painted decorations with the phrase, "so fortunate the painter is by the poet, as the Poet by the painter,"¹⁶⁰ a phrase often ascribed by scholars as direct reference to Sebastiano.¹⁶¹ In light of this prior reference, however, to the hidden narrative of these walls, it would seem that Palladio may be commenting on the competitive undercurrent among the artists working on the Farnesina's overall visual program and thus to some extent his text foreshadows the artistic interactions in the years to come.

Palladio continues his narration by describing the floor plan of the villa, wandering between the open-air loggias and separate floors while highlighting elements of the structure ("Should I marvel at the excellently painted brick. . . . should I sing of the frames of doors and windows made from parian marble?")¹⁶² from the cellars to supposed steam rooms, "rolling forth subtle vapors and

¹⁶⁰ "Tam foelix pictor vate, ut pictore Poeta" (Quinlan-McGrath, "Blosius Palladius," I: 69, 119).

¹⁶¹ Hirst, 34; Barbieri, 153.

¹⁶² "An pictum egregie laterem. . . . pario ne e marmore postes/ Portarumque fenestrarumque canam?" (Quinlan-McGrath, "Blosius Palladius," I: 94-96, 121).

yourselves made of parian marble,"¹⁶³ and the various exotic and spoliated marbles that throughout.¹⁶⁴

Following these evocations, Palladio progresses to discussion of the lavish nature of the grounds and gardens, exclaiming "be ye present nymphs of the Tiber, and ye Satyrs, with the Fauns wandering Gods of the country; lead out endlessly the young Poet through the shady tracts of the garden."¹⁶⁵ He too is careful to point out that he describes what was to be, not what actually existed at the time of his writing. He mentions, for example, the forthcoming garden fountain, "to whom the golden Tiber grudges the shining waters, do appear; you shot forth the soft water with fine murmurs, and you make music in the watered garden."¹⁶⁶ He also discusses the wide variety of plant species that filled, or were to fill, the grounds, including self-cultivated hybrids that sought to achieve more perfect fruits. "Let this be the true home of Spring,"¹⁶⁷ Palladio proclaims, as he concludes his discussion of plantings and moves on to his imaginings of the eventual riverfront grotto and casino.

¹⁶³ "Vos ne hipocausta canam tenues voluentia fumos/ Ipsa vel pario constatia marmore?" (Quinlan-McGrath, "Blosius Palladius," I: 110-111, 123).

¹⁶⁴ "So also, though no ships bring foreign marbles, we see these which you gather on all sides from far and wide, either dug up from the earth or broken from the ruins of ancients" ("Sic quoque Quum nullae vectent externa carinae, /Marmorae conspicimus late. quae tu undique cogis/ Eruta seu terra, veterum seu fracta ruinis" (Quinlan-McGrath, "Blosius Palladius," I: 119-121, 123).

¹⁶⁵ "Adsitis nympphae Tyberinides: Et vaga ruris/ Numin cum Faunis Satyri: tenerumque Poetam/ Usque per umbrosos horti deducite tractus" (Quinlan-McGrath, "Blosius Palladius," I: 174-176, 127).

¹⁶⁶ "Tuque, o, cui nitidas flavus tibris invidet undas,/ Fons hortensis ades. tenui qui murmure molles/ Eicularis aquas, rigoque interstrepis horto" (Quinlan-McGrath, "Blosius Palladius," I: 177-179, 127); Frommel, *Die Farnesina*, 8, 41.

¹⁶⁷ "Haec Veris sit ver domus" (Quinlan-McGrath, "Blosius Palladius," I: 239, 129).

Palladio outlines the riverfront grotto as a locale for gods and mortals alike¹⁶⁸ as well as signals the calming sounds of the Tiber that abound, “the neighboring quiet of the river, and the distant sound of the waves on both sides, . . . so that the sounds does not rage with many murmurs.”¹⁶⁹ Palladio also hints at the potential for flooding, invoking the Tiber’s and Neptune’s aid in preventing such disasters.¹⁷⁰ “Oh powerful Agostino,” Palladio concludes, “Rome owes you crowns, and worthy inscriptions; Rome to whom you restore her ancient walls. . . . You, more than generous, ornament the Tiber, the city, and the Roman suburbs.”¹⁷¹ He closes his writing by lauding Chigi’s connections with both Rome (“Could you have been able to be better born, and reborn, than to obtain Siena by birth, and Rome by gift?”)¹⁷² and the della Rovere family (“Why should I tell of the Chigi and the Rovere, the names of your race? For indeed as there are two fatherlands, there are two names to your family”).¹⁷³

¹⁶⁸ “Here . . . Diana, the gods and goddesses bathe. And there is the same practice for mortals. . . there is [also] a little boat at hand in which you could survey the swimming of the Nymphs, and the fishes in their glassy whirlpool” (“Heic. . . Diana venusque:/ Diique, deaeque lavant. . . . Cymbula nam presto est qua tu lustrare natatus Nympharum, et vitreo possis in gurgite pisces” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Blosius Palladius,” I: 252-257, 131).

¹⁶⁹ “Sic fluvii vicina quies: et longus utrinque/ Undarum scontinue iuvat: ut nec murmure multo” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Blosius Palladius,” I: 283-285, 133).

¹⁷⁰ “And so that the gardens not be covered with mud due to the rising waters, we will restrain the spring waters, and so that your cave may play together with various fish” (“Lenibus alluviis, ne ve excrescentibus undis/ Horti oblimentur: vernas cohibebimus undi/ Utque tuum variis colludat piscibus antrum” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Blosius Palladius,” I: 400-402, 139).

¹⁷¹ “Macte animo Augustine potens: Qui praedia tantis/ Erexti speciosa bonis. Tibi Roma coronas/ Debet, et insigne titulos: cui prisca reponis/ Moenia: queis nostro iam nos desuevimus aevo./ Tu Tybrim, tu urbem, et Romana suburbia, plusquam/ Prodigus exornas” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Blosius Palladius,” I: 409-414, 139).

¹⁷² “An poteras melius nasci, meliusque renasci,/ Quam Senas natur nancisci, munere Romam?” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Blosius Palladius,” I: 442-443, 141).

¹⁷³ “Quid Chisios, Ruerasque loquar cognomina gentis?/ Namque duae ut patraie, duo sun cognomia genti” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Blosius Palladius,” I: 448-449, 141).

As much as these two encomiums reveal about the Farnesina, one is nevertheless left with questions. The extent to which, for example, Chigi's grounds served as incubator for humanist thought and the Roman Academy is unknown.¹⁷⁴ There is evidence to suggest that Chigi and Colocci were close friends, not only in their shared support of writers but also in the fact that Colocci had his own copy of Gallo's *De viridario Augustini Chigii vera libellus* in his library.¹⁷⁵ Chigi's inclusion in the circle of documented patrons who played host to such gatherings would not be far-fetched. Chigi's associates Tommaso Inghirami, the papal librarian, and Angelo Colocci, humanist and later papal secretary, hosted such gatherings in their lavish gardens. Also noted is Johannes Goritz, whose similarly lavish gardens, as well as his altar at Sant'Agostino, served as the locale for numerous such gatherings beginning around 1512.¹⁷⁶ Thus, one could surmise the Farnesina hosted similar occasions, perhaps orchestrated by Chigi's secretary, Greek scholar Cornelio Benigno.¹⁷⁷ This

¹⁷⁴ As Quinlan-McGrath comments: "As far as evidence will allow, it seems that the remnant of [Pomponio Leto's Roman] academy [following his death in 1498], now more or less a literary social club, had no fixed seat in the first decade of the new century and moved from patron to patron and banquet to banquet"(Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa, 75-76).

¹⁷⁵ Ubaldini, 28, n. 33. Interestingly, these two men also worked closely with Raphael, leading one to wonder if Raphael played a role in orchestrating such literati gatherings at Chigi's abode.

¹⁷⁶ Virginia Anne Bonito, "The Saint Anne Altar in Sant'Agostino, Rome" (PhD Diss., New York University, 1983). Prefacing this dissertation was Bonito's deconstruction of the altar to examine the original installation, as recounted briefly in: Virginia Anne Bonito, "The St Anne Altar in Sant'Agostino in Rome: A New Discovery," *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol. 122 (933) (Dec., 1980), 805-812.

¹⁷⁷ Quinlan-McGrath supports such a claim by suggesting, "Agostino's gardens must have served as one of the [Roman Academy's] gathering places." (Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 73). As she continues: "one would like to know to what degree Agostino discovered literary talent, or whether he used this group as a talent pool from which to hire poets. (Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 74). As Quinlan-McGrath continues, "since the Rome of that age was crowded with poets . . ., it can be assumed that more versifiers than those gathered here found favor with the patron or his secretary [Benigno]." Cornelio Begnino, or Cornelius Benignus, hailed from Viterbo. In addition to serving as

proposal is further strengthened by Quinlan-McGrath's mention of a letter by Sadoletto to Angelo Colocci in 1529 in which, while triangulating nostalgically the locations of early sixteenth century meetings of Roman literati, he implicitly includes the Farnesina.¹⁷⁸

Furthermore, considering the necessity of one's navigation of nature to reach the villa within, it seems one can perhaps seek inspiration for Chigi's gardens in contemporary literature, in which the merits and the fantasy of nature were encouraged. In this sense, the gardenscape that Chigi created, along with the garden filled with Roman fragments that he created along the riverfront, could also be read as an embodiment of the quest of Poliphilo in the popular late-fifteenth century text, *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* ("The Strife of Love in a Dream"). Purportedly written by Francesco Colonna, a Venetian monk, the *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* "found an audience of devoted readers in its own day, readers for whom its pages conjured up the ancient world as a dream, a mystic initiation, a romance couched in a rapture of strange words."¹⁷⁹ Following

Chigi's secretary and chronicler of his antiquity collection, Benigno managed an in-house printing press at the Farnesina, preparing Latin translations of Greek texts by ancient authors, such as Pindar and Ptolemy (William Beloe, *Anecdotes of Literature and Scarce Books*, 5 (London: Rivington, 1811), 69-70).

¹⁷⁸ Jacobus Sadoletus, *Epistolae quotquot extant* (Rome: Salomonius, 1760), 309-318; Ubaldini, 67-75; Domenico Gnoli, "Orti letterari nella Roma di Leon X." *Nuova Antologia* 7 (269)(Jan.1, 1930), 15-16; As Quinlan-McGrath recounts, "[Sadoletto] specifically names only his own estate and that of his correspondent Colocci as meeting points, yet he mentioned as well the Circus Maximus, the Temple of Hercules on the Tiber, and "other" pleasant locations. . . . Chigi's estate, so close to the Circus Maximus and the Temple of Hercules, the first of which is specifically cited as the ritual location in [Egidio's] 1511 poem . . . was probably one that Sadoletto had in mind, since so many of the people he names were friends of the great banker" (Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 83).

¹⁷⁹ Francesco Colonna, *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* originally published in Venice: Aldus Manutius, 1499) All references here refer to Francesco Colonna, *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*. trans. By J. Godwin. (London: Thames and Hudson, 2005). Rowland suggests that the attribution of this text to "Francesco Colonna" is debatable because though some have identified this Colonna as a variety of individuals

Boccaccio's and Petrarch's writings on the splendors of nature from a century before, a similar theme of the splendor and mysterious fantasy found in nature arises in *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*, which tells the story of Poliphilo on his quest to locate his love, Polia.¹⁸⁰ Along the way, Poliphilo describes in great detail the landscape through which he walks (Fig. 26), highlighting antique architectural and sculptural fragments interspersed amongst rough patches of foliage contrasted with ordered garden spaces. Specifically, Poliphilo mentions elaborate obelisks, seductive fountains, and the manner in which architectural constructions seem to emerge out of nature.¹⁸¹ The Farnesina conjured this sort of experience, from the garden layout to its mixture of ancient figures and fragments.

Colonna surpasses his literary predecessors of Boccaccio and Petrarch, by introducing a plan for an ideal garden as characterized by the garden island of Cythera (Fig. 27). Though Colonna himself was not well versed in the components of architectural design, his circular garden plan bears significance in its logical division of the garden into planting "zones."¹⁸² In addition, Colonna

(from monk to prince), it is also possible that this is a pseudonym. (Rowland, *The Culture*, 60). Regardless of this debate, the impact of the *Hypnerotomachia* is undoubted; Rowland, *The Culture*, 60-61.

¹⁸⁰ Giovanni Boccaccio, *Decameron* (Firenze, 1353).

¹⁸¹ For descriptions of the obelisks, please see: Colonna, *Hypnerotomachia* 22-25. For a description of erotic fountains, please see same, 70-72. Rowland comments on the impact of Boccaccio's publication: "written in Italian vernacular (albeit a very peculiar vernacular, which strives to sound like Latin), illustrated with elegant woodcuts, set in a new Roman typeface on expansive quarto pages, the *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* was a stylish book designed to attract the most stylish of late fifteenth-century readers; it remains one of the most hauntingly beautiful objects ever to leave the printing press. There is hardly a better visual record to be found of the way in which a late fifteenth-century humanist might have experienced the ruins of antiquity." (Rowland, *The Culture*, 61).

¹⁸² As Rowland comments, "Ironically, however powerfully the *Hypnerotomachia*'s scrupulous descriptions of pyramids, obelisks, . . . they also reveal only a limited comprehension of some basic

offers a basic sketch of a garden compartment, another unprecedented illustration. So, not only does Colonna advance this love for nature's mystical and fantastical qualities, but he also supplements his fantastical fiction with suggested garden compositions.

Building on this connection with Colonna's text, one can also find parallels between Chigi's villa and those inspired by contemporaneous writer, Jacopo Sannazaro. Five years after Colonna's pivotal work, Jacopo Sannazaro published *Arcadia*, a collection of twelve eclogues narrated by Sincero (a stand-in for Sannazaro himself in the majority of the text) that expresses a love for the pastoral as told through stories recited by shepherds.¹⁸³ Sannazaro here casts "nature" as the setting in which stories of love and death play out, creating a romanticized encapsulation of the natural world that became synonymous with his native city of Naples. The late fifteenth-century and early sixteenth-century villas surrounding Naples, such as the Villa del Sannazaro a Mergellina, are distinctive, as Ingrid Rowland puts it, in their close connection with water.¹⁸⁴ As Rowland comments, "pools and fish ponds inspired by ancient verse abounded around the bay of Naples and are still visible in the ruins at Baia, Pozzuoli,

architectural concepts." (Rowland, *The Culture*, 65); This connection between Colonna's ordered plan and Chigi's gardens is not meant to imply that the entirety of the Farnesina gardens were similarly ordered; instead, the emphasis here is the notion that there is a distinction of space between untamed and tamed (or ordered) nature within the garden, a distinction that was created in Chigi's original garden.

¹⁸³ For the full text, please refer to: Jacopo Sannazaro, *Arcadia & Other Piscatorial Eclogues*. Trans. by R. Nash. (Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University Press, 1966).

¹⁸⁴ "Le ville napoletane del tardo Quattrocento e primo Cinquecento, dal romito regio di Poggioreale, ai ritrovi del Pontano alla villa del Sannazaro a Mergellina, si distinguevano da quelle toscane per il loro rapporto con l'aqua." (Rowland, "Il Giardino *Trans Tiberium*," 63).

Posillipo, and Fuorigrotta.”¹⁸⁵ Chigi had observed Neapolitan villa garden design when renting the Villa del Sannazaro while dealing with some alum mining near Agnano around 1501.¹⁸⁶ This exposure could have perhaps then fed into the transformation of Chigi’s Roman riverfront garden into an ancient oasis. Such distinction between untamed nature and its ordered counterpart of the garden is again echoed in Chigi’s garden plan. The eastern (or riverside) and southern boundaries of the property were hemmed in with relatively untamed swaths of garden, a contrast to the ordered gardens oriented towards the façade of the villa. Thus, the surrounding gardens of the Villa Farnesina were a space of sensorial and temporal confluences, essential in preparing the visitor for what was to come once arriving at the villa.

Chigi’s Collection of Antiquities

Amplifying the ancient allusions conjured in Gallo’s and Palladio’s writings, Chigi further solidified his ties to ancient and contemporary Rome by ensuring his garden was a space in which the display of antiquities was paramount. He cultivated a *vigna* within the southern and eastern boundaries of

¹⁸⁵ “Attorno alla baia di Napoli, abbondavano le piscine e peschiere, evidentemente ispirate à quelle antiche, lodate nei versi dei poeti antichi e ancora visibili nelle imponenti rovine di Baia, Pozzuoli, Posillipo, e Fuorigrotta” (Rowland, “Il Giardino *Trans Tiberium*,” 63).

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 62; Rowland, *The Correspondence*, 32.

his property that stretched to the villa, transforming it into an elaborate riverside garden teeming with antique artifacts typical “of refined humanist taste.”¹⁸⁷

Gallo’s and Palladio’s verse provide little to illuminate the scope of Chigi’s collection of antiquities. As mentioned earlier, such references in Gallo’s writing are kept notably vague, and Palladio’s *Suburbanum* refers only to Chigi’s efforts to collect antiquities and ancient materials for his dwelling, not what he was actually able to acquire. The inventory conducted by Cornelio Benigno and his associate, Filippo Sergardi, between November and December of 1520, following Chigi’s death, revealed a vast collection of medals, gems, coral, cameos, and a wide array of antique objects so valuable that Alessandro Farnese stipulated their inclusion in his contract to purchase the property in 1579.¹⁸⁸

Amongst this accounting, however, Chigi’s arsenal of antique objects was never fully documented.¹⁸⁹ A careful review of this inventory, however, along with the

¹⁸⁷“Con raffinato gusto umanistico tra rare piante esotiche erano celate statue classiche: sarcophagi, iscrizioni e frammenti marmorei decoravano i viali” (Gerlini, *Giardino e architettura*, 4). David R. Coffin, *The Villa in the Life of Renaissance Rome*. Princeton Monographs in Art and Archaeology, 43. (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1979) 87. Unfortunately, much of these gardens were washed away in a massive flood of the Tiber River in 1514 before they could be completed. It is unclear as to why Chigi never made an effort to rebuild this garden, but a few suggestions could be proffered: aside from the potential that the flood had eroded the bank of the Tiber so severely that restorations could not have been made, the lack of repairs could also be due to Chigi’s attentions being drawn elsewhere. As he was already coping with the installation of Pope Leo X by attempting at all costs to curry favor with the Medici family (including being instrumental in the coronation gift of Hanno the Elephant, the first elephant to enter Rome since the Imperial Age), struggling to maintain his control over Porto Ercole, the northern coastal port essential for international trafficking of Chigi’s alum, with the Siense Balià, and continuing to fear his brother Sigismondo’s ineptitudes as a banker, it seems that perhaps Chigi’s worries about supremacy in Rome distracted him from making essential repairs. For a greater description of these varied concerns in Chigi’s words, please see: Rowland, *The Correspondence*.

¹⁸⁸ Republished in full in: Roberto Bartolini, “Due Episodi del Mecenate di Agostino Chigi e le Antichità della Farnesina.” *Prospettiva* 67 (1992), 25-34.

¹⁸⁹ “Latto di vendita della villa, stipulato il 6 luglio 1579 . . . certifica la cessione di tutto il complesso assieme ad ‘aeris, lapidibus etiam marmoreis affixis, et non affixis et etiam statuis ad dictum Palatium spectantibus et esistentibus.’” (Cremona, *Felices Procerum Villulae*, 570-571; Archivio di Stato di

accounts of Jacopo Mazzochi (1521)¹⁹⁰, Pietro Arentino (1537), Ulisse Aldrovandi (1556),¹⁹¹ Paolo Alessandro Maffei and Domenico de Rossi (1704),¹⁹² among others, one gains a glimpse into the sculptures, inscriptions and fragments that did “come to life” in Chigi’s garden to amplify the desired *all’antica* atmosphere.

The 1520 inventory of the Farnesina property highlights total of nine sculptures on the periphery between the villa and the garden. Four marble statues, two of men and two of women were counted within the limits of the building’s interior and garden exterior and were accompanied by an additional four fragmentary sculptures.¹⁹³ The presence of several of these sculptures is arguably referenced in Aldrovandi’s 1556 account, wherein he describes a handless statue of nude Venus and a seated male figure accompanied by

Roma, Collegio di Notai Capitolini, Prosper Campanus, vol. 443, c. 40v). Quinlan-McGrath suggests Chigi’s secretary, Benigno, had a full inventory of the garden’s holdings, a fact referenced by Palladio (“And these things here and there Cornelius would recall and explain with learned mouth”/Quae singular passim explicet: et doctor memoret Cornelius ore (Quinlan-McGrath, “Blosius Palladius,” 1: 315, 134-135.) Unfortunately no such inventory has survived. Fabio Chigi’s inventory discussed the presence of many ancient marbles and Latin inscriptions, mentioning only one sculptural group, *Pan and Daphnis*, by name: “Domi . . . cum luxu, aula, aedes, mensas, cubilia, Attalicis, holosericis, aulaeis velisque pretiosis exornavit . . . Signa vero ac touremata nummosque, eo magis si ex antiquitatis tenebris eruta essent. His referta erat domus omnis et horti, conquisiveratque diligentissime et liberali mercede coemerat. . . . In aedibus mirabile dictu est quot marmora, aequae preciosa congesserat, quot statuis picturisque ornaverant, quanto argento, auroque laqueria, lactos intexerat. . . . Neque vero conticescam quamplurimis refertos fuisse statuis ac preciosis antiquitatis marmoribus, ut familiars epistolae abunde testantur, nec non purae latinitatis inscriptionibus. Lascivum sane Satyrum marmoreum puero blandientem lauat Petrus Arrentinus in epistola at Baptistam Zattum Brixianum dat. A.. MDXXXVII” (Fabio Chigi, *Chisiae Familiae Comentarij* (Biblioteca Vaticana, MS Chigi a. 1.1, 1618; Cugnoni, 63-65; Cremona, 567). Here Chigi references a letter written by Pietro Arentino in 1537, in which he mentions a “satiro di marmo che tenta di violare un fanciullo” (Pietro Aretino, letter to Battista Zatti da Brescia, Dec. 19th, 1537, in *Tutte le opere di Pietro Aretino. Lettere. Il primo e secondo libro* (Milan: Arnoldo Mondadori, 1960), 399-400).

¹⁹⁰ Jacopo Mazzochi, *Epigrammatica antiquae urbis* (Rome: Mazzochi, 1521).

¹⁹¹ Ulisse Aldrovandi, *Delle statue antiche di Roma* (Rome: 1556).

¹⁹² Domenico de Rossi and Paolo Alessandro Maffei, *Raccolta di statue antiche e moderne* (Rome: 1704).

¹⁹³ “Nella prima sala da basso alla intrata del palazzo: quattro statue marmoree integre, doi de donne e doi de homini [e] quattro altre statue senza testa, etiam marmoree.” (Benigno inventory, as published in Bartalini, “Due episodi,” 31).

fragmentary pieces of another sculpture within the entryway.¹⁹⁴ The inventory continues by noting a portrait bust over the archway leading out of the villa forecourt and into the garden grounds, upon which one was greeted with a sculptural group of Europa upon a bull.¹⁹⁵ This sculpture was that of, or similar to, *The Rape of Europa* (currently held by the Vatican's Museo Pio Clemente).¹⁹⁶ The sixteenth-century writers Pirro Ligorio and Pietro Aretino as well as eighteenth-century chroniclers Maffei and de Rossi noted nearby these two sculptures the sculptural grouping of *Pan and Daphnis* (Fig. 29) (not that unlike the group in the present-day collection of the Palazzo Altemps) along with

¹⁹⁴ “In una camera, che è in questo luogo, si vede una Venere maggiore del naturale, ignuda da mezzo corpo in fu, e si tiene la veste ristretta fra le coscie: non ha mani. Si vede appresso una statua d’huomo assiso: li manca la testa, un braccio, una mano, e la gamba dritta: a le arme, che li giacciono à i piedi. Poi si vede una mano poggiata al luogo, ove siede: e tiene la veste attaccata a con un bottone fu la spalla: le manca il braccio dritto, e i piedi” (Aldrovandi, 166). While his identification of the location of these sculptures is only the non-descript “in una camera,” the progression of his account suggests he has arrived the entry façade of the villa at this point, thus the implication that the room of which he speaks is the Loggia di Amore e Psiche. Other antique sculpture is noted within the villa, specifically: “in una camera adpresso la sala: una testa marmorea tucta integra, decta de Geta, de valo de ducati 100, come asserisce messer Cornelio cosi fo comprata; una testa da donna marmorea col pecto de alabastro, decto Julia Mammea, de valor de ducato 50, come asserisce decto messer Cornelio . . . un augure de marmore, sta a ginocchi piegati et sega un saxo, cinque teset de marmore sopra a 5 pote de mischiso che sonno in sala, [e] doi figure piccolo de marmore sopra el camino in sala” (Benigno inventory, as published in Bartalini, “Due episodi,” 31). Bartalini identifies the “augure de marmore” as *L’Arrontino* (Fig. 28); the remaining pieces have yet to be identified.

¹⁹⁵ “Nel capo dell’orto una statua, adpresso al giardino segreto, de un tauro porta Europa marmorea [e] sopra all porta de dicta sala una testa d’huomo marmoreal” (Benigno inventory as published in Bartalini, “Due episodi,” 31).

¹⁹⁶ Cremona proposes that this grouping of “un Europa sopra il Torro” is that which ended up in the Farnese collection. Though he admits that this grouping was already listed in the Farnese inventory in 1568, prior to their purchase of the Villa Farnesina, Cremona posits that Chigi’s heir and Farnesina caretaker, Lorenzo Leone Chigi, most likely sold this statue to the Farnese family earlier, as he did with Chigi’s *Cowering Psyche*, sold to the Cardinal D’Este in 1570, and with *Pan and Daphne*, sold to the Cesi family, both of which emerged in the Aldrovandi inventory of 1549-1550. (Cremona, 571-572). Aretino, *Tutte le opere*, 399-400); Cugnoli, 65; also reiterated by Pirro Ligorio in 1520: “nella ‘casa di Agustin Chisi’. . . una statua antica d’un satire co’ piedi caprini, qual dimostra carazzar un giovinetto che nel sinistro fianco li siede fatti ambedui di bonissimo maestro.” (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ms. Canon Ital. 138, fol. 131; Cremona, 576-578). A similar version of this statue is held in the Museo Archaeologico in Naples.

another satyr group in Chigi's garden. The placement of these respective groups, however, is difficult to determine.¹⁹⁷

Further into the garden, Aldrovandi described a sculptural group including Venus, holding a conch shell, and accompanying *putti*, carrying urns and in the act of pouring water.¹⁹⁸ His description suggests he is most likely referring to the figure of Venus inset into a fountain niche along the southeastern perimeter of the Farnesina property, still visible today (Fig. 30). This may or may not be the same sculptural group Georg Fabricius included as one of his two noted fountains during his visit to the Farnesina grounds in the 1530s.¹⁹⁹

Aldrovandi recounts a similar fountain, one including Venus naked from the waist, holding a shell in front of her as if to catch the water once distributed by her *putti* counterparts, now missing.²⁰⁰

¹⁹⁷ Pirro Ligorio in 1520: "nella 'casa di Agustin Chisi' . . . una statua antica d'un satire co' piedi caprini, qual dimostra carazzar un giovinetto che nel sinistro fianco li siede fatti ambedui di bonissimo maestro." (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ms. Canon Ital. 138, fol. 131; Aretino, *Tutte le opere*, 399-400; de Rossi and Maffei, Taf. 155, S. 147; Cugnoni, 65; Cremona, 576-578). A similar version of this statue is held in the Museo Archaeologico in Naples.

¹⁹⁸ "In un giardinetto, che si trova prima si vede sopra una pila antica una Venere ignuda da mezzo corpo in fu; e si tiene fra le coscie ristretti i panni: ha le treccie sparse sul collo, e tiene in mano una conca marina: Da i lati di questa statua sono due putti ignudi con le vesti ranolte in spalla, è di sopra vi tengono due urne, e stanno in atto di versare acqua" (Aldrovandi, 164). A sculpture of Venus, which could be the same statue David Coffin referred to as "a female nude pressing water from her right breast into a basin" (Coffin, *The Villa*, 98).

¹⁹⁹ As Fabricius recounts: "In domo Chisiorum, extra Portam Septimianam, ante Deum aquarum, eo quo diximus modo cubantem, nuda mulier stans, dextramque mamillam manu comprimens, aquam in subiectum labrum inmittit" (Georg Fabricius, *Roma* (Basel: per Ioannem Oporinum, 1550), I: 146). Christian comments that this sculptural group might have been a pseudo-antique reproduction (*Empire*, 301).

²⁰⁰ Joannides comments in his analysis of two drawings of Raphael, both *Studies of a Putto* along with *Architectural Studies of the Stalle Chigiane* (294v and 294r; Uffizi 1474E) that they perhaps were created as part of a design for a fountain. The fact that they share the page with sketches of Farnesina stables has led Oberhuber and Bartalini to surmise that these might have been intended as part of this now-incomplete Venus fountain feature (Joannides, 206).

Additional sculpture belonging to Chigi is identified, however determining where it was placed within the villa complex has proven problematic. Maffei and de Rossi describe a statue of *Antinous*, known today as the Farnese *Antinous* (Fig. 31), as well as *Boy on a Dolphin*, known also as *Satyr on a Dolphin* and part of the Borghese collection (Fig. 32), generally within Chigi's garden.²⁰¹ The *Cowering Psyche* (today in the Capitoline Museum collection) (Fig. 34) was similarly placed there in a sketch by Jacopo Sansovino inscribed "in the garden of Agostino Chigi."²⁰² Erkinger Schwarzenberg suggested that the *Cowering Psyche* might have been positioned within the forecourt of the villa, as if

²⁰¹ Reinforcing the presence of both *Boy with a Dolphin* and *Antinous* in Chigi's collection is Schwarzenberg's observation that sculptor Lorenzetto put the head of *Antinous* on the body of *Boy on a Dolphin* in his depiction of *Jonah* for Chigi's Chapel in Santa Maria del Popolo (Fig. 33) (Schwarzenberg, 121). As Vasari recounts: "Assisted by Raffaello, [Lorenzetto] executed the figures to perfection: a nude Jonah delivered from the belly of the whale" (Vasari, *The Lives*, I: 804). Crowe and Cavacaselle imply in their analysis that Raphael played a role in this sculpture's creation: "under Raphael's supervision, if not indeed with Raphael's design, Lorenzetto produced two. . . . [statues wherein] there is more trace of the spirit of the antique than the hand of Raphael" (Crowe and Cavacaselle, 2:341). This connection with Raphael is important to unearth because it reinforces the discussions to follow on Raphael's connections with the antique. *Boy on a Dolphin* appears a curious restoration, as the head, that of a child, seems not to correspond with the body. It is interesting to consider if this was the manner in which the sculpture was displayed in Chigi's garden and if it perhaps was the reason that Raphael, and correspondingly Lorenzetto, used it as inspiration for *Jonah*. More to the point, in his understanding of ancient sculpture, perhaps Raphael was cognizant of the dissonance between this head and torso and thus performed his own act of "restoration" with the help of Lorenzetto by recombining elements in *Jonah*.

²⁰² The bottom of the sketch reads: "nel orto digostin chigi." Erkinger Schwarzenberg challenges the previous attribution of this sketch to G.B. da Sangallo and its connection to the Palazzo Altoviti. He cites the additional inscription, "iacopo delo sovino," on this reverse side and explains that the identification of the structure depicted at right as part of the Altoviti interior was merely a guess, first proposed on the part of Bernard Berenson (*The Drawings of the Florentine Painters* (Chicago: 1938), no. 1747, S 244) that was then reiterated by Shearman, who again suggests the structure was the lost Altoviti fireplace (Shearman, *The Chigi Chapel at Santa Maria del Popolo* (London: Warburg Institute, 1961), 230, no. 31). This has never been challenged: "Er hat aber erraten, daß vom Hause Altoviti die Rede ist. Die Innenarchitektur erinnert an Vasaris Beschreibung des Kamins den Sansovino für Bindo Alotviti schuf" (Erkinger Schwarzenberg, "Raphael und die Psyche-Statue Agostino Chigis," *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien*, 73 (1977), 121). The reversal of longstanding assumption will be proposed in subsequent pages.

entranced by the story unfolding inside the Loggia di Amore e Psiche.²⁰³ With none of the contemporaneous chronicles or inventories mentioning such a placement, however, it seems one cannot accept Schwarzenberg's placement securely.²⁰⁴ Similarly, Fabricius mentions the presence of a stature of a reclining river god, however its placement and full function is also unknown.²⁰⁵

Uncertainties of location aside, the documentary support for the presence of this array of ancient sculpture begins to illustrate the extent to which antiquities populated the Farnesina's grounds. Moreover, the fact that those sculptural groups identified in the gardens retold mythological narratives feeds the notion that the garden space was to be a type of "playground" for mythology. The play of the elements and of nature on these figures would undoubtedly bring them to life for the viewer who passed, vivifying history and fantasy for a captivated *cinquecento* visitor.

Complementing these freestanding sculptures was the display of relief carvings, in the form of sarcophagi, throughout the Farnesina grounds, still visible by Aldrovandi in 1556. In addition to two reliefs teeming with figures of

²⁰³Schwarzenberg, 107-136.

²⁰⁴Cremona questions the location of this statue during Chigi's lifetime, as well as to its completeness. In the previously mentioned sketch, *Cowering Psyche* is missing her left arm, yet the statue as it stands today in the Capitoline has been made whole. Cremona thus suggests that "la collezione del banchiere si presentasse al modo delle alter raccolte di primo Cinquecento, fatte di molti frammenti e manufatti recuperate dalla terra, ancora non integrati restaurati, ma communiqué esposti per il loro valore antiquario." (Cremona, 588).

²⁰⁵ Fabricius, I: 146; Coffin, *The Villa*, 98; Christian, *Empire*, 301. As Lanciani comments, part of the difficulty in determining which pieces were in Chigi's garden is the confusion over which pieces were in the Farnese collection: "Non c'è dubbio che i sei sarcophagi e le alter anticaglie descritte dal' Aldrovandi . . . 'nel giardino Farnese che è al di là del Tevere' sieno state incominciate a mettere insieme da Agostino: ma è difficile distinguere l'uno dall'altro I pezzi chigiani dai farnesiani." (Rodolfo Lanciani, *Storia Degli Scavi di Roma e Notizie Intorno le Collezioni Romane Di Antichità*. Vol. 1. (Edizioni Quasar, 1989).

humans and animals, Aldrovandi notes that near the garden's entrance appeared a sarcophagus relief depicting the nine Muses. One can propose that this was the Sarcophagus of the Muses (Fig. 35)(now in the collection of the Palazzo Massimo alle Terme), in part based on its similarities with Aldrovandi's description. He described the presence of two masks and only one surviving portrait head, that of Euterpe, at center, which is exactly how this sarcophagus appears in the present day. The inclusion of this sarcophagus in Chigi's collection is further reinforced by past connections between its pictorial program and Raphael's muses in *Parnassus* whose instruments reflect an "almost archaeological attention to detail" owed to his study of this Sarcophagus of the Muses.²⁰⁶ These parallels suggest that Raphael's study of this ancient sarcophagus was facilitated by its presence on Chigi's grounds.

Across from the Sarcophagus of the Muses Aldrovandi mentions a relief depicting a Bacchic celebration,²⁰⁷ with another on a similar Bacchic theme

²⁰⁶ Pierluigi del Vecchi, *Raphael* (New York: Abbeville, 2002), 168; Emanuel Winternitz, "Archaeologia musicale del Rinascimento nel Parnaso di Raffaello," *Reconditi della potificia Accademia romana di archeologia*, XXVII (1952-1954), 359 ff; Emanuel Winternitz, "Il Parnaso di Raffaello," *Gli strumenti musicali e il loro simbolismo nell'arte occidentale* (Turin, 1982). Bober suggests this sarcophagus could be found at San Paolo fuori le mure in the fifteenth and most of the sixteenth centuries, a location attested to in a sketch of the muse Erato from this sarcophagus by Francesco di Giorgio that is labeled, "a san pavolo" (*Renaissance Artists*, 78, no. 37; Emanuel Winternitz, "Musical Archaeology of the Renaissance in Raphael's *Parnassus*," *Musical Instruments and their Symbolism in Western Art* (London, 1967), 185-201, plate 88b), however her vague accounting of the sarcophagus' exact location for the early sixteenth century leaves open the possibility that Chigi perhaps purchased it from the Church in the early years of the sixteenth century for his own collection, with its eventual return the result of his demise and his caretaker's liquidation of portions of the Farnesina's antique assets (please see note 353).

²⁰⁷ "Vi è un'altra grande pila antica, dove sono di mezzo rilieno iscolpite d'ogni intorno varie figure di huomini, da donne, e di leoni. Nel giardino poi, presso al portico, che sopra sta al Tevere, si vede una pila antica iscolpita in figure di huomini, leoni, e canalli. Su l'entrare del giardino si trova una antica pila; ne la quale sono iscolpite di mezzo rilievo nove Muse vestite: fra le quale due ne tengono una maschera per una; una tiene una testadine, l'altra una palla in mano" (Aldrovandi, 164). Dal altro

appearing in the Farnesina forecourt. Aldrovandi describes this latter piece as having ties to Tivoli, and it has since been identified as the *Revelers Gathering Grapes Sarcophagus* currently in the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum collection (Fig. 36).²⁰⁸ Finally, Aldrovandi mentions a fragmented column covered in damaged Greek inscriptions.²⁰⁹

Additional sarcophagi panels were noted for their inscriptions. Jacopo Mazzochi identifies three ancient Latin inscriptions found on the Farnesina grounds (see Appendix A, Part I). One of these, included on a sarcophagus dedicated to Caesia Daphne as illustrated in the drawings of Jean Jacques Boissard (Fig. 37), bears maritime relief panels of putti guiding harnessed sea monsters that flanked either side of the central inscription.²¹⁰ Mariangelo Accorsio, writing around 1513, noted another sarcophagus, this one bearing a

canto si vede un'altra pila, dove sono le feste di Bacco iscolpite: e tra le altre cose vi si veggono molti Fauni, e Satiri, e acluni di loro hanno in mano le faci accese; due altri di loro conducono Sileno ebbro, che fu colui, che allenò Bacco: vi si vede medesimamete un Priapo; un che giace; un Siatro, che esce di una camera: Nel fronte di quella pila si veggono duo, che portano in una cistella un puttino; da l'altra parte sono due donne, una de le quali ha in mano un vasetto. E sotto à queste pile si veggono iscolpite le fasci antiche, che solenano portare in Roma i sergente e ministri de' confoli" (Ibid., 164-165)

²⁰⁸ "Nel cortile prima, che nel giardino s'entri, si vede una grande e bella pila, adorna d'ogni intorno di varie figure: perche vi sono le feste di Bacco; e quasi tutti i compagni di questo idio portano in mano, e ne'vasi, grappi di una: e vi sono molti puttini, che giacciono loro à piedi cone vasetti con uva. Fu questa pila ritrovata à Tiboli" (Ibid, 165) Cornelius Vermeule identifies this sarcophagus as the same as that originally seen by Aldrovandi at the Farnesina ("Sarcophagus: Revelers Gathering Grapes," in A. Chong, *Eye of the Beholder* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 2003), 12-13).

²⁰⁹ Vi si vede ancho una colonna in tre pezzi bellissima con molte antiche inscrittioni greche, che male si possono leggere. Fu ritrovata in Tiburi; e vogliono alcuni, che vi fosse di Hierusalem trasferita" (Ibid., 165-166).

²¹⁰ Jean Jacques Boissard, *Codex Holmiensis*, fol. 38v (1559); reprinted as etching in Boissard's *Romanae urbis Topographiae & antiquitatum, qua succincte, breviter describuntur Omnia quae tam publice quam privatum videntur animadversione digna* (Frankfurt, 1597-1602), fol. 82r; reprinted in Christian Hülsen, *Roemische Anitkengaerten des XVI. Jahrhunderts* (Heidelberg, 1917), 28, no. 100. Cremona mentions this sarcophagus is still today on the Farnesina grounds (Cremona, 569), however it is not in a publically accessible area.

Greek inscription upheld by flanking winged goddesses and having been transformed into a fountain (Fig. 38).²¹¹

Giovanna Tedeschi Grisanti's recent examination of a paired set of additional antique artifacts, still installed on the Farnesina grounds today, further builds this inventory of Chigi's garden antiquities.²¹² Consisting of a strigilated sarcophagus that Grisanti dates to the late third century-early fourth century CE and a Head of a Triton dating to the late 2nd century CE, these two artifacts were joined in a fountain construction placed immediately upon entrance to the *giardino segreto* from the southern villa façade (Fig. 40). As Grisanti recounts, The Head of a Triton, inserted in the wall above the sarcophagus basin "like a fountain mask,"²¹³ was potentially derived from a Hellenistic model by Skopas Minor, yet the remaining detail of stylized seaweed that appear on this fragment's face and neck are actually identical to those found on triton groups of the Roman era, such as seen in similar fragments from the Esquiline Hill's Horti Lamiani (excavated in 1874; today held by the Palazzo dei Conservatori) (Fig. 41). The stylistic treatment of the facial features, "wildly beautiful with a somber expression,"²¹⁴ is also echoed, according to Grisanti, in another second century fragment, that of the *Erinni* (Palazzo Altemps)(Fig. 42), thereby securing the dating of the Farnesina fragment.

²¹¹ Mariangelo Accorsi, *Osci et Volsci dialogus ludis Romanis actus* (Rome, 1513; Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Ms. D 420, fol. 66). The inscription transcribed: Ηρωι /Μαρκω/ Αυρηλιω /Ιουκουνοδω.

²¹² ". . . come un mascherone di Fontana . . ." (Giovanna Tedeschi Grisanti, Schede 23, *Villa Farnesina*, 167-168). It could be argued that these winged goddesses served as visual prototype for Peruzzi's similar spandrel *sgraffito* figures that once adorned the villa's main façade.

²¹³ Grisanti, 167.

²¹⁴ Grisanti, 167; B.M. Felletti Maj, "La Tetide della Stazione Termine," in *Archaeologica Classica*, 1 (1949), 46-68.

As this fragment grouping is still in its original position, it merits some consideration as to how it functioned within the context of the villa and its grounds beyond being a mere water feature. It is possible, for example, that the presence of this fragment fountain encouraged Gallo's book describing Triton's trip to Neptune's palace and thus may suggest it was already installed at this point. The undeniable connection with Neptune and the sea would have resonated not only with the presence of the Tiber only feet away but also could have fostered a symbolic connection with *Galatea* in the nearby loggia, a connection to which discussion will return in the next chapter.

In all, one could only imagine that these artifacts, punctuating one's path through the garden, would create an interesting conflation of the old and new Rome for those who visited, instigating thoughts about antiquity. Thus, though Chigi himself was not learned in ancient literature and philosophy, his garden suggested the opposite. It created a haven for intellectual pondering and, from an artistic perspective, intense innovation.

**Chapter Four: “Et de migliore perfectione si e possibile:”¹ Raphael and Rivalry
in the Loggia di Galatea**

“When Agostino decided to engage both Raphael and Sebastiano to paint on the same wall, . . . he created the first, most enduring and significant competition between two artists, thus orienting the artistic development and the artistic discussion in Renaissance Rome.”

- Costanza Barbieri, 2005²

The extensive collection of antiquities gathered within the Farnesina gardens transformed it into a *vigna* worthy of Rome’s most illustrious humanists. As was seen in the previous chapter, this was in part owed to the impassioned verse of Gallo and Palladio, but it was also thanks to the multitude of antique artifacts, the inventory of which is slowly gaining fuller understanding. This revival of the ancients fed into the fantasy and phenomenon that permeated the villa’s garden and was then carried into the villa through an equally carefully cultivated interior visual program, headed by Peruzzi and further fueled by the efforts of Sebastiano del Piombo and Raphael, all of whom first contributed artistically to the Farnesina within the Loggia di Galatea.

Originally an open-air loggia running along the eastern side of the villa, thus giving it direct access to the gardens, the Loggia di Galatea served as a transitional space along a visitor’s trajectory. The adjacent Loggia di Amore e Psiche, a second open loggia along the northern façade that served as the main

¹ This phrase was included in the contract drafted for Raphael for a commission by the Poor Clares of Monteluca I Perugia, dated December 12th, 1505. This excerpt is part of the stipulation that Raphael in his commissioned work meet, if not surpass, Domenico Ghirlandaio’s altarpiece of San Girolamo in Narni. (Golzio, 11-15; Goffen, *Renaissance Rivals*, 176).

² Barbieri, 153.

entrance, met the Loggia di Galatea at its northwest corner. This meant that a visitor never lost sight of the gardens, unifying the two spaces as if one was a continuation of the other. Visually speaking, however, these two rooms are separated by much more than a doorway. Indeed, the frescoes in these two spaces represent both the beginning and the end of the Farnesina's visual program, their creation having spanned almost ten years time and reflecting the evolution of two central characters, Raphael and Peruzzi, over than time.

This chapter focuses on the first of these two spaces, the Loggia di Galatea, wherein the artistic contributions of Peruzzi, Sebastiano and Raphael create a visually complex interior that foreshadows long-term interactions between the artists. This artistic discourse opens with Peruzzi's astrological ceiling, a remarkably intricate and symbolic work completed between 1509-1511, and carries over into the subsequent commissions of Sebastiano and Raphael for *Polyphemus* and *Galatea*, respectively, completed between 1511-1513. Though scholars have already pointed to the confrontation between Sebastiano and Raphael in the Loggia di Galatea as the basis for their career-spanning competition, the aim in this chapter is to better contextualize this initial engagement between the two, specifically in regard to Peruzzi's preliminary artistic impact within the space.

Furthermore, this instance of interaction between Raphael and Sebastiano will be positioned as foundational for co-opetition. A careful reading of both Sebastiano's and Raphael's contributions reveals two works that, while on the

one hand are in direct confrontation or competition with one another, nevertheless simultaneously and seamlessly engage in a larger overall visual allusion of the Farnesina and its grounds as a new Parnassus, a desired implication for humanist *vigne* in Rome. This tempering of competition with the overall aim to conjure such a harmonious inference to the mythological mount suggests co-opetition in its formative stages. Over the remaining years of the decade, this co-opetitive model would become further refined, as indicated with the unified visual program of the late 1510s for the Farnesina *scaenae frons*, created through a blend of competition and collaboration between Raphael and Peruzzi. This initial interaction between Raphael and Sebastiano, then, begins the development of a novel approach to large-scale decorative programs that reaches a level of maturity by the end of Raphael's career and also coincided with the essential turning point in Raphael's artistic production both in his approach to painting and his diversification into a variety of professional roles.

Raphael was called to the Villa Farnesina for his first commission there, that for the monumental *Galatea*, around 1512, in the loggia by the same name.³ He had just concluded work in the Stanza della Segnatura and was beginning work in the adjacent Stanza di Eliodoro. His work in the stanze was a pivotal achievement for Raphael – as Bette Talvacchia posited, it would become known as “the site of Raphael's greatest triumph, which established [Raphael] as the

³ The first commission Raphael actually received from Chigi was several years prior, as accounted in a deposit dated November 10th, 1510, from Chigi of 25 ducats for the design for two bronze *tondi* (Shearman, *Raphael in Early Modern Sources*, 132), however most evidence suggests that these bronzes never materialized.

foremost artist working in Rome, in contest only with Michelangelo.”⁴ That Raphael’s early efforts in the chamber resulted in the Pope’s awarding of the entire commission for all three stanze to the young artist indicates that Raphael’s efforts therein were remarkable. Moreover, the fact that Raphael enjoyed continued substantial patronage from the Pope, for example his eventual assumption of the role of architect to the new Saint Peters in 1514, further substantiates the notion that Raphael’s Stanza della Segnatura was a key moment of success.

Equally pivotal, however, is Raphael’s successful integration of his own themes and elements within his final three Stanza della Segnatura compositions. Melding messages of Papal propaganda with theological doctrine in the scenes he crafted, Raphael also began exploring his own interests in these works. As Nagel and Wood have discussed, each of the Stanza della Segnatura scenes reflects Raphael’s manipulation of artistic convention. The *Disputa*, for example, deliberately flattened a scene seemingly designed for the semi-circular dimensions of an apse. The *School of Athens* is imbued with careful study of the ancients and of architecture, a field that would be of growing interest to Raphael in the years to come, while also challenging Renaissance pictorial conventions by decentering the composition and allowing ancient philosophers Plato and Aristotle to share center stage.⁵ *Parnassus* also implies Raphael’s fascination with antiquity and extends it into the realm of poetry by chronicling the great poets of

⁴ Talvacchia, *Raphael*, 86.

⁵ Nagel and Wood, *Anachronic Renaissance*, 360.

history along with the mythic god Apollo and his Muses.⁶ Here too, however, Raphael subverts tradition by including a quotation of contemporary culture in the grips of Apollo's hands. Erwin Panofsky was the first to note that Apollo's *lira da braccio* was a contemporary, not classical, instrument.⁷ As Nagel and Wood comment, these subtle inclusions reflect Raphael's guidance "by the artist's imagination, and not by mere blind tradition,"⁸ an impetus echoed in the final wall, that of *Jurisprudence* (Fig. 43).

Raphael's fourth and final contribution to the Stanza della Segnatura, *Jurisprudence* is often overlooked, in part due to the fact that its decoration is less substantial relative to the other three walls (to account for a large window that looks southward toward Saint Peter's) and also because it is not wholly Raphael's work.⁹ Nevertheless it merits further consideration, as it bears similar seeds of Raphael's growing interests. *Jurisprudence* consists of three narrative scenes: two lower rectangular zones on either side of the window topped by an accompanying lunette-shaped zone above. This upper lunette reveals personifications of Fortitude, Temperance and Prudence, the essential qualities

⁶ As mentioned in the previous chapter, Emanuel Winternitz has presented convincing evidence that Raphael's detailed study of the antique Sarcophagus of the Muses resulted in the overall historical accuracy of the ancient instruments held by the Muses. For greater discussion of this connection, please see: Emanuel Winternitz, "Musical Archaeology of the Renaissance in Raphael's *Parnassus*," *Musical Instruments and their Symbolism in Western Art* (London, 1967), 185-201.

⁷ Erwin Panofsky, *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art* (NY: Harper & Row, 1960), 204-205; E. Winternitz, "Il Parnaso," 198-199. Winternitz goes on to suggest that Raphael's inclusion of this contemporary deviation was in part to emphasize the allusions to the virtuosic solo player, as Apollo was to be interpreted. Nagel and Wood cite a similar parallel in the *School of Athens*: "Just as the philosophers of the *School of Athens* bear, in some cases, the features of modern people, contemporaries of Raphael, so too are they carrying in their hands, in effect, modern books, printed books" (*Anachronic Renaissance*, 364).

⁸ Nagel and Wood, *Anachronic Renaissance*, 354.

⁹ The register to the left of the window, though designed by Raphael, was not completed by him (Rowland, "The Vatican Stanze," 109; Nesselrath, "Lorenzo Lotto," 4-12).

the philosopher Plato outlined in his theory of Justice in the fourth century BCE.¹⁰ Each figure is matched with paired putti and an identifying attribute. At right, Temperance holds a bridle; at center Prudence has both a mirror and a “double face” to reflect her providence, and at left, Fortitude’s strong grip bends a young black oak tree, a fitting inclusion that plays on both the Latin word for Fortitude or Strength, *robur*, and the Pope’s family name.¹¹ Below, the scene to the left of the window, completed by Lorenzo Lotto and titled by Nesselrath the *Presentation of the Pandects*, depicts sixth-century Emperor Justinian I as he receives a portion of his *Corpus Juris Civilis*, or civil law code, from Trebonianus, one of his officials.¹² Opposite this scene is a depiction of *Gregory IX Approving the Decretals*, which shows the thirteenth-century Pope Gregory as he hands a similar document of canon law to Saint Raimund.¹³ These two narrative scenes, united by the shared architectural recessed niches in the background and the entablature the extends across the entirety of the composition, bear notice for two reasons, both of which could be seen as precursors to Raphael’s Farnesina works.

First, these two scenes stand out from all the rest in the room for having such a specific narrative. The *Disputa*, *School of Athens* and *Parnassus* include identifiable figures and themes but nevertheless remain more universal, freed from illustrating a specific moment in time. These two registers, however, tell a very direct story, and for that they become relatively conspicuous within the

¹⁰ For more on Plato’s theories, please see: Plato, *The Republic*, Book II.

¹¹ Rowland, “The Vatican Stanze,” 110.

¹² Arnold Nesselrath, “Lorenzo Lotto in the Stanza della Segnatura,” *The Burlington Magazine*, 142 (1162) (Jan., 2000), 4-12; Nagel and Wood, *Anachronic Renaissance*, 364.

¹³ Nesselrath, “Lorenzo Lotto,” 4-12; Nagel and Wood, *Anachronic Renaissance*, 364.

room. Rowland, perhaps noting this distinction, mentions that “scenes of presentation like these are more common on the first pages of manuscripts than in monumental paintings.”¹⁴ Rowland’s connection between these scenes and manuscript illustration is intriguing because it brings one back to Raphael’s interests in text, or more accurately, the art of the word, as expressed in his exploration of poetic themes in *Parnassus*. Nagel and Wood further reinforce this connection by pointing to the emphasis in these scenes on moral guidance through textual sources, a direct contrast to the overhead spandrel scenes, such as that of *Adam and Eve*, that reflect decisions based on human impulse.¹⁵ This contemplation foreshadows an ongoing interest on Raphael’s part in the intersections between text and image and, consequently, the realm of reproducibility in the burgeoning print age.¹⁶

Second, it is noteworthy that these scenes were the product of collaboration between Raphael and Lotto, an artistic relationship that would

¹⁴ Rowland, “The Stanze,” 109.

¹⁵ Nagel and Wood, *Anachronic Renaissance*, 364.

¹⁶ This connection becomes increasingly intriguing upon consideration of Raphael’s ongoing connections to these “literary” references in his works. Marcantonio Raimondi’s engraving of Raphael’s *Quos Ego* (1515-1516), for example, has been similarly interpreted as emulating a book illustration (for more on this please see Chapter 6 and also: Christian K. Kleinbub, “Raphael’s *Quos Ego*: forgotten document on the Renaissance *paragone*,” *Word & Image*, 28 (3) (July-September 2012), 287-301). It also seems significant that this connection between literature and painting emerges in Raphael’s career roughly around the same time Chigi returns from Venice, bringing with him not only Sebastiano but also the Greek bookmaker/printer Zacharias Kallierges, a native of Crete who had emigrated to Venice. Kallierges, thanks to Chigi’s patronage and a press installed at the Farnesina, is credited with printing the first Greek book in Rome, a 1515 edition of Pindar’s Four Odes (*Olympia, Pythia, Nemea, Isthmia*). This was an edition of 1000 copies dedicated to Cornelio Benigno. For more on Kallierges and this inaugural Greek text in Rome, please see: Nicolas Barker, *Aldus Manutius and the Development of Greek Script & Type in the Fifteenth Century* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1992); A. Hobson, “The printer of the Greek editions ‘in gymnasio medico ad Cabillinum montem,’” in F. Barberi, G. de Gregori, and M. Valenti, *Studi di biblioteconomia e storia del libro in onore di Francesco Barberi* (Roma: Associazione italiana biblioteche, 1976), 331-335; Evro Layton, *The Sixteenth-Century Greek Book in Italy: Printers and Publishers for the Greek World* (Venice: Istituto ellenico di studi bizantini e postbizantini di Venezia, 1994), 318-329.

extend into the subsequent years of work within the Vatican stanze.¹⁷ While Lotto faithfully produced Raphael's design for the *Presentation of the Pandects*, he nevertheless employed his own artistic style. As Nesselrath notes, Lotto's approach was to create figural volume and compositional depth through "the application of successive, fairly even layers of different tones one on top of the other."¹⁸ The result was a colorfully rich yet visually distinct composition to that of Raphael's adjacent *Gregory IX Approving the Decretals*. Here Raphael matches vibrant color with masterful shadow and, as Nesselrath comments, "figures [that] show Raphael's virtuosity at portraiture."¹⁹ Thus, while the two registers read together well, the distinction of styles is apparent and, arguably, deliberate. As Nesselrath argues, "the different appearance of the *Presentation of the Pandects* from the other frescoes in the room, in particular the *Approval of the Decretals*, serves to emphasize a difference of technique."²⁰ This close pairing of two distinct painterly styles hearkens back to Campbell's discussion of artistic grafting, wherein the juxtaposition of these styles, in the case of Venetian painters, resulted in a contemplation of the making of art, which one might also extend to this exchange between Raphael and Lotto.²¹

These themes imbedded within the visual program of the Stanza della Segnatura primed the young artist for continued innovation. It seems not

¹⁷ For more complete discussion of this ongoing collaboration between Raphael and Lotto, please see: Arnold Nesselrath, "Lotto as Raphael's Collaborator in the Stanza di Eliodoro," *Burlington Magazine* 146 (1220, Raphael) (Nov. 2004), 732-741.

¹⁸ Nesselrath, "Lorenzo Lotto," 5.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 4.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 5.

²¹ For complete discussion of Campbell's argument, please see Chapter 2.

without coincidence, for example, that Raphael's *Madonna di Foligno*, commissioned in 1511 by Sigismondo di Conti for the high altar of Rome's Santa Maria in Aracoeli, bears hints of a more atmospheric approach to painting, perhaps owing to his early exposure to Lotto's technique. This innovation would be further encouraged upon Raphael's arrival at the Farnesina, wherein direct engagement with Sebastiano del Piombo would serve as further catalyst for Raphael's ideas and launch him into the most artistically dynamic period of his career.

A Venetian Arrives in Rome

"Tam foelix pictore vate, ut pictore Poeta."
-Blosio Palladio, *Suburbanum Augustini Chisii*, 1512²²

In 1511, with Raphael's position as lead artist in the Vatican stanze certain,²³ Peruzzi was virtually complete with construction of villa. He had also, by this time, already finished the magnificent astrological ceiling in the eastern garden loggia, known today as the Loggia di Galatea (1509-1511)(Fig. 43), as well as the intricate frieze decorating Chigi's office on the opposite side of the villa and known today as the Stanza del Fregio. Chigi, nevertheless, sought additional artistic talent by commissioning Raphael for a massive version of *Galatea* in one

²² Quinlan-McGrath, "Blosius Palladius," 119.

²³ Rowland, "The Vatican Stanze," 111.

of his main villa loggias.²⁴ Raphael, however, would not complete this commission until the following year, beginning shortly after Sebastiano del Piombo, the creator of the paired *Polyphemus* (Fig. 50), arrived.²⁵

The banker returned from Venice in 1511 following political negotiations for the Pope in the aftermath of Julius II's failed anti-Venetian League of Cambrai. With him he brought Francesca Ordeaschi, his future wife and mother to his four children, and Sebastiano Luciani, better known as Sebastiano del Piombo. It has been left to speculation as to why exactly Chigi would bring the budding artist all the way from Venice to Rome. Michael Hirst proposes, for example, that Chigi may have brought Sebastiano with him simply because Venetian paintings were *en vogue*. As Hirst comments: "[Chigi's] resolution . . . must reflect the appeal that Venetian painting of the first decade of the century had for him."²⁶ As heir to the artistic tutelage of Giovanni Bellini and the enigmatic Giorgione, both of whose works embodied the *colorito* for which Venice was becoming renowned, Sebastiano provided an artistic approach distinct from that of contemporary Roman painting. This Venetian emphasis on

²⁴ Frommel suggests that Peruzzi had also by this time completed the work in the Stanza del Fregio, begun as early as 1508 (Frommel, "La Villa," 70-71).

²⁵ Significant debate has been logged as to whether Sebastiano or Raphael painted their half of the pair first. Although it conflicts with Vasarian interpretation, this thesis asserts that Sebastiano's did indeed come first, in accordance with the abundance of scholarly and analytical data (Michael Hirst, *Sebastiano del Piombo* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 34; Mauro Lucco, *L'Opera completa di Sebastiano del Piombo* (Milan: Rizzoli, 1980), 100-101; Alma Maria Mignosi Tantillo, "Restuari alla Farnesina," *Bolletino d'Arte* 57 (1972), 33-42, esp. 40; Barbieri, 153).

²⁶ Hirst, 32. This hypothesis as to why Chigi bought Sebastiano home with him is echoed, albeit in a slightly modified form, in Costanza Barbieri's theory: "when in Venice, Agostino could have looked at the decoration of the facades of Venetian palaces – like the Fondaco dei Tedeschi or Ca Soranzo at San Polo, painted by Giorgione. . . with curiosity and admiration. The decision to bring Sebastiano, Giorgione's pupil, with him to Rome, could have stemmed from Chigi's fascination with Giorgione's frescoes." (Barbieri, 152). Interestingly, in this regard, Sebastiano is again serving as surrogate, a stand-in for the unattainable Giorgione.

the expressivity of color would have provided an immediate degree of novelty to Chigi's decorative program; however whether or not this was his rationale in transplanting the artist remains undetermined. Regardless of the exact motive, Sebastiano's arrival in Rome was both transformative for the artist, as he was suddenly in the epicenter of one of the most dynamic periods of Rome's history, and intimidating, as he was set to work on a massive project in a medium he did not know.

At the time of Sebastiano's arrival, Peruzzi had already established a visual architecture for the Loggia di Galatea, the apex of which was already devoted to an elaborate astrological ceiling (Fig. 44). Totalling twenty-six vignettes representing various constellations and their complementary personifications, this ceiling was designed to illustrate with impeccable accuracy the astrological moment of Chigi's birth. Supporting this upper register of the room from below was to be a series of nine lunettes, from Sebastiano's hand, depicting scenes from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Below these lunettes was to appear a series of frescoes to encircle the room, framed and divided by *trompe l'oeil* pilasters. Only two of these of lower frescoes were completed, that of *Polyphemus* and *Galatea*.²⁷ The fact, however, that the painted pilasters dividing these scenes

²⁷The remaining decoration within this register seen today dates to the seventeenth century: "[In the mid seventeenth century,] the open [Loggia di Galatea] was enclosed and the remaining wall panels were frescoed. The *basamento* was given fictive drapery and hangings and putti on globes. By contrast, when Chigi died the loggia was open, all but two of the wall panels were white, and the *basamento* has some fascinating sketches in the *arriccio*, some of which may pertain to the 'Polyphemus' and 'Galatea' panels. It is likely that tapestries covered the empty wall expanses during festivities, but as the restorer [Alma Maria Mignosi Tantillo] points out, the sketches in the *arriccio* below the wall panels were left exposed for approximately a century" (Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 236). In her analysis of the restorations on the room, Tantillo proposes that a scene of Acis was also

date to the first decade of the sixteenth century, combined with Rosalia Varoli-Piazza's implication that Peruzzi designed them, suggests that Peruzzi was integral in the overall vision for the loggia.²⁸

More than just sharing this vision, however, Peruzzi actually defined the function of the overall space with his ceiling decoration, establishing with its orientation how one was to enter the loggia. Entering this loggia today, from either the doorway that connects it to the adjacent Loggia di Amore e Psiche or the doorway to the present-day entry foyer of the villa, the viewer is struck with a ceiling whose imagery appears upside down. This peculiarity is due, as Quinlan-McGrath points out, to Peruzzi's orientation of the room for entry from the garden, that is, through the once open archways of the loggia.²⁹ More specifically, it was entry through the central archway that brought the ceiling's vibrant and illusionistic elements into correct alignment.

Peruzzi divided the central vault into three octagonal shapes, the central one bearing a coat of arms while the flanking two adopt an elongated shape to become pictorial panels revealing *The Constellation of Perseus with Fame* and *The Constellation of the Chariot*, respectively.³⁰ *The Constellation of Perseus with Fame*

once intended for one of these panels (Alma Maria Mignosi Tantillo, "Restuari alla Farnesina," *Bolletino d'Arte*, 57 (1972), 41).

²⁸ Rosalia Varoli-Piazza, "Peruzzi e Beccafumi alla Farnesina," *Quaderni di Palazzo Venezia*, 1 (1981): 60-64.

²⁹ Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 237.

³⁰ Vasari was the first to identify the scene depicting the constellation of Perseus: "But what is the greatest marvel of all is the loggia . . . painted by Baldassarre with scenes of the Medusa turning men into stone, . . . and then there is Perseus cutting off her head" (*Lives*, I; 811); The Constellation of the Chariot was identified through Gallo's 1511 panegyric (5: 99-100). Förster and Saxl reinterpreted the Constellation of Perseus rather as Pegasus with Fame (Förster, 39-40; Fritz Saxl, *La fede astrologica di Agostino Chigi: interpretazione dei dipinti di Baldassarre Peruzzi nella sala di Galatea della*

depicts Perseus on the cusp of Medusa's decapitation, above which the figure of Fame trumpets inward. The backdrop consists of a deep blue ground scattered with twenty-three stars. In the adjacent *Constellation of the Chariot*, a maiden rides upon an oxen-led chariot, sharing a similar deep blue backdrop and, in the case of this scene, twenty-four stars.³¹ These two panels, accentuated with golden triangular articulations and the stucco illusion of recessed molding, serve to establish a north-south celestial axis, only a matter of degrees off from the direction of true north.³²

Peruzzi then surrounded this central vault with ten spandrels, each depicting a zodiacal personification framed within a hexagonal enclosure oriented to depict their celestial position on November 30th, 1466. This hexagon within a triangle resulted in three small triangular panels surrounding each constellation hexagon, the top two of which depict *putti* in various states of riding sea creatures and the bottom one of which shows *putti* standing on globes and holding scrolls, all conjured in subtle *grisaille* on a deep navy background. The subsequent severies, or compartments, each depicting additional constellations, appear as if rendered in mosaic and are oriented to indicate the

Farnesina (Rome: Reale Accademia d'Italia, 1934), 30-31), but Quinlan-McGrath effectively argues for a return to Vasari's original interpretation of these two central panels (Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 279-280).

³¹ The Constellation of the Chariot could incorporate either the nymph Helice, known to modern astrologers as Ursa Major, or the nymph Cynosura, or Ursa Minor, which, according to Quinlan-McGrath, left Peruzzi with a challenge: "short of including an inscription, he really had no visual way to distinguish the two nymphs driving the chariot with oxen, since both were so closely associated with mythology" (Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 281-282).

³² Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 238.

time of Chigi's birth, between eleven o'clock in the evening of November 30th and one o'clock the following morning.³³

This illusionistic "medley of 'sculpture,' paintings, 'mosaics' and 'carved frames' . . . on a flat surface" that so artfully translated a complex celestial scheme into a logical loggia ceiling demonstrated Peruzzi's skill as figural artist.³⁴ As Quinlan-McGrath posits, Peruzzi's design for this astrological ceiling is not unprecedented but instead issues from "a rich tradition" already established both in his former Siena, namely his prior program designed for a lower level loggia at the Villa Le Volte and Pinturicchio's decoration for the Piccolomini Library, as well as in Rome, such as Pinturicchio's work within the Vatican's Room of the Prophets and Sibyls.³⁵ While Peruzzi's approach to this

³³ As Quinlan-McGrath expounds: "The ten spandrels give us a choice of two days, November 29-30, 1466; Altar's position next to Sagittarius must limit that day to November 30; and the remaining thirteen severies and two ceiling panels tell us that the birth occurred as Virgo was ascending. Since each of the zodiac signs was on the rise for approximately two hours, Chigi's ideal birth took place approximately between 11:00 p.m. and 1:00 a.m. the night of November 30th, 1466" (Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 284-285).

³⁴ Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa, 243; As Quinlan-McGrath continues in later pages: "it is hard to imagine who but Peruzzi could have cloaked so much mathematical and astronomical intricacy in this lovely poetry of paint. His fame as an astrologer must have been due in part to the great success of this vault" (Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 285). Here Quinlan-McGrath's references Vasari's mention of such studies ("but meanwhile he did not neglect the studies of astrology . . .")(Vasari, *Lives*, I: 815), however the extent to which Peruzzi actually studied astrology is uncertain.

³⁵ "At the Villa Le Volte, . . . a small ground floor room had the same architectural vault format . . . [dividing] the ceiling into a series of *quadri riportati* within a long rectangular frame, [treating] the spandrels with a unified scheme of *grotteschi*, the severies with a separate but difficult to identify series, and [filling] the lunettes with portrait medallions and fluttering ribbons" (Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 245). An illustration of Peruzzi's frescoed ceiling for the studiolo of the Villa Le Volte, completed roughly by 1505 (illustrated in Francesco Scoppola, "Villa Chigi alle Volte," *Rilievi di fabbriche attribuite a Baldassarre Peruzzi* (Siena: Palazzo Pubblico, 1981), 361-433), reveals striking compositional similarity to that used at the Farnesina. For comparison to Pinturicchio's Room of the Prophets and Sibyls: "Peruzzi must have taken his spandrel design directly from those here, for they are divided like Peruzzi's with central polygonal pictures of the zodiac and planets. . . . each main spandrel is flanked by fanciful monsters, . . . [and] the severies, like Peruzzi's, are heavily framed and have gold grounds. Quinlan-McGrath goes on to cite two additional examples of Pinturicchio's work, that in the Palazzo die Penitenzieri (circa 1490) and that in the "turn-of-the-century" Palazzo Colonna (Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 248-249).

ceiling's design fell squarely into this pictorial tradition, Quinlan-McGrath notes two important departures. The first of these is the vibrancy with which Peruzzi imbued his figures, a "heroic dimension, classical grace and decorative life" that Quinlan-McGrath asserts "no one other than Raphael had ever combined . . . with such robust vigor."³⁶

This suggested connection to Raphael's style bears further consideration, especially given Raphael's ties to one of the rooms that served as visual precedent for Peruzzi's Loggia di Galatea ceiling. Pinturicchio's Piccolomini Library (Fig. 45), which served as an inspiration for Peruzzi's design, was created through collaboration with Raphael, who enlivened the library's visual program as evidenced in his *modello* for *The Journey of Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini to the Count of Basel* (circa 1502).³⁷ In the early years of the 1500s, Peruzzi also had the opportunity to be exposed to and to study the work in the Piccolomini Library. During that time he had completed a ceiling fresco for the San Giovanni Chapel in the same church, and Alessandro Angelini provides evidence to suggest that he, like Raphael, also collaborated with Pinturicchio in the design of *The Coronation of Pius III* (Fig. 46) around the same time.³⁸

³⁶ Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 251.

³⁷ Talvacchia, *Raphael*, 48. Specifically she notes the similarity between Raphael's *modello* (Uffizi 520E) for and Pinturicchio's final fresco depicting *The Journey of Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini to the Council of Basel*, circa 1502-1508, a point echoed by earlier scholars. For example, as Joannides comments: "comparison between Raphael's *modello* . . . and Pinturicchio's fresco shows immediately why the twenty-year-old artist was called upon to help a man some thirty years his senior, and clearly demonstrates the latter's conceptual inferiority" (Joannides, cat. no. 56, 48).

³⁸ Documented payment to Peruzzi for the San Giovanni ceiling frescoes dates to 1501, and Angelini proposes that Peruzzi perhaps worked with Pinturicchio between 1503 and 1504 to create, in his words, "una delle opera più interessanti della stagione matura del pittore umbro" (Alessandro

Also intriguing about this composition, which is featured prominently above the entrance to the Library, are the included elements of theatricality and antiquity, both qualities that implicate Peruzzi's involvement and also that would become increasingly significant in Peruzzi's future career. Angelini notes this "theatrical quality" to *The Coronation of Pius III*, a feature that, when comparing this composition to those within the library, becomes apparent. The perspectival depth within this composition is arguably accurate than that seen in the Library's interior (the most extreme contrast is seen in *The Conversion of Saint Catherine*, wherein the lack of perspectival depth results in a confusingly collapsed image). Added to this perspectival recession is the animation of the figures, each of whom seem to be captured in a different position. This animation is witnessed in the Library scenes as well, however in *The Coronation of Pius III* it is arguably most pronounced.

Also significant is the inclusion of a quotation of an ancient relief below the central composition inscription, which also was arguably Peruzzi's addition. This relief panel, which depicts a maritime battle between Tritons and sea nymphs, is significant because it is the only panel of the entire Library decorative program that includes a direct antique quotation. At the same time, it draws an immediate connection with Cardinal Francesco Piccolomini's *The Three Graces* (Fig. 47), which, from 1502, was displayed prominently within the Piccolomini Library. These thematic connections to Peruzzi's continued work with antiquity

Angelini, "Francesco di Giorgio e l'architettura dipinta a Siena alla fine del Quattrocento," *Bolletino Senese di Storia Patria*, 109 (2002); 124; 140).

and eventual foray into scenographic design, combined with the potential conceptual connection between Peruzzi and Raphael in this space while collaborating with Pinturicchio, implies that Peruzzi's study of or involvement in the pictorial program of the Piccolomini Library might have contributed to the vivacity of the figures that played out across Peruzzi's Farnesina ceiling.

The second of these developments that McGrath notes in Peruzzi's ceiling is his ingenuity in "selecting parts from [this visual] tradition, enhancing them pictorially, and tailoring the pieces to fit the particular needs of the very complex program he had to illustrate."³⁹ Peruzzi's ability to choose certain artistic elements and then recombine them into a novel composition can be illustrated in his quotation of the same *Three Graces* in the Piccolomini Library. This sculpture offered, in the words of Talvacchia, "an exciting opportunity open to Raphael for first-hand study [of antiquity]" and undoubtedly fed into his painted rendition of these three handmaidens of Venus around 1504 (Fig. 48). At the same time, it presented a similar opportunity for Peruzzi to study the intricacies of the sculptural group, and the evidence that he did so is reflected in his depiction of *Venus in Capricorn*, one of the hexagonal spandrel images on the western wall of the Loggia di Galatea (Fig. 49).

Here Peruzzi cites the right-most hand maiden from the antique triad, making only slight adjustments to accommodate his vision of Venus set against common reductive blue background shared by these hexagonal scenes. As such, this example illustrates Peruzzi's ability, like that of Raphael, to harvest elements

³⁹ Quinlan-McGrath, 245-246.

simultaneously from the antique and the contemporary and recombine them into an expressive part of a much larger pictorial narrative. In other words, Peruzzi's creation of this astrological ceiling in many ways prefigures a co-opetitive model for artistic production. His ability to recombine various competing visual sources produced an innovative reconceptualization of Chigi's astrological birthdate unparalleled in subject and finesse. Moreover, Peruzzi's quotation of these outside sources foreshadows his subsequent interactions with Raphael and the competition that would eventually play out on the wall below between Raphael and Sebastiano.

Thrust into Peruzzi's workspace following the completion of this ceiling, Sebastiano was most likely already aware of the dynamism of the Farnesina's visual program and was perhaps questioning his role within it. This contemplative aspect is suggested, albeit indirectly, in Sebastiano's contemporaneous portrait, *Ferry Carondelet and His Secretaries* (Fig. 50), which was completed only shortly after his arrival in Rome. Archdeacon Ferry Carondelet, a budding humanist from Flanders who made frequent visits to the Farnesina, commissioned Sebastiano to paint his portrait around 1511.⁴⁰ The resulting portrait commits Carondelet's image to eternity as much as it presents a preliminary commentary on Sebastiano's new role in Rome and, potentially, his

⁴⁰ As he writes to Margaret of Austria, to whom he served as advisor, on November 14th, 1512: "le dit Augustin ne laisse. . . à parachever une certaine maison de plaisance qu'il a commensé faire hors des portes de Rome, qui est la plus belle et riche chose pour autant qu'elle contient que je vis jamais" (R. de Maulde e L. de la Brière, "Dépêches de Ferry Carondelet, procurer en la cour de Rome (1510-1513)," *Bulletin historique et philologique du Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques* (1895), 129-132, no. 21.

engagement with artists such as Peruzzi and Raphael. The background behind Carondelet is effectively divided into two realms. At right, the detailed landscape that recedes into the distance is evocative of the contemporary Venetian painting tradition and thereby characteristic of Sebastiano's prior paintings. Juxtaposed at left is a characteristically Roman interior, with a pedimented doorway visible in the background and a colonnade of marble Corinthian columns effectively cutting the composition in two. From this perspective, Sebastiano's portrait presents the clear divergence of painterly style between Rome and Venice at the beginning of the sixteenth century, perhaps as he contemplated his entrée into the Roman echelon of artists, specifically those working at the Farnesina.

Sebastiano was tasked first with the execution of the frescoed lunettes that encircle the grand hall illustrating scenes from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, including *The Myth of Zephyr* (Fig. 51). Sebastiano had not previously attempted the medium of fresco, thus transforming the series into a challenge akin – albeit on a much smaller scale – to that presented to Michelangelo in the fresco commission for the Sistine Chapel ceiling. Whereas Michelangelo championed the medium, however, Sebastiano visibly struggled. This is perhaps why few scholars have discussed Sebastiano's work at the Farnesina. In fact, the only significant discussion of this lunette series and the accompanying *Polyphemus* was presented in Hirst's monograph on the artist written over thirty years ago (still today the most comprehensive published monograph on the artist), and he still describes

to these lunettes as “verging on sheer incompetence.”⁴¹ Sebastiano’s lunettes may have suffered from an ambitious artist’s unsuccessful efforts in a difficult medium,⁴² but as such they have worked against a sufficient analysis of Sebastiano’s accompanying *Polyphemus*, which is more illustrative of the artist’s skill.

In Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, Polyphemus was the gigantic Cyclops who fell in love with the Nereid Galatea. His affection was left unrequited, as Galatea already loved Acis. Polyphemus grew jealous and, realizing his competition for Galatea was futile, he killed Acis. As the story goes, Galatea was so distraught over the death of her love that she transformed his flowing blood into the waters of the Acis River. Rivalry was the nexus of this story, so it was a fitting narrative through which a new rivalry would begin.

Sebastiano’s rendering of *Polyphemus* captures this foreboding sense in pose yet tempers it with his coloristic abilities. Here Polyphemus sits astride a rock outcropping, his entire figure captured rotating to his left. His gaze, permanently fixed in the direction of the adjacent *Galatea*, created an indelible connection between the two panels, while also assisting Sebastiano in overcoming the difficulties of rendering a Cyclops’s distinctive facial features

⁴¹ Hirst, 35. Hirst’s monograph supplanted that by Mauro Lucco (*L’Opera Completa*, 1980). Quinlan-McGrath seconds the troubles Sebastiano experienced with the lunettes: “without an iconographic precedent, he had grave difficulties with composition. And it is his imaginative failure in selecting and then composing this significant mythological moment in these stories which makes them so difficult to identify now. He produced no memorable images here which would be copied by generations of later artists” (Quinlan-McGrath, “The Villa,” 294-295).

⁴² Frommel suggests that it was Sebastiano’s struggles that encouraged Chigi to pull him off of work on the lunettes one segment shy of completion to instead focus on *Polyphemus*, leaving room for Peruzzi’s monumental portrait head. So difficult was the technique of fresco for Sebastiano that the *Polyphemus* was his last effort in the medium (Frommel, “La Villa,” 2: entry 141, 181).

(Fig. 53).⁴³ Even with the loss over time of Sebastiano's *a secco* additions, the figure of Polyphemus nevertheless projects from the wall. The striking depth of color in his blue robes combined with the terra cotta detailing of his musculature are accentuated against the soft, ethereal foliage that constructs his backdrop. In all, *Polyphemus* more than compensates for the pictorial struggles exhibited in his lunettes; indeed, in addition to its skill and its characteristic Venetian *colore*, Sebastiano's *Polyphemus* was the gauntlet thrown, so to speak, challenging Raphael to what would become an ongoing competition between artists that would reverberate through their future contributions to the villa.

In his monograph on Sebastiano, Hirst ruminates on the visual precedents of Sebastiano's *Polyphemus*. His hypotheses have been cited (and have remained largely unquestioned) by subsequent scholars. Hirst proposes that the monumental Cyclops, "a true Venetian exercise in colour and tone,"⁴⁴ was derived from a quotation of Michelangelo, who had, according to Hirst, by that time become a close associate of Sebastiano. As Hirst comments, "...we may be justified in detecting in the figure's design, for all its Venetian appearance, the first major impact of Michelangelo's art on the painter. . . . A hint of the Sistine *ignudi* may be suspected to lie behind Sebastiano's seated *Juno* (Fig. 54); in the slightly later *Polyphemus*, the influence seems explicit and the figure a tribute to

⁴³ These struggles are revealed in the sketches uncovered on the *arriccio* below *Polyphemus*, wherein it appears Sebastiano attempted a frontal composition and soon realized the challenges of portraying a one-eyed visage. Additional adjacent sketches he soon after switched to a profile approach (Frommel et al. *La Villa*, cat. nos. 125, 128-129).

⁴⁴ Hirst, 36.

the *ignudo* above and to the right of Joel (Fig. 55), carried out in Michelangelo's first campaign in the chapel."⁴⁵

The notion that Sebastiano would quote Michelangelo seems, with preliminary analysis, plausible. Scholars have noted that the two were veritable allies feeding off of each other, with Michelangelo harvesting the power of Sebastiano's Venetian *colorito*, and Sebastiano gleaning Michelangelo's mastery of Florentine *disegno*. As Rona Goffen posits, "Michelangelo may have envisioned Sebastiano as the panacea to his perceived problems with *colorito*, a characteristic for which Raphael was highly praised."⁴⁶ Raphael and Michelangelo had by this point already established themselves as rivals,⁴⁷ so if indeed Michelangelo had taken Sebastiano under his wing it would seem only fitting that Sebastiano would act as Michelangelo's surrogate at the villa, particularly in light of the fact that Michelangelo was never offered a commission there.⁴⁸

A visual comparison between Sebastiano's *Polyphemus* and Michelangelo's *ignudi* perched above the figure of Joel, however, undermines Hirst's argument. To begin, one can assume that, while Hirst references the *ignudo* "above and to the right of Joel," he instead is referring to the *ignudo* on Joel's right, which

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ As Goffen comments: "Michelangelo's dislike of Bramante, his resentment of Raphael, and his sense that he was outnumbered and sometimes outmaneuvered by them led him to seek, or recognize, an ally in Sebastiano Veneziano. . . . Collaboration with the Venetian painter marks the beginning of Michelangelo's use of proxies in his rivalries." Michelangelo's stand-ins were in part a logistic move, as he would spend the majority of 1516-1534 in Florence (Goffen, *Renaissance Rivals*, 227-228).

⁴⁷ Barbieri, 145.

⁴⁸ Barbieri reiterates this surrogate status by highlighting Vasari's use of the term in the context of Sebastiano's relationship with Michelangelo.

makes sense, as it is this figure that at least assumes the same directionality of Sebastiano's *Polyphemus*. If this assumption is correct, one can find only vague similarities between this figure and that of Sebastiano's Cyclops. Both figures are seated and exhibit vaguely similar postures, however the similarities end there. Instead of the figural torsion one finds in *Polyphemus*, Michelangelo's *ignudo* faces wholly to the left, with only his gaze turned slightly inward and downward. Furthermore, Sebastiano incorporated a more refined musculature than the undulous ripples used in the *ignudo*'s muscular rendering, which further distances this connection with the *ignudo* as a visual precedent. If one reverts to Hirst's implied *ignudo*, that being above and to the right of Joel, Sebastiano's *Polyphemus* becomes even further distanced from a Michelangesque prototype. Furthermore, a review of the remaining *ignudi* that encircle the Sistine Ceiling reveals none that come any closer to matching Sebastiano's Cyclops.

This is not to eliminate the impact of Michelangelo's work on Sebastiano, but rather to propose that alternate visual influences are at play.⁴⁹ Further supporting a quest for alternative influences is the complication of chronology. When Sebastiano began work on his *Polyphemus*, he had not yet befriended Michelangelo, and thus preparatory study from Michelangelo's Sistine Chapel compositions is implausible. Furthermore, in 1511, Pope Julius II's project in the

⁴⁹ Goffen tries to ameliorate the connection between Sebastiano and Michelangelo by proposing former was not quoting a singular of the latter's *ignudo* but rather "combined several . . . evoking all of them though not replicating any one of them exactly," (Goffen, *Renaissance Rivals*, 231) but even an amalgam of these figures, however, still creates an inconclusive connection.

Sistine Chapel was not only incomplete but also closed to the public,⁵⁰ which at the time would have included Sebastiano, who had yet to ingratiate himself into the Pope's circle. Thus it seems a search for additional visual sources for Sebastiano's *Polyphemus* is warranted, and doing so can potentially establish the initial point of competition between Sebastiano and Raphael. Specifically, it can be argued that Sebastiano here quotes Raphael's figure of Apollo as rendered in the *Parnassus* in the Stanza della Segnatura.

Though Sebastiano's arrival in Rome in late August 1511 precluded him from the public viewing of Michelangelo's work in the Sistine Chapel on the Feast of the Assumption (the fourteenth and fifteenth of August), his arrival did coincide with Raphael's completion of the Stanza della Segnatura, which Sebastiano most certainly visited. For as much as the completion of this stanza was a momentous occasion for Raphael, this viewing was also a turning point in Sebastiano's career. As Rona Goffen has commented, "it is impossible to exaggerate the impact of [the stanza's] two great cycles on Sebastiano."⁵¹ Indeed, a clear transition in Sebastiano's paintings is apparent when considered within the context of this viewing of Raphael's work. For example, one can draw visual parallels between Sebastiano's original Farnesina lunettes and Raphael's treatment of the upper lunette in *Jurisprudence*. Raphael's figures of Fortitude,

⁵⁰ According to Vasari, Raphael was nevertheless able to view the Sistine program: "For it happened in those days that Michela[n]gelo made the terrifying outburst against the Pope in the chapel, . . . whence he was forced to fly to Florence. Whereupon Bramante having the keys of the chapel, allowed Raffaello, who was his friend, to see it, to the end that he might be able to learn the methods of Michela[n]gelo" (Vasari, *Lives*, I; 723); reiterated in: Goffen, *Renaissance Rivals*, 220.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 229.

Temperance and Prudence are accompanied by minimal props and are set against a fictive sky, the format Sebastiano employed in all of his Farnesina lunettes. In addition, Sebastiano's confrontation between Roman and Venetian painting as alluded to in the previously mentioned *Portrait of Ferry Carondelet and His Secretaries* could in part have been in reaction to the monumental, Bramantesque classicism as seen in Raphael's *School of Athens*.

Perhaps even more indicative of the Stanza's impact is Sebastiano's *Death of Adonis* (Fig. 56), commissioned by Chigi at approximately the same time as Sebastiano's arrival at the Farnesina.⁵² It seems significant that Sebastiano would embark on his first recorded rendering of a fully mythological scene, a strong divergence from the religious narratives that played out in his prior works, shortly after having viewed Raphael's Vatican fresco cycle. Moreover, *Death of Adonis* arguably marks Sebastiano's first use of an ancient prototype in his paintings, that of either the *Spinario* (Fig. 57) or the *Nympha alla Spina* (Fig. 58) in his figure of Venus.⁵³ Indeed, from this perspective, Sebastiano's treatment of this mythological tale creates a similar juxtaposition of Roman and Venetian elements

⁵² Frommel dates this work to being simultaneous to Sebastiano's work on the lunettes of the Loggia di Galatea, approximately 1511-1512 (Frommel, "La Villa," 91).

⁵³ Sebastiano's Venus might also be quoting the ancient sculpture *Venus Binding Her Sandal*, which Bober comments as being a recurring quotation in Renaissance imagery, however she cannot trace its origins, and thus its connections to composition such as this is doubtful (For more on *Venus Binding Her Sandal*, see: Bober, *Renaissance Artists*, 64, no. 20). The *Nympha alla Spina*, so named by Bober, was part of the Caffarelli family collection by 1500, reinforced by a sketch from the Holkham Album that is captioned accordingly (Bober, *Renaissance Artists*, 97, no. 61 and 61a). If the ancient source in this instance is indeed the *Nympha alla Spina*, one must recall Barkan's discussion of this ancient piece, which he describes as an "alluring enigma" for its incomplete state and confounding figural torsion, "missing just those extremities that would render the posture logical" (Barkan, *Unearthing the Past*, 141). Thus, Sebastiano's quotation of this ancient source could be read as alluding to his own antiquarian interests, as he patently restored this piece from its fragmentary state into a depiction of Venus.

as seen in *Ferry Carondelet*. Here, the mythological scene plays out across the foreground of the composition, while in the distant background across a lake one sees the sun setting on Venice, the *campanile* of San Marco and the Palazzo Ducale identifiable along the skyline. The fact that the sun is setting on Venice, which one cannot help but consider as a questioning of abandoning his Venetian style of painting in favor of a Roman one, speaks to Sebastiano's contemplation and preparation to engage with the new artistic arena available to him in Rome, specifically the work of Raphael. Thus, if the *Portrait of Ferry Carondelet and His Secretaries* and *Death of Adonis* reflect a general confrontation of early *cinquecento* Roman painting, Sebastiano's *Polyphemus* is a confrontation directed specifically at Raphael. Originally intended as one register within an all-encompassing mural,⁵⁴ Sebastiano's *Polyphemus*, completed no doubt at times side by side with Raphael,⁵⁵ arguably borrowed from Raphael's *Parnassus* and thus launched an unprecedented dialogue with Raphael that persisted throughout the remainder of Raphael's career, most importantly in his remaining projects at the Villa Farnesina.

A visual comparison between *Polyphemus* and *Parnassus's* Apollo reveals immediate similarities. Surrounded by his muses and the revered poets of antiquity, Raphael's Apollo appears at the center of *Parnassus* (Fig. 59). He sits

⁵⁴ After 1514, Chigi abandoned more ambitious plans for decorations in the Loggia di Galatea, for reasons unknown. There is some speculation that damage to his property following a swelling of the Tiber River in 1514 shifted his attentions and perhaps caused the reduction in scale.

⁵⁵ As Goffen comments: "whether the two masters worked side by side on their adjacent frescoes is not documented but would seem to have been unavoidable at least during part of the two-year period when their murals were painted." (Goffen *Renaissance Rivals*, 230).

upon a rock outcropping just behind a babbling brook, poised to play his *lira da braccio* as he gazes upward, presumably toward the personification of Poetry that appears in the ceiling above. Behind him, laurel trees dot the landscape, echoed in the wreaths of laurel worn by Apollo and his fellow poets. Comparison between this figure of Apollo and Sebastiano's *Polyphemus* reveals striking parallels. Polyphemus appears almost as an unkempt Apollo, sporting a similar blue drapery and similar figural torsion as he turns to gaze upon his muse, Galatea. Furthermore, Polyphemus exhibits a bulkier physique to that of Apollo, appearing of a more Herculean stature that perhaps most clearly reflects the impact of Michelangelo's *ignudi*. He too rests upon a rock outcropping adjacent to a coursing stream, and is crowned similarly with a wreath of laurels, yet replacing Apollo's *lira da braccio* is a worn syrinx, or panpipe. This was an instrument most often relegated to pastoral shepherds, thus symbolizing, as Luba Freedman argues, "that [*Polyphemus*'] efforts were crude and unsophisticated. . . .[as] a true poet accompanies himself on a stringed instrument."⁵⁶ Thus it seems not without coincidence that Egidio Gallo, when writing his encomium on the Farnesina, likens the grounds, out of all possible

⁵⁶ Freedman, 78-79. The impact of this reference resonates in the notion of *ut pictura musica*, "what goes for painting goes for music," the parallel to *ut pictura poesis* (on which discussion will center in the following pages). As Stuart Lingo posits: "the theme of music as an analogue to painting occurred with increasing frequency over the course of the sixteenth century and was certainly flourishing during the next century." (Stuart Lingo, *Federico Barocci: Allure and Devotion in Late Renaissance Painting* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 209). Arguably first codified in the seventeenth century writings of Giovanni Pietro Bellori, the indelible link between painting and music gained scholarly attention again in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, however it has yet to be afforded an equivalent study to that of its parallel axiom, *ut pictura poesis*. Winternitz comments that the syrinx becomes the conventional instrument represented in Polyphemus' possession ("Il Parnaso," 191); since Sebastiano's rendering of the Cyclops is, by all accounts, the first since antiquity, one can safely credit his composition as inaugurating this trend.

allusions, to Parnassus (“Here within perpetually the suavest distinctions the voice of Phoebus and the nine Muses resonate among themselves. Here within is the gathering of the poets, wither/the poets come together to practice sacred poetry with varied verse”).⁵⁷

A further consideration of Gallo’s citation of these “suavest distinctions” is merited in light of the bolstered significance of Polyphemus’ panpipes when juxtaposed against their *Parnassus* parallel, Apollo’s *lira da braccio*. As previously mentioned, the *lira da braccio* stands in contrast to the other instruments depicted in *Parnassus* as it was a contemporary invention, appearing for the first time in courtly performances around the end of the fifteenth century.⁵⁸ Further complicating Apollo’s instrument is the fact that it bears nine strings, which was two more than a *lira da braccio*’s traditional number. Winternitz proposed this deviation was intentional, suggesting Raphael desired a visual, or numerical, allusion to the Nine Muses.⁵⁹

⁵⁷ “Perpetuo hic intus resonant suavissima Phaebi /Musarmumque novem inter se discrimina vocis. /Concilium his intus vatum: quo sancta Poetae /Conveniunt vario tractare Poemata versu” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 5: 147-150, 91).

⁵⁸ As Sterling Scott Brown comments in terms of dating the origins of the instrument: “Even though the *lira da braccio* is one of the most frequently depicted instruments in paintings and drawings of the Italian Renaissance, particularly during the early 16th century – the instrument seems to have been exclusively Italian – it is one which we know least about. This is because so few instruments have survive and because no written music for the instrument has been found except for a short section added in a 1540-45 to an earlier lute manuscript” (Sterling Scott Brown, *The Lira Da Braccio* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995), 1). Winternitz goes on to suggest that Raphael’s inclusion of this contemporary deviation was in part to emphasize the allusions to the virtuosic solo player, as Apollo was to be interpreted, and also its role as the instrument of *cinquecento* poet-musicians (“Il Parnaso,” 198-199).

⁵⁹ Winternitz reinforces this connection to the allegorical number of the Muses through a brief excerpt from sixteenth-century writer Natalis Comes, which echoes the words of Gallo: “the spirit of Apollo forcefully moves these Muses; residing among them, he embraces the universe “Mentis Apollinea vis has movet undique Muses/In medio residens complectitur omnia Phoebus” (Natalis Comes, *Mythologiae sive explicationis fabularum libri decem, in quibus omnia prope Naturalis & Marlis*

One finds a parallel number in Sebastiano's depiction of Polyphemus' instrument. A careful count reveals nine pipes of the syrinx appearing above grip of the Cyclops' hand. This numerical connection not only reinforces the proposal that Sebastiano had carefully scrutinized Raphael's *Parnassus* but also that the Venetian was cognizant of Raphael's included numerical allusion and wished to invoke it in his rendering of *Polyphemus*. In doing so, Sebastiano further solidified both the link between *Polyphemus* and its cited source, *Parnassus*, and the desired allusory connections between the Farnesina and a new "Parnassus."

Sebastiano's ingenuity of approach in this fresco is made all the more striking in consideration of the fact that both *Polyphemus* and Raphael's subsequent *Galatea* represented "the earliest known representations since antiquity of this mythological subject in mural painting."⁶⁰ As Luba Freedman asserts, there was no antique relief depicting Polyphemus and Galatea known to early sixteenth century society, and the few textual depictions of Polyphemus that appear in fifteenth century iterations show Polyphemus as cannibal, not a failed courtier.⁶¹ This singularity of the representation of this *all'antica* narrative

Philosophiae dogmata contenta fuisse demonstatur (Padua, 1616), 583); a similar discussion on the Interestingly, the illustration of the Muses included in Comes' 1616 edition (7: 403) is closely modeled after Raphael's *Parnassus*. Franchino Gaffori, *Theorica musicae* (NY: Broude, 1967), I: 2.

⁶⁰ Freedman, 78; Eleanor Winsor Leach, "Polyphemus in a Landscape: Traditions of Pastoral Courtship." in John Dixon Hunt, ed., *The Pastoral Landscape* (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1992), 63-87.

⁶¹ Freedman, 79. Freedman suggests that Sebastiano's *Polyphemus* does borrow elements from Angelo Poliziano's description in his *Stanze* (Libro Primo, Stanza 116: "Dall'uno all'altro orecchi un arco face, il ciglio irsuto lungo ben sei spanne; largo sotto la fronte il naso giace, paion di schiuma biancheggiar le zanne; tra' piedi ha 'l cane, e sotto il braccio tace, una zampogna ben di cento canne; lui guata il mar che ondeggia, e alpestre note par canti, e muova le lanose gote..." Angelo Poliziano, *Stanze*, in Saverio Orlando, ed., *Poesie Italiane* (Milan: Rizzoli, 1988). The only true similarity here, however, is the inclusion of the dog at Polyphemus' feet.

is important for the greater examination of the Villa Farnesina, but it is particularly significant for this discussion as it supports the notion that Sebastiano, left with no antique precedents to follow, drew quotations from a contemporary source for his *Polyphemus*.⁶² Considering the impact of Sebastiano's exposure to Raphael's work in the Stanza della Segnatura, as evidenced in his other contemporary paintings and seen particularly Sebastiano's close allegiance to Raphael's *Jurisprudence* lunette in his designs for the Farnesina lunettes, it would seem plausible that, when creating *Polyphemus*, Sebastiano once again looked to Raphael for inspiration.

The quotation of Raphael's *Parnassus*, however, goes beyond mere artistic emulation. Indeed, for as much as Sebastiano here plays on Raphael's composition, he is at the same time engaging in an important discourse with Raphael. On the one hand, Sebastiano's quotation of this monumental scene can be read as a commentary on Raphael's growing divine status. Indeed, as Barbieri comments, already by 1512 "Raphael was a central figure at the papal court, celebrated in countless poems and epigrams. A recently discovered poem by Girolamo Aleandro, dedicated to Raphael . . . exalt[s] the artist's divine genius, 'ingenii divina tui vis' . . . In fact, much before Michelangelo, it was Raphael who was celebrated as 'divine.'"⁶³ Raphael arguably took great stock in this rising divinity, choosing to include his own self-portrait in both the *School of Athens* in

⁶² Further distancing Sebastiano's *Polyphemus* is a comparison with later sixteenth-century interpretations of the Cyclops, namely those depicted by Giulio Romano (Palazzo del Tè, Mantua, 1526-1528) and Annibale Carracci (Palazzo Farnese, 1595-1605), both of which display a noticeably more empowered, vengeful figure.

⁶³ Barbieri, 147.

the guise of Apelles,⁶⁴ and, as argued earlier, as part of the group of poets in *Parnassus*.

On the other hand, just as *Polyphemus* can be read as commentary on Raphael's status, so too does it bear resonance as a symbol of Sebastiano's growing acclaim. As Goffen comments in her analysis of Polyphemus and his inborn *pathos*: "[he] invites the beholder to sympathize with his plight. . . . and [know] that the story does not end there."⁶⁵ Though these words reflect the plight of Polyphemus, the same could be applied to Sebastiano. Arriving in Rome as a relative unknown artist in 1511, Sebastiano was faced with the insurmountable "triumph" of Raphael, whose already-established success was a direct contrast to the young Venetian's position. Sebastiano was thus left to wallow in the quandary of how to surpass his rival, yet he too understood that this was just the beginning. Just as Polyphemus eventually reaped his revenge on his love, so too was Sebastiano confident that his competition with Raphael was only just beginning. Thus it seems pertinent that Vasari chose to open Sebastiano's biography, albeit many decades later, thus: "the first profession of Sebastiano, so many declare, was not painting, but music, since besides being a singer, he much delighted to play various kinds of instruments, and particularly the lute, because on that instrument all the parts can be played, without any accompaniment."⁶⁶

⁶⁴ Apelles (Raphael) appears nestled between Strabo, the Greek geographer (portraying associate Baldassarre Castiglione), and fellow painter Protogenes (depicting the likeness of fellow painter Giovanni Antonio Bazzi, better known as Il Sodoma). (Ingrid Rowland, "The Vatican Stanze," 106.)

⁶⁵ Goffen, *Renaissance Rivals*, 234.

⁶⁶ Vasari, *Lives*, I:140. Interestingly, Bartolini makes note of the display of Sebastiano's *Death of Adonis* within the Farnesina's music room: "la 'tavola picta grande' 'con figure de più donne nude et

Vasari's musical allusion, particularly its reference to Sebastiano's preference for performing "without any accompaniment," could allude to Sebastiano's potential challenge to Raphael's artistic supremacy while also perhaps intimating a position of painterly isolation – that is, that Sebastiano preferred to work alone. This individual approach, diametrically opposed to Raphael's collaborative *esprit* as illustrated through both his later Farnesina commissions and the management of his workshop, is nevertheless tempered by the inclusion of the rustic panpipes, a symbolic gesture of relative humility. Thus this navigation between modesty and hubris added arguably another valence of symbolism to the inclusion of Polyphemus' worn panpipes.

Furthermore, by choosing to portray Polyphemus as the blundering poet, Sebastiano draws direct reference to the Horatian aphorism *ut pictura poesis*, "just as in painting, so is poetry." This idiom bore particular resonance for Raphael, who featured himself as an intellectual associate of humanist circles in sixteenth-century Rome. Thus he contemplated at great length the indelible rhetorical connections between painting and poetry, as evidenced in his work in the Vatican stanze and in the "fundamental sense of the unity of human creative force" that Rowland identified in Raphael's work.⁶⁷

Simultaneously, *ut pictura poesis* related to Sebastiano's painting as well, particularly with the poetic ties so often associated with sixteenth-century Venetian painting. The notion that paintings were *poesie*, literally a form of

belle' era allora, alla fine del 1520, in una camera del piano superiore, 'adpresso la Salotta', dove si era soliti fare della musica" (Bartalini, "Due episodi," 18).

⁶⁷ Rowland, "Raphael, Angelo Colocci," 513.

pastoral poetry themselves, would become central to the later career of Sebastiano's contemporary, Titian. Titian's eventual use of this term, to briefly recall Campbell's argument, was to reflect a grafting of artistic styles, one that can be traced to the early years of the sixteenth century in works such as the Dresden *Sleeping Venus* (1510). That such a theme was already emerging in Titian's paintings in the first years of the sixteenth century, when Titian and Sebastiano were both in Venice, suggests that Sebastiano might have picked up a similar approach to painting and perhaps implemented it in *Polyphemus* as a declaration of a growing Venetian tradition as it was transplanted to Rome. At the same time this poetical connection bore contemporaneous significance, it also elicited connections with the ancient world. As Freedman has commented, "the term *poesie* forged an instant association with both classical poetry and classical paintings, and thus implied a revival of the two traditions, visual and literary, which had been used in antiquity to express the subjects of classical mythology."⁶⁸ Thus the poetical aspect of Sebastiano's *Polyphemus* is both literal, in its rekindling the ancient prose, but also methodological, contemplating the mechanics of poetry and their relations to painting.

The poetry of Sebastiano's works is repeatedly cited throughout literature, from Blosio Palladio summarizing his work in the Loggia di Galatea thus: "then these whom the verses of Ovid painted, the painter repainted, and he equaled in skill the Ovidian colors. So Fortunate the painter is by the poet, as the Poet by the painter," to Vasari later referring to his "poetical compositions in the manner that

⁶⁸ Freedman, 201-202.

he had brought from Venice”⁶⁹ This Venetian poetry can be traced to *Polyphemus* as well, for it also resonates visually with Giorgione’s *Tempest* (Fig. 60), borrowing a strikingly similar pose to the problematic nude figure in the foreground and landscape that surrounds her.

With these connections in mind, Sebastiano’s *Polyphemus* becomes its own sort of visual treatise, merging the ancient poetry of Rome with the contemporaneous artistic poetry of Venice.⁷⁰ It at once gives credence to the supremacy of Raphael’s visual style while also challenging it, proposing an alternative mode of representation in the battle for artistic superiority in Rome. One must consider momentarily what an impact such a visual exposition would have made for visitors to the Chigian villa, particularly Chigi’s circle of humanist associates who frequented the grounds.⁷¹ For those literati milling about within a metaphorical Parnassus outside as they gazed into the Loggia unto Sebastiano’s allusion to Parnassus, poetical bounds would blur and the Poet would be undoubtedly forced into a deep contemplation. Raphael’s response to this challenge, however, in his depiction of *Galatea*, is equally powerful.

⁶⁹ “Denique quas Ovidi versus pinxere, repinxit Pictor, et aequavit Pelignos artes colores. Tam foelix pictor vate, ut pictore Poeta” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Blosius Palladius,” 1: 65, 118-119); Vasari, *Lives*, 2:141.

⁷⁰ This treatise-like quality to Sebastiano’s work is echoed in his later career, as argued by Elena Calvillo (“Authoritative Copies and Divine Originals: Lucretian Metaphor, Painting on Stone, and the Problem of Originality in Michelangelo’s Rome.” *Renaissance Quarterly*, 66 (2) (Summer 2013), 453-508.

⁷¹ Included most significantly within this coterie were Cornelio Benigno, Egidio Gallo, the storied Roman courtesan Imperia, Matteo Bandello, Pietro Aretino, Pietro Bembo, Bibbiena, and Baldassarre Castiglione, all of whom “were intimates, associates or dependents of Chigi, as evidenced by the poem or letters which they left, though not all of them have extant works which discuss the villa” (Quinlan-McGrath, “The Villa,” 42).

Raphael's Response – A Clash of Temporalities

If one accepts Sebastiano's Polyphemus as the preliminary challenge presented to Raphael in the battle for artistic preeminence in Rome, Raphael's response to Sebastiano's visual provocation in *Galatea* is telling. To respond directly to Sebastiano's image, in essence to emulate an emulation of his own work in *Parnassus*, would have no doubt seemed too derivative, so instead Raphael further expands their artistic discourse into the realm of antiquity. As discussed previously, Raphael's imagery in the Stanza della Segnatura, particularly *Parnassus*, was infused with a study of the ancients, an element invoked through Sebastiano's reinterpretation of Raphael's Apollo as Polyphemus. In response, Raphael's *Galatea* emerged not truly as a companion to *Polyphemus* but rather as a new, advanced mode of antique revival, one that did not merely quote antique sources but instead emulated an antique wall painting laid out with an "archaeological and classical appearance."⁷²

This stylistic shift is made apparent by recalling Raphael's works in the Stanza della Segnatura, completed immediately prior to *Galatea*. These compositions bear hints of Raphael's future pursuits into archaeology and architecture, however they are included with relative restraint as to not obscure the larger message of the pictorial program. In *Galatea*, however, Raphael for the first time fully explores the pictorial potential of antiquity while also quoting contemporary sources to create his own sort of visual treatise. The included

⁷² Barbieri, 154.

figures, all of whom could have been borrowed from an antique fragment, come together to create a rather monumental composition that exalts the power of *all'antica* painting in a *cinquecento* interior.

The fact that this dynamic composition was created in part in tandem with and also in response to Sebastiano's *Polyphemus*, suggests that Raphael's rivalry becomes paramount to a full understanding of the Villa Farnesina. On the one hand, it could be argued that Raphael's engagement with Sebastiano arguably encouraged, or perhaps served as catalyst, to Raphael's launch into a new style of painting as witnessed in *Galatea*. On the other hand, while *Polyphemus* and *Galatea* stood in direct stylistic competition with one another, these compositions nevertheless worked together to create a visual dynamic interior, one that would undoubtedly elicit both intellectual discussions on contemporary artistic practice and the mythological allusions connecting the villa's interior to its equally lavish outdoor grounds. This confrontation of imagery, then, is fundamentally co-competitive in that these frescoes, though heavily tinged with competition, nevertheless were consciously designed to work together on some level with each other and with the additional imagery in the Loggia di Galatea to conjure a desired allusory visual program. This subtle tempering of competition with a hint of collaboration to produce a more perfect product, *un migliore perfezione* – would become a central theme throughout Raphael's commitments at the Farnesina.

Raphael showcased Galatea at the center of his composition, dwarfed in size compared to the adjacent *Polyphemus* and gazing backward in his general direction. The red drapery in which she is enveloped whips behind her in the wind as she is pulled forward through the sea on a shell chariot led by two dolphins, one of which has just caught an octopus.⁷³ Surrounding her are a bevy of sea gods, Tritons, and *putti* in various states, from one riding a sea horse at left to other circling over head poised to shoot Galatea with Cupid's arrow.⁷⁴ In sum, *Galatea* is at once a composition that fits within its intended narrative while also indicating an important shift in Raphael's approach toward the *all'antica*.

Raphael's creation of a Galatea that has been alternately identified as Venus exemplifies the careful crafting of this *all'antica* shift. Indeed, nineteenth-century scholars, such as J.J. Haus, identified this image as one of Venus, not Galatea, in an effort to establish visual continuity with the neighboring Loggia di Amore e Psiche.⁷⁵ Hermann Grimm seconded this claim to Venus,⁷⁶ but this alternate association fell dormant until practically a century later, when Christoph Thoenes revived it, although altered, to suggest that Raphael's depiction was an allegorical representation of both earthly and divine Venus.⁷⁷ An interpretation of this scene as one of Venus also would help explain Gallo's

⁷³ Vasari describes them as dolphins. (Vasari, *Lives*, I: 723).

⁷⁴ Vasari, *Lives*, I: 723.

⁷⁵ J.J. Haus, *Riflessioni di un oltramontano sulla creduta Galatea di Raffael d'Urbino* (Palermo: n.p. 1816).

⁷⁶ Hermann Grimm, *The Life of Michelangelo*, 2 vols. Trans. by F.E. Bunnett (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1899), 1: 461, 553-555.

⁷⁷ Christoph Thoenes, "Zu Raffaels Galatea," in Lucius Grisebach and Konrad Renger, eds., *Festschrift für Otto von Simson zum 65. Geburtstag* (Vienna: Propyläen Verlag, 1977), 231-244.

extended epigrammatic narrative of Venus' travels. Most of these interpretations fall apart, however, when attempting to explain her pairing with *Polyphemus*.

Though scholarly consensus has settled to agree uniformly that Raphael's intended subject was indeed *Galatea*, it seems worthy of mention that Raphael, in the midst of reinvention and the pursuit of *all'antica* themes, perhaps intended a dual interpretation of his muse, desiring Venus to be reflected as well.

Undoubtable connections between visual and antique precedents for depictions of Venus exist throughout. The fact, for example, that Raphael's composition echoes that of Sandro Botticelli's *Birth of Venus* (1486) (Fig. 61) seems significant, particularly in light of the fact that both were supposedly derived from the similar source of Angelo Poliziano's *Giostra*.⁷⁸

The possibility that Raphael alludes to Venus in his depiction of *Galatea* not only conflates imagery of Venus and Galatea but it also provides a unifying quality to the main visual programs of the villa. Referencing Venus here, the only such reference included in the Loggia di Galatea, not only established an eventual connection with the later Loggia di Amore e Psiche next door, as Haus suggested; it also united this visual program with the Sala delle Prospettive upstairs, wherein Peruzzi, as will be discussed later, included his own version of *The Triumph of Venus*, while further strengthening the connection with Chigi's

⁷⁸ Specifically, stanza 118, which reads: "duo formosi delfini un carro tirono: /sovrasso è Galatea che 'l fren corregge, / e quei notando parimente spirano; ruotasi attorno più lasciva gregge: / qual le salse onde sputa, e quai s'aggirano, / qual par che per amor giuochi e vanegge; / la bella ninfa colle suore fide / di si rozo cantor vezzosa ride" (Orlando, 26). Förster was the first to suggest this connection to Poliziano's writings (Richard Förster, *Farnesina-Studien: ein Beitrag zu Frage nach dem Verhältnis der Renaissance zur Antike* (Rostock: Stiller, 1880), 57-60).

outdoor splendors. On approach to the loggia, gazing through the trees into the open archways ahead, one could assume from a distance this monumental depiction was indeed Venus, brought to life by the trembling branches as they moved with the breeze. Upon coming closer however, and becoming absorbed in the liquid music of the nearby fountains, a viewer could witness the transformation of Venus into Galatea.

Raphael's *Galatea* appears as a total opposite to Sebastiano's *Cyclops*, with the first glance leaving the viewer to question if the two panels are indeed intended to communicate with one another. In some respect such division follows the narrative being retold – that is, the clear division of space and different vantage points employed reinforce that Galatea is forever out of Polyphemus' reach. Thus, Raphael did not merely respond to *Polyphemus* through an emulation of Sebastiano's technique; rather, he charted a new course for painting and, subsequently, for his career.

With no extant representations of Galatea on which to base his rendition, Raphael was forced to, in the words of Risjer, craft an "assemblage of pictorial elements from different sources [to] reflect his 'divine creation' of the ideal picture, conforming to the procedure of Zeuxis, but now applied to fragmentary remains of sculpture rather than living maidens."⁷⁹ Sebastiano was faced with a similar challenge in his depiction of *Polyphemus*, yet it seems Raphael's *Galatea* goes one step further, incorporating visual references that cross chronology and media. Two intriguing inclusions, quite often overlooked by scholars, bear

⁷⁹ Risjer, *Raphael's Poetics*, 382.

deliberate reference to the ancient world. One of Galatea's charging dolphins devours an octopus, an allegorical inclusion that recalls the ancient poet Oppian's *Halieutica* and his discussion of the demeanor of marine creatures.⁸⁰ Also noteworthy is the curious paddle-wheel feature of Galatea's shell that, according to Millard Meiss, is remarkably novel.⁸¹ Tracing the literary precedents in the writings of Philostratus⁸² and Poliziano, from whom Raphael derived the basic concept of the *carro*, or chariot, on which Galatea rides, Meiss surmises, "he found them not quite what he wanted. Abandoning the chariot he gave the nymph a sort of super-shell. . . .unprecedented in the arts and in iconographic tradition."⁸³

This feature, which became absorbed into the subsequent iconography of Galatea,⁸⁴ has never been further probed, however it merits reevaluation in light of Peruzzi's concurrent developing plans for a water wheel structure for Chigi's gardens. Frommel comments on a monumental waterwheel engineered by Peruzzi that debuted at the first of Chigi's lavish festivities 1518.⁸⁵ Its aim was to

⁸⁰ Oppian, *Halieutica* (Loeb Classical Library, 1928), 425-427. Quinlan-McGrath proposes this inclusion as a "moralizing allegory that Galatea's chastity is triumphing over the lubricious Polyphemus" (Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 315).

⁸¹ Millard Meiss, "Raphael's Mechanized Seashell: Notes on a Myth, Technology and Iconographic Tradition," *The Painter's Choice: Problems in the Interpretation of Renaissance Art* (New York: Harper and Row, 1976), 203-211.

⁸² Philostratus, *Immagines* II, 18, "Cyclopes," trans. by Arthur Fairbanks (London: W. Heinemann, 1931).

⁸³ Meiss, 205-206.

⁸⁴ Later versions by Marcantonio Raimondi, Pietro da Cortona, and the circle of Annibale Carracci included this paddle wheel feature.

⁸⁵ "Das Haus glänzte von Silbergeschirr, und im Garten konnte man einen Brunnen bewundern, der durch eine besondere Maschinerie, wohl eine Art von Wasserrad, das Wasser aus dem Tiber in den Garten heraufschöpfte; eine Erfindung, hinter der man Peruzzi vermuten darf." (Frommel, *Die Farnesina*, 8). Cremona also mentions another reference to Mantuan ambassador's account of an "underground fountain" in the garden that transported water from the Tiber "with some ingenuity."

facilitate water movement from the Tiber to both irrigate the gardens and replenish the fountains and was, from contemporary reports, a feat of engineering that perhaps even included, according to Palladio's previously recounted description, a musical component.⁸⁶ The state of the water wheel's construction at the time Raphael was executing *Galatea* is unknown. It is, however, plausible that Raphael was aware of Peruzzi's designs, and thus chose to play upon this future engineering accomplishment before it had been executed.

This playful potential commentary on Peruzzi's water works would have been the second friendly jab Raphael included in *Galatea*. As Quinlan-McGrath comments, Raphael's positioning of a seahorse at left engages with the same beast included in Peruzzi's rendition of Pisces in the spandrel on the opposite side of the room.⁸⁷ This visual connection created between the two works was perhaps Raphael's response to Peruzzi's quotation of the *Three Graces* in his

(Cremona, 528; Ludwig von Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste im Zeitalter der Renaissance und der Glaubensspaltung: von der Wahl Leos X. bis zum Tode Klemens' VII. (1513-1534), Vol. 1 Leo X* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1907), 152). Finally, a similar mention was made in the account of a member of Pope Leo X's coterie who accompanied him to the infamous festivities on February 27th, 1518: "Il zardino bellissimo e grando, et havia consegnato una Fontana soto tera che toleva l'aqua d'il Tevere et con alcuni ingegni butavano l'aqua per il zardino; ch'è sta un bel veder" (Ludwig von Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Freiburg, 1885-1933), vol. 28, 152).

⁸⁶ A letter to Chigi from January 27th, 1519, from Antonio and Nicola Burchiella, presumably engineers themselves, talks of Chigi's desire for a fountain in the garden and the necessity to mechanize water movement, either from drilling into the ground or pulling it from the Tiber, to feed it. (Ottorino Montenovese, *Agostino Chigi banchiere e appaltatore dell'allume di Tolfa*. Archivio della Società Romana di Storia Patria, vol. 60 (Rome: 1938), 121. In a 2004 article, Mara lo Sardo connects *Galatea*'s paddle-wheeled shell to Vitruvius' precepts for an odometer, which, if not reinforcing this potential reference to Peruzzi's engineering accomplishments, definitely support the connections to Vitruvius that consistently appear throughout the Farnesina's design. For more on lo Sardo's analysis, please see: Mara lo Sardo, "Raffaello e l'odometro," *Rivista on line di storia dell'arte*, 1 (2004), no page numbers. For more on Vitruvius' description of the odometer for both land and sea, please refer to Chapter Nine of Vitruvius' 10th book on architecture, as translated in: Rowland and Howe, 127-128.

⁸⁷ Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 315.

depiction of *Venus in Capricorn* that was positioned directly above *Galatea*. Thus Raphael uses his composition to draw (potentially playful) connections with Peruzzi that applaud his associate's accomplishments, imply a collegial relationship already established between them, and also further tie this visual representation to the actual gardens outside.

Raphael's references within *Galatea* do not end there. The central *putto* in the lower register, for example, quotes the contemporary sculpted relief of Michelangelo, the *Taddei Tondo* (Fig. 62).⁸⁸ In addition to this sculptural quotation of Michelangelo, Raphael also arguably quotes the popular fragment *Torso Belvedere* (Fig. 63) in the figure of the Triton at lower left, a quotation that is carried over into Raphael's depiction of Galatea herself, whose rendition has been critiqued over history as being overly muscular.⁸⁹ Indeed, a review of the *giornate* necessary to complete the *Galatea* reveals Raphael's division of her figure at upper thigh, the same axis upon which the lower extremities of the *Torso Belvedere* are truncated (Fig. 64).⁹⁰ Finally, Raphael was careful also to reference Sebastiano by adopting his color-centric technique. As Barbieri points out, though Raphael conjured a Galatea seemingly otherworldly by comparison to that of Sebastiano's *Polyphemus*, he nevertheless expended careful observation on

⁸⁸ Rijser, 383; Raphael had already cited this tondo in his *Virgin and Child (Bridgewater Madonna)* of 1507.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ As illustrated in Tantillo, "Restauri," 46, no. 9. According to her analysis, both Sebastiano's *Polyphemus* and Raphael's *Galatea* required thirteen days work.

Sebastiano's glaze-like technique of pigment application to achieve a unique balance of color.⁹¹

Also evident is his desire to explore the intersections of visual art and its sisters. As Risjer comments within the context of *Galatea*, "visual echoes enable us to see how Raphael creates a network of references very similar to those created and employed by contemporary poets by way of quotation, allusion, and intertext."⁹² For a brief moment, *Galatea* blurs the lines of painting and poetry, foreshadowing the subsequent major steps Raphael was about to take in his career.

It is worth noting that conspicuously missing from the loggia is the third protagonist of the narrative, Acis. His absence is not altogether remarkable aside from the fact that it draws attention to the unfinished state of the loggia. Though the exact plans have not survived, common consensus suggests Chigi envisioned the continuation of this monumental mural series around the room. Such a plan was most likely dashed with the massive flood of the Tiber River in 1514 that shifted Chigi's attention to the repair of damages to the villa property, leaving the remaining Loggia di Galatea walls decorated only in whitewash and occasionally accented with Sebastiano's and Raphael's preparatory sketches in

⁹¹ Raphael's interest in the Venetian technique could have contributed to his close camaraderie with Giovanni da Udine, who had trained under Giorgione. (Michel Hochmann, *Venise et Rome 1500-1600: deux écoles de peinture et leurs échanges*. (Genève: Droz, 2004), 173). Also noteworthy is Nesselrath's previously mentioned identification of Venetian Lorenzo Lotto's hand in a portion of *Jurisprudence* in the Stanza della Segnatura ("Lorenzo Lotto," 4-12), suggesting an earlier influence of the Venetian technique on Raphael's style.

⁹² Rijser, 386.

the underlying *arriccio*.⁹³ Thus, just as the loggia lacks a visual depiction of Acis, so too does it leave the hands of Rome's other artistic masters, such as Michelangelo, potentially unaccounted for. As such, we are only left to imagine the scope of competition that could have been achieved had Chigi's original plans materialized. Regardless, the fact that Sebastiano and Raphael stand alone in competition on the loggia's walls, accentuated by the white stucco panels that accompanied them, one is struck with the visual impact these works would have had on a viewer in Chigi's day.

Furthermore, one could argue for the metaphorical presence of Acis within this artistic arrangement, suggested in consideration of how the Loggia was to be entered and viewed as well as in light of the close proximity of both the Tiber and water features in the garden. As mentioned previously, the eastern wall of this loggia was originally a series of open archways to the garden, from which one could seek the ideal viewing place for Peruzzi's astrological ceiling and thereby the entire room.⁹⁴ With this arcade long-since enclosed such an entry is now impossible, yet it bears consideration that the entire visual program, as begun with Peruzzi's astrological ceiling, is oriented to this vantage point as entering not from another room in the villa, but rather from the garden.

⁹³ Quinlan-McGrath suggests an alternate explanation that Raphael's simultaneous work in the Vatican stanze, combined with "indecision as to how the [loggia's] cycle would proceed once Raphael had upstaged the artists of the rest of the room," also potentially contributed to the cessation of a full pictorial cycle (Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 242). Quinlan-McGrath posits that these lower panels showing the sketches of Raphael and Sebastiano remained exposed until roughly a century after Chigi's death, when the faux tapestry panels, still seen today, were installed to cover them (Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 236; Tantillo, "Restauri," 41).

⁹⁴ Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 236-237.

From this entry, one can imagine the once-abundant water sounds with which a visitor would have been enveloped as they entered, not only from the nearby shores of the Tiber River but also by the formidable Triton fountain installed across from the southern Farnesina façade, mere steps from the loggia. The placement of *Polyphemus* and *Galatea* then seems to suggest they were sited on the southern-panels of the western loggia wall to guarantee the audible element of water, be it babbling fountain springs or sounds of the Tiber, which symbolically would evoke Acis, he who had been transformed from mortal to eternal river. Such a metaphorical evocation would undoubtedly serve a dual purpose, for as much as it would complete the essential triad of characters within the loggia it would also add a vivifying aspect to the antique Triton outdoors, the messenger featured so prominently in Gallo's epigram and thus again accentuated through the interior visual program.

Potentially reinforcing this proposed arrangement is Peruzzi's monumental grisaille portrait head that stands out conspicuously among the loggia' upper-register lunettes.⁹⁵ This was not an unprecedented inclusion in contemporary decoration. Recall, for example, Pinturicchio's incorporation of similar grisaille treatments in his fourteenth-century decorations at the Palazzo dei Penitenzieri.⁹⁶ The lunette portrait in the Loggia di Galatea, however, is

⁹⁵ Confirmed to be by the hand of Peruzzi with the discovery of his initials, "BP", inscribed in the plaster adjacent to the head (Frommel, *La Villa*, 2: 93, and Entry 141, 181).

⁹⁶ Indeed, Quinlan-McGrath cites Peruzzi's prior giant head roundel completed for a lunette of the Rocca di Ostia. She also mentions earlier precedents for the same in the Sala Regia frieze of the Palazzo Venezia (begun 1450s) as well as in Pinturicchio's Sala degli Apostoli e Profeti in the Palazzo della Rovere, also known as the Palazzo dei Penitenzieri (1480-1490) (Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa,

decidedly unusual. It does not correspond to the narratives of Sebastiano's lunettes nor, for that matter, to any other tale invoked in the room's visual program.⁹⁷ Also striking is its unusual pose. Instead of assuming the traditional profile pose of a numismatic portrait, the inspiration for many similar roundel portraits of the day, Peruzzi's head assumes a somewhat unnatural twist to its right his gaze extending generally toward the doorway to the adjacent Loggia di Amore e Psiche, yet at the same time angled to be enclosed within the loggia itself.⁹⁸ This portrait had perplexed many, with some even invoking the presence of Michelangelo in its origins.⁹⁹ McGrath suggests it could be a remnant of an earlier visual program or a representative symbol of an antique fragment, but as she concludes, "whatever its meaning, this egregious monochrome head . . . is not to be linked with the other eight lunettes, from which it is also so pictorially distinct."¹⁰⁰

The simplest explanation for its presence would be as an orienting guide for visitors to the loggia. For those just on the precipice of the loggia, this imposing head would undoubtedly draw one inside, similar to the manner in

252; Toby Yuen, "Illusionistic Mural Decorations of the Early Renaissance in Rome" (PhD Diss., New York University, 1972), 138-139).

⁹⁷ As Quinlan-McGrath posits, this head is depicted "due to a Renaissance tolerance, not to iconographic pertinence ("The Villa," 298).

⁹⁸ Frommel reinforces this vague directional gaze: "lo sguardo del giovane è rivolto a destra, ma non è chiaro se si rivolge a una scena particolare" (Frommel, "La Villa," 2: 93).

⁹⁹ Frommel revives this Michelangesque connection by mentioning it is "non per nulla le guide turistiche raccontavano che Michelangelo lo avesse tracciato con pochi tratti di carbonico sul muro durante una visita" (Frommel, "La Villa," 2:181). There is no evidence that Michelangelo actually contributed in any way to this lunette, however a surviving sketch in the *arriccio* below *Galatea* that bears similarities to Peruzzi's monumental head could be the sketch to which these fabled sources refer.

¹⁰⁰ Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 299. The earlier visual program to which Quinlan-McGrath refers is one of emperor portraits, "a theme quite common in the decoration of the times, especially favored by Peruzzi" (Ibid., 299), however she offers no concrete examples to support her claim.

which Venus encourages one's exit into the garden in the adjacent Loggia di Amore e Psiche (a feature which will enjoy additional discussion in the forthcoming pages). Having thus attracted viewers, Peruzzi's head would not only encourage the gaze to examine Sebastiano's and Raphael's scenes on the western wall but it would also orient them correctly to begin reading the astrological ceiling above (Fig. 24). Embedded within this practicality, however, is a foreshadowing of the exchange to continue between these three artists in the years to come.

At the same time Peruzzi's monumental head might have drawn viewers into the loggia, one of Sebastiano's lunette figures in *The Myth of Zephyr* (Fig. 51) reciprocates through a visual cue to the garden outdoors. Identified by Richard Förster¹⁰¹ as depicting Zephyr and his wife Flora, Federico Hermanin challenged this hypothesis by suggesting that the matron of the scene was instead Earth, whose likeness to Flora is strikingly similar.¹⁰² McGrath sides with Hermanin's interpretation, pondering, "one wonders . . . why Sebastiano did not include just one flower if he wanted to indicate Flora."¹⁰³ The absence of a flower can be explained, however, if one looks to the woman's lowered right arm, which hooks across her body and, instead of holding the flower which McGrath notes as conspicuously absent, pronouncedly points out of the lunette frame.

The intent of this gesture was most likely not to point to the scene adjacent to her, that of the monumental head by Peruzzi, as there is no viable connection

¹⁰¹ Förster, 46.

¹⁰² Federico Hermanin, *La Farnesina* (Bergamo: Istituto Italiano d'Arti Grafiche, 1927), 47.

¹⁰³ Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 298.

between the two, nor was it to point to the scenes in the panels below because at the time of Chigi's demise these panels were bare. Her deliberate point nevertheless suggests she is pointing at *something* or *somewhere*, leaving the only alternative being outside, that is, to Chigi's gardens that would have visible when loggia was still open. Thus, Sebastiano's lunette at once both plays on the ambiguities between Earth and Flora - though not including a flower, his figure gestures to the multitude of blooms which were no doubt on view just outside the loggia's archways - while incorporating a similar visual connection between the interior and the exterior, the ancient and the contemporary.

The Competition Persists

Beyond the loggia, a career-spanning competition emerged between Raphael and Sebastiano in works both sacred and secular.¹⁰⁴ Later connections, for example, between Sebastiano's *Portrait of a Young Woman (Dorothea)* (1512-1513) and both Raphael's *La Donna Velata* (1512-1513) and *La Fornarina* (1520), have been cited by scholars,¹⁰⁵ as have relationships between Raphael's *Liberation of Saint Peter* in the Stanza di Eliodoro with his atmospheric treatment of his *Viterbo Pietà*.¹⁰⁶ The capstone of these quotations was that between Sebastiano's *The Raising of Lazarus* (1517-1519) and Raphael's *Transfiguration* (begun 1516), wherein the borrowing of ideas became so extreme that Raphael orchestrated that the two works never be in close enough proximity for charges of copying to be leveled.¹⁰⁷

On the other hand, and most importantly for the Villa Farnesina, the borrowing of ideas between the two masters initiated an exchange that combined

¹⁰⁴ Raphael's response to Sebastiano could arguably have contributed to the development of Raphael's pictorial "vernacular," an element of his later works gaining increasing scholarly attention (Patricia Reilly, "Raphael's *Fire in the Borgo* and the Italian Pictorial Vernacular." *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 92(4) (Dec. 2010), 308-325).

¹⁰⁵ Kia Vahland, "Sebastiano and Raphael," in Giuseppe Scandiani, ed., *Sebastiano del Piombo, 1485-1547*. (Milan: Motta, 2008), 29; Goffen, "Raphael's Designer Labels," 135.

¹⁰⁶ Barbieri posits this work was actually collaboration between Sebastiano and Michelangelo, further fueling the rivalry aspects. (Barbieri, 147.)

¹⁰⁷ Interpretation of a letter from Domenico da Terranuova to Michelangelo in 1518 reveals Raphael aimed to have Sebastiano's painting framed in France, to spite Sebastiano ("per fare dispetto a Bastiano." (Giovanni Poggi, Paola Barocchi, and Renzo Ristori, *Il Carteggio di Michelangelo* (Firenze: Sansoni, 1965-83), Vol 2, 38). As Sheryl Reiss posits: "Hirst and others believe, rightly, I think, that Raphael was "lobbying" to have Sebastiano's painting framed *in situ*, that is to say, in Narbonne, in order that the two works not be compared by a sophisticated Roman audience under the best possible circumstances. Sebastiano, who in retaliation seemingly planned to tell the Cardinal that Raphael robbed him of at least three ducats a day, won this round and his picture was framed and gilt in Rome" (Sheryl Reiss, "Cardinal Giulio de' Medici as a Patron of Art, 1513-1523"(PhD Diss., 1992), 316; Golzio, 71-72; Hirst, 68-69.); Andreas Henning, *Raffaels Transfiguration und der Wettstreit um die Farbe: koloritgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur römischen Hochrenaissance* (München: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2005) 29); and Vahland, 35.

with their innovative abilities. Sebastiano's ingenious quotation of Raphael's *Parnassus* both defined the iconographic conventions for future renditions of Polyphemus and figuratively called for Raphael's response, which yielded Raphael's unprecedented revival of an *all'antica* theme. It also conjured camaraderie that further nuanced each artist's approach, and one could hypothesize that, had a later commission similar in scope to the Loggia arisen for which both Raphael and Sebastiano could have worked in tandem once again, that later engagement might have resulted in a more clear example of co-opetition. For Sebastiano, it was this rivalry with Raphael that kept him at his best, at least according to biographer Giorgio Vasari, who went so far as to posit, "while the competition of art between [Sebastiano] and Raphael lasted, . . . he tired himself continuously, so as to not be held inferior,"¹⁰⁸ whereas Sebastiano's production following Raphael's death suffered from decreasing finesse and speed, as attested to in his work for the *Nativity of the Virgin* (1530-1534) in Chigi's Chapel at Santa Maria del Popolo.¹⁰⁹

For Raphael, responding to Sebastiano's composition with his wholly antique treatment of *Galatea* charted a course for Raphael's subsequent forays

¹⁰⁸ Vasari, *Lives*, 140; Anna Forlani Tempesti, *Rafaello e Michelangelo*, exhibition catalogue. Florence: Casa Buonarroti, 1984), 15.

¹⁰⁹ As Roberto Contini comments, with the death of Raphael, "for the next decade, Sebastiano was considered . . . the most celebrated artist in town. . . . Now Luciani's pride could really be measured without any sort of understatement to the disadvantage of his rival." (in Giuseppe Scandiani, ed., *Sebastiano*, 180). Following that period, however, Sebastiano lost focus, a prime example being his poor performance with *The Nativity of the Virgin* for Chigi's chapel in Santa Maria del Popolo. So slow was his work that Agostino's son, Luigi, called upon fellow artist Francesco Salviati to finish, "and in a short amount of time Salviati was able to achieve that perfection that Sebastiano's negligence and indecision had not." (Vasari, *Lives*, I: 571-572; Tullia Carratù, catalogue entry in Giuseppe Scandiani, ed., *Sebastiano*, 226).

into the fields of archaeology and architecture. His interest in the antique blossomed after this initial competitive engagement, with quotations from the ancient world seen elsewhere not only in his body of work but also in his subsequent projects at the Villa Farnesina. In painting this interest is made apparent in his designs for the Loggia di Amore e Psiche, but even before this lavish space, actually running concurrently with *Galatea*, Raphael embarked upon these themes architecturally, striking a new interaction with Peruzzi.

Chapter Five: Artist as Architect and Archaeologist

“Me ne porge una gran luce [Vitruvio], ma non tanto che basti.”

- Raphael, Letter to Baldassarre Castiglione, 1514

Work in the Loggia di Galatea not only instigated a competition between Sebastiano and Raphael that persisted through the end of the latter's career, but it also most likely played a role in encouraging Raphael's subsequent pursuits of architecture and *all'antica* motifs. When *Galatea* is thus contextualized chronologically as a contemporaneous product to Raphael's first architectural projects, Sebastiano's challenge emerges as a potential catalyst to Raphael's multifarious interests, encouraging not only a rapid transformation of his painterly technique but also a merger of these ideas with his interests in architecture and archaeology.

This chapter examines this trajectory in Raphael's career, tracing his earliest explorations of architecture and archaeology as evidenced in his drawings. Discussion will then turn to his subsequent transition from theorist to practitioner with his architectural debut at the Farnesina in the years following *Galatea's* completion, when he was commissioned to build a riverfront entertainment complex due east from the villa along the Tiber around 1513. Shortly after commencing work on this riverfront casino, Raphael also began work on Farnesina's stables, located at the far northwestern corner of Chigi's property.

Unfortunately, like many of Raphael's architectural projects, little evidence remains of their existence, nor is there adequate documentation to completely reconstruct them. Both of Raphael's Farnesina architectural projects are victims of this documentary lacuna, particularly the riverfront casino, the design and decoration of which is virtually unknown. Nevertheless, the aim of this chapter is to once again contextualize Raphael's architectural pursuits in an examination of his evolution from artist to architect. This chapter also works to offer new interpretations and speculative evidence to continue the reassembly of these fragmentary architectural designs where possible in an effort to resurrect Raphael's first architectural projects.

This reconstruction suggests a potential collaboration between Raphael and Peruzzi in both of Raphael's Farnesina architectural commissions, particularly that of the riverfront casino, allowing continued discussion of the concept of co-opetition. As will be discussed, Raphael, though arguably desirous of his own architectural acclaim, nevertheless coordinated designs for the riverfront casino with Peruzzi to result in a structure that not only accommodated Peruzzi's innovative engineering within the Farnesina complex but also established one of the earliest recorded Renaissance revivals of the ancient nymphaeum. Raphael's subsequent design of the Farnesina stables continues this discussion as he paralleled Peruzzi's artfully merged study of Vitruvian and Albertian principles, creating a structure that would have

complemented Peruzzi's adjacent Villa Farnesina in an ongoing shared commitment between the two architects.

Raphael's expansion from artist to architect and antiquarian was most likely encouraged by both the antiquarian culture that had pervaded Rome as well as his growing companionship with Peruzzi. Practically the same age, the two became close associates once in contact with each other, with Raphael serving as guarantor for a property rented by Peruzzi in Rome in late 1511.¹ And, as mentioned in the previous chapter, Peruzzi was already borrowing from Raphael's artistic approach in his design for Chigi's astrological ceiling, completed roughly between 1509-1511.² Thus, whereas Sebastiano was predominantly a rival, it seems plausible that Peruzzi was a good friend of Raphael and undoubtedly a frequent visitor to Chigi's compound between his contribution to the Loggia di Galatea and his subsequent design for the Sala delle Prospettive several years later. Thus, while the rivalrous engagement between Raphael and Sebastiano yielded a rudimentary co-opetitive exchange, what emerged from the relationship between Raphael and Peruzzi was a case of co-opetition founded in camaraderie. The result in both instances, however, was a

¹ "I guardiani dell'ospedale di Sant' Ambrogio dei Lombardi cedono in enfiteusi a Baldassarre di Giovanni di Silvestro pittore senese, cioè Baldassarre Peruzzi, e a suo fratello Pietro due case appartenenti all'ospedale, alla condizione che quelli entro cinque anni impieghino trecento ducati per riparazioni e miglioramenti; Raffaello interviene a dar cauzione per i due fratelli" (November 18-21, 1511; Golzio, *Raffaello*, 24). Cristiano Tessari suggests that Peruzzi and Raphael might have met as early as the turn of the century: "È possibile, nel contempo, che Peruzzi abbia conosciuto Raffaello – di due anni più giovane – nel periodo precedente l'esecuzione degli affreschi nella libreria Piccolomini, o che, comunque, ne abbia visto i disegni preparatori per alcuni dei cartoni a essi relativi" (Tessari, 20), a point perhaps reinforced in the earlier proposal of Peruzzi and Raphael's shared prototype in the Sienese *Three Graces*.

² Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 251.

more perfect product that could only be achieved by the joining (or clashing) of forces within a large-scale commission. In the case of Raphael and Peruzzi, it was collaborative engagement that spoke to the rise of *all'antica* architectural forms and the achievement of beauty through harmony that yielded a permanent impact on Raphael's future architectural and artistic production. In other words, Raphael's designs for both Chigi's riverfront casino and stables reveal the influence of Peruzzi through unique resonances of Peruzzi's forms that, when put back into Raphael's oeuvre, reveal just how quintessential his time at the Villa Farnesina truly was.

Blurry Beginnings

The problem inherent in examining Raphael's career as an architect is that little evidence remains.³ Though Raphael was involved in a number of architectural commissions from 1514 onward,⁴ few have survived in drawn form

³ Ray reinforces this point: "Il nodo del problema sta nei documenti che, nell'insieme, sono troppo frammentari e lacunose, e lasciano pertanto in ombra ampie zone dell'opera. I disegni, in particolare, sono molto pochi, non soltanto in rapporto ai disegni di figura che conosciamo, ma anche in sé per sé." (Ray, "Il Volo di Icaro," 47).

⁴ John Shearman summarizes the importance of Raphael's role as an architect thus: "I should like to remind you of two statistics. First, Raphael began to erect buildings to his own design . . . [when] he was then 29, . . . [reaching] a full commitment to architecture at about the same age as did Bramante, and earlier than did Brunelleschi, Alberti or Michelangelo. Second, his active architectural career produced results which are impressive in quantity alone. Two large palaces were erected to his designs, the ground plan for a third survives, a fourth . . . in collaboration with Giovanni Francesco da Sangallo, and a fifth in collaboration with Giulio Romano; the huge Chigi Stables at the Farnesina were aesthetically equivalent, in the street façade, to a sixth place. His intervention at Saint Peter's was far more extensive than is commonly admitted; . . . he built a church [as well as the designs for the] Chigi mausoleum in Santa Maria del Popolo; he produced competition designs for San Giovanni de' Fiorentini in Rome and for the façade of San Lorenzo in Florence. . . . All this amounts to a density of activity which would be startling enough in eight years from the life of a man with nothing

and even fewer still stand.⁵ Furthermore, it is impossible to pinpoint the moment at which Raphael's interests turned to architecture or, for that matter, archaeology. The seed could have been planted in his early days in his native Urbino, an architecturally innovative city that boasted the contributions of Leon Battista Alberti and Donato Bramante to the grand architectural visions of Federigo da Montafeltro, the Duke of Urbino.⁶ Equally significant could have been: Raphael's early study with Perugino, from whom he could have gleaned an artist's approach to classical architecture and perspective that would carry him into the sixteenth century; the classicizing influence of Giuliano da Sangallo; or study of the *Codex Escurialensis*, a repository of sketches and drawings of antique monuments and buildings that had been assembled in the workshop of fifteenth-century Florentine painter Domenico Ghirlandaio.⁷ With no personal account to go on, however, nor a dated sketch or plan, one is left to reconstruct a rough chronology using the materials and evidence available, a task made all the more difficult in light of the few early drawings by Raphael available to us today.

else to do" (John Shearman, "Raphael as Architect," *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, 116 (5141) (April 1968), 389.

⁵ As Talvacchia suggests: "[Raphael's] architectural projects, although just as accomplished [*as his painterly works*], had the opposite fate, with few of the buildings extant or enduring in the form that he had envisioned. Further crippling our knowledge of Raphael's attainment in the field of architecture is the dearth of surviving drawings. . . . [*and*] even under the best circumstances of preservation there were never many plans drawn by his hand. The final impediment . . . is the near silence of Vasari on the matter (Talvacchia, *Raphael*, 141).

⁶ "Quando Raffaello nacque, . . . la sua città natale Urbino era, in architettura, uno dei centri più progrediti. Federigo da Montefeltro aveva capito che doveva invitare personalità artistiche . . . per concepire – insieme a loro – il modello di una città post-medioevale." (Frommel, "Raffaello e la sua carriera architettonica," 13).

⁷ As Frommel comments: "influenzato forse da Giuliano da Sangallo, Raffaello sviluppò allora quell'interesse per l'architettura classiche anche non lo abbandonerà più. Verso il 1506-1508 disegnò una veduta dell'interno del Pantheon; ma non è stato accertato se ritrasse il monumento dal vero . . . o – come è invece più probabile – utilizzando lo stesso modello, ora perduto, che usò anche il disegnatore del *Codex Escurialensis*." (Frommel, "Raffaello e la sua carriera architettonica," 17)

One can return, however, to John Shearman's discussion of Raphael's sketch of the Pantheon to propose the start of Raphael's architectural interests as shortly after the turn of the century. Though the thrust of Shearman's article, "Rome, Raphael and the Codex Escurialensis,"⁸ is his argument for Raphael's presence in Rome prior to 1508, in doing so he proposes the date of the drawing as around 1506.⁹ This reinforces Raphael's early presence in Rome, as discussed in Chapter Two, yet it also represents one of the first examples of Raphael's pure study of architecture.¹⁰

To be sure, Raphael had in some sense already begun such exploration through the architectural elements he wove into his paintings. His earliest known architectural drawing¹¹ appears in a study for the *Coronation of St Nicholas of Tolentino* (Lillie, *Musée des Beaux Arts*, 475), wherein a quickly drafted *cortile* overlaps with the bottom right-hand corner of the page.¹² Such study would develop into the grandly painted architecture of Raphael's early works, such as

⁸ Shearman, "Rome, Raphael," 107-146.

⁹ As Shearman comments, "comparison with the architectural elements of the Stockholm *Annunciation* drawing of about 1506-07 will show at least the feasibility of such a date for UA 164." ("Rome, Raphael," 134).

¹⁰ As Arnold Nesselrath reaffirms: "apart from a very few small and minor sketches only one drawing after the antiques from Raphael's early years is preserved, his perspectival views of the Pantheon." ("Raphael's Archaeological Method," in A. Chastel, *Rafaello a Roma: Il Covegno del 1983* (Rome: Edizioni dell'Elefante, 1986), 358).

¹¹ This is not to exclude an ink sketch by Raphael circa 1498 that depicts a series of architectural pediments; this drawing however depicts no buildings but rather mere architectural adornments, which Paul Joannides suggests were "variant designs for the pediment of a tomb or plaque." (Joannides, 134).

¹² As illustrated in Joannides, Plate 4, Cat. 14v, 41, 137. As Joannides comments: "The architecture of the *cortile* bay is not dissimilar to that of the Palazzo Ducale in Urbino, but the decorative pediment on the *piano nobile* window occurs frequently in Perugino's work, and is not necessarily drawn from a real building. It is interesting to note that Raphael has hinted at an overlap in the pilaster framing the corner bay, suggesting that he was already thinking of the differential stress that became so important in High Renaissance architecture." (Joannides, 41). Another such sketch exists from 1506-1507 (Oxford, Ashmolean 534) of a triumphal arch, which Joannides posits was "probably for a pictorial rather than an architectural composition." (Joannides, 167).

seen in the *Sposalizio della Vergine* (1500-1504) (Fig. 65), but Raphael's sketch of the Pantheon interior marks a pivotal moment, as he began his transformation from architectural painter to architect through a concurrent study of the antique.

Architectural design was, in the early years of the *cinquecento*, inextricably linked to study of the antique, or in other words, archaeology. As this sketch illustrated, Raphael readily embraced both. Of course the structures that Raphael sketched were antique themselves, but concurrent with these studies were drawings after antique sculpture as well. In addition to Raphael's previously mentioned quotation of the Piccolomini *Three Graces* ancient sculptural group in 1504, Michael Kwakkelstein has cited additional sketches by Raphael dating to around 1506 that reveal careful study of ancient Roman sculpture held in the Roman Casa Sassi collection.¹³

These instances illustrate some of Raphael's earliest studies as architect and archaeologist and the indelible link between the two practices. In many respects, to be an architect, particularly one who aimed to conjure an *all'antica* style, meant seeking inspiration from antique structures. Raphael thus pursued archaeological explorations with equal fascination, allowing him to develop into "a scholar with a unique understanding of antiquity. . . . and an archaeologist in the modern sense of the word."¹⁴

From this point, Raphael's exploration of the antique and of architecture continued to punctuate his painterly production in the years following. His

¹³ Michael W. Kwakkelstein, "The Model's Pose: Raphael's Early Use of Antique and Italian Art." *Artibus et Historiae*, 23 (46) (2002), 37-60.

¹⁴ Nesselrath, "Raphael's Archaeological Method," 357.

inclusion, for example, of the Roman Torre de Milizia in *Saint George and the Dragon* (1506), his quotation of an ancient *Death of Meadager* relief (the only known examples of which were in Rome) in his design for the *Baglioni Entombment* (1507), his miniature rendition of the *Forum Transitorium* in the *Esterhazy Madonna* (1508) or his quotation of the *Ciampolini Jupiter* in his unfinished *Madonna del Baldacchino* (1507-1508) all allude to his ongoing ruminations on antique architecture.¹⁵ Such thinking about the intersections of the antique and architecture would be invigorated once Raphael was installed at the Villa Farnesina.

Raphael's Riverfront Casino

Around the same time as he commissioned Raphael's *Galatea*, roughly in 1512, Chigi decided to add to his *all'antica* oasis by asking Raphael to design and build a porticoed loggia at the riverfront edge of his property.¹⁶ The result apparently was a magnificent structure, so sumptuous that, as folklore would have it, an elaborate banquet within the riverside loggia in the summer of 1518 culminated in, on Chigi's request, a procession of the dinner party to the edge of

¹⁵ Frommel, "Raffaello e la sua carriera architettonica," 17.

¹⁶ The attribution of the riverfront casino to Raphael was first proposed by Gaspare Celio in 1638 (Celio, 128), and subsequently accepted by Geymüller (Enrico di Geymüller, *Raffaello Sanzio studiato come architetto con l'aiuto di nuovi documenti* (Milan: Hoepli, 1884), 38f) and Frommel (Frommel, *Die Farnesina*, 32-33).

the Tiber to dispose of all of Chigi's priceless serving pieces within its murky water, an extravagant performance to reinforce Chigi's endless wealth.¹⁷

The exact date of the casino's construction remains speculative. Stefano Ray, however, argues that the porticoed structure that appears on a preparatory sketch of Raphael's *Madonna d'Alba* (currently in the holdings of the Musée Wicar, Lille, 456/7r)(Figs. 66 and 67) was an early design of this loggia, which would place its conception around 1511.¹⁸ Further reinforcing this date is Egidio Gallo's mention of the casino (or at least plans for the casino) in his 1511 epigram,¹⁹ suggesting a feasible starting date concurrent with, or immediately in

¹⁷ This fabled story continues by explaining that, prior to this lavish display of excess, Chigi had his servants line the riverbed with nets, allowing an easy retrieval of Chigi's silver goods the following morning. While the accuracy of this fable is doubtful, it is significant in that it suggests that, while portions of the garden were obliterated in the flood of 1514, the riverside loggia apparently survived relatively unscathed, as it was used for this party of epic proportions only four years later in 1518.

¹⁸ Stefano Ray, "Opere per Agostino Chigi," in C.L. Frommel, S. Ray, and M. Tafuri, eds., *Raffaello architetto* (Milan: Electra, 1984), 119. This sketched structure bears visual similarity to the painted architecture of Pinturicchio's *Incoronazione di Enea Silvio Piccolomini* in the Piccolomini Library in Siena, where Raphael was also commissioned to work in 1502-1503 (as evidenced by a signed *modello*; Shearman, *Raphael in Early Modern Sources*, 75). Ray comments that the square ground plan appearing next to his proposed casino design, "che potrebbero essere messi in relazione con la loggia" (Ray, "Opere per Agostino Chigi," 119). In point of fact, though Ray seems quite certain of the link between this sketch and the riverfront loggia, there is no documentary evidence that secures this suggestion, nor is it supported by Joannides' analysis, who suggests that "the architectural elevation and plan are probably for the building under construction in the left background of the *Disputa*" (Joannides, *The Drawings*, 202:278r) What this drawing does bear noticeable similarity to, however, is a sketch of watchtower as dictated through Alberti and described in Cosimo Bartoli's 1550 translation of *De Re Aedifactoria (L'Architettura di Leon Battista Alberti tradotta in lingua fiorentina da Cosimo Bartoli . . . con l'Aggiunta de Disegni* (Florence: Lorenzo Torrentino, 1550); illustrated in *On the Art of Building in Ten Books*, trans. by J. Rykwert, N. Leach and R. Tavernor (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992), 259). While it is unknown if a similar sketch accompanied earlier editions of Alberti, such a connection could prove edifying, as it would support later arguments for Raphael's adherences to Albertian principles in a harmonic exchange with Vitruvius and Peruzzi.

¹⁹ Quinlan-McGrath, "Aegidius Gallus," 5: 123-129, 90-91.) Quinlan-McGrath has pointed out, Gallo's verse reads more as a "piece for the Renaissance stage" than it does a documentary account (Quinlan-McGrath, "Aegidius Gallus," 93), and this, combined with the fact that Gallo and Chigi were good friends, suggests he may have been privy to a planned structure that was not yet constructed or complete but was nevertheless fodder for his epigram. Adding credence to this supposition is the fact that Blosio Palladio's nearly contemporary *Suburbanum Augustini Chisii* makes no mention of the loggia (Quinlan-McGrath, "Aegidius Gallus," 104).

succession to, the *Galatea*. Regardless of the exact date of construction, this structure nevertheless marked the official beginning of Raphael's architectural career, with construction beginning just before the stables.²⁰

For as informative as this inaugural architectural production could be, its ruinous state already in the sixteenth century left little detail to be recorded. Though lauded in its day, and a veritable landmark of Raphael's career, the loggia has long-since been lost, falling victim to the ravages of Tiber flooding. Damaged as early as 1514, it was rebuilt for its magnificent banquet of 1518, only to undoubtedly incur more destruction during the next great flood of the Tiber in 1531, leaving Frommel to find in Duperac's drawing of 1577 only fragments of what once was.²¹ By the following century painter Gaspare Celio wrote of only the ruins of the loggia along the banks of the Tiber.²²

Deciphering the design of this riverfront casino has been made all the more problematic due to the lack of conclusive documentation. Gallo's verse

²⁰ Ray, "Opere per Agostino Chigi," 119.

²¹ Celio, 128; Frommel, *Die Farnesina*, 32; Coffin, *The Villa*, 87. It is unclear as to why Chigi never made an effort to rebuild this garden, but a few suggestions could be proffered: aside from the potential that the flood had eroded the bank of the Tiber so severely that restorations could not have been made, the lack of repairs could also be due to Chigi's attentions elsewhere. As he was already coping with the installation of Pope Leo X by attempting at all costs to curry favor with the Medici family (including being instrumental in the coronation gift of Hanno the Elephant, the first elephant to enter Rome since the Imperial Age), struggling to maintain his control over Porto Ercole, the northern coastal port essential for international trafficking of Chigi's alum, with the Sienese Balià, and continuing to fear his brother Sigismondo's ineptitudes as a banker (all of which are recounted throughout his letters in: Rowland, *The Correspondence*), it seems that perhaps Chigi's worries about supremacy in Rome distracted him from making essential repairs. "Nella veduta di Dupérac del 1577, si distinguono i resti di muri. La parete settentrionale è chiusa, il frammento del muro occidentale aperto da una finestra sul giardino" (Frommel, "La Villa," 42).

²² Cugnoni, 107; Frommel, *Die Farnesina*, 33. Photography from the 1880s, just prior to the construction of the raised traffic embankments that still today line the river, reveals a porticoed riverside oasis, but this space was most likely built in the late sixteenth-early seventeenth century as a "quasi gemella di quella Chigi." (Cremona, 607).

describes the casino as commencing from “a broad way [lying] open in the middle [*from the villa*] which emerges from the bed of the Tiber, and opposes the bank with the aid of a retaining wall, softly inviting to the leisures and shade of the stream. Here a twin portico on both sides most beautiful to see and spacious with many an arch, and many columns, is erected, which at the setting of the burning sun invites the fathers as guests to cups and to elegant banquets.”²³ This excerpt might offer the clearest image of the riverfront casino, however its validity is questionable. Palladio, for example, writing at the same time as Gallo, offers no description of the casino, suggesting Gallo perhaps might have embellished or imagined a partially finished structure.

None of Raphael’s drawings, nor plans, nor even clearly identifiable rudimentary dimensions for the loggia survive either. Indeed, much of what is “known” of the riverfront casino has been handed down through drawings of Rome along the Tiber, all of which reveal the villa and its accompanying outbuildings with varying deviations. The casino appears not only in different locations but also with different architectural designs. Raphael’s study of Vitruvius, which most likely began in earnest once he received his Italian translation of the text around 1514, might offer some insights into the casino’s design, however Vitruvius offers no prescription for such a structure to serve as

²³ “In medio via lata patet: quae Tybridis alveo /Eminet: atque obstanti opponit pariete ripam, /Dulciter invitans ad fluminis ocia et umbras. /Hic gemina utrinque erigitur pulcherrima visu /Et multo spaciosa arcu: multisque columnis /Porticus: in lapsu rabidi quae add pocula solis /Lautaue convivas agitet convivias patres” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 5: 123-129, 90-91.) As Quinlan-McGrath comments, “One might wish to argue that in 1512 [Blosio] could only describe what was finished. However the gardens . . . were merely adumbrated, while Peruzzi’s palace was complete.” (Quinlan-McGrath, “Aegidius Gallus,” 104).

a starting point.²⁴ A final confounding factor in exploring this riverfront structure is how it functioned in conjunction with the purported subterranean grotto.

These challenges preclude the drawing of decisive conclusions on the riverfront casino, leaving one at speculation at best. This hypothetical analysis, however, of the available, if not murky, evidence of the casino's design bears reconsideration as it points to Raphael's continued innovation, this time in architectural form. Qualified with the spirit of conjecture, the following will propose a novel reconstruction of the riverfront casino. The proposal will be made that Raphael's Farnesina casino, along with its related grotto below, revived the ancient nymphaeum, a structure not seen since antiquity. It will be suggested that Raphael's revival of this ancient architectural type was in part to maintain the Farnesina's overall connections to antiquity but also, by including the underground grotto, to accommodate Peruzzi's aquatic engineering necessary for the villa's gardens. From this perspective, the riverfront casino can be seen as illustrating both Raphael's novel approach to architecture while also further supporting a level of ongoing collaboration with Peruzzi.

One can begin with the siting of the casino. If one can glean any similarities by looking across the various depictions, it seems safe to suggest that the casino was nestled along the bank of the Tiber nearly equidistant between the future site of the stables and the extant villa, as Frommel's twentieth-century ground plan implies (Fig. 68). Connected to the villa with a pergolated walkway, also reiterated by Frommel and the remnants of which are visible in Du Pérac's

²⁴ Golzio, 35.

1577 depiction of Rome (Fig. 69)²⁵ as well as Antonio Tempesta's *Pianta di Roma* of 1593 (Metropolitan Museum of Art (1983.1027, 1-12) (Fig. 70), the casino consisted of open porticoes to both the river and the garden that created a pavilion for entertaining, the archways of which were adorned with engaged pilasters of an unknown order.²⁶

Building on these general attributes, a sketch by Sallustio Peruzzi (Baldassarre's son) suggests that the casino was capped with a unique pediment and perhaps even a second floor.²⁷ Ray's analysis of the Lille sketch reiterates a second level. Ray describes, and the drawing shows, a structure potentially having a first level consisting of four bays each enclosed with a balustrade, on top of which was a second floor mimicking the first yet reduced in size and capped with an attic level decorated with volutes.²⁸ He also suggests that the secondary level might also have included a navigable walkway to allow one to perambulate from side to side in keeping with the dual open facades below.²⁹ Ray comments, however, that the inclusion of a second level is problematic, and in an attempt to resolve this issue proposes that the first level seen in the Lille

²⁵ Etienne Du Pérac and Antoine Lafréry, *Nova Urbis Romae Descriptio* (Rome: Antonius Lafreri, 1577).

²⁶ Coffin, 97; reiterated by Ray, "Opere per Agostino Chigi," 119.

²⁷ As Ray comments, "la difficoltà maggiore sta nella presenza di un secondo piano, più stretto, che ripete il primo." (Ray, "Opere per Agostino Chigi," 119).

²⁸ "L'architettura del foglio del 'taccuino rosa' ha qualche probabilità di rappresentare la loggia: un basamento con balaustra, quattro fornic (cosa inconsueta per tipologie di edifici correnti), una terminazione à attico con volute" (Ray, "Opere per Agostino Chigi," 119). Ray also suggests that, considering the superimposed sketches in the attic level, that Raphael considered the possibility for both a horizontal and oblique voluted cornice (Ray, "Opere per Agostino Chigi," 119).

²⁹ "In questo caso, rafforzata anche dalla presenza nel disegno di linee più scure che serrano il portico ai lati, quasi a indicare la chiusura delle testate, in accordo con ciò che sappiamo con l'apertura sui due fronti, l'ipotesi di un'indetificazione dell'opera rappresentata nel 'taccuino rosa' con la loggia sul Tevere" (Ray, "Opere per Agostino Chigi," 119).

sketch is actually part of the building's foundation, or basement, serving as a servant's area for banquet cooking and preparation.³⁰ An alternate explanation for the presence of two levels would be that the first level would have functioned as the central access point to the underground grotto while the second level served as the main entertaining arcade. By the nature of its height, this second floor entertainment space would guarantee not only the best viewing point for the garden but also for the villa itself, as illustrated in an anonymous mid-sixteenth century drawing (Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest) (Fig. 71).

If the orientation of the fragmentary structure seen in the Budapest sketch is correct (which is likely, as it bears architectural features in accordance with those described textually), one is faced with another conundrum for which one can only speculate. This sketch shows a bay of an open portico with an archway on the left (facing south) and a solid wall on the right (facing north). If the casino did indeed have two porticoes, one of which opened onto the gardens and the other the river, this would imply that the casino ran along, not perpendicular to, the river's edge. Frommel's analysis also suggests this alignment along the shores of the Tiber.³¹ In consideration of this orientation, it would seem that this drawing illustrates the end of the riverfront casino, from which the double open portico would have extended southward along the riverbank. This assumption, supported by the singular archway of the structure included in Tempesta's 1593

³⁰ "Si direbbe che la pianta non sia collegabile con il prospetto, a meno di non supporre che rappresenti un livello inferiore, magari interno al basamento, contenente i servizi per i banchetti" (Ray, "Opere per Agostino Chigi," 119).

³¹ Frommel, *Die Farnesina*, 25; as illustrated in Fig. 68.

map, would suggest that the casino perhaps adopted a U-shaped structure, which matching extensions onto the shore toward the villa on its northern and southern ends.³²

In other words, if one merges these architectural attributes of the riverfront casino with what Du Pérac and Tempesta, as well as the anonymous Budapest sketch, reflect, one can envision a riverfront casino that assumed a shape akin to that of the villa, with two bays extending in from the riverfront on either end of the loggia (the portion to the north still remains in the Budapest drawing). The casino loggia arguably thus extended southward to meet the pergolated walkway (remnants of which are again visible in the Budapest drawing) that returned to the forecourt in front of the northern Farnesina façade. This would leave ample room for the four-arch portico included in the Lille sketch. It would not be unreasonable, however, to suggest that there were in fact five archways, replicating in near exactitude the façade of the villa itself.³³ If one

³² Unfortunately Tempesta's map page cuts off any additional bays of the riverfront casino, again forcing one to speculate its potential design.

³³ Also informative is the fact that, at the same time, Bramante was almost complete with his work on the Tempietto (a dating is based on Mark Wilson Jones' assumption that the Tempietto was not complete until roughly 1514 (Mark Wilson Jones, "The Tempietto and the Roots of Coincidence," *Architectural History*, 33 (1990), 1-28), a half-scale structure at San Pietro in Montorio that, in the words of Mark Wilson Jones, "created a novel synthesis which referred to famous antecedents, without directly imitating any of them." Though ultimately intended to commemorate the location of Saint Peter's crucifixion, Bramante merged with this ecclesiastical message his interest in ancient structures, including quotations from numerous sources, including, according to Jones, the Pantheon and Hadrian's villa at Tivoli (Jones, "The Tempietto," 17-18), two essential sources for both Raphael and Peruzzi as well. Being close associates of Bramante, both Peruzzi and Raphael would no doubt have been familiar with his designs, as Jones attests to in the similarities in mathematical footprint between Peruzzi's Villa Farnesina and the Tempietto: "most of the Farnesina's principal measurements are whole numbers in both *palmi* and *pedi*. . . . This same dualism characterizes the design of the Tempietto, the masterpiece of Bramante, with whom Peruzzi had the closest of professional links." (Jones, "Palazzo Massimo," 66) Raphael's knowledge of the Tempietto is no doubt reflected in his designs for Chigi's Chapel in Santa Maria del Popolo, begun at approximately

can assume a structural similarity between the riverfront casino and the villa, one could propose an extrapolation of stylistic design as well, a straightforward simplicity that is suggested in the Budapest drawing (Fig. 71), including archways springing from Doric piers to create the open-air portico, all of which was capped with a cornice decorated with dentil molding running underneath.³⁴

Ray's closing remarks on this riverfront casino not only reinforce this proposed layout but also extend it by alluding to parallels with the contemporary Nymphaeum built at Genazzano near Palestrina, designed as a space of pleasure and entertainment presumably for Pompeo Colonna (Fig. 73).³⁵ His connection between the two structures ends there, perhaps because there is no scholarship to confirm either the architect or the source for this Genazzano structure's design, nor has subsequent scholarship considered further analysis of this connection.

Advancing Ray's initial remarks, a comparison of this structure at Genazzano and Raphael's riverfront project suggests that Raphael perhaps incorporated a nymphaeum into his designs. Raphael himself has never been associated with the Genazzano nymphaeum; Peruzzi, on the other hand, has

the same time and thus perhaps modeled the design of Chigi's riverfront casino as a reduced-scale emulation of his villa.

³⁴ With these design elements in mind, it seems one could look to a later riverfront casino constructed on the property, roughly in the mid-eighteenth century, that might have borrowed its design from Raphael's original (Figs. 80-82). While not the loggia of Chigian lore, evident mainly as it is set upon a fortified embankment that post-dated Chigi's era, it would seem this later creation could have borne some of the hallmarks of the original riverfront casino, giving a potential glimpse of what the original structure could have looked like. For an expanded discussion of the evolution of the Tiber embankment, please refer to: Lanciani, *The Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*.

³⁵ "Il bramantesco 'ninfeo' di Genazzano, esso pure prospiciente un fiume e con destinazioni affini, del resto, offre una interessante indicazione verso la ricerca di una soluzione corposa e modellata con forza" (Ray, "Opere per Agostino Chigi," 119).

been linked to its design in some capacity. This connection, combined with the necessity for Raphael's casino's design to accommodate the functionality of Peruzzi's garden waterworks, suggests collaboration between Raphael and Peruzzi, a sharing of ideas that arguably resulted in both one of the earliest Renaissance revivals of the nymphaeum type in Rome and the artful blending of the fantasy of the garden with the functionality of Peruzzi's aquatic engineering within the Farnesina grounds.

The Novelty of the Nymphaea

Nymphaea, generally referring to a place for nymphs to congregate, were a concept from antiquity that were beginning to reappear in the early years of the *cinquecento*.³⁶ An ancient poem appearing in a late fifteenth-century compendium gave rise to the popularity of the "Sleeping Nymph" fountain, the first version of

³⁶ The revival of the nymphaeum was not without complication. Known to antiquity simply as the *sanctum* in which the nymphs resided, the concept of the nymphaeum was often misunderstood by *cinquecento* scholars. As Frank Alvarez posits, "the nature of the nymphaeum [in the Renaissance] was . . . a subject of controversy among scholars . . . at times frankly admitting bewilderment at the vague and often contradictory literary evidence" (Frank Alvarez, "The Renaissance Nymphaeum: Its Origins and Its Development in Rome and Vicinity" (PhD diss., Columbia University, 1981), 49). Pomponio Leto likened the nymphaeum to a source of water, similar to an aqueduct ("De vetustate urbis," *De Roma prisca et nova* (Rome, 1523), 23; Alvarez, 55), as did Andrea Fulvio (*Antiquaria urbis* (Rome, 1513), 40; Alvarez, 55), while Fabio Calvo illustrated several nymphaea in his eventual *Antiquae urbis Romae* of 1527 yet avoided full description of their function (Alvarez, 54). Thus, those structures that ascribed to the features of a nymphaeum, such as the water pools, were commonly referred to instead as *grotta* or *fontana* (Alvarez, 63). Interestingly, a letter from Paolo Giovio to Ferrante Gonzaga in 1547 suggests *ninfeo suburbana* as the name for Gonzaga's villa, implying it was synonymous with *villa suburbana*. (Paolo Giovo, *Lettere*, ed. by G.G. Ferrero (Rome, 1958), II, 117). Alvarez goes on to claim that the term "nymphaeum" was not correctly ascribed until Pirro Ligorio's designs for the Casino of Pius IV in the Vatican in the second half of the sixteenth century (using Ligorio's variant of "lymphaeum") (Alvarez, 71).

which was installed at the Vatican in 1512.³⁷ This water feature incorporated the ancient statue of a reclining Ariadne set within a craggy grotto niche and in essence revived the nymphaeum type. Soon after, Colocci installed a similar nymphaeum in his *vigna*, inseting a relief depicting a reclining nymph into the ruins of an ancient Roman aqueduct that transversed his property.³⁸

The elaboration of these nymphaea continued over successive installations during the sixteenth century. Blosio Palladio, for example, dedicated a tiered fountain within his gardens to such a purpose near the Vatican in 1547.³⁹ The popularity of this type was in part due to the perceived symbolic connection between nymphs and the Muses, the narratives and imagery of which were central to early sixteenth-century humanist thought. Indeed, Palladio's nymphaeum was referred to as Parnassus in its day, as was a similar nymphaeum incorporated into the casino within the *vigna del Bufalo*, constructed around the mid-point of the sixteenth century and adjacent to Colocci's gardens.⁴⁰

The popularity of the nymphaeum, its allusions to Parnassus and its elaboration from stand-alone fountain to incorporation into exceedingly larger structures, for example *vigne* casinos, gives some contextual background for the

³⁷“Huius nymphae loci, sacra custodia fontis/ Dormio dum blandae sentior murmur aquae./ Parce meum quisquis tangis cava Marmora somnum/ Rumpere: sive bibas, siva lavere taces” (Michael Fabricius Ferrarinus, included in *Corpus inscriptionum latinarum* (Berlin, 186-1940), 6: 5, 3e); Elizabeth McDougall, “The Sleeping Nymph: Origins of a Humanist Fountain Type,” *The Art Bulletin*, 57 (3)(Sep., 1975), 357.

³⁸ McDougall, “The Sleeping Nymph,” 362; Elizabeth McDougall, *Fountains, Statues and Flowers: Studies in Italian Gardens of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1994), 48.

³⁹ Girolamo Rorario, *Quod animalia bruta ratione melius homine libri duo*, II (Paris, 1648), 117; McDougall, “The Sleeping Nymph,” 363.

⁴⁰ McDougall, “The Sleeping Nymph,” 363.

nymphaeum found at Genazzano. Frommel's analysis of this nymphaeum, which he confidently places within the oeuvre of Bramante,⁴¹ provides the ground plan of a central three-bay structure, flanked on either end with exedra extensions (Fig. 73). Attached to these central bays through columnated archways was a secondary set of three chambers, the central one of which also was extended with an exedra. The entirety of this rear wall of the nymphaeum was punctuated with small niches. The extant remains, including an inner columnated wall that separated the two halves of the structure, reveal archways supported by Doric columns extending from either entablature and punctuated with equidistant circular penetrations.

Subsequent to Frommel's interpretation, scholars have proposed other influences at play in the nymphaeum's design. James Ackerman, for example, describes this design as "too inelegant in detail for the architect of Saint Peter's," and thus proposes it is borrowed from Raphael's designs for a garden loggia at the Villa Madama.⁴² The recent work of Piers Dominic Britton, perhaps most pertinent to this current analysis, draws parallels between a sketch by Peruzzi (U529Ar) (Fig. 74) and the designs for this nymphaeum. Although this drawing most often associated with Peruzzi's preparations for work at Saint Peter's,

⁴¹ Christoph Luitpold Frommel, "Bramantes 'Ninfeo' in Genazzano," *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 22 (1969) 137-160. Christoph Thoenes challenged this attribution ("Note sul 'ninfeo' di Genazzano," *Studi Bramanteschi* (Rome, 1974), 575-583), as did Arnaldo Bruschi (*Bramante* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977), 1048ff), and still today it remains debated. Frommel reiterates his attribution in a brief reference in his recent monograph published on the Farnesina, suggesting that Chigi and Peruzzi might have found inspiration in the Nymphaeum's design for the villa: "Chigi e Peruzzi potrebbero essere venuti a conoscenza di simili progetti grazie a Bramante che nel "Ninfeo" di Genazzano diede la forma più perfetta a questa tipologia" (Frommel, "La Villa," 58).

⁴² James S. Ackerman, "The Tuscan/Rustic Order: A Study in the Metaphorical Language of Architecture." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 42 (1) (Mar., 1983), 26.

Britton points out specific elements included in the drawing that suggest ruminations on alternate structures. He cites, for example, the two uppermost plans (numbered 1 and 3 in Fig. 74), which are direct quotations from the water court and nymphaeum at Hadrian's Villa in Tivoli.⁴³ Furthermore Britton isolates the plan located at the lower center (numbered 2 in Fig. 74) of the sketch as not only quoting another antique structure, that of the Basilica of Maxentius and Constantine, but also strikingly similar to the rear elevation wall of the Genazzano Nymphaeum.

The question Britton is left with is whether Peruzzi here is studying from or designing for the Genazzano nymphaeum, a question whose answer depends on the date Peruzzi began assisting with the design of Saint Peter's. Britton cites the work of Meg Licht, who proposes Peruzzi was already assisting Bramante as early as 1505,⁴⁴ and thus suggests, "if Licht is correct, . . . Peruzzi might have been either simply an assistant to Bramante or else a coadjutor with creative responsibilities," particularly on projects such as the Genazzano nymphaeum.⁴⁵ Setting aside the ongoing complication of chronology, namely that this sketch, as well as Peruzzi's first study with Bramante, both remain undated, Britton and Licht's analysis shed insight into Peruzzi's potential role in the architectural revival of the antique nymphaeum. Pushing this hypothesis further, and in consideration of Ray's preliminary association between the Genazzano

⁴³ Piers Dominic Britton, "A Peruzzi Drawing and the Nymphaeum at Genazzano." *Notes in the History of Art*, 19 (4) (Summer 2000), 1.

⁴⁴ Meg Licht, ed., *L'Edificio a pianta centrale: Lo sviluppo del disegno architettonico nel Rinascimento* (Florence, 1984) 93-94.

⁴⁵ Britton, 5.

nymphaeum and the Farnesina casino, one could propose that Peruzzi's peripheral ruminations in ink were not intended for work at Genazzano but rather at the Farnesina.

While this connection cannot be reinforced with a comparison of ground plans, it is nevertheless supported by a comparison of both the verbal descriptions and the Lille drawing (Figs. 66 and 67) with the Genazzano ground plan. Though admittedly sketchy, Raphael's drawing at Lille depicts a two-tier structure set atop a noticeably enlarged base. The first floor appears as a series of four archways delineated with a single pilaster between each. It bears indications that it was to be enclosed by a balustrade or parapet, and a small red chalk mark in the center of each arch suggests an additional element, however it is too nondescript to offer interpretation.

The second level has a similar series of four archways, again with a pilaster dividing each, except for the space between the center two archways, where a double pilaster appears. The vague suggestion of pilaster capitals visible suggest the Doric order and rise to meet a thin entablature, on top of which rests some sort of placard. This upper level bears more deliberate indications of a balustrade or parapet along with more drawing within the individual archways, suggesting perhaps that these upper level arches framed niches filled with sculpture rather than a secondary level, yet again this is too vague to determine.

Some parallels can be discerned between this preliminary sketch and reconstructions of the Genazzano nymphaeum. Although Raphael's sketch

includes four bays to Genazzano's three, the engaged pilasters that appear across Raphael's façade are similar to those seen in the remnants of the nymphaeum. Furthermore, the small notations seen between each arch in Raphael's drawing could refer to niches further within, such as is seen at Genazzano. Ray's thickened lines, which he attributed to supports for an upper-level porch could instead be perceived as the implication of an exterior curved wall. This would have accommodated an exedra within, thus further aligning this sketch with the nymphaeum's design. What is perhaps most striking, however, in connecting these two structures is a comparison between the ruin in the anonymous Budapest drawing and Frommel's reconstructed elevation for the Genazzano nymphaeum (Fig. 75). The similarity between this sketched fragmentary structure and that which would be the equivalent portion of Frommel's reconstruction suggests that some connection between the two structures is plausible.

Further reinforcing the presence of a nymphaeum component within Raphael's Farnesina casino design is the potential connection construed with the Muses and allusions to Parnassus. The Farnesina grounds, as discussed in previous chapters, were to be an ideal locale for humanist contemplation. Drawing allusions to the sacred waters of Parnassus' Hippocrene spring, the waters of the nymphaeum would recall that revered mount and thereby conjure imaginative imagery of the Muses who lived there. Additionally, the notion of the nymphaeum as the space wherein the nymphs could come and bathe in its

waters again furthers the role of Chigi's grounds in the congregation of mythological deities and entities. Creating this allusory connection would in turn have been reinforced by the presence of antiquities, for example the Sarcophagus of the Muses (Fig. 35), thereby completing the fantasy. Thus, if one accepts the inclusion of a nymphaeum within Raphael's design for the Farnesina casino, one can look to other relatively contemporary designs for such structures in an effort to yet again come to better terms in understanding how this riverfront space looked and functioned.

The first of these is the casino of the *vigna del Bufalo*, completed roughly around 1525 near the Trevi Fountain (Figs. 76 and 77).⁴⁶ Surviving until the nineteenth century, the del Bufalo casino featured a nymph fountain at its center, inset into a shallow roccailled niche. Atop this niche was a decorative element including a roundel, perhaps illustrating the del Bufalo family crest, with a molding above that created the lower boundary of the upper belvedere's parapet. While Enrico Maccari's engraving of the façade suggests an equal pairing of doorways on either end of the building which are then matched with a series of three niches that extend to the roofline (Fig. 77), the photograph of the structure reveals in actuality that the only doorway is on the left-hand side of the

⁴⁶ Rolf Kultzen proposes this approximate dating: "Immerhin sei unter Hinweis auf eine demnächst an anderer Stelle ausführlich nachzuliefernde Begründung festgestellt, dass die Malereien Polidoros im Giardino del Bufalo gegen 1525 entstanden sein dürften – das heist, in den mittleren Jahren der selbständigen Tätigkeit Polidoros in Rom, di etwas 1520 nach der Fertigstellung von Raphaels Loggiendekoration [Loggia di Amore e Psiche] beginnt und 1527 mit dem Sacco di Roma endet, als der Künstler di Stadt für immer verlässt" (Rolf Kultzen, "Die Malereien Polidoros da Caravaggio im Giardino del Bufalo in Rom," *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz*, 9 (2) (Feb. 1960), 102. The villa itself was located along present-day via del Bufalo near the intersection with via del Nazareno.

structure, presumably the portal for accessing the belvedere stairway. On the right-hand side of the casino, the doorway has been replaced with a visibly smaller niche.

While the sculpture that once inhabited these niches has been lost, what remains are significant portions of the casino's plaster façade, the entirety of which was originally decorated in fresco. Peruzzi's workshop assistants Polidoro da Caravaggio and Maturino were the two artists responsible for the cycle, which depicted the creation of the Hippocrene spring, the magical water sourced from Parnassus. This fresco cycle, portions of which still survive today, thus, as Christian summarizes, "[allowed] guests to imagine that the del Bufalo had transported the supernatural fountain from Greece to Rome."⁴⁷ These allusions to Parnassus and the overall design elements of the del Bufalo casino could have easily related to Raphael's Farnesina casino design, considering that both Polidoro da Caravaggio and Maturino had, just prior, completed work with the Sala delle Prospettive at the Farnesina and perhaps also contributed to the façade frescoes there, a point to be returned to in the following chapter.

A Noteworthy Sketch "nel'orto d'agostin chigi"

Another source to consider that perhaps reveals something of Raphael's Farnesina casino is that included in the sketch of the *Cowering Psyche* (Fig. 40). As

⁴⁷ Christian, *Empire*, 179. The Casino del Bufalo's fresco fragments are currently housed in the Museo di Roma.

discussed in Chapter Three, this sketch served as a crucial piece of evidence to corroborate the presence of the *Cowering Psyche* on Chigi's grounds, as next to her feet appears the inscription: "nel'orto d'agostin chigi." Adjacent to the *Cowering Psyche* in this drawing is an architectural sketch of the left half of a structure (Fig. 78). At its center is a rectangular opening, flanked by two Doric pilasters that frame a shell-capped niche. Another rectangular panel above the opening suggests a sculpted relief aligned with the top of the adjacent niche, and the structure itself is capped with a decorative flourish seemingly incorporating a figure within a shell motif and punctuated at the far end with a ball finial. This architectural sketch has, to this point, been classified as a preparatory image for an ornate fireplace for Florentine Palazzo Altoviti. In the following pages, however, the argument will be made for a reinterpretation of this sketch as instead potentially depicting a portion of the Farnesina's riverfront casino.

John Shearman was the first suggest that this drawing depicted Jacopo Sansovino's designs for a fireplace to be included in the Florentine Palazzo Altoviti, a work eventually lost when the palazzo came under the control of the Corsini. He made this connection through the additional inscription found in the rectangular opening of this structure at the far right margin, "Jacopo Sa/sovino/ in casa Sgr ato/viti."⁴⁸ Shearman's interpretation has since become the commonly accepted reading of this image.⁴⁹ His interpretation, however, seems

⁴⁸ Shearman, *The Chigi Chapel*, 230; Schwarzenberg, "Die Psychen-Statue," 121; Bruce Boucher, *The Sculpture of Jacopo Sansovino*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), I: 361, no. 82)

⁴⁹ See Mary D. Garrard, "The Early Sculpture of Jacopo Sansovino: Florence and Rome" (Ph.D. Diss., Johns Hopkins University, 1975), 275-278; Boucher, 261.

predicated only on this inscription, which, in point of fact, does not reference a fireplace. Furthermore, Vasari's original description of the fireplace's design also does not resonate in this image. Vasari, for example, mentions the presence of a relief depicting Vulcan and two *putti* atop holding the Altoviti coat of arms.⁵⁰ Neither Vulcan nor the *putti*, however, are included in this sketch. Vasari potentially accounts for the missing cherubs by explaining their removal to be transformed into a fountain, but this does not account for the missing image of Vulcan, nor does it explain the missing Altoviti arms, which in this drawing are replaced with a shell motif.

Moreover, this repeated shell motif seems an unusual inclusion for a fireplace. The image of Vulcan to which Vasari refers seems more appropriate for a hearth, the allusion to Vulcan's forge apparent. The shell motif, however, though admittedly used in a wide variety of Renaissance contexts, nevertheless rather seems more appropriate as a tie-in to maritime mythological allusions, such as seen in Raphael's *Galatea* or Venus in her shell as she appears on the Casino del Bufalo (Fig. 76).

The questions raised regarding Shearman's interpretation create a murky connection between this drawing and the Sansovino fireplace and leave room for an alternate interpretation of this sketch. One potential reading of this sketch is

⁵⁰ "For Messer Bindo Altoviti [Sansovino] had a chimney-piece of great cost made, all in grey-stone carved by Benedetto da Rovezzano, which was placed in his house in Florence, and Messer Bindo caused Sansovino to make a scene with little figures for placing in the frieze of that chimney-piece, with Vulcan and other Gods . . . but much more beautiful are two boys of marble that were above the crown of the chimney-piece, holding some arms of the Altoviti in their hands, which have been removed by Signor Don Luigi di Toledo . . . and place about a fountain in his garden" (Vasari, *Lives*, II: 807; Boucher, 261).

that it instead relates to the design of the Farnesina's casino, a connection reinforced through comparison with similar contemporaneous reconstruction imagery by Francisco de Holanda illustrating the ancient Grotto of Egeria (Fig. 79).⁵¹

Discovered in the 1520s, this grotto was attributed by contemporaries to that of the celebrated Egeria, a nymph who was honored with an ancient Roman cult and also served as council to King Numa Pompilius.⁵² Holanda's image offers a reconstruction of the ruined grotto, including the Renaissance import of an ancient river god statue seen within the space.⁵³ The façade that Holanda envisions here exhibits some important similarities to that seen in the Florentine sketch. For example, the column-flanked niche adjacent to the central opening appears in both images, and while the niche in the Florentine drawing is devoid of sculpture, as appears in Holanda's image, the pedestal included in the drawing suggests sculpture was once included. In addition, Holanda's view includes two niches within the grotto interior. This interior niche is perhaps what is indicated in the Florentine drawing in question: within the rectangular

⁵¹ Holanda's depiction of the grotto dates to around 1538, and while the Florentine sketch is undated, if one accepts the attribution of the sketch to the hand of Giovanni Battista da Sangallo, as Ian Campbell proposes in his analysis of the Codice Stosch ("Introduction," in Lyon & Turnbull (Firm), *Printed Books, Maps, Photographs and Manuscripts* (Edinburgh, 2005), 5-10), one can surmise the date of the sketch to be between the 1520s and the 1570s. As Cremona suggests, Sangallo's initial access to the Farnesina gardens could have been as early as 1518, when "un esponente dei Sangallo, Giovanni Francesco, fosse presente nel 1518 come perito estimatore dei lavori di costruzione delle stalle monumentali" (Cremona, 587); the upper bound of the 1570s is assumed since the drawing's inscription, "nel'orto d'agostin chigi," most likely would not have appeared following the sale of the property to the Farnese family in 1579. While this makes for a wide window of time, it nevertheless places both images in relative chronological concordance.

⁵² Flaminio Vacca, *Memoriae di varie antichità trovate in diversi luoghi della città di Roma* (Rome, 1594), no. 83; Alvarez, 14; Christian, *Empire*, 179

⁵³ Christian, *Empire*, 179.

opening appears a small niche inset within the recessing wall. These connections seems to suggest that the Sangallo sketch is depicting not a fireplace but rather a full-scale architectural form that bore the hallmarks of a nymphaeum, thereby aligning it with Raphael's riverfront project.

This is not to suggest that the elements between these two images are identical; on the contrary, Holanda's grotto façade exhibits greater architectural articulation of these side niches, with blocky, rusticated columns and capped with triangular pediments. The general connections, however, established between these two images serves to further reinforce the notion that the Florentine sketch depicts not a fireplace but rather another structure altogether.

An alternate reading of this image is that it depicts another feature within the Farnesina grounds, arguably a portion of Raphael's riverfront casino and nymphaeum. The maritime motifs seen within the sketch would correspond to the location next to the Tiber while also feeding into the numerous references to Venus within the Farnesina grounds. What, then, to make of the inscription, "Jacopo Sansovino in the House of Altoviti"? One could argue that this phrase is included not so much to identify the structure being portrayed but rather to identify the artist and to give the drawing a time stamp, perhaps indicating an instance during which Sansovino was a guest of the Palazzo Altoviti in Rome.

While no documentation of such a visit exists, Sansovino was indeed an associate of Raphael. Vasari recounts Raphael's judgment of Sansovino the winner of a sculpture contest for Sansovino's small bronze version of the *Laocoön*,

in Rome in 1508. He also completed a bronze of the *Madonna del Parto* for the Roman Church of Sant'Agostino, which appeared along side the work of Raphael and Andrea Sansovino, who had taken Jacopo as a student and soon after adopted him into his artistic family. Raphael and Andrea had worked together in what Virginia Ann Bonito termed "an early, concrete realization of the theoretical *paragoni*" in the creation of Raphael's fresco of *The Prophet Isaiah* and Andrea Sansovino's *St. Anne, the Virgin and Child* for the Tomb of Johann Goritz between 1510-1512.⁵⁴ Furthermore, Raphael was also an associate of Bindo Altoviti, painting his portrait in 1515, while Altoviti was living in Rome.⁵⁵ This connection between the three increases the potential that this drawing is perhaps related to a Roman structure, tentatively Raphael's Farnesina casino.

This inscription also could imply Sansovino was a collaborator on the design for the Farnesina casino, as was perhaps, Giovanni Battista Cordiani da Sangallo, to whom this drawing has been previously attributed. Giovanni

⁵⁴ Bramante had facilitated this competition: "whereupon Bramante, . . . having seen some drawings by [Sansovino], . . . took him under his protection and ordered him that he should make a large copy in wax of the Laocoön, which he was having copied by others. . . . Bramante [then] caused to be seen by Raffaello Sanzio of Urbino, in order to learn which of the four had acquitted himself best; whereupon it was judged by Raffaello that Sansovino, young as he was, had surpassed the other by a great measure" (Vasari, *Lives*, I: 805). Garrard argues for a date of late 1507 or 1508 based on time during which all of the contestants would have been in Rome (Garrard, 99-100) This winning piece has since been lost (Boucher, 361). Bonito continues her discussion of these two pieces in Sant'Agostino thus: "it seems particularly important to understand how the artists had intended the sculpture and painting to be seen in relation to each other. . . . Raphael's *Isaiah* responds and relates to the *Saint Anne* group and to the viewer in the nave, with the exciting chromatics and execution which are the hallmark of [Raphael's current] phase." (Virginia Anne Bonito, "The Saint Anne altar in Sant'Agostino: Restoration and Interpretation," *The Burlington Magazine*, 124 (950) (May, 1982), 268; 273-275. The dating of this tandem commission in Sant'Agostino to between 1510-1512, around the same time as Raphael's execution of the Farnesina *Galatea* (between 1512-1513), suggests a relation between the two in terms of inter-artist competition and emergent co-opetition.

⁵⁵ For more on the association between Raphael and Altoviti, please see: David Alan Brown and Jane Van Nimmen, *Raphael & The Beautiful Banker: The Story of the Bindo Altoviti Portrait* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005).

Battista, the younger brother of Antonio da Sangallo, completed a handful of recorded drawings during his time in Rome. The majority of these sketches are known through a twenty-three-folio compendium depicting ancient Roman monuments, known as the Codex Stosch. Campbell surmises, “Giovanni Battista could have done these [Codex] drawings for Raphael,” and goes further to suggest that “they probably give us a better impression of what Raphael intended [for the reconstruction of ancient Rome] than anything else.”⁵⁶ This page depicting *Cowering Psyche* is one of only two other documented works attributed to Giovanni Battista’s hand, included today within the Royal Institute of British Architect’s Drawings and Archives collection. The relative scarcity of Giovanni Battista’s drawings, combined with the close connection he apparently held with Raphael, again furthers the argument that this structure seen adjacent to *Cowering Psyche* relates more to Raphael and Rome than Florence and the Altoviti fireplace.

Gaining Insight on the Grotto

Accepting these potential connections sheds potentially enlightening new perspective on the design and function of Raphael’s Farnesina casino. Specifically, these sources provide some plausible visual elements that might have been incorporated into the casino, including most notably a nymphaeum component. This connection is crucial as it could rectify some problematic

⁵⁶ Campbell, “Introduction,” 5-10.

aspects of the recurring references to the Farnesina's grotto. Both Gallo and Palladio described the grotto as physically below the casino, and its entrance, visible in Du Pérac's illustration, was apparently still identifiable as late as the 1880s.⁵⁷ The poems of both Gallo's and Palladio's poems highlight Chigi's grotto, describing it as a fishpond or bathing and boating pond lined with seating and accessible from exterior stairs: "Now one is delighted to see the gardens; now the cave gently adjacent to the gardens; the cave suitable for a Bathing-pool, and cool swimming."⁵⁸ Scholars have repeatedly accepted Gallo's description as fact.⁵⁹ One must question, however, how accurate Gallo's account of the grotto truly was, particularly in light of the fact that no other accounts from the period reinforce his description. Having established the flowery nature of Gallo's

⁵⁷ "Del suddetto portico dà una vivace descrizione Egidio Gallo nel citato poemetto del 1511: sotto la loggia un antro, con la volta forate da un'ampia apertura circondata de sedili, fungeva da pescheria alimentata dall'acqua del fiume. Il piccolo edificio così esposto agli staripamenti del Tevere al limite delle Mure Aureliane, nelle varie edizioni del 1773. Nel 1880 è ritratto in un'aquarelle di Ettore Roesler Franz; infine è visibile ancora integro in una rara fotografia anteriore al 1884. Il rudero definitivamente abbattuto durante i lavori per la costruzione del Lungotevere tra il 1884-1886" (Gerlini, *La Villa Farnesina*, 17).

⁵⁸ The exact location of this underground grotto along the Tiber bank is difficult to determine, as much of it was destroyed in early sixteenth-century flooding. Vestiges, however, are visible in sixteenth century drawings, namely those of Sallustio Peruzzi (1564-65) and E. Dupèrac (1577), though these depictions unfortunately offer little concrete insight. ". . . nunc hortis subiectum molliter antrum. Antrum Piscinae, gelidisque natatibus aptum" (Quinlan-McGrath, "Aegidius Gallus," 5: 116-117, 89) Gallo also devotes a good portion of his lines to the grotto: "for under Jupiter runs the easy descent into a cave, a cave worked by art. . . either it is a grotto, or that which the Gods decided to be the spot among the bowels of the Earth, where they could occasionally set aside their weighty cares on coming from the pure ether. Within are sweet waters, which the wall itself receives from the Tiber by the way of a double window. . . They, wondering whether the Nymphs flock together with tremulous leap, straightway hide themselves in the first mouth of the pond. Within are the seats pleasing to the Gods, more pleasing to the Nymphs in which they enjoy residing with busy song" (Sub Iove nam occurrit facilis descensus in antrum, /Arte laboraturm Caelo faelicus antrums: /Au tantrum, aut intra Telluris viscera quem Dii /Esse locum voluere, graves ubi ponere curas /Interdum ex liquido venientes aethere possent. /Intus aquae dulces: duplici quas ipse fenestra /Ex Tyberi paries decipit, servatque receptas. /Intus longa patent arii certamina piscis: /Qui dubitans tremulo salute concurrere Nymphas /Protinus in primo se gurgitas occulit ore. /Intus grata Deis: mage grata sedilia Nymphis /In quibus assiduo gaudent consistere cantu" (Quinlan-McGrath, "Aegidius Gallus," 5: 132-141, 90-91).

⁵⁹ See, for example, Gerlini, *La Villa Farnesina*, 17; Coffin, *The Villa*, 97.

embellishments on the villa, it is plausible that his account is more fantastical than factual. There is in fact no evidence to suggest such an extensive underground lair was ever constructed, a point reinforced by the few vestiges of this grotto that have been identified in period drawings, none of which suggest such a grandiose structure. Further complicating the grotto's existence is the fact that the downward slope of the Tiber bank would have made any full-scale grotto a noticeable intrusion on the shoreline and would have most likely created such a pitch to have made the construction of the accompanying riverfront casino impossible.⁶⁰

Gallo's words could, however, be read as indicating the presence of a nymphaeum, which was sometimes used interchangeably with "grotto" to refer to an elaborate water feature or reflecting pond sometimes secluded within a manmade cave. As Alvarez comments, "those structures that ascribed to the features of a nymphaeum, such as the water pools, were commonly referred to instead as *grotta* or *fontana*."⁶¹ From this perspective, perhaps Gallo is indeed referring to a nymphaeum, taking the form of an above-ground grotto-like space on the casino's ground level, accessible from the gardens yet seemingly entering into an underground lair.

This leaves room for an additional below-ground component to the casino, but it would seem that this underground space, perhaps viewable from

⁶⁰ Reinforcing this point is Frommel's suggestion that Peruzzi sited the location of the villa to accommodate the sloping banks: "Il terreno, . . . raggiungeva una lunghezza di più 150 m, ma una buona parte si trovava così in basso e così vicino al fiume che non era edificabile (Frommel, "La Villa," 45).

⁶¹ Alvarez, 63.

the above-ground nymphaeum, served a more practical purpose. In other words, it served not so much as a pleasure space but rather as a more utilitarian access point for water supply to the villa's cisterns, fountains, and garden irrigation systems. This interpretation implies a collaborative interaction between Raphael and Peruzzi, an implication strengthened with the knowledge that Peruzzi devoted a great deal of time to the engineering of Chigi's garden fountains and perhaps this grotto component itself.⁶²

The fountains once included with the Farnesina grounds were an additional source of spectacle. A Mantuan ambassador in attendance at Chigi's 1518 festivities for Pope Leo X described an "underground fountain" that transported water from the Tiber "with some ingenuity," and Frommel mentions Peruzzi's engineering of a monumental water wheel, perhaps the same structure noted by the ambassador, at the same event.⁶³ Remnants of other fountains, such as that of the converted strigilated sarcophagus (Fig. 41), suggest that the gardens were indeed dotted with such water features, which would have required a carefully crafted plumbing network and a vast resource of water. The Tiber, of course, was an obvious source, however the fact that Chigi's grounds

⁶² Indeed, Frommel comments on a monumental water wheel engineered by Peruzzi for the first of Chigi's lavish 1518 festivities: "Das Haus glänzte von Silbergeschirr, und im Garten konnte man einen Brunnen bewundern, der durch eine besondere Maschinerie, wohl eine Art von Wasserrad, das Wasser aus dem Tiber in den Garten heraufschöpfte; eine Erfindung, hinter der man Peruzzi vermuten darf." (Frommel, *Die Farnesina*, 8); Frommel, "La Villa," 42.

⁶³ Cremona, 528; Ludwig von Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste*, 152. "Das Haus glänzte von Silbergeschirr, und im Garten konnte man einen Brunnen bewundern, der durch eine besondere Maschinerie, wohl eine Art von Wasserrad, das Wasser aus dem Tiber in den Garten heraufschöpfte; eine Erfindung, hinter der man Peruzzi vermuten darf" (Frommel, *Die Farnesina*, 8).

went literally to the water's edge meant that any siphoning of the Tiber's waters could not interrupt the mood the gardens and the riverfront casino conjured.

The solution, arguably designed through collaboration between Peruzzi and Raphael, was a lower-level grotto, not so much a pleasure space but rather a to source water. Frommel added credence to this proposal by attributing the design of the grotto to Peruzzi, who he proposes was deeply embroiled in engineering the water supply to the villa grounds, and thus it would follow that, for such a feat of engineering, a more pragmatic, rather than aesthetic, design was employed.

Thus, it seems as if one could envision the Farnesina casino as having two "grottos." The first, a ground level nymphaeum, is that which Gallo described as a metamorphic space where the Gods "could occasionally set aside their weighty cares on coming from the pure ether."⁶⁴ Below this would have been a secondary "grotto," open to the Tiber and thus filling the Farnesina's water reserves. The oculus that Gallo describes, then, would be the connection between the two spaces, situated in the floor of the riverfront casino's ground level grotto. If this oculus was adequately large, it would appear as if it was the enclosure of a wading pool upon approach, yet, when at its edge visitors could look into it to view fish in the waters below. Furthermore, the exterior stair that was said to lead down to the grotto was also probably present, however its use was most likely for periodic maintenance, not revelry.

⁶⁴ Quinlan-McGrath, "Aegidius Gallus," 5: 134-136, 90.

This reinterpretation of the underground grotto as not for pleasure but rather for practicality within the overall scheme of the villa is strengthened in consideration of the rarely cited interpretation of the grotto as the figurative entrance to the Underworld. As Shearman and Schwarzenberg proposed, the grotto was envisioned as the portal to Hades, in part in an effort to conjure a connection between the garden feature and the proposed rendition of Psyche's visit to the Underworld that would have appeared on the interior of the Loggia di Amore e Psiche (a hypothesis that will be dealt with at greater length in Chapter Six).⁶⁵ Thus, while amplifying the visual impact of the Farnesina, this interpretation also works in some regard to minimize the grotto's role as an actual entertaining space. While Gallo's vision of the grotto as the play space of Nymphs would no doubt attract Chigi's visitors to enter, the interpretation of this grotto as a stand-in for the Underworld, complete with Charon's ferry, would seem wholly unappetizing, and thus the ability to merely peek in from above would undoubtedly satisfy anyone's curiosity.

This interpretation of the Farnesina casino displaying two grottos also helps to explain Gallo's reference to the cave being "improved with the help of a chisel."⁶⁶ This most likely alludes to the presence of sculpted figural groups inside the grotto, perhaps even some reused ancient works, such as that seen in

⁶⁵ Shearman, "Die Loggia der Psyche in der Villa Farnesina und die Probleme der Letzten Phase von Raffaels graphischen Stil," *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien* 60 (1964), 71; Schwarzenberg, "Psyche-Statue," 118. As Schwarzenberg summarizes: "Aus der Grotte im Garten wurde der Eingang der Unterwelt, aus dem Teich dies Styx, auf dem Kahn Charons Fähre" (Schwarzenberg, "Psyche-Statue," 118).

⁶⁶ Quinlan-McGrath, "Aegidius Gallus," 5: 133-134, 90.

the later Grotto of Egeria (Fig. 79). For example, the Tiber sculpture that has been noted previously in Chigi's collection but whose location on the grounds has never been speculated upon might have been incorporated here. Thus, while this underground grotto was predominantly a functional space, scaled for the transport of water and not for leisure pursuits, it was nevertheless designed to fit into the overall message of the villa. Gazing down through the oculus into the grotto from the riverfront casino, seeing fish swim about, the viewer would be swept up as if he or she was peeking in upon Gallo's resting place of the Gods.

Based on this various connections, one can offer a hypothetical image of Raphael's Farnesina casino (Fig. 80). The lower level might have appeared as a three- or five-bay structure, either echoing the Genazzano nymphaeum (Fig. 73) or the Farnesina façade, set upon an enlarged podium. The central bay would have been slightly enlarged as it potentially served as an entry into the grotto, which could have been a space extended with the addition of a rear exedra, akin to Peruzzi's sketch (No. 2 on Fig. 74). At the rear of this grotto would have appeared Chigi's ancient Tiber statue, in front of which a wading-pool like opening would have served as the viewing point for the wading pool grotto below. Above this grotto entryway might have appeared an inset relief panel, perhaps corresponding to the secondary façade level with additional niches for sculpture and a central decorative element, such as that suggested in the Lille sketch (Fig. 67) and the Sangallo drawing (Fig. 78). On either side of the grotto entry would have appeared niches adorned with sculpture. If an additional set of

bays existed on either end, these might have provided another set of niches for the display of sculpture, or they could have equally functioned as portals, either to attached colonnades, as seen in the Casino del Bufalo (Fig. 76) or to a rear extension running along the riverfront that allowed for views of the Tiber. This rear porch would have allowed for riverfront dining, however its presence is unconfirmed.⁶⁷

While this proposed plan is purely conjecture, it is worth consideration, as the fact remains that Raphael's inspiration for the casino, potentially designed in tandem with Peruzzi, represents not only his first architectural commission, but could also represent his first collaboration with Peruzzi and one of the first revivals of the ancient nymphaeum in Renaissance Rome. For as much as this design process was one of architectural exploration of antique methods, so too was it a major contributor to the fantastical feel of Chigi's property. It marked, in the words of Ray, "a new way of thinking,"⁶⁸ wherein the design of the casino echoed that of the villa, seemingly a continuation of the opulence begun in the open loggia of the Loggia di Galatea. This continuation was, in some regard, quite explicit, as a pergola extended from the villa through the gardens, creating a verdant and flowering pathway that culminated in a large dining loggia at the bank of the river.

⁶⁷ It is also possible that the upper level of the Farnesina casino served as the dining pavilion, as it did for the Casino del Bufalo's upper level belvedere. As Christian recounts: "it is likely the del Bufalo entertained their guests in the upper loggia of the casino, which would have served as a dining pavilion" (Christian, *Empire*, 282).

⁶⁸ Ray, *Raffaello architetto*, 154.

Furthermore, one could draw mythological connections to the Loggia di Galatea as well. Acis, the previously-mentioned absent third character of the story which Polyphemus and Galatea represent, could have easily been replaced symbolically by the babbling waters of the Tiber, brought to life, so to speak, only as one stood in the riverfront casino and gazed back upon the villa. This sensory interplay between riverfront casino and villa is reinforced in consideration of the unusual placement of Polyphemus and Galatea. Appearing on a monumental scale in the far left-hand bays, both Galatea and Polyphemus would no doubt have been visible from Chigi's riverfront casino, particularly in consideration of the fact that these bays were originally open to the garden. Thus, yet again one is left to wonder how impressive it would have been to stand in this riverfront structure and gaze up to the villa as it once stood. As the waters of the Tiber lapped onto the shores nearby, it would appear as if the third character of the story, Acis, had joined in, bringing the ancient story to life in a blur of temporal context. For as much as this casino did for the overall Chigi complex, one can also imagine that it established an architectural discourse between Raphael and Peruzzi. This engagement would carry over in to Raphael's design for the stables in his notable effort to achieve an architectural harmonic concordance.

The Stables

On the heels of the construction of the riverfront casino, Raphael was tasked with the design of Chigi's stables, to be situated at the intersection of the Via della Lungara and the Via Buon Pastore at the northwest corner of the property. Chigi was inspired by Bramante's relatively contemporaneous work on an impressive palazzo for the Riario family across the via della Lungara, a space occupied today by the Palazzo Corsini. So lavish was his design that Pope Julius II was rumored to have spurred Chigi on to build something even more magnificent,⁶⁹ so Raphael undoubtedly felt the pressure to produce a noteworthy building. With construction beginning around late 1513, the stables consisted of a lavish two-story structure that, akin to the riverfront casino, also served as the locale for folklore.⁷⁰ Once considered some of "Rome's most sumptuous stables,"⁷¹ these stables were fabled in local lore regarding a famed bet Agostino Chigi made with his neighbors, the Riario brothers (of the same family as the previously-mentioned Cardinal Raffaello Riario), relatives to Pope Julius II.⁷²

⁶⁹ Frommel, "La Villa," 18; Cugnoni, 2:63; Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 32.

⁷⁰ Gerlini, *Giardino e Architettura*, 5; Frommel, "Raffaello e la sua Carriera Architettonica," 20. The payment of Milanese mason Giovanni di Cristoforo Pallavicini is noted on May 23rd 1514 ("Die 23 Maii [1514]. Magister Johannes Antonius Christophori de Pallavicinis Mediolensis architector confessus fuit habuisse a DD. Heredibus quondam Mariani de Chisiis ducatos 40, quos sibi dederunt pro parte solutionis laborum et aliarum rerum cuiusdam stabuli per eundem in horto domini Agustin de Chisis conficiendum, cum certis pactis inter eos conventis etc. fol. 1129"). This is, according to John Shearman, "the first known reference to the work on the stables project, which must have been under way for at least a few months." (Shearman, *Raphael in Early Modern Sources*, 1514/4, 178).

⁷¹ Majanlahti, 337.

⁷² Anthony Majanlahti provides a brief anecdotal account of this folkloric tale: "[Chigi] made a bet with the brothers that he could make his mere stables more opulent than the main reception rooms of the palazzo Riario. . . . This enormous building played host to one of Rome's most famous banquets [of] 1518. Chigi had, as his guest, no less a person than the Pope himself, Leo X de Medici, and a selection of cardinals, including, no doubt, the Riario. The foods were so sumptuous, the music so

The first sketch of these stables appears in Raphael's drawings around 1512, appearing alongside a sketch for a putto included in his *Galatea* (Florence, Uffizi 1474E)(Fig. 81), with the construction of the stables beginning around the same time as work commenced on the Chigi Chapel in Santa Maria del Popolo. Ray proposes that construction on the stables most likely began sometime between 1512 and 1513 but suggests it might have been as late as 1514.⁷³

Progress on the stables, however, was much slower than the other portions of the villa.⁷⁴ Shearman notes the documentation of stonemason Antonio di Cristoforo Pallavicini, whose work at the stables concluded in 1518, with Frommel mentioning the hire of additional masons in 1520, indicating the prolonged construction of the stables.⁷⁵ As Stefano Ray has commented, almost a decade later the first floor was not yet complete, and there is a good chance that

exquisite, the wall hangings of cloth of gold so beautiful, that the Pope, a genial man, exclaimed to Agostino, 'But my friend, why do you not treat me with more familiarity?' 'Your holiness,' replied the banker, 'perhaps I have treated you with too much familiarity rather than too little. For I have invited you to a banquet in my stables!' He made a gesture and all of the hangings fell to the ground, revealing the stalls and mangers of the stables. This theatrical trick won him both the admiration of the guests and his bet with the Riario (Ibid); As Quinlan-McGrath comments in relation to this tale: "it is probably that this kind of anecdote, recorded in the earliest biography of Agostino, is part of the Italian tradition of the mythically true, 'se non è vero, è ben trovato.' The stables were not secretly constructed, and Leo no doubt knew where he was; yet at the same time both the implied intimacy between Leo and Agostino, as well as the extravagant nature of Chigi parties, must have been real." (Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 34).

⁷³ "Le date fondamentali, partendo dai pagamenti, dai disegni e dai rapporti tra Raffaello e Agostino, indicano negli anni medesimi della cappella Chigi quelli dell'inizio dell'opera, e cioè nel 1512-1513 o, al più tardi, '14" (Ray, *Raffaello architetto*, 148).

⁷⁴ Joannides, 294v, 206. Thus it comes as no surprise that around the same time as the Uffizi 1474E sketch Raphael also completed another study of the entablatures and windows of the Pantheon (London, R.I.B.A. XIII/IP), "perhaps," in the words of Joannides, "in preparation for his own architectural work." (Joannides, 296r/v, 206). Indeed, the design of the Pantheon played heavily into Raphael's design for the Chigi Chapel at Santa Maria del Popolo. Jones and Penny suggest Raphael's work on the structure continuing until approximately 1518 (Jones and Penny, 211), which coincides with the end of work by the initial mason, Giovanni Antonio (February 1518, as recorded in Shearman, *Raphael in Early Modern Sources*, 178).

⁷⁵ Ibid; Frommel, *Die Farnesina*, II: 154-155, 169-170).

even by the time of Chigi's death in 1520 the overall structure was still unfinished.⁷⁶

This slow progress on the stables might have been due in part to Raphael's increasingly saturated schedule. The year 1514 was a remarkably busy one for the artist, filled with successes and stresses. In that year, he faced undoubted disappointment when the Farnesina's riverfront casino, his inaugural architectural work, was heavily damaged from Tiber flooding.⁷⁷ He was also assuredly grappling with the plans for Chigi's stables, as Chigi's desire to surpass Bramante's work for the Riario family across the via della Lungara were no doubt palpable. In the same twelve-month period Raphael experienced artistic and architectural triumphs. In July 1514 he began work in the Stanza dell'Incendio, and the month following Pope Leo X named Raphael *magister operis* at Saint Peter's, sharing the title with Fra Giocondo, an architectural master a generation Raphael's senior.⁷⁸ Thus, to say 1514 was a busy one for Raphael would be an understatement, and it is perhaps these exterior pressures that delayed progress on Chigi's stables.

⁷⁶ Shearman, *Raphael in Early Modern Sources*, 178; Ray suggests that this third floor was most likely added much later. "Mentre al principio del '20 l'interno del primo piano non è ancora terminato, e si può pensare che la costruzione non fosse integralmente finita alla morte di Agostino. Le vedute di Roma mostrano immagini discordanti, e pare che, almeno in parte, vi fosse successivamente aggiunto un terzo piano." (Ray, *Raffaello architetto*, 148).

⁷⁷ Please see Note 529.

⁷⁸ Raphael's appointment at Saint Peter's was made official in August 1514, however for all accounts he assumed the role earlier, in April of that year. Raphael and Fra Giocondo are both listed as *magister operis*, each receiving a salary of 300 ducats per year for their efforts (although the equivalence of the two architect's month salary has been debated). It seems significant that Raphael, an unproven architect, was receiving the same monthly sum as his much more architecturally accomplished co-*magister*. Giuliano da Sangallo was installed as *administer et coaditur operis*, an assistant role, and Peruzzi was also hired as "third architect" near the end of the year, receiving the relatively measly sum of 6 ducats a month (von Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste im Zeitalter der Renaissance*, 544-545; Shearman, *Raphael in Early Modern Sources*, 188).

The stables, ravaged by time, were finally demolished in 1808.⁷⁹ All that is visible today a small section of the stylobate still running along the Via della Lungara and turning the corner of the Via dei Buon Pastore. Fortunately, in contrast to the riverfront casino, a variety of sketches, including those by Raphael himself, document the design of the stables.⁸⁰ Furthermore, measurements of constituent architectural components are reflected in drawings such as U 1474E and have been later incorporated into Frommel's twentieth-century reconstructions (Fig. 82).⁸¹ These drawings and reconstructions reveal a structure that assumed a footprint of approximately 54 by roughly 190 *palmi* or approximately 12 by 43 meters (using the standard relation of 0.2234 *palmi* = 1 meter), and Frommel describes the structure as relatively rectangular, as does Giovanni Battista Falda in his 1676 map of Rome, with an interior large enough to hold forty horses.⁸² The shorter southern façade, which faced the Farnesina forecourt, met the main length of the western street façade running along the Via della Lungara. This orientation provided greater monumentality in the more public face and gave the structure the overall impression of being "as large and

⁷⁹ Ray, *Raffaello architetto*, 148.

⁸⁰ There has been some debate as to whether Raphael or Peruzzi designed the stables. A late sixteenth-century engraving of the structure by Cherubino Alberti credits the design to Peruzzi, but later it was given back to Raphael with the discovery of several sketches of the structure by his hand. Ray, *Raffaello architetto*, 148.

⁸¹ Frommel, *Die Farnesina*, 57-58; see also Appendix A.

⁸² Frommel proposes that Raphael's original length was to be 193 *palmi*, but in the end he shortened it to 190.5 *palmi*, "per ragioni forse puramente formali nell'esecuzione" (Frommel, "La Villa," 49). Subsequent analysis herein will round this number to 190 for clarity's sake; Cugnoni, 63.

as stylish as the more magnificent palaces being built.”⁸³ It is a portion of this western façade that remains visible today.

Designed with refined austerity, this western side façade consisted of two clearly defined levels of seven bays each, echoing the seven bays that comprised the Farnesina’s nearby western façade. The first level was lined with paired sets of Doric pilasters, an element borrowed directly from Bramante,⁸⁴ each with distinct bases that ran along the entire façade set upon a prominent socle.⁸⁵ Between these paired pilasters were strikingly empty recesses, most likely originally decorated with elegant marble revetments.⁸⁶ The second level, divided from the first by an architrave, complemented the first with corresponding pairs of Corinthian columns, creating eight vertical axes⁸⁷ that, while unifying the façade, notably punctuate it. Both Ray and Frommel mention a third level. They disagree, however, as to whether this was a full floor or a reduced attic space, as indicated in the presentation of two different third level elevations in Frommel’s diagram (Fig. 82). It would seem quite clear, however, in review of an

⁸³ Jones and Penny, 211.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ It is difficult to determine whether or not these paired pilasters on the *piano nobile* were of the Doric order, similar to the *primo piano*. This difficulty arises in the fact that there is no remaining evidence for the capitals of these pilasters, however most scholars agree that these were indeed Doric order pilasters.

⁸⁶ It seems likely that marble was a key decorative feature of the façade of the stables. As Jones and Penny comment: “all that is left of the street façade is brick and tufa, but Chigi’s villa was noted for the splendor and variety of its marbles, and it is possible that the columns of the entrance portal to the stables were of marble.” (Jones and Penny, 211). This also would have coincided with Raphael’s design for the Chigi Chapel at Santa Maria del Popolo, which is also abundantly decorated with various marbles. Thus, with this potential use of marble in mind, it would not be beyond reason to think that these recesses would have also bore accompanying revetments, perhaps akin to the variegated marble panels that lined the Pantheon’s interior, however such ostentation would be rather unusual in Rome.

⁸⁷ Ray, *Raffaello architetto*, 153.

anonymous French drawing of the stables (Fig. 83), that, regardless of the original plans, only an attic third level was constructed, as attested to by the reduced-scale windows included above the second level.

The austere design that ran the exterior length of the stables was contrasted by the refined southern façade, that which faced the villa and was accessible only once inside the entrance gates from the Via della Lungara. The important, anonymous elevation drawing (Fig. 84) reveals the main portal of this southern elevation that led to the horse stalls on the *pianoterreno*. This entryway was flanked by Doric pilasters set upon pedestals and accompanied both by freestanding columns of the same order and a frieze overhead that bore the inscription seen elsewhere on the villa grounds “Aug. Chisius. Senensis.”⁸⁸ This shorter façade suffered from noticeable asymmetry, with two smaller paired archways adjacent to the main portal that appear disproportionately situated along the façade. These two auxiliary doors, capped on their interior with groin vaults (as included in Fig. 84) provided access to the second level chambers that served as space for guests’ quarters, as illustrated by the same anonymous French draftsman (Fig. 83).⁸⁹

The contrast between the public exterior, or western, elevation and the private interior, or southern, elevation no doubt worked to differentiate the interior, garden façade from the austere street-facing views and thus maintaining

⁸⁸ It seems, according to Ray, that Raphael here was working through a similar challenge presented to Bramante in his design for the *cortile* of Santa Maria della Pace, that is the adjustment and development of the column base moldings to best fit the space (Ray, *Raffaello architetto*, 154); Frommel, “La Villa,” 43.

⁸⁹ Frommel, “La Villa,” 43-44.

the oasis-like feel Chigi's property worked so diligently to achieve. Furthermore, according to Ray, the stable's design incorporated ancient forms to convey a sense of dignity and classicism in accordance with the rest of the villa.⁹⁰ He cites, for example, the use of vaults on the stables interior as reflecting both the inherent invention of the technique by the ancient Romans and the contemporary problem of covering Saint Peter's (stable vaults visible in Fig. 84).⁹¹

Even if one sets the problematic third level aside, what has been reconstructed of the western façade's first two levels reveals a somewhat unusual structure, one the leading eighteenth century critic Francesco Milizia described as "an ugly view with too many interruptions . . . [and] lacking unity."⁹² This is perhaps why past scholars have tried to extricate this structure from Raphael's oeuvre.⁹³ Given that this structure, along with the loggia, was to serve as his demonstration of his abilities, though, it seems unlikely that any element of these

⁹⁰ Ray, *Raffaello architetto*, 154.

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² "Il primo piano è di pilastri gemellati con . . . piedistalli distinti. Sono d'ordine dorico, coll'architrave a tre fasce, fregio liscio e cornice intiera. Il secondo piano ha altrettanti di questi pilastri Corinti, parimenti col loro piedistalli divisi, il che fa un brutto vedere per tanti interruzioni e l'opera pare secca e per quella cornice del primo piano senza unità" (F. Milizia, *Memorie degli architetti antichi e moderni* (Parma, 1781); Ray, *Raffaello architetto*, 120).

⁹³ Some scholars have gone so far as to attribute the stable structure to Peruzzi instead of Raphael. Frommel explains this misattribution as it ties back to a sketch by Cherubino Alberti: "Nun hat Federigo Hermanin erstmalig ein Blatt aus einem Skizzenbuch des Cherubino Alberti veröffentlicht. Aufnahmen antiker und neuerer Architekturen findet sich in diesem Skizzenbuch auch eine lavierte Federzeichnung mit der Aufschrift: 'Membri della stalla di Augustino Ghisi in Trastevere di pietra biga di Baldassari opera architectura.' Der Zuschreibung Albertis an Peruzzi ist kein besonderes Gewicht beizulegen. Ihm ging es wohl mehr um die klassische Lösung bestimmter architektonischer Aufgaben als um die subtileren Unterschiede zwischen Raffael und Peruzzi, dem ja der benachbarte Palast zugeschrieben wurde. So war die Verwechslung naheliegend." (Frommel, *Die Farnesina*, 57). Ray further confirms the design was indeed Raphael's: "l'attribuzione a Raffaello, già in Vasari, è confermata da un disegno autografo." (Ray, Frommel and Tafuri, *Raffaello architetto*, 120). Interestingly, Frommel proposes that the project was directed away from Peruzzi at the behest of the Pope, who was "insoddisfatto della Farnesina del Peruzzi sulla nuova via della Lungara." (Frommel, "Raffaello e la sua carriera architettonica," 20).

structures was not deliberate.⁹⁴ In some regards, it seems Raphael's design for the stables can be seen continuing discourse on contemporary architectural design, one begun with his collaboration with Peruzzi for the riverfront casino and here responding more directly to Peruzzi's proportions for the adjacent villa and its blend of Vitruvian revival and Albertian ideology.

As mentioned previously, Peruzzi began his design for the Farnesina with a plan of seven by nine bays with two levels. Adopting what Frommel calls an "unusually [narrow] bay length" of eighteen *palmi* (4.02 m), the span of the longer northern and southern nine-bay façade totaled 167.4 *palmi* (37.38 m) while the shorter western and eastern seven-bay facades measured 131.4 *palmi* (29.35 m).⁹⁵ Frommel surmises that these initial proportions would hardly have rendered the stately quality that distinguishes the villa in its final form, a quality he believes Peruzzi eventually achieved by adjusting elements of the structure⁹⁶ to achieve the classical ratio of 1:2, "loved by the ancients and corresponding to a musical octave."⁹⁷ These measurements correspond to Jones's analysis, which highlighted Peruzzi's adherence to this ratio, from the footprint of the villa,

⁹⁴ As Frommel comments, "Prima della morte del Bramante, il giovane architetto dovette dimostrare la sua competenza con una prova pratica. Particolarmente adatta a questo scopo si rivelò l'occasione di costruire l'edificio, per l'appunto spettacolare, come la capella funeraria le scuderie di Agostino Chigi." (Frommel, "Raffaello e la sua carriera architettonica," 20).

⁹⁵ As reported by Frommel, "La Villa," 46.

⁹⁶ Namely, Frommel reports that Peruzzi reduced the dimensions of the five recessed bays of the entrance façade from 18 *palmi* to 17.8 *palmi* while reducing the extended bays to 17 *palmi*. This, according to Frommel, "in modo che la larghezza complessiva di ca. 162.2 *palmi* (36.30 m) raggiungesse esattamente la misura di partenza di 9 assai a 18 *palmi*. Così poteva ridurre l'altezza insolita senza dover rinunciare al rapporto musicale di 1:2" (Frommel, "La Villa," 47).

⁹⁷ "Quindi furono sufficienti correzioni minime per portare l'altezza e la larghezza al rapporto di 1:2 amato già dagli antichi e corrispondenti all'ottava musicale" (Frommel, "La Villa," 46).

assuming a height of 80 *palmi* and a width of 160 *palmi*, to the elements of the façade as well as the interior organization.⁹⁸

With Peruzzi's Vitruvian proportional scheme in mind, it would be convenient to find a similar ratio appear in the known measurements of Raphael's stables. And indeed such a ratio does appear in Raphael's stable designs, however it at times becomes intermixed with different proportional relationships. For example, while the ratio between the height, approximately 97 *palmi*, and the length, 193 *palmi*,⁹⁹ produces a neat ratio of 1:2, the relation between depth of the stables, 54 *palmi*, and the previously mentioned height relates not in a ratio of 1:2 but rather 2:7. Frommel suggests that this ratio of depth to length as 1:2 can be reestablished by including the exterior staircase and courtyard that were part of the stable's eastern façade. These additions would have increased the depth of the structure to 88 *palmi*, which when compared with the length of 193 *palmi*, yields a neat 1:2 ratio.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Frommel suggests that Raphael reduced the length of the stables from 193 to 190.5 and thus scaling all architectural components accordingly: "Raffaello ridusse la lunghezza della facciata a ca. 190.5 *palmi*, la singola campata [da 26 *palmi*] a 25.3 *palmi*, i campi ciechi a 14.4 *palmi* e la distanza tra le paraste a 2.25 *palmi* allargando solo i margini a 1.3 *palmi*. Anch'egli deviò quindi nel dettaglio dalle misure totali per perfezionare l'equilibrio estetico" (Frommel, "La Villa," 49). While this adjustment is possible, it seems an unusual adjustment considering the reduction in length of five *palmi* would not impact the overall ratio relationships between constituent parts. There is perhaps another reason for this reduction that has yet to be ascertained.

¹⁰⁰ Frommel, "La Villa," 49. What Frommel neglects to point out, however, in his effort to establish this ratio between the length and depth of the stables is that, by expanding the depth to 88 *palmi*, the ratio of height to depth becomes virtually 1:1. Furthermore, as Frommel admits, the height of the stables, estimated at 97 *palmi*, is based on the assumption that there was a third attic story, measuring 27 *palmi* in height. If, to take the contrary point of view, there was never intended to be a third story to the stables, this would mean the ratio of the stables' height, now reduced to 70 *palmi*, the length would be approximately 1:3, and the ratio of depth to height would be roughly 3:4, given a depth of 54 *palmi*, or again approximately 1:1, assuming Frommel's extended depth of 88 *palmi*.

These relative proportions continued throughout Raphael's exterior stable façade given Frommel's reconstruction measurements. Comparing Vitruvian prescriptions with those Frommel records from the stables' components (Appendix B), one can find a loose adherence to Vitruvian proportions in the lower socles and pedestals, upper pedestals, and upper pilasters. The relations between lower pilaster and entablature height do not correspond so neatly however, with the lower pilaster height prescribed by Vitruvius' scheme and that of the stables achieving a ratio of $1:\sqrt{2}$ and the lower entablature heights achieving a ratio of 1:2.3. This further skewed the overall proportions of the Doric order on the *pianoterreno*, which Frommel suggested achieved a proportional ratio of 1:8.3, "smaller than that indicated by Vitruvius however more squat than the majority of columns in the order used in preceding years."¹⁰¹

Raphael's less straightforward system of ratios used in his designs for the stables can be explained somewhat with an infusion of Albertian architectural theory. Alberti's writing borrowed heavily from the proportional systems Vitruvius promoted, stressing particularly the element of architectural harmony. In translating Vitruvian thought, Alberti amplified the notion of architectural harmony, in that the relation between parts of a building should interact as if they were part of a musical composition. He borrowed from Greek musical theory, particularly the theoretical writings of second century CE mathematician Nicomachus (Appendix C). In doing so, Alberti stressed the importance of

¹⁰¹ "Raffaello proporzionò l'ordine dorico con ca. 1:8.3, decisamente più snello di quello indicato da Vitruvio, ma comunque più tozzo della maggior parte degli ordini risalenti agli anni precedenti" (Frommel, "La Villa," 49).

buildings and their ornaments to respect ratios derived from a musical score, anywhere from a simple relationship (1:2, 1:3, 1:4 and so on), to the more dynamic fourths (3:4) and fifths (2:3). As Alberti comments, “numbers naturally harmonic include those whose ratios form proportions such as the double, triple, quadruple, and so on.”¹⁰² Not unlike Vitruvius, Alberti found central among these relationships that of 1:2, or the octave, because of the manner in which it brought together these other harmonious ratios. As Alberti continues, “a double may be constructed from the single by adding a *sesquialtera* [3:2] and then a *sesquitertia* [4:3], as in the following example: let the lesser dimension of the double be two; to this add a *sesquialtera* to produce three; by adding a *sesquitertia* to the three, four is produced, which is itself twice the original two.”¹⁰³ This proportional approach alludes to the Albertian concept of *concinnitas*, synonymous with ideal beauty created through the harmonious joining of architectural elements.¹⁰⁴ With concept in mind, it seems one could see in Raphael’s design for the Farnesina stables as an exploration into Albertian architectural harmony, particularly in the relation of the stables to the adjacent Villa Farnesina.

Foreshadowing this relation between the buildings was Raphael’s choice to incorporate seven bays into the length of the stables. Number for Alberti was

¹⁰² Leon Battista Alberti, *On the Art of Building in Ten Books*, trans. by Joseph Rykwert, Neil Leach, Robert Travenor (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992), Book 9: Section 6:167-169v, 306.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ Advocating for a blend of the concepts of *numerus* (number), *finito* (finishing), and *collocatio* (composition), all of which were, to some extent, derived from or refined from Vitruvius’ concepts of disposition and *symmetria*, Alberti declared, “it is the task and aim of *concinnitas* to compose parts that are quite separate from each other by their nature, according to some precise rule, so that they correspond to one another in appearance” (Alberti, Book 9: Section 5: 164-167v, 302).

an essential element of beauty, as it was proscribed by Nature. The number seven was perhaps the most significant. As Alberti proclaimed: “as for the number seven, it is clear that the great maker of all things, God, is particularly delighted by it.”¹⁰⁵ The ratios of the different constituent parts of the stables’ western façade to one another reveal a similar preference for harmonic relations. It does not seem to have been remarked upon that if one takes the lower column (pilaster) height of 5.68 meters as the base measurement, then a relation of this height to all other dimensions on the façade results in round ratios that all fall within the Nichomachian table (Appendix C), as if each element plays off of the other as a chord. In this sense, Raphael achieved, for his oeuvre, a novel harmony and beauty following Albertian logic.

Missing from Raphael’s structure, however, was a clear adherence to both Vitruvius’s and Alberti’s preference for the dominating ratio of a structure’s elements to be 1:2. This deviation seems to suggest Raphael’s manipulation, or experimentation, with architectural form as it deviates from this relationship. Raphael was as much a student of Vitruvius as he was of Alberti. Rowland points to Raphael’s indebtedness to Vitruvius in his designs for the Vatican Loggie, between 1514-1518, and his letter drafts to Pope Leo X of the same period reflect Raphael’s close study of Vitruvius by 1514.¹⁰⁶ At the same time, however,

¹⁰⁵ Alberti, *On the Art of Building*, 304.

¹⁰⁶ Rowland, “Raphael, Angelo Colocci,” 82; Ann C. Huppert, “Envisioning New St. Peter’s: Perspectival Drawings and the Process of Design,” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 68 (2)(June 2009), 160. Rowland also mentions a copy of Vitruvius’s *Ten Books* (Cod. It. 37) purported to have been in Raphael’s collection, with margin notes “that indicate his repeated study of Books III and IV in particular, the sections of Vitruvius that deal with the proportions of ancient

Raphael stressed the importance of ground plan and one-dimensional elevation drawings over a perspectival approach, which suggests a greater allegiance to Albertian principles.¹⁰⁷ Thus, perhaps Raphael's approach to the design of the Farnesina stables was one of exploration, merging his study of both Vitruvius and Alberti while also experimenting with his own approach to proportional relations.¹⁰⁸

Thus, though once described as "il che fa un brutto vedere," Raphael's stables succeeded as a structure that not only reflected the study of Vitruvius and Alberti but also that of Peruzzi.¹⁰⁹ This corresponding quality established between these two structures no doubt worked to amplify the magnificence of Chigi's compound. Indeed, if one imagines that this forecourt between villa and stables was once completely enclosed, as it once was, then Raphael's deliberate treatment of the stables' façade could have allowed it to be mistaken for another wing of the villa itself, wherein the use of the architectural orders gave unexpected monumentality to what was a nominally functional structure. This is perhaps how the Pope was hoodwinked at the earlier mentioned 1518 banquet held within these stables into believing he had entered part of the luxurious villa. At the same time this aspect of the stables would have added intrigue to Chigi's

temples. Clearly, in his annotations Raphael is seeking out a systematic understanding of classical architecture" (Rowland, "Raphael, Angelo Colocci," 88-89. (Cod. It. 37 is reprinted in: Vincenzo Fontana and Paolo Moracchiello, *Vitruvio e Raffaello: De architectura di Vitruvio nella traduzione inedita di Fabio Calvo Ravennate* (Rome: Officina, 1975).

¹⁰⁷ For more on these parallels between Alberti and Raphael, see: Huppert, "Envisioning New St. Peter's."

¹⁰⁸ Part of the impetus behind the Albertian theme to his design could also have been due to the recent reprint of his treatise in 1512: *Libri de re aedificatoria decem* Paris: Berthold Rembolt, 1512.

¹⁰⁹ Milizia, *Memorie degli architetti antichi e moderni* (Parma, 1781); Ray, *Raffaello architetto*, 120.

grounds, it also establishes a continued level of exchange between Raphael and Peruzzi. The reflexive quality of Raphael's stables – that is, at the same time it “completes” the Farnesina façade it also accentuates what is missing – foreshadows the co-opetitive engagement between both Raphael and Peruzzi highlighted during their subsequent and final years at the Farnesina. It also hints at the experimental nature of Raphael's architectural contemplation as he worked, along with his contemporaries, to merge ancient convention with contemporary innovation that continued through his architectural career.

Moving Forward: Santa Maria del Popolo to the Villa Madama

Going forward, Raphael's architectural career would blossom into a wide variety of commissions, all of which echoed this extended meditation in the stables' design. This architectural approach was, according to Ray, one reflecting “remarkable maturity and total ruthlessness against the authors of the [predominant architectural] texts.”¹¹⁰ But at the same time he was playing with history, Raphael also experimented with the contemporary, responding to Peruzzi's *all'antica* forms, carried forth to Raphael's subsequent architectural projects.

A fitting example is Raphael's work, relatively concurrent to his work on the stables, within the Chigi Chapel at Santa Maria del Popolo (1515-1655). Similar to Peruzzi's early work, Raphael here quotes both ancient and

¹¹⁰ Ray, *Raffaello architetto*, 154.

contemporary in his design for chapel. He borrows, for example, a ground plan similar to Bramante's recently completed Tempietto. The chapel's footprint can also be seen as quoting the Pantheon, and the incorporation of the "well motivated hybrid" pyramid-obelisk tombs on either side of the chapel reflect a blend of the ancient pyramid, such as the Pyramidal Tomb of Gaius Cestius, and obelisk, thus serving to both reference antiquity while increasing the illusory visual pull upward in the space.¹¹¹

Simultaneous with this negotiation of the antique and the contemporary is a seamless blend of visual media, the conflation of art and architecture. As Shearman argues "we think of [the Chigi Chapel at Santa Maria del Popolo] primarily as a monument in the history of architecture, but every conceivable medium is present: painting and mosaic, figurative and decorative sculpture, in white marble, grey and coloured marble, stucco granite, bronze and gold."¹¹² This thoughtful integration created, in short, a similar sense of harmony, that between art and architecture, and between form and meaning, a point further supported by the recent work of Nicholas Temple.

Temple argues that Raphael included the two pyramidal forms in the chapel design for reasons beyond their mere funerary connotations. Suggesting a link between Raphael's ongoing topographical mapping and these pyramidal inclusions, Temple proposes that they were in some senses designed as

¹¹¹ Shearman, "The Chigi Chapel," 134; "E sospinge tutto il piano inferiore verso l'alto, facendo leva sugli accenti verticali dei monumenti funerari a piramide, come nelle scuderie Chigi." (Frommel, "Raffaello e la sua carriera architettonica," 21-22).

¹¹² Shearman, "Raphael as Architect," 397.

surrogates for the Meta Romuli, which stood in the Borgo Nuovo near Castel Sant Angelo, and the Meta Remi, another name for the Pyramidal Tomb of Gaius Cestius, located to the south near the Porto San Paolo.¹¹³ Both pyramids were revered in Julian Rome as antique landmarks, yet Temple suggests they also served as figurative boundaries of Chigi's Rome that, when triangulated with the Tempietto, thus "demarcate[d] a territory for ritual procession and sacrifice, . . . [defining] spatially what their urban counterparts achieve topographically."¹¹⁴

Building on Temple's analysis, it seems one can go even further to postulate that's Raphael's invocation of these landmarks suggests a deliberate effort on Raphael's part to allude to the melding of ancient and contemporary practices through his own architectural commentary. Such an idea is supported by Shearman's claim that Raphael's aims included "the emulation of the original splendor of the Pantheon . . . [and also] the conviction that earlier Renaissance architecture, and specifically that included Bramante's, had not attained the perfection of the antique in the opulence of materials."¹¹⁵ Thus, if one maintains the roughly north-south axis through *cinquecento* Rome established, as Temple proposes, between the Meta Romuli and Meta Remi, and then forms a triangle atop that line connecting the Chigi Chapel at Santa Maria del Popolo, one discovers that the intersection of this line and triangle occurs directly over Chigi's Villa Farnesina (Fig. 85). Of course this intersection could be coincidental,

¹¹³ The Meta Romuli stood at the corner of the Via Cornelia and Via Triumphalis, an area appropriated in to the Borgo Nuovo in 1499.

¹¹⁴ Temple, *Renovatio Urbis*, 32.

¹¹⁵ Shearman, "Raphael as Architect," 397.

however the fact that it exists suggests that Raphael was not only honoring Chigi in his design for the chapel at Santa Maria del Popolo but also paying homage to the evolution of architecture from ancient ideal to Renaissance innovation, a transition in which Raphael played a crucial part.

This novel pursuit of architectural themes would next manifest in painting, particularly with Raphael's designs for the Stanza dell'Incendio, to which discussion will turn in the subsequent chapter. In the few remaining years of his life, however, Raphael also embarked on several physical architectural projects, including four palazzi - the Palazzo Pandolfini in Florence (1516-1520), Rome's Palazzo Vidoni-Caffarelli (1515), the Palazzo of Jacopo da Brescia (1515-1519), and the Palazzo Branconio dell'Aquila (1518-1520) - the churches of Sant'Eligio degli Orefici (begun 1516)¹¹⁶ and San Giovanni dei Fiorentini (1518), the façade of Florence's Basilica di San Lorenzo and designs for his own residence on the Via Giulia (1519-1520). Little information on these structures remains. What one can glean, however, from extant information about Raphael's later architecture works, specifically the Palazzo Branconio dell'Aquila and the Villa Madama (1518), suggests that Raphael continued his innovative explorations of architectural harmony in his subsequent designs that in many respects can be traced back to his work at the Farnesina only several years prior.

¹¹⁶ Shearman proposes that, while designs for Sant'Eligio could have begun as early as 1514, construction could not have commenced until 1516 at the earliest, with "the first document testifying to building work begun is of September 1516" Shearman, "Raphael in Early Modern Sources," 1514/11;195 and 1516/28; 269)

The Palazzo Branconio dell’Aquila, demolished in the seventeenth century to make way for Bernini’s colossal colonnade for Saint Peter’s, first appeared in Raphael’s sketches in 1517 and is known today from subsequent sketches (Fig. 86). As Shearman notes, when juxtaposing his designs again those for Bramante’s relatively contemporaneous Palazzo Caprini (circa 1510), that Raphael pushed and played with Bramante’s style through “a unique play between scale and ornament as one ascended the façade [as well as] a flexibility of rhythm vertically and horizontally.”¹¹⁷ Raphael’s unusual punctuation of architectural levels begins with a Doric order *pianoterreno* absent a frieze, progresses to a *piano nobile* level of alternating triangular and arched pediments that adorn the windows, and culminates on a third level, where suddenly the irregular animation of the second level is replaced with relatively austere window frames, between which were to appear paintings.

Thus, as Shearman posits, “as the structural elements were diminished in emphasis toward the top the decorative ones proliferated, from sculpture in the niches through a rich pattern of stucco-work festoons and medallions, to paintings.”¹¹⁸ In other words, to rephrase Shearman, Raphael here introduced what could arguably be considered a reinterpretation of the traditional rustication of palazzo façades, wherein the aim was to create a façade that increased in refinement and order as one progressed upward. Here Raphael replaced architectural refinements with artistic ones. The extensive decoration,

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 407.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

for example, of the *piano nobile* visually interrupts the lower and upper levels. This playful navigation of architectural levels and aesthetic syncopations within the Palazzo Branconio dell'Aquila's façade seems not that unlike what Raphael was experimenting with in his designs for the Farnesina stables. True, these stables were nowhere near as ornate as the palazzo, however it seems the same foundational principle, that is to achieve a unique harmony between built elements, is shared between the two structures.

For as seemingly disjointed as the levels to the Palazzo Branconio dell'Aquila appear, they nevertheless blend together to convey a sense of wholeness or harmony, not only between architectural elements but also between architecture and art, a harmony that would become essential in designs for Raphael's subsequent work on the Farnesina *scaenae frons*, to which extensive discussion is devoted in the following chapter. Furthermore, the notion that Raphael is playing with Bramante's consistency again alludes to the engagement of his stables to Peruzzi's Farnesina design. Though Raphael's palazzo would not be misinterpreted as a Bramantesque design, the elements Raphael incorporated not only reflect knowledge of Bramante's approach but also Bramante's novel commentary upon it.

At the same time Raphael began designs for the Palazzo Branconio dell'Aquila, he also drafted sketches for the Villa Madama on the slopes of Monte Mario, whose fate was similarly troubled. As David Coffin proclaims, "as the Sack of Rome marked the termination of the brief Renaissance of the city [*of*

Rome], so did it interrupt and, in the end, leave pathetically mutilated the most ambitious villa-garden complex planned for post-classical Rome.”¹¹⁹ The plan of which he speaks is that of Raphael’s for the Villa Falcona, known today as the Villa Madama and commissioned by Cardinal Giulio de’ Medici, cousin to Pope Leo X and future Pope Clement VII (1523-1524).¹²⁰ Commissioned and begun around 1518, only months before Raphael’s untimely demise, the Villa Madama was to be a glistening beacon of *all’antica* style set amongst the undulating hills of Monte Mario, perched carefully to overlook the Vatican borgo that sat two miles to its south.¹²¹

Raphael’s close ties with the Papacy made him an easy choice for such an ambitious architectural endeavor, and although Raphael died the year following the commencement of construction, work progressed on the villa rather quickly. A portion of the structure was habitable by the spring of 1523, when it was the stopping point for Florentine ambassadors on their way to Rome to pay homage to the newly-elected Pope Hadrian VI.¹²² Giulio de’ Medici, anointed Pope in November 1523, continued work on the villa in the subsequent years, with particular focus on its waterworks. His efforts were short-lived, as the Sack of Rome in 1527 brought the project to a standstill. What is more, the Villa Madama sustained damage during the invasion of the city, but even with architect

¹¹⁹ David R. Coffin, “The Plans of the Villa Madama,” 111.

¹²⁰ For more on this original name of the villa, please see: Sheryl E. Reiss, “‘Villa Falcona’: The Name Intended for the Villa Madama in Rome,” *The Burlington Magazine*, 137 (1112)(Nov., 1995), 740-742.

¹²¹ John K.G. Shearman, “A Functional Interpretation of the Villa Madama,” *Römische Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, Vol. 20 (1983): p. 315. This dating is reiterated by Christoph Luitpold Frommel, “Raffaello e il teatro alla Corte di Leone X,” *Bolletino Palladio*, 16 (1974), 173-187.

¹²² Coffin, “The Plans of the Villa Madama,” p. 111.

Antonio Sangallo's restoration efforts in the early 1530s,¹²³ it seemed forward progress had stalled. Medici Pope Clement X's death in 1534 was perhaps the final blow. Though the eventual sale of the property to Empress Margaret of Austria resulted in its now familiar name, the Villa Madama,¹²⁴ the villa that had been originally envisioned by Raphael, potentially the "most ambitious villa-garden complex of post-classical Rome," was left forever incomplete.¹²⁵

Similar to Temple's arguments regarding Raphael's conception of the Chigi Chapel in Santa Maria del Popolo, John Shearman posited that, "the Villa Madama [was] exceptionally endowed with views and communications. . . . which [suggested] a place of symbolic identity."¹²⁶ Shearman posits that the selection of location was significant, not only because of its proximity to the Via Triumphalis, the ancient road that still served as a central route to the Vatican, but also because it held a villa that had been used previously for visitors to Rome in *obedientiam*, performing a ritualistic, staged entry into the city for a congress with the Pope. This ceremonial function of this earlier structure, the villa of Arcangelo Tuzio, lead doctor to Pope Leo X,¹²⁷ was, according to Shearman, no doubt an important factor in Leo's decision to buy the property sometime between 1513 and 1517. Shearman even goes so far as to suggest that, instead of a

¹²³ Coffin, "The Plans of the Villa Madama," 112; Theobald Hofmann, *Raffael in seiner Bedeutung als Architekt I, Villa Madama zu Rom* (Zittau: Menzel, 1908), 98.

¹²⁴ Shearman, "A Functional Interpretation of Villa Madama," 314; Renato Lefevre, *Villa Madama* (Rome: Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato, 1964), 5.

¹²⁵ Lefevre, *Villa Madama*, 6; Shearman, "A Functional Interpretation of Villa Madama," 316.

¹²⁶ Shearman, "A Functional Interpretation of Villa Madama," 316.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 321.

complete demolition of Tuzio's existing structure, Leo X perhaps worked with Raphael to first attempt its modification and to reinforce its ceremonial history.

Raphael's letter outlining his plans for the Villa Madama, along with Antonio da Sangallo the Younger's drawing supposedly faithful to Raphael's intentions (U A314r), provide some sense how Raphael envisioned the space (Fig. 87).¹²⁸ Raphael's descriptions, echoing Pliny the Younger's letters describing his ancient Laurentine and Tuscan villas, suggest Raphael envisioned an elaborate structure overlooking the Tiber with a central axis that would have led visitors through an entry loggia on the south.¹²⁹ This would have opened into a circular central court and thence into a theater intended to be nestled into the gardens that spread out southwest from the villa. This central courtyard rotunda would have been surrounded by the main salons and rooms, with two portals diametrically positioned on either side that led into formal gardens. To the south being a formal courtyard leading to the main entrance, and to the north a loggia, punctuated with exedrae, that opened on to a garden and elaborate fishpond or nymphaeum (Fig. 87).

The result was a remarkably complex footprint. As Shearman comments, "no Renaissance architect had visualized a more complex and varied sequence of internal spaces, and this truly Roman variety becomes so extreme in the Eastern wing that it would appear impossible to reconcile with exterior symmetry of

¹²⁸ For more on the text of this letter, please see: Phillip Foster, "Raphael on the Villa Madama: The Text of a Lost Letter," *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 11 (1967), 111-122.

¹²⁹ Pliny the Younger, *Letters of the Younger Pliny*, trans. by B. Radice (Penguin Classics, 1963), 5:6 (discussing his Tuscan villa) and 2:17 (discussing his Laurentine villa).

elevation.”¹³⁰ Added to this innovative relation between forms was the inclusion of unusual elements, such as a nymphaeum as well as a hippodrome accessible “from the Via Trionfale at the summit of Monte Mario, [and leading] the visitor into the theater, down quadrant-ramps (still on horseback) and into the central courtyard.”¹³¹

For as elaborate as these plans were, in light of prior analysis it seems these essential innovations for which Raphael’s Villa Madama has been praised can again trace their roots back to his work at the Farnesina. Raphael’s ground plan for the Villa Madama bear echoes of the harmonies he wished to strike in his Farnesina architecture. As Inge Reist has summarized the Villa Madama’s design:

It was the depth of Raphael’s knowledge of the vocabulary and the intentions of ancient designers that enabled him to create a villa whose archaeological legitimacy seems above reproach but whose aesthetic independence from its models is equally significant. . . . For no matter how self-consciously his contemporaries and his successor among villa architects sought to evoke the ethos of antiquity, they stopped short of designing structures that violated their modern prejudices for symmetrical planning and structural containment.¹³²

Raphael’s abilities to so truthfully convey the ideas and ideals of the ancients no doubt achieved a new apex with his work at the Villa Madama, however the essence of this pioneering spirit with an unerring passion for the ancients can be seen in his earliest works at the Farnesina. This can be seen with his

¹³⁰ Shearman, “Raphael as Architect,” 404.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 324.

¹³² Inge Jackson Reist, “Raphael and the Humanist Villa,” *Source: Notes in the History of Art*, 3 (4) (Summer 1984), 19.

incorporation of direct *all'antica* quotations, such as the indication of the riverfront casino as an early conception of the ancient nymphaeum. It can also be sensed in his work with Peruzzi on the Farnesina's *scaenae frons* that melded antiquity and theatricality, discussed in Chapter Six, and was then grown exponentially in scope in designs for the Villa Madama's amphitheater. In this regard, Reist comments that "Raphael's conception of the Villa Madama not only includes a theater but in some respects *is* a theater [emphasis Reiss']," reflecting the importance Raphael "attached to the incorporation of a *teatro antico* in the villa complex. . . . as essential to the archaeological statement he sought."¹³³

With so much left incomplete in the villa's design, however, and with the sudden, early death of the lead architect, Raphael, scholars have grappled not only over what the final plans actually *were* for the space but also how much of this plan was based in Raphael's original conception. Despite these debates, even the preliminary ideals espoused in the villa allude to the consistent innovation in Raphael's approach to architecture, one traceable to these early projects at the Farnesina.¹³⁴ In endless pursuit of a meaningful discourse between ancient and contemporaneous architects, Raphael's architectural projects dating back to his earliest work at the Farnesina reflect the inherent potential behind co-opetition.

¹³³ Reist, 21.

¹³⁴ These two projects can also be seen as another instance of competition in light of the conclusions of Renato Lefevre who posits, "the man who took villa Chigi as a model to imitate and even to surpass – in order to enhance the prestige of his family and his own position at the Papal Court – was Giulio de' Medici. . . . the birth of the Villa Madama was due to this spirit of emulation between a Florentine and the banker from Siena." (Lefevre, *Palazzo Chigi*, 14). From this perspective, in designing the Villa Madama Raphael was in some senses competing with Peruzzi and his design for the Farnesina but also with his own prior designs for the same, another striking unique instance wherein the term "competition" falls short.

It was this experimentation that would not only fuel projects like *Fire in the Borgo* in the Vatican stanze, but it would also ensure continued alignment with Peruzzi, with the capstone of this connection being their final commission for Chigi. Completed in tandem, almost as a replaying of Raphael's initial Chigian engagement alongside Sebastiano, Peruzzi's *Sala delle Prospettive* and Raphael's *Loggia di Amore e Psiche* represent a painterly coda to the former architectural engagement between the two masters.

Chapter Six: Raphael Transformed: Lasting Impact and Last Days at the Villa

Farnesina

*“So many heroes and such a long time it took to build Rome!
So many enemies and so many centuries it took to destroy it!
Now Raphael is seeking Rome in Rome, and finding it.
To see is the sign of a great man, to find – of a god.”*

- Celio Calcagnini, 1519¹

The methods and ideas with which Raphael had experimented in his architectural designs for the Farnesina encouraged him in the years following to continue to push the bounds of artistic and architectural understanding, examining the interconnectedness of the two fields while infusing throughout his designs his passion for the antique. On the one hand, he had transformed into a true scholar, not only of Roman and Greek antiquity but also of architectural theory. On the other hand, and through this scholarly development, he continued his quest for artistic and architectural ingenuity, blending ideas from his experience with Peruzzi to continue a discourse that would eventually bring them back to the Farnesina for its final decorative campaign.

This chapter traces Raphael’s continued transformation following his architectural commissions at the Farnesina from between 1514 and 1520, incorporating, when possible, what is known about Peruzzi’s activity during this

¹ “Tot proceres Romam, tam longa extruxerat aetas, Totque hostes, et tot saecula diruerant; Nunc Romam in Roma quaerit, repertique Raphael, Quererere magni homini: sed reperire, Dei est” (Golzio, 79). This was later published as part of a longer epigram in 1553 (Jo. Baptistae Pignae Carminum lib. Quantoer. . . . his adiunximus Caelli Calcagnini Carm. lib. III, Ludovici Areosti Carm. lib. II, Venice, 1553).

time. Again, though Peruzzi's biography during this portion of his career is incredibly murky, contextualizing his pursuits with those of Raphael during this period help to further illustrate the level of exchange between the artists/architects not only in terms of *all'antica* inspiration but also architectural prowess. Highlighting this exchange will be a juxtaposition of Raphael's *Fire in the Borgo* (1514) and Peruzzi's concurrent work as theatrical designer in an overarching examination of architecture, antiquity, and theatricality, all of which would feed into their final projects at the Villa Farnesina, where both Peruzzi and Raphael would return in the closing years of the decade.

As will be discussed in the following pages, these final Farnesina commissions, namely Peruzzi's Sala delle Prospettive, Raphael's Loggia di Amore e Psiche and their shared intentions for the Farnesina façade frescoes, allowed for continued commentary to be exchanged between artists. Peruzzi, for example, arguably offered quotations of both Raphael's and Sebastiano's previous work in his program for the Sala delle Prospettive. In addition, while in its present state the Loggia di Amore e Psiche offers no apparent quotations of Peruzzi's work, Raphael nevertheless intended a much more elaborate visual program that would have worked in conjunction with Peruzzi's façade frescoes. These two sets of imagery arguably came together to create a unified façade that concurrently served as theatrical backdrop, as Peruzzi's design for the façade itself represented one of the first incarnations since antiquity of the *scaenae frons*, or stage front of an ancient theater. The following will navigate this collaborative

imagery and will include attempts to identify and situate the imagery Peruzzi intended for the façade (now predominantly lost), in a larger effort to illustrate how this capstone Farnesina commission marks an innovative co-competitive exchange between Peruzzi and Raphael.

“Una Bottega Antiquariana di Sanzio”²

Although Raphael’s fascination with the antique world may have developed out of a competition for artistic supremacy, its longevity was fueled by pure personal passion. His dedication to archaeology, seeking “Rome in Rome,” as the Ferrarese humanist Celio Calcagnini put it,³ aimed at a progressively deeper understanding of the ancient world. This translated into an impressive architectural expertise combined with a developing archaeological method that Arnold Nesselrath suggested was so advanced that it foreshadowed modern archaeological practice.⁴

Though once again only minimal autograph material survives to substantiate his importance as an antiquarian, what does remain is telling. In a 1516 letter to Cardinal Bibbiena, Pietro Bembo remarks upon an outing planned with a group of individuals, including Raphael, to scour the ruins of Hadrian’s Villa, and not long after Raphael was known to visit, along with his workshop

² The notion of the “bottega antiquariana” was first proposed by Morolli (*Le Belle Forme*, 32).

³ As quoted at the beginning of the chapter.

⁴ As Nesselrath comments: “something of Winckelmann’s archaeological method . . . seems not to occur for the first time with the great German scholar, but seems already true for Raphael, who lies are the root of certain strains of archaeology.” (“Raphael’s Archaeological Method,” 369).

protégé Giovanni da Udine, the remnants of Nero's Domus Aurea.⁵ Artistically the record of this study exists in both his sketches of extant Roman ruins, such as the Arch of Constantine, Trajan's Column, or the colossal horses of the Quirinal,⁶ and in his careful translation of antique paintings from textual accounts to accurate visual interpretations. Such study could have informed his *Galatea*, but it can most certainly be seen in his designs for a version of the *Nuptials of Alexander and Roxanne* (1516-1517; Albertina, Graphische Sammlung, Vienna, R118, SR 266, inv. 17634) (Fig. 88). This work, known only from a drawing, which reveals a careful study of 2nd century CE rhetorician Lucian's description of a similar painting.⁷ Drawings derived from Vitruvius's text that are arguably by Raphael's hand and that are included in the Fossombrone sketchbook (38v and 39r) support the notion that Raphael anticipated participating in a fully

⁵ As Talvacchia comments, this visit to the Golden House was confirmed by an unfortunate *sgraffito* left behind by Giovanni da Udine: "Giovanni left his signature, 'Zuan da Udene,' scratched on the vault of the Domus' *cryptoporticus* as witness to his visit, admiration and vandalism alarmingly combined." (*Raphael*, 150).

⁶ As Jones and Penny comment: "his drawing of one of the colossal marble horses on the Quirinal, carefully noting the breaks in the stone, can almost be thought of as an elevation drawing, seen from the viewpoint of one standing on a level with it, rather than from the more normal viewpoint from the ground below. If the measurements on it are his, or contemporary with him, it is the earliest surviving measured drawing of an antique sculpture." (*Raphael*, 205).

⁷ As Lucian recounts: "it must have been a very wonderful picture. . . . Well, I have seen it - it is now in Italy -, so I can tell you. A fair chamber, with the bridal bed in it; Roxana seated - and a great beauty she is - with downcast eyes, troubled by the presence of Alexander, who is standing. Several smiling Loves; one stands behind Roxana, pulling away the veil on her head to show her to Alexander; another obsequiously draws off her sandal, suggesting bed-time; a third has hold of Alexander's mantle, and is dragging him with all his might towards Roxana. The King is offering her a garland, and by him as supporter and groom's-man is Hephaestion, holding a lighted torch and leaning on a very lovely boy; this is Hymenaeus, I conjecture, for there are no letters to show. On the other side of the picture, more Loves playing among Alexander's armour; two are carrying his spear, as porters do a heavy beam; two more grasp the handles of the shield, tugging it along with another reclining on it, playing king, I suppose; and then another has got into the breast-plate, which lies hollow part upwards; he is in ambush, and will give the royal equipage a good fright when it comes within reach." (Lucian, *Herodotus and Aëtion*, trans. by H.W Fowler and F.G. Fowler (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1905), Vol. II, 92-93). Interestingly, Hall suggests that it was this design that inspired Sodoma's rendition of the same in Chigi's bedroom around 1517.

illustrated edition of Vitruvius, a source that he had studied already for some time. As Shearman mentions, “Raphael was reading Vitruvius, critically, in 1514, and his notes upon the manuscript translation into Italian show him a careful student of the exact meaning of the original text.”⁸ His Vitruvian study ultimately encouraged him, along with the help of Marco Fabio Calvo and Angelo Colocci, to produce his own translation of the text, a project that was left incomplete at the time of Raphael’s death.

Had this group finished the translation, however, it would have been a watershed production. According to Huppert, “had it reached completion, the Calvo-Colocci-Raphael project might have preceded [Cesare di Lorenzo] Cesariano’s publication as the first illustrated translation of Vitruvius.”⁹ Though this groundbreaking achievement was not to occur, leaving Raphael’s study of architecture to become obscured beneath the dense veil of painterly celebrity, it nevertheless suggests his overarching desire to achieve a new depth of understanding of architecture and antiquity as it related to his work.

This fascination resulted in Raphael’s circulation among the intellectual elite of Rome. Indeed, by the time he had completed the architectural projects for Chigi, Raphael had established his own “bottega antiquariana,” working in close collaboration with the likes of Calvo and Andrea Fulvio, both of whom would go on to produce two of the most complete accounts of ancient artifacts in sixteenth

⁸ Shearman, “Rome, Raphael,” 138. He goes on to note that Raphael was also well-versed in the writings of Pliny, Columella, and Alberti.

⁹ Huppert, “The Archaeology,” 29. Cesariano’s edition was published in 1521 (Cesare Cesariano, *Di Lucio Vitruvio*).

century Rome.¹⁰ So deeply was Raphael immersed in his study of the ancient world that his interests intersected the Greek world as well. Vasari reported that Raphael sent draftsmen to Greece to sketch the ruins there, as the Greeks represented, in Golzio's paraphrase of Raphael, "the perfect masters of all the arts."¹¹ What is more, Raphael incorporated Greek antiquities into his own collection. As Christian notes, the 1556 *Hieroglyphica* published by Pierio Valeriano, Greek tutor to the Medici and associate of Raphael, mentioned in the artist's possession a marble sculpture of *Philemon*, the fourth-century BCE Athenian poet who rivaled Menander. Though long since lost, Raphael's *Philemon* represented a rarity, as it bore an identifying Greek inscription. And, as Christian points out:

Raphael did not know Greek but, as was the case with other collectors, his ownership of an inscribed portrait of a Greek writer would have connected him with the few that did. In this sense, his display of *Philemon* is a counterpart to his study of the images of the Greek authors for *The School of Athens* and the *Parnassus*. If Raphael's project to map ancient Rome was one way to access the antique, his 'expertise' in the portraiture of writers of the ancient world was another. These artistic projects, so closely tied to literary antiquarian studies, gave Raphael the credentials to join Rome's humanist circles, even without the usual linguistic skills.¹²

¹⁰ Morolli, "Le Belle Forme," 32. Andrea Fulvio, *Antiquitates Urbis per Andream Fulvium Antiquarium* (Rome, 1527); Marco Fabio Calvo, *Antiquae Urbis Romae cum Regionibus Simulachrum* (Basileae, 1532).

¹¹ "Li perfetti maestri di tutte l'arte . . ." (Golzio, 36). As Nesselrath comments, "only one document of Raphael's research into ancient Greece is left to prove Vasari's story: an engraving by Agostino Veneziano showing the base of the column of the emperor Marcian in Constantinople, which according to the legend at the bottom of the print [which reads 'Basamento d[el]la colona d[i] constantinopolo/mandato a Rafelo da urbino'] must have been copied from one of the drawings sent to Raphael." (Nesselrath, "Raphael's Archaeological Method," 361) For further identification of this column base, see: Ekaterini Samaltanou-Tsiakma, "A Renaissance Problem of Archaeology," *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, 78 (1971), 225-232.

¹² Kathleen Wren Christian, "Raphael's 'Philemon' and the Collecting of Antiquities in Rome," *The Burlington Magazine*, 146 (1220) (Nov., 2004), 763. This connection between Raphael and Greek literature merits additional examination beyond the scope of the present research, in consideration of both Raphael's continued contemplation of the dialectic between word and image and Chigi's

It is Raphael's circle of connection that so positioned him at a critical juncture between art, architecture, antiquity and intellectual thought. As Gabriele Morolli summarizes, "only Raphael was destined to give form with a dizzying acceleration to humanist ideas reflecting the maturation of notions from antiquity to his own artistic universe."¹³ Simultaneous with his achievement of status as an antiquarian was his ascendance in architectural acclaim. In 1514, with the sudden death of Bramante in March, Raphael was appointed *maestro della fabbrica* for the rebuilding of Saint Peter's. At the time "[Raphael's] name stood at the hub of the artistic and cultural world that the splendour of Leo's Court had attracted to Rome."¹⁴ Within only a few years of his earliest architectural commissions at the Villa Farnesina, Raphael assumed the position of the foremost architect and antiquarian in Rome. This position is perhaps best encapsulated in his letter written to Pope Leo X, of which three versions exist.

A collaboration between Baldassarre Castiglione¹⁵ and an anonymous architect whom most assume to have been Raphael,¹⁶ this letter's date has been a

previously mentioned import of book printer Zacharias Kallierges in 1511, resulting in the first edition of texts in Greek in Rome.

¹³ "Raffaello, e solo Raffaello, sembrava essere l'uomo, l'artista . . . destinato a dare forma visibile alle idee che con una vertiginosa accelerazione l'ultimo Umanismo stava maturando nei riguardi dell'Antichità e del suo universo artistico." (Morolli, 32-33).

¹⁴ Lefevre, *Palazzi Chigi*, 18. For a full account of the chronology of the new Saint Peter's development, please see: Suzanne Boorsch, "The Building of the Vatican: The Papacy and Architecture," *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, 40 (3)(Winter, 1982-1983), 4-64.

¹⁵ Vittorio Cian, *Nel Mondo di Baldassarre Castiglione: documenti illustrate* (Milano, 1942), 70.

¹⁶ As Shearman comments, "the case for Raphael's authorship still rests chiefly upon . . . the consistency between its description of a project for the graphic reconstruction of ancient Rome and the methods and ambitions known from other sources to have been Raphael's." Specifically, Shearman cites the work of D. Francesconi, *Congettura che una lettera creduta di Baldessar Castiglione sia di*

subject of great debate. Shearman argues effectively, however, that the initial draft was penned in 1514, based on his previous proposal that Raphael first visited Rome around 1502 and in conjunction with a chronological reference in Raphael's own words in his lament over vandalism, "'poi ch'io sono in Roma, che anchora non è l'undicimo anno. . . .'"¹⁷ Scholarship today dates these three letter drafts to between 1514 and 1518, Raphael's chief years of architectural production, including his two architectural commissions for Chigi.

All three versions of the letter assess the state of antiquities in Rome, including Raphael's laments as to their mistreated state. In addition, Raphael recounts his intention to recreate the ancient city on paper, a massive undertaking that would actually be only fractionally complete upon his death. In fact, some suggestion has been made that this letter was to eventually serve as an introductory *epistola* to this compendium on ancient Rome.¹⁸

Though this project was left incomplete upon Raphael's death, evidence suggests the eventual product would have been the most technically comprehensive view of ancient Rome on paper. Nevertheless, Raphael's incredibly detailed sketches from the Domus Aurea, through the Fora Imperiali to the Baths of Diocletian remain, capturing these structures down to the intricacies of archways and stucco adornments. From this study, complete with

Raffaello (Florence, 1799) and P.E. Visconti, *Lettera sulla antichità di Roma scritta da Raffaello d'Urbino a Papa Leone X* (Rome, 1833).

¹⁷ Shearman, "Rome, Raphael," 137; Shearman, *Raphael in Early Modern Sources*, 1519/70, 500-545 (includes text and analysis of all three letters). As Shearman points out, this dating is updated in the second version of the letter to indicate that now twelve, not eleven, years have passed.

¹⁸ This notion was first proposed by Anton Springer (*Raffaello und Michelangelo*, vol. 2 (Leipzig: Seemann, 1895), 128) and reiterated by Nesselrath ("Raphael's Archaeological Method," 363).

technical surveying and analysis of relevant texts, came an in-depth knowledge of antiquity so adroit that Raphael was able to date structures with unprecedented accuracy. Nesselrath highlights the example of the arch of Constantine:

Raphael dates the architecture to the Constantinian age and the reliefs to the periods of Trajan, Antoninus Pius and Constantine respectively. 'Antoninus Pius' can also mean Marcus Aurelius, so that except for the Hadrianic tondi, Raphael noticed all the stylistic differences in the monument that are distinguished by scholars today. Even if he had indeed meant the predecessor of Marcus Aurelius, he was out only by one emperor. . . . An analysis of the arch of Constantine like the one attributed to Raphael has been achieved only in this century after 400 years of research on the monument. At the beginning of this tradition stands Raphael himself: our present dating of the great frieze to the age of Trajan goes back to him, while his other discoveries have been forgotten.¹⁹

As Nesselrath's commentary implies, Raphael had positioned himself at this hub of antiquarian pursuits, adding to his growing list of titles the Papal appointment of *commissario delle antichità* in 1515.²⁰

As scholars have suggested, however, this 1514 letter was more than a mere pledge of an ambitious architect's intentions. Rather, it spoke on several levels to the significance that such an undertaking bore. Indeed, by this time drawing had become an essential tool in the effort, as Huppert posited, "to recover the ancient manner of building, that is the exploration of texts and the exploration of buildings,"²¹ which was inherently an act of reconstruction or

¹⁹ Nesselrath, "Raphael's Archaeological Method," 364-365.

²⁰ His full title was: "Praefectus armorum et lapidum omnium," which gave him jurisdiction over "de marmi e di tutte le pietre che saranno estratti a Roma e furor Roma nel giro di dieci migla." (Morolli, 35).

²¹ Huppert, "The Archaeology," 24.

recreation. As Leonard Barkan posited, “ [Raphael’s] very language suggests, the acts of recording, decoding, and reconstructing the ancient city . . . are inextricably interwoven.”²² Thus, for Raphael, the analysis of ancient Rome was multidimensional, not that unlike that which he was asked to perform at Chigi’s villa.

Peruzzi, Performance and Perspective

At the same time this letter offers a glimpse into Raphael’s antiquarian expertise, one can also get a sense of the continued impact of his association with Peruzzi as well, who shared Raphael’s innovative archaeological and architectural language. In his letter variations to Pope Leo X, for example, Raphael placed equal emphasis on the importance of ground plan, elevation and perspectival drawings, however it is in his third letter draft that Raphael includes a clear statement of the significance of perspective, which, as Huppert has pointed out, was also echoed in his architectural sketches.²³ Raphael was careful, however, to relegate the perspectival drawing to the realm of the painter, not the architect. Raphael attributed them thus because, to quote Huppert, such “drawings expressed the principle of arrangement and represented the thought

²² Barkan, *Unearthing the Past*, 38.

²³ Huppert, “The Archaeology,” 33; please also see Huppert, “Envisioning a New Saint Peter’s,” 160, 165; and Arnold Nesselrath, “Raphael’s Archaeological Method,” 358.

or imagination and invention of the designer.”²⁴ Peruzzi also placed great stock in the incorporation of perspectival drawings in his analysis of ancient architecture, however this perspective was often lavished on detailed studies of component parts of antique structures.²⁵

This distinction between the pictorial, or painterly, rendition versus the architectural, orthogonal depiction of ancient structures was the initial step toward the development of a new type of “architectural” drawing that stressed analytic precision. Both Raphael and Peruzzi shared an analytical element to their respective approaches, employing the tools of mathematics and cartography and documenting measurements and directions.²⁶ Peruzzi perhaps surpassed Raphael in this regard, not only in that his recording, particularly of ancient structures, was done with remarkable exactitude, but also because no extant drawing by Raphael demonstrates this application. Mark Wilson Jones cites as an example of this precision Peruzzi’s documentation of the Roman

²⁴ “In proposing, as Raphael did in all versions of the text, that perspectival drawings were the province of the painter rather than the architect, he maintained Alberti’s distinctions between the two fields, invoking the tacit endorsement of his Renaissance predecessor. Yet in support of his claims about the utility of perspective for architects, he found sanction in an even more venerable source, Vitruvius, who in addition to discussing plans and elevations (*ichnographia* and *orthographia*), also considered what he called *scaenographia*, or perspective” (Huppert, “Envisioning a New Saint Peter’s,” 160).

²⁵ For more on these approaches please see: Ann C. Huppert, “Baldassarre Peruzzi as Archaeologist in Terracina,” in Frommel et al., *Baldassarre Peruzzi, 1481-1536* (Venice: 2005), 213-224.

²⁶ Based on Raphael’s letters, Huppert suggests that essential to Raphael’s approach was the “bussola di calamita,” a magnetic compass that was designed for cartographic land surveys. (Huppert, “The Archaeology,” 51). On his plan of a house at the Tiber beneath the Aventine hill, “for example, as Huppert recounts, “Peruzzi marked not only the distances in *piedi* and *digiti* but also orientations. . . . [referring] to the Latin words for two of the cardinal points,” all four of which were demarcated on the essential *bussola di calamita*. (Huppert, “The Archaeology,” 52).

Forum's Temple of Castor columns, wherein "modern measurements . . . agree with those of Peruzzi to within half a centimeter."²⁷

This emphasis on the importance of perspective and precision was no doubt influenced by the concurrently burgeoning field of theatrical scenography. A field where perspectival relationships are essential, theatrical scenography was fittingly an interest of both Raphael and Peruzzi, with Peruzzi arguably achieving greater success. This discourse on architectural drawings, the use of perspective, and an inherent theatrical element in both brings us full circle, so to speak, back to the stanze at the Vatican, where Raphael's pictorial style came to inform the subsequent and final engagement between Raphael and Peruzzi, that of the tandem commissions for Peruzzi's Sala delle Prospettive and Raphael's Loggia di Amore e Psiche.

Raphael's Fire

While Peruzzi's influence can be detected in Raphael's aforementioned letters, Peruzzi's impact is more explicit in Raphael's design for *Fire in the Borgo*, the most noted fresco in the Stanza dell'Incendio (Fig. 89), completed in 1514. It seems not without coincidence that this work has also been cited as the moment at which a sort of pictorial "vernacular" emerges, one that reads almost as an elaborate stage play of Raphael's interests in archaeology, *all'antica* motifs, and architecture. This was the first wall Raphael completed following his initial

²⁷ Jones, "Palazzo Massimo," 64.

exchanges with Sebastiano and Peruzzi, and thus it seems significant that this was also one of the more controversial works of Raphael's oeuvre.

Past scholarship disparaged *Fire in the Borgo* on a number of counts,²⁸ from accusations of a "plodding execution"²⁹ to being likened to a "mechanical chessboard of filled and empty spaces,"³⁰ yet more recently scholars have reconsidered Raphael's aims in the work. Patricia Reilly, for example, has recently revisited *Fire in the Borgo* as a representation of what she terms a vernacular style.³¹ Working against previous characterization of this composition as an aberration in contrast to otherwise harmonious beauty of Raphael's oeuvre, Reilly contends that *Fire in the Borgo* represents a visual argument for a new approach to painting.³²

Reilly suggests that this composition reflects the influence of the humanist Pietro Bembo's emphasis on style over subject matter, which Bembo asserted was the essential characteristic of laudable poetry. As Reilly posits: "when considered in light of Bembo's dictate that poets should be judged on 'how much *piacevolezza* [pleasantness] and how much *gravità* [gravity] they have created and distributed

²⁸ As Kurt Badt points, contemporary reception of this work was quite good: "the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, too, judged [*Fire in the Borgo*] favourably. Vasari, for example, admired the imaginative power of the *ingeniosissimo e mirabile artifice*, who had painted a *storia* in which *si veggiono diversi pericoli figurati*; not only persons, but situations made manifest through persons. Bellori (Bellori, *Descrizione delle Immagini dipinti da Raffaello d'Urbino nelle Camere del Palazzo Vaticano* (Rome, 1695), 85-95) saw *gran maniera* in Raphael's figures, whilst Francesco Albani, in a letter quoted by Bellori (*Descrizione*, 92), praised the picture as "a terrible spectacle, full to the brim with inventions [*concetti*] expressed with so much clarity that one is moved to pity." It was Jakob Burckhardt that, according to Badt, last gave the painting a positive gloss. (Badt, "Raphael's 'Incendio del Borgo,'" 36).

²⁹ Hermann Dollmayr, "Raffaels Werkstätte," *Jahrbuch des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, XVI (1895), 248-9.

³⁰ Ettore Camesasca, *Tutta la pittura di Raffaello* (Milan, 1956), 24.

³¹ Reilly, "Raphael's *Fire in the Borgo*," 308-325.

³² *Ibid.*, 308.

throughout their compositions,' Raphael's *Fire in the Borgo* can be seen as a demonstration piece of his ability to do just that in pictorial form."³³ Tempering the seriousness of the story retold - that of ninth-century Pope Leo IV's momentous cessation of a fire that threatened to destroy the Borgo neighborhood adjacent to Saint Peter's - Raphael injected a critique of Michelangesque technique by borrowing pictorial and anatomical styles from Michelangelo's concurrent work in the Sistine Chapel. She points specifically to the nude figure dangling precipitously from the smoldering wall on the left-hand side of the composition, a figure whose bulging musculature is uncharacteristically blundering for someone of Raphael's skill. In connecting this figure with that of *Haman* in Michelangelo's Sistine Chapel ceiling, Reilly suggests that Raphael intentionally distorted this figure to illustrate a "humorous demonstration of Michelangesque *gravità* gone bad."³⁴

Such levity, as advocated by fellow humanist Bernardo Dovizi (later Cardinal Bernardo Bibbiena),³⁵ transforms *Fire in the Borgo* into a statement on the changing status of painting and the painter in early *cinquecento* Rome. As Reilly concludes:

Raphael argues . . . that his own style made his work the perfect poetic model on which to base an Italian *pictorial* vernacular. In appropriating Bembo's theories and the practice of literary *imitatio* in this way, Raphael

³³ Ibid., 317.

³⁴ Reilly, "Raphael's *Fire in the Borgo*," 318.

³⁵ As Reilly comments: "Such humor must be appropriate to the context in which it is received, however, and Bibbiena cautions that 'we must be prudent and pay considerable attention to the place and timing and the kind of people to whom we speak,' for 'laughter is most agreeable to everyone, and the one who inspires it at the right time and place deserves every praise.'" Reilly, "Raphael's *Fire in the Borgo*," 319; Baldassarre Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier*, trans. by George Anthony Bull (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1976), 155.

claimed a place for himself and his art in the intellectual hierarchy of Leonine Rome.³⁶

Reilly's arguments resonate in similar scholarly discussions of the significance of this fresco, specifically that offered by Rowland, who encapsulates *Fire in the Borgo* as "on one of its most significant levels . . . a treatise on beauty, architectural beauty in particular."³⁷ Rowland cites Raphael's direct engagement with issues of beauty and architectural decorum, elements of which Raphael had learned a great deal working with close friends Angelo Colocci and Baldassarre Castiglione. He drew upon the Vitruvian ideal of architectural proportions analogous to human proportions, juxtaposing figural references with nearby referential architecture. The female figure at far right, for example, who balances a vase on her head, alludes to the Platonic notion that items of utility should at once be beautiful and practical. Behind her and to her left appears an Ionic colonnade, the order that Vitruvius first defined through the proportions of the female form. Rowland then incorporated the previously mentioned sprawling male nude on the opposite side of the composition as a means of balancing the image, as adjacent to him is a Corinthian colonnade, drawing again on the same proportional parallel described by Vitruvius.³⁸

Whereas Reilly's pictorial vernacular depends upon Raphael's emphasis on style over subject, Rowland's conceptualization of Raphael's architectural vernacular within *Fire in the Borgo* reveals the transformation of style *into* subject,

³⁶ Reilly, "Raphael's *Fire in the Borgo*," 322.

³⁷ Rowland, "Raphael, Angelo Colocci," 523.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 524-525.

suggesting it reveals a new architectural theory designed for an early sixteenth-century audience. The rusticated papal benediction loggia of the original Saint Peter's Basilica bears the hallmarks of the Tuscan-Doric order.³⁹ Employed in the Basilica Aemilia, built in the 1st-century BCE and still extant in 1500, this order, which employed a Tuscan colonnade combined with a Doric entablature, was only just being resurrected for the first time since antiquity in Raphael's day.

As other scholars have illustrated, however, this fresco bears multiple valences on which it can be understood. On one level, *Fire in the Borgo* can be read as an allegory of papal authority, as John Onians argues. Citing the quotations of ancient structures within the composition, Onians proposes that it represents "an expression of the historical development of the Christian Church from simple origins to a perfect fulfillment."⁴⁰ Rowland echoes Onians' position, arguing that *The Fire in the Borgo*, "the only fresco in the room that clearly bears the stamp of Raphael's design and execution,"⁴¹ represents a deliberate allegory of a new Rome, juxtaposing Rome founders, Aeneas, Anchises, and Ascanius, who trekked to the region at the burning of Troy, with Julius' renovations of Rome, particularly the creation of a new Saint Peter's.

Thus, when juxtaposed against his earlier work in the Stanza della Segnatura, the imagery of the Stanza dell'Incendio's *Fire in the Borgo* reveals Raphael's more incisive commentary on theories of architecture and painting under the veiled propaganda in support of the pope. While the Stanza della

³⁹ Ibid., 526.

⁴⁰ John Onians, *Bearers of Meaning* (NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988), 258.

⁴¹ Rowland, "The Vatican Stanze," 115.

Segnatura's imagery revealed hints of Raphael's early fascination with antiquity and architecture, the Stanza dell'Incendio's *Fire in the Borgo* reflects the full maturation of these interests, wherein Raphael developed his own visual vocabulary to summarize in one image both the intersections of his passions for painting, architecture and antiquity and also the invocation of references to his contemporaries.

Amid all these potential references, one cannot help but look to the fictive architecture incorporated into this composition as signifying a part of this declaratory treatise and ask where Raphael found his inspiration. Interestingly, the architecture incorporated in *Fire in the Borgo* is very similar to that seen in a scenographic drawing (Uffizi A291) (Fig. 90) attributed to Peruzzi's hand.⁴² From this drawing, Raphael borrowed the use of raking perspective to indicate a deep recession in space, while also adopting similar, albeit slightly modified, architectural forms.⁴³ At the farthest reaches of the drawing appears a triumphal arch; Raphael, however, replaced this ancient motif with a figurative vignette of the old Saint Peter's façade. The intended air, then, of Raphael's *Fire in the Borgo*

⁴² "Non conosciamo questa scena peruzziana del 1514, ma essa doveva essere simile al disegno di Torino, opera certa del Peruzzi a databile all'autunno del 1515. Il famoso disegno Uff. Arch. 291 sicuramente non è da sua mano, e il progetto suo per la scena dei "Bacchides" è soltanto del 1531. L'unico disegno scenografico sicuro, dopo l'incisione bramantesca e prima del 1520, rimane dunque quello torinese" (Christoph Frommel, "Raffaello e il teatro alla corte di Leone X," *Bolletino del Centro internazionale di studi di architettura 'Andrea Palladio'*, (1976), 173-174).

⁴³ "The similarity starts with the general central perspectival layout, in which the buildings to the right and left of the street are distributed in equilibrium, and continues – reversed, as in a mirror – in the row of pillars with a section of the beams and with the small staircase projecting into the street, the two details which largely determine the architectural composition of the *Incendio del Borgo*" (Badt, "Raphael's 'Incendio,'" 40-41). This drawing had once been attributed to Peruzzi, however this attribution has since been discounted (see: Christoph Frommel, "Raffaello e il teatro alla corte di Leone X," *Bolletino del Centro internazionale di studi di architettura 'Andrea Palladio'*, (1976), 173-188; Henrich Wurm, *Baldassarre Peruzzi: Architekturzeichnungen* (Tübingen: Ernst Wasmuth, 1984).

is one of theatricality, as the architectural backdrop he created is reminiscent of contemporary stage design.⁴⁴ Thus, if the transition seen between *La Disputa* and the *School of Athens* in the adjacent Stanza della Segnatura signifies Raphael's shift from painter to architect, then between *School of Athens* and the Stanza dell'Incendio's *Fire in the Borgo* one witnesses the evolution of architect to scenographer.

In this respect, one could interpret the architectural backdrops of *School of Athens* and *Fire in the Borgo* as representing the dichotomy between the architect's and the painter's approach to architectural rendering. The architecture Raphael included in *School of Athens* belies his early study of architectural forms as he maintains a close allegiance in his quotations of designs for Saint Peter's as well as his examination of *all'antica* forms. The *Fire in the Borgo*, however, represents his translation into the artistic realm of theatrical design, conjuring a different conception of space altogether. In *Fire in the Borgo*, as opposed to *School of Athens*, there is no cohesion of the structures and architectural elements included; it is, in essence, fragmentary. As such these architectural features are privileged to an exalted status, becoming as much characters in the narrative as the dramatic figures already included. Thus, *Fire in the Borgo* establishes yet another instance of Raphael's ability to create visual connection, or harmony, between divergent approaches that also encourages contemplation on the boundaries between painter as architect and architect as painter.

⁴⁴ As Badt reiterates: "This is definitely a 'stage decoration' view, as opposed to the spatial width of the 'School of Athens'" (Badt, "Raphael's 'Incendio,' 40-41).

Raphael was indeed intrigued by the novel field of theatrical set design and was involved after *Fire in the Borgo* with the set design for the 1519 performance of Ludovico Ariosto's comedy *I Suppositi*.⁴⁵ Peruzzi had, by this time, already established himself as an expert scenographer. He had designed theatrical apparati for both the *posse* of Leo X and the confirmation of Roman citizenship on Giuliano and Lorenzo de Medici in 1513. He can be securely linked to scenographic designs for a performance of Cardinal Bibbiena's "La Calandria" during the Carnival season of 1515,⁴⁶ the first performance of which, in 1513, incorporated the first use of a perspectival architectural theatrical backdrop.⁴⁷ As Vasari recounts, Peruzzi's efforts were so impressive that they rekindled the long-dormant field of set design:

In such works he deserved all the greater praise, because dramatic performance, and consequently the scenery for them, had been out of fashion for a long time. . . .And either before or after (it matters little which) the performance of the aforesaid Calandria, . . . Baldassarre made two such scenes, which were marvelous, and open the way to those who

⁴⁵ Golzio, 94; Frommel, "Raffaello e il teatro," 183. Commissioned by Leo X's nephew Cardinal Innocenzo Cibò, Raphael's designs, including a perspectival view of Ferrara, were used for a performance at the Castel Sant'Angelo (Oskar Fischel, *Raphael* (London: K. Paul, 1948), vol. 1, 212). So devoted to his designs for this production that he further delayed his promised commissions to Duke Alfonso d'Este of Ferrara, which drew the admonition in early 1520 from the Duke to his agent that Raphael should "think carefully about what it means to give his word" and that the agent should "speak to the most reverend Lord Cardinal Cibò commending us to his Lordship and remind him of the promise he made to manage things so that this Raphael would quickly finish our picture." (Golzio, 105-106).

⁴⁶ Bibbiena brought his play to Rome for two performances, one in December 1514 for Pope Leo X and Isabella D'Este held at the Vatican, the second during the carnival season of 1515. Peruzzi perhaps contributed to both Roman productions, however this is unconfirmed: "Non conosciamo questa scena peruzziana del 1514, ma essa doveva essere simile al disegno di Torino, opera certa del Peruzzi a databile all'autunno del 1515. Il famoso disegno Uff. Arch. 291 sicuramente non è da sua mano, e il progetto suo per la scena dei "Bacchides" è soltanto del 1531. L'unico disegno scenografico sicuro, dopo l'incisione bramantesca e prima del 1520, rimane dunque quello torinese" (Frommel, "Raffaello e il teatro, 173-174).

⁴⁷ As described in a letter by Castiglione to Count Ludovico Canossa, October, 1513; Alfred Schard, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bühnenbildes vom 15. Zum Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Ph.D. diss, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1925), 35).

have since made them in our own day. . . . This kind of spectacle, in my belief, when it has all its accessories, surpasses any other kind, however sumptuous and magnificent.⁴⁸

According to Kurt Badt, Raphael would have had an intimate knowledge of these designs, giving him the opportunity to channel the same theatrical energy into *Fire in the Borgo*.⁴⁹ Raphael borrows heavily from the architectural scenography of Peruzzi, but more importantly he chooses to incorporate those elements characteristic of a stage set for tragedy as defined through Vitruvius and Aristotle's *Poetics*.⁵⁰ As Badt comments, "in showing columns of different architectural orders he was not moved by a desire to display his knowledge of antique architecture or to introduce famous Roman ruins, but to emphasize the tragic character of the subject of his painting and to indicate that he understood it as a tragedy in the antique sense."⁵¹

In short, *Fire in the Borgo* represents the intersection of the multiple veins of Raphael's pursuits just as *Galatea* had done approximately two years prior. His fascination with antiquity, his interest in the intellectual pursuits of humanism and poetry and his passion for art and architecture in early *cinquecento* Rome came together in a remarkably dynamic composition. As such, just as with

⁴⁸ Vasari, *Lives*, 814.

⁴⁹ "Raphael would therefore not only have had an exact knowledge of this kind of stage design, but he would also have gathered its full literary significance in conversations on the subject" (Badt, "Raphael's 'Incendio,'" 42).

⁵⁰ Vitruvius identifies the scenography of tragedy thus: "there are three types of sets: one that is called tragic, one called comic, and the third satiric. . . . tragic sets are represented with columns and gables and statues and the other trappings of royalty." Vitruvius, Book 5, Chapter 6 (Ingrid Rowland and Thomas Noble Howe, *Vitruvius: Ten Books on Architecture* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 70).

⁵¹ Badt, "Raphael's 'Incendio,'" 43. Such a sentiment is echoed by Morolli, who comments that *Fire in the Borgo* 'ha l'impianto di una vera e propria 'scena tragica' classica dal grande valore programmatico" (Morolli, 36).

Galatea, this composition becomes a veritable self-homage as he navigated the artistic community of early sixteenth-century Rome while also exploring his own interests.

Essential throughout this elaborate navigation of *Fire in the Borgo*, however, was Raphael's connection to Peruzzi. The two were not only sharing ideas – Raphael borrowing Peruzzi's architectural schemata for *Fire in the Borgo*, and Peruzzi reciprocating with a similar emulation of the architectural backdrop in his eventual *Presentation of the Virgin in the Temple* fresco in Santa Maria della Pace (1516)⁵² – but they were building upon them. This connection is important because shortly after Raphael completed *Fire in the Borgo*, he would return to the Villa Farnesina, this time to design the decoration of the Loggia di Amore e Psiche. His last contribution to the space, Raphael's Loggia di Amore e Psiche, struck a new discourse with Peruzzi and his Sala de Prospettive upstairs.

Perspective and Psyche

By the time Raphael and Peruzzi commenced work on these final Farnesina projects around 1517, the atmosphere at the villa had changed decidedly.⁵³ The influence of Pope Julius II (1503-1513) had imposed a

⁵² Frommel suggests Peruzzi completed this work around 1523 (Frommel, "La Villa," 67), however Tessari, who offers a much more thorough analysis, proposes a date of 1516 (Tessari, 49). Tessari's more complete discussion leads this author to accept this alternate date.

⁵³ Consensus among scholarship dates both the Sala delle Prospettive and the Loggia di Amore and Psiche as having been completed at roughly the same time, between 1517-1519, following the completion of minor construction in the Sala delle Prospettive to expand the space in 1516 (Frommel,

conservative decorum on Chigi's complex, so much so that Egidio Gallo, in his panegyric on the Farnesina, stressed the properness of all villa activities. Under Pope Leo X (1513-1521), however, these proprietary efforts were relaxed, and the close relations between Leo X and Chigi, which Quinlan-McGrath described as "more intimate and less commercially useful" than those experienced with Julius II guaranteed a more raucous atmosphere.⁵⁴ As she comments, "it is noteworthy that all of the documented bacchanals at the Chigi estate date from Leo's pontificate,"⁵⁵ of which Leo attended six, each time accompanied by a coterie of nuns⁵⁶ and cardinals,⁵⁷ and at one such occasion, in February of 1518, was greeted with triumphant cannon fire upon arrival.⁵⁸ Quinlan-McGrath suggests the ever-increasing luxury of Chigi's events was in part in response to Leo X's more relaxed conventions but also reflected Chigi's desire to continually outdo, setting ever-increasing standards that no family or entity in Rome at the time could match.⁵⁹

Prior to these final respective Farnesina projects, Raphael was embroiled in an impossible number of commissions across Rome. In addition to overseeing

Farnesina, 48-49) as well as evidence of Sodoma's borrowing of Raphael's figures, including several from the Loggia di Amore e Psiche in his 1519 rendition of *Alexander the Great and the Mother of Darius* (Hayum, *Giovanni Antonio Bazzi*, 31; Frommel, *Peruzzi*, 87, n. 393).

⁵⁴ Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 33.

⁵⁵ Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 35; Frommel, *Der Römische Palastbau*, 2: 151-154.

⁵⁶ Frommel notes two sisters as accompanying the Pope for the February 27th visit of 1518 (Frommel, "La Villa," 64).

⁵⁷ Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 36; Frommel, *Der Römische Palastbau*, 2: 152-154.

⁵⁸ Frommel, *Farnesina*, 8; Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 172.

⁵⁹ As Quinlan-McGrath comments: "in considering Chigi's motivations [for such banquets], it would seem that the main problem in portraying him as a social climber is that he had nowhere to climb. His only competition was the Vatican, and Leo X bankrupted it in three years, while Agostino was still going stronger than ever in 1519. The noble Roman families like the Colonna and Orsini were hard pressed to match his political power and wealth, and if he was in competition, it was probably only to outdo his own last extravaganza" (Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 176).

the rebuilding of Saint Peter's and monitoring the state of archaeological research across Rome, Raphael had also recently completed a series of cartoons for tapestries that were to line the Sistine Chapel recounting Gospel narratives. Such varied projects, compounded with numerous painting requests, could never have been completed by one man, even one the stature of Raphael. Fortunately for Raphael, by 1517 he had also become *capomaestro* of his own workshop, housed in Bramante's Palazzo Caprini.⁶⁰ Raphael's workshop was structured counter to the conventional system, wherein underling artists work diligently as apprentices under a master artist. Instead Raphael followed a less hierarchical approach to workshop management similar to his own former master, Perugino.

As such, Raphael's workshop was more a place of equals, where collaboration, rather than competition, instigated artistic production.⁶¹ Shearman described Raphael's "curiously casual" approach to workshop management thus: "visitors from northern Italy, even from northern Europe, floated in and out. Specialists and independent, mature artists such as Giovanni da Udine worked there as collaborators rather than strictly as assistants."⁶² Thus, as opposed to churning out artists sharing a homogenous Raphaellesque painterly style, Raphael's workshop was, in some respects, designed after a co-opetitive

⁶⁰ John K.G. Shearman, "The Organization of Raphael's Workshop," *Art Institute of Chicago Museum Studies*, 10 (1983), 40.

⁶¹ Such an atmosphere is supported by Anka Ziefer's observation: "è noto che il Sodoma si trovava a Roma come collaboratore nella bottega di Raffaello dal 1508" ("*Marte e Venere sorpresi da Vulcano*: la fortuna iconographica di un affresco perduto di Baldassarre Peruzzi per la Villa Farnesina a Roma," in M. Beltramini and C. Elam, eds., *Some degree of happiness: Studi di storia dell'architettura in onore di Howard Burns* (Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore, 2010), 214). This date is perhaps too early to claim Sodoma's membership within Raphael's workshop; nevertheless, it does speak to the collaborative nature Raphael espoused among his artistic associates.

⁶² Shearman, "The Organization," 40.

model, wherein artists, though individually seeking acclaim, nevertheless shared ideas and techniques to that were then infused into Raphael's commissions. As Ray comments, with the advent of Raphael's radical workshop managerial style, "[Raphael] was no longer 'the master,' and students were not there simply 'to help'."⁶³ And, as time progressed, and Raphael became increasingly committed to projects, his workshop of artists assumed an increasingly larger role in his commissions.

Through Raphael maintained status as "creative director," to borrow Talvacchia's terminology, this collaborative element became central to Raphael's artistic practice. His collaboration with engraver Marcantonio Raimondi, for example, began as early as 1510, with Raphael going so far as to create drawings, such as the *Judgment of Paris* (Fig. 91), destined for the express purpose of translation into print. Another prime example of this collaborative element to his oeuvre was his completion, along with help from his chief assistant Giovanni da Udine, of a stufetta and loggia for Cardinal Bibbiena (circa 1516). An elaborate set of rooms that were in part inspired by a previous visit to newly unearthed

⁶³ Ray suggests that Raphael radically reinvented the way in which the workshop system worked: "Prima di Raffaello esiste un filo diretto che colleghe committenti, artisti e allievi, secondo una successione che definisce un posto per ciascuno, senza però impedire una circolarità e una sovrapposizione, e integrazione, tra l'operato degli artisti e quello degli allievi. Dopo Raffaello, invece, ruoli e struttura risultano irreversibilmente mutate. L'artista non è più il "maestro," l'allievo si fa 'aiuto.'" (Ray, "Il Volo di Icaro," 54). Talvacchia echoes a similar sentiment, stressing that this collaboration was a key factor in Raphael's artistic innovation: "the collaborative process was not only a necessity in bringing a tremendous number and variety of commissions to completion, but also a stimulus to his inventiveness" (Talvacchia, *Raphael*, 186). As Shearman commented in regard to Raphael's workshop management and the *cinquecento* demand for novelty: "an option that was not open to Raphael was Perugino's. An artist with a passionate dedication to excellence, Perugino coped with the problem of pressure following success by economizing on invention. He repeated cartoons; he cannibalized previous designs to rearrange the parts. That system could not survive in the more critical climate of the new century. To the younger generation, inspired by Leonardo and Michelangelo, invention was everything" (Shearman, "The Organization," 44).

ancient painted rooms near San Pietro in Vincoli,⁶⁴ these chambers for Bibbiena were, according to Jones and Penny so reminiscent of ancient Roman interior decoration that they were easily mistaken as such.⁶⁵ Simultaneous with such projects, Raphael's status in Rome continued to ascend. The success of his Vatican stanze assured him steadily increasing echelons of patrons, and rumors even abounded that Bibbiena himself had intentions to transform the artist into a cardinal.⁶⁶ Regardless of how overtaxed Raphael might have been with commissions, he nevertheless returned to the Farnesina to play a role in the final designs of the Loggia di Amore e Psiche,⁶⁷ a testament not only to his camaraderie with Chigi but also to his ongoing conversation with Peruzzi.

That Raphael was, even during this busy time of his career, still contemplating the practice of painting is evident in his drawing, printed as another engraving by Marcantonio Raimondi entitled *Quos Ego* (Fig. 92). Depicting a series of scenes from Virgil's *Aeneid*, Raphael's *Quos Ego* reads as if it

⁶⁴ Vasari mentions their visit to these well-preserved rooms as highly inspirational, yet the date of this visit is uncertain.

⁶⁵ According to Jones and Penny, these chambers for Cardinal Bibbiena were "the earliest surviving rooms to be created in modern Europe which can be mistaken, even by expert eyes, for decorations of the early Roman Empire"(Jones and Penny, 192).

⁶⁶ As Vasari wrote: "it had been hinted to [*Raphael*] that when the hall on which he was engaged was finished, the Pope proposed to reward him for his labors and abilities by giving him a red hat, of which he had already determined to distribute a good number, and some of them to men of less merit than Raphael."(*Lives*, trans. de Vere, 745). Such an inkling was echoed by Vasari's contemporary, Ludovico Dolce, and later by Francesco de Holanda, who wrote in 1571: "[*Raphael*] did not get married because he held it for very certain that the pope would have given him the cardinal's cap as soon as he brought his work to completion, and this would have happened without a doubt (according to what everyone says), if death had not prevented it." (in Francisco de Holanda, *I trattati d'Arte*, ed. by Grazia Modroni (Livorno: Sillabe, 2003), 222). Raphael's death in 1520 precluded such a station.

⁶⁷ As Rosalia Varoli-Piazza comments, "anche se affidata in gran parte ai suoi collaboratori, e seguendo i lavori molto da vicino" (Rosalia Varoli-Piazza, "Un Esempio di Concinnitas," in Rosalia Varoli-Piazza, *Raffaello: La Loggia di Amore e Psiche all Farnesina* (Cinisello Balsamo, Milan: Silvana, 2002), 58).

is a frontispiece for text and yet, as Christian Kleinbub argues, there is potentially more to Raphael's message. Kleinbub proposes that Raphael's narrative scenes here are deliberately intended to recall ancient Roman reliefs, thereby transforming the work into a more profound conversation on the competition between painting and sculpture.⁶⁸ Kleinbub suggests that Raphael pursued such a theme in response to his growing competition with Michelangelo, thus using this work to declare the supremacy of two-dimensional illusion. As Kleinbub summarizes, "in *Quos Ego*, the spectrum favors the pictorial art that, paradoxically, creates the greatest illusion of *rilievo* within the bounds of two dimensions."⁶⁹ This commentary seen in Raphael's *Quos Ego* is significant in several respects. On the one hand, it stresses that the thread of competition continued to be woven throughout Raphael's Roman career.

It is particularly striking that this statement about the competition between painting and sculpture (or, between Raphael and Michelangelo) would be wrought from a collaboration between Raphael and engraver Marcantonio Raimondi, whose medium, according to Kleinbub, was commonly likened to sculpture rather than painting.⁷⁰ On the other hand, Raphael's interest in *rilievo*, or the illusion of reality, seems a particularly important precursor to his final work in the Loggia di Amore e Psiche at the Farnesina, wherein the emphasis on

⁶⁸ Christian K. Kleinbub, "Raphael's *Quos Ego*: forgotten document on the Renaissance *paragone*," *Word & Image*, 28 (3) (July-September 2012), 290.

⁶⁹ Kleinbub, 291.

⁷⁰ Kleinbub, 293.

illusion, through fictive architecture and visual exchange with Peruzzi's *scaenae frons* façade, would become prevalent.

At the same time, Peruzzi had also kept busy. By the 1510s he was involved with the charitable Confraternity of San Rocco,⁷¹ for whom he would eventually provide designs for their church renovations. He had also been employed around Rome for a variety of projects, being credited with work on both the apse frescoes of Sant'Onofrio and the nave decorations for San Pietro in Montorio around 1508.⁷² Peruzzi's rendition of *Presentation of Mary at the Temple* for the Ponzetti Chapel Santa Maria della Pace (Fig. 93) dated to the subsequent decade (1516). With a narrative set against a background described by Vasari as "filled with buildings and most beautiful ornaments,"⁷³ Peruzzi's composition alluded to his concurrent career as theatrical set designer and his subsequent Sala delle Prospettive. He too was also managing a flourishing workshop, which had been considered by modern historians as second only to that composed by Raphael.⁷⁴

While the two had pursued varied commissions since their shared days at the Farnesina the decade before, the late 1510s brought both Raphael and Peruzzi

⁷¹ Huppert, "The Lessons of Rome," no page number available.

⁷² Huppert points out that, in the case of the Sant'Onofrio frescoes, "although debate continues about the roles that Peruzzi and Jacopo Ripanda played in the execution of these frescoes, a drawing by Peruzzi supports his involvement" (Ibid., 22). The drawing she mentions, depicting a group of sibyls, is illustrated in a variety of sources, most recently: Laura Testa, "Gli affreschi absidali della chiesa di Sant'Onofrio al Gianicolo: committenza, interpretazione ed attribuzione," *Storia dell'arte* 21(1989), 171-186.

⁷³ Vasari, *Lives*, vol. 2, 811.

⁷⁴ "Più vicino all'antichità e a Raffaello è Baldassarre Peruzzi, che a Roma aveva la bottega più fiorentina dopo quella di Raffaello, e che otteneva di continuo incarichi dal suo concittadino senese Agostino Chigi." (Konrad Oberhuber, "Lo stile classico di Raffaello e la sua evoluzione a Roma fino al 1527," in K. Oberhuber, ed., *Roma e lo stile classico di Raffaello* (Milan: Electa, 1999), 20 (17-30).

together again for another project immediately prior their final collaborations at the Farnesina. This was the commission for a ceiling fresco at the Palazzo della Cancelleria, known the *Volta Dorata* (Fig. 94) (1516-1518), in reference to the ancient ceiling of the first-century CE Domus Aurea which it quotes. Achim Gnann has suggested that the project became a joint commission out of choice.⁷⁵ The seamless manner in which the two artists' approaches came together in this ceiling, however, speaks both to their shared study of antiquity or, as Konrad Oberhuber described it, the "compositional criterion"⁷⁶ of ancient architecture and decoration. At the same time, this imperceptible blend of styles alludes to the stock both Raphael and Peruzzi must have placed in collaborative interactions and the potentially powerful artistic product that could come from a blend of their styles. While Oberhuber, for example, suggests Raphael's style lacked Peruzzi's monumentality while carrying this study of the antique further than did Peruzzi, their ability to co-create led to a sovereignty of classical form that superseded all other elements. This collaborative spirit would bring them together again during their final days at the Farnesina.

⁷⁵ Achim Gnann, "Peruzzi oder Raphael? Zu den Entwürfen für die Fresken der *Volta Dorata* in der Cancelleria," in C.L. Frommel et al., eds., *Baldassarre Peruzzi 1481-1536* (Venice: Marsilio, 2005), 199-212. Gnann identified several sketches by Raphael's hand as pertaining to the designs for the *Volta Dorata*. Huppert reiterates this point: "while Raphael may have received the commission and initially conceived of the overall design, it was Peruzzi who carried out the work, instituting changes to Raphael's proposal as he went" (Huppert, "Peruzzi and Rome," 23).

⁷⁶ "In confronto à Raffaello qui manca però la monumentalità; . . . "la vivace floridità e la libertà di movimento delle figure, nonché una profonda comprensione del criterio compositivo degli antichi, secondo il quale le forme agiscono sovrane" (Oberhuber, "Lo Stile Classico," 20).

The Sala delle Prospettive and the Architecture of Painting

Peruzzi's Sala delle Prospettive (Fig. 95), his first artistic commission on Chigi's grounds since completion of the astrological ceiling nearly a decade prior, is a remarkable example of Peruzzi's abilities in both painting and perspective. A closer look at the pictorial narrative imbedded within these *trompe-l'oeil* walls reveals Peruzzi's contemplation of painterly practice through visual references to antiquity along with quotations of both Sebastiano's and Raphael's paintings. Not having had the chance to do so in the Loggia di Galatea, as his was the first fresco work completed in the space, it seems Peruzzi took this latter opportunity at the Farnesina to invoke a dialogue with his two colleagues Sebastiano and Raphael. In doing so, Peruzzi instigated a dialogue with Raphael that would reach its pinnacle in the designs for the Farnesina's *scaenae frons* façade, a commission to which Peruzzi would turn following the Sala delle Prospettive's conclusion.

The Sala delle Prospettive appears as an open-air structure, with painted loggias on three of the four walls reminiscent of an ancient imperial Roman villa. Its walls reveal the expanse of Rome and countryside beyond, illustrating, as Quinlan-McGrath puts it, "the ancient and contemporary notion that a suburban villa should allow an interpenetration of house and grounds,"⁷⁷ a theme, as has been discussed, that runs throughout the Farnesina itself. It is in itself a statement of Peruzzi's expert handling of perspective, exemplifying his status as

⁷⁷ Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 375.

“principe dei prospettici pratici.”⁷⁸ The columns of the four walls are oriented such that a viewer facing north toward the monumental hearth would be treated to a *trompe-l’oeil* revelation of the city, the identical positioning for the ideal viewing of Peruzzi’s astrological ceiling on the villa’s lower level. For visitors to Chigi’s villa, this space guaranteed a rosy view of Rome. As Marcia Hall commented, “one can imagine Chigi bringing his guests here when the weather would not permit dining in the garden loggia. Warmed by the fire, they could enjoy the *illusion* [emphasis Hall’s] of light air and breeze and the view over the surroundings.”⁷⁹ Multi-colored faux marble revetments, the illusionistic rendering of mythological deities and an upper-register narrative frieze, encircling the room with each episode demarcated by herms, only amplified the magnificence of the space.⁸⁰ Sandwiched between this uppermost register and the cornices of the doorways below are paired fictive niches. A god or goddess of the ancient Roman pantheon inhabits each painted niche of the upper level, and below them are physical niches for statuary, each framed by a floriated archway held in place by two winged putti.

This layout reinforced the distinctions between the celestial and terrestrial realms, with the gods and their Ovidian narratives playing out over views onto

⁷⁸ Ignazio Danti, *Le due regole della prospettiva pratica* (Rome: Francesco Zannetti, 1583), 68. Quinlan-McGrath echoes a similar sentiment: “Peruzzi’s decorative and illusionistic gifts are particularly remarkable in this room. This point cannot be made too strongly that he had to decorate a very awkward architectural space. It is quite amazing that he so convincingly concealed the numerous asymmetries which resulted when the room was enlarged ca. 1516” (Quinlan-McGrath, “The Villa,” 375).

⁷⁹ Marcia Hall, *After Raphael: Painting in Central Italy in the Sixteenth Century* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 28.

⁸⁰ Claudia Cieri, “Sala delle Prospettive: via, storia, e funzione della sala,” in S. Rossi and K. Cassanelli, eds., *Di luoghi di Raffaello a Roma* (Rome; Multigrafica Editrice, 1983), 70.

the city of Rome. With this in mind, Peruzzi's Sala delle Prospettive alludes in some senses to Chigi's dominion as the symbolic Parnassus on earth, a revered space wherein the gods and their consorts could dwell, wherein the seasons met in perfect harmony, and wherein the concordant theme of the cycle of life – love, death, and rebirth – reigns. It is this overarching theme that guides the viewer around the room. This sort of symbolism provided a powerful message for both Chigi and his guests, creating a space that encouraged reverence as well as contemplation.

For as much as this room emphasized the extravagance of Chigi's domain, the classical references woven throughout served a visual testament to Peruzzi's affinities for antiquity. Quinlan-McGrath argues, for example, that Peruzzi modeled the room's design after the Pantheon. According to her, in addition to vibrant marbles, "like the Pantheon, Peruzzi's wall is articulated by solids framed with piers, and alternating voids which are 'opened' through colonnades."⁸¹ This connection with the Pantheon is reinforced most directly through the niche frescoes of different deities around the room, but in some senses it can also be extended to the uppermost frieze register of the room. Invoking the recurring narratives of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*,⁸² this series of imagery appears modeled from ancient relief sculpture, as pointed out by Nicole

⁸¹ Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 380.

⁸² As Quinlan-McGrath asserts: "no painting cycles, tapestries or cassoni have been found which preserve the group of fifteen frieze scenes painted here" (Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 385).

Dacos.⁸³ It also, however, bears extensive reference to ancient sculptures and fragments, transforming Peruzzi's Sala delle Prospettive into a "pantheistic" celebration of some of the most popular contemporaneous finds from antiquity.

Along with these classical allusions, Peruzzi also quoted the work of Sebastiano and particularly Raphael, both within and outside of the Farnesina. These contemporaneous quotations of Raphael, some of which themselves were based in his study of antiquity, reveal a remarkable melding of traditions on the part of Peruzzi in the design of this frescoed frieze. From this perspective, Peruzzi's frieze in the Sala delle Prospettive becomes his equivalent to Raphael's *Galatea*, presenting a network of references to works both classical and contemporary, perhaps staking his own claim in the emerging field of *all'antica* painting. It is important to note that, thanks to his workshop, Peruzzi himself did little actual work within the Sala delle Prospettive, similar to Raphael in the Loggia di Amore e Psiche downstairs. Scholars agree, however, that the designs for the entire room were solely his, making the visual references he chose to incorporate in the room's design all the more striking.⁸⁴

Classical and contemporary connections can be seen throughout this upper register fresco cycle, however it would seem prudent to focus on those

⁸³ Nicole Dacos, "Peruzzi. Dalla Farnesina alla Cancelleria. Qualche Proposta per la Bottega della Pittore." In M. Fagiolo and M. L. Madonna, *Baldassarre Peruzzi: Pittura, Scena, e Architettura nel Cinquecento* (Rome: Enciclopedia Italiana, 1987), 469-490.

⁸⁴ Nicole Dacos, "Ni Polidoro, ni Peruzzi: Maturino," *Revue de l'Art*, 57 (1982), 17; Cieri, "Sala delle Prospettive," 67; Peruzzi's authorship of the frieze was first suggested in by Förster (*Farnesina Studien*, 88) and subsequently reinforced by Crowe and Cavalcaselle (J.A. Crowe and G.B. Cavalcaselle, *A History of Painting in Italy, Umbria, Florence and Siena from the Second to the Sixteenth Century* (London: J. Murray, 1903-1914), 6: 19-20); Interestingly, Frommel (*Baldassarre Peruzzi als Maler und Zeichner* (Vienna: Anton Schroll, 1967-1968), 87-91) implies that Peruzzi's frieze exhibits the growing influence of Raphael, yet does not elaborate on specifics.

narrative registers of the northern wall as these, given the orientation of the room, would have served as the main focal point of viewing (Fig. 96). The respective scenes of *Apollo and Daphne* and *Venus and Adonis* are the two registers that meet in the northwestern corner of the room. While *Apollo and Daphne* (Fig. 97) appears on the western wall, a reclining male nude figure included in its lower right periphery is noteworthy since it is a direct quotation of the colossal ancient river god statue known as *Marforio* (Fig. 98).⁸⁵ At the time *Marforio* could be found in the Roman Forum, thereby making it readily accessible for Peruzzi's study. In some regards, this image reads as a study after the antique, rather than a simple quotation. For example, Peruzzi's inclusion of a mirror image of this reclining figure in the background of this scene, revealing to the viewer the opposite side of the figure, is reminiscent of contemporaneous sketches after the antique that capture the same sculpture from various vantage points.

By quoting this classical figure, Peruzzi concurrently incorporates references to contemporary Rome. For example, Dacos has noted the similarities between this figure and the nearly identical reclining nude in Raphael's depiction of *The Judgment of Paris*, a drawing completed around 1510 for translation into an engraving by Marcantonio Raimondi.⁸⁶ This reflexivity of quotations – in other words, that Peruzzi is quoting antiquity while concurrently

⁸⁵ Raphael's associate Andrea Fulvio was the first to clearly identify this sculpture as that of a river god, suggesting the name "Marforio" was derived from Nar Fluvius, a Tiber tributary. (*Antiquitates Urbis*, 156f). Bober comments that *Marforio* stood near the Arch of Septimius Severus until 1588, when it was moved to the Capitoline Museum (Bober, *Renaissance Artists*, 100, no. 64).

⁸⁶ Raimondi's print dates to around 1510-1520, suggesting Raphael's drawing would have had to predate this time period (Grazia Bernini Pezzini, Stagnia Massari, Simonetta Proserpi Valenti Rodinò, *Raphael Invenit: stampe da Raffaello nelle collezioni dell'Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica* (Rome: Quasar, 1985), 242).

citing Raphael, who arguably was also inspired by the same antique source – deepens upon consideration of Coffin’s mention of the presence of a Tiber river god sculpture displayed within Chigi’s complex.⁸⁷ One can imagine that this ancient river god would had been similarly posed as *Marforio*, suggesting that Peruzzi’s inclusion of this quotation was also intended to implicate Chigi’s holdings, as Chigi counted an ancient sculpture of a river god among his antiquities collection. This multi-dimensional citation implies dynamism in Peruzzi’s artistic approach akin to, if not surpassing, that witnessed in the earlier Loggia di Galatea: here he collapsed a complex set of references into an otherwise straightforward visual narrative. At the same time, this foreshadows the direct collaboration he would share with Raphael in the years to come.

Beginning with *Venus and Adonis*, the north wall of the Sala delle Prospettive recounts five scenes, a noteworthy anomaly as it is matched asymmetrically with only four such scenes on the south wall.⁸⁸ Beginning from the left, the first of these is *Venus and Adonis* (Fig. 99),⁸⁹ alternatively known as *Venus at Her Bath*.⁹⁰ Compositional comparison of this vignette, however, reveals

⁸⁷ See note 368.

⁸⁸ As Cieri comments, “Ciò potrebbe essere la conseguenza della costruzione prospettica che nel decentrare il camino sull parete nord ha comportato anche una diversa spatizione del fregio, in tre scene nella prima parte e due scene nella seconda, dopo il camino; tale divisione sembra dunque rispettata anche nel programma iconografico del fregio: infatti se le prime tre scene della parate nord, analizzate, si collegano all ciclicità umana e stagionale posta sotto la giurisdizione di Mercurio e di Cerere, le due divinità che presiedono a questa prima fase del ciclo, le due scene che occupano la second parte del fregio fanno riferimento alle due divinità poste sulla parete orientale: Apollo e Venere che corrispondono compositivamente e concettualmente a Mercurio e a Cerere su un piano più elevato e sovrintendono all ciclicità cosmica.” (Cieri, 70).

⁸⁹ Gianfranco Malafarina, *La Villa Farnesina a Roma* (Modena: Franco Cosimo Panini Editore, 2003), 68.

⁹⁰ Dacos, “Peruzzi. Dalla Farnesina alla Cancelleria, 474.

that Peruzzi drew heavily from Sebastiano's *Death of Adonis* (Fig. 56) commissioned by Chigi around 1511, the same time as Sebastiano worked on *Polyphemus* and once displayed in an adjacent room.⁹¹ Peruzzi's dying Adonis at left assumes a nearly identical posture to that of Sebastiano's painting; his Venus does as well, however with one notable adjustment. Sebastiano's Venus exhibits a rigidly flexed right foot, giving her overall posture a wrenching quality as she tugs right leg over left, seemingly a visual quotation of the ancient *Spinario* or *Nympha alla Spina*. Peruzzi's Venus instead crosses left over right in a more graceful pose that nevertheless quotes another ancient artifact, that of a fragmentary nymph statue that appears in another of Peruzzi's drawings (*Study of a Seated Woman*, Walter Art Gallery inv. 1995.244) (Figs. 100 and 101).⁹² This conscious quotation of Sebastiano's painting,⁹³ which perhaps hung at one point in close proximity to this chamber, suggests Peruzzi was conscious of the

⁹¹ Luitpold Dussler first suggested that Peruzzi used Sebastiano's version as a model (Luitpold Dussler, *Sebastiano del Piombo* (Basel: Holbein-Verlag, 1942), however he made no note of Peruzzi's significant variations proposed here. Bartalini suggests that this painting might have been displayed in a nearby music room: "la 'tavola picta grande' 'configure de più donne nude et belle' era allora, alla fina del 1520, in una camera del piano superiore, 'adpresso la Salotta', dove si era soliti fare della musica" (Bartalini, "Due episodi," 18).

⁹² Valeria Cafà identifies another drawing of this antique sculpture as the work of Peruzzi (as illustrated in: "Divinità a pezzi," 697, no. 88). This drawing is more finished than the one held by the Walter Art Gallery, however it is problematic from this author's perspective that the border bears the inscription "A. Caracci." Cafà offers no explanation as to its presence, nor does she provide further reliable reference to support this attribution, so for the purposes of this examination it will be excluded from discussion as a relevant example of Peruzzi's work. Dacos invokes another drawing of a Venus-type statue in her analysis of Peruzzi's imagery for this room (Fig. 103)(Dacos, "Peruzzi," 475). She does not identify it as Peruzzi's drawing; nevertheless, its incorporation adds to the visual repertoire available to early *cinquecento* artists like Peruzzi.

⁹³ As Cieri points out, while Peruzzi visually quotes Sebastiano's work, he symbolically invokes another Venetian, Titian, by consciously calling upon the theme of love, death, and rebirth, which was represented in Titian's 1514 *Sacred and Profane Love*, a connection she makes based on "nella corrispondenza fra il mito di Cerere e Proserpina e quello di Venere a Adone mediato, nell'interpretazione di Calvesi (*Il sogno di Polifilo Prenestino* (Rome: Officina, 1983), dall'*Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* di Francesco Colonna." (Cieri, 69).

competition that had commenced one floor below and perhaps wished to include himself in the discussion.⁹⁴

Here too, one finds another important simultaneous quotation of both antiquity and Raphael. The kneeling figure immediately in front of Venus in the foreground (Fig. 99) recalls the ancient *Crouching Venus* (Fig. 102). According to Dacos, Raphael used the same ancient source almost simultaneously in his rendering of compacted figure of Bathsheba in the bay depicting *David and Bathsheba* in the ceiling decoration of the Vatican Loggie (1518-1519)(Fig. 104), which, interestingly, is superimposed upon a backdrop of a fictive architectural colonnade not dissimilar from that created in Peruzzi's Sala delle Prospettive. This shared quotation could also yet again tie into Chigi's antiquities collection, perhaps attempting visual allusions to the *Cowering Psyche* likely featured in the villa's theatrical forecourt.⁹⁵ Close variations to this crouching figure reappear in subsequent scenes, for example the kneeling attendant in the foreground of *Toilet of Venus*, which appears on the southern wall.

⁹⁴ The proposal, however, that Peruzzi deliberately quoted Sebastiano's painting in his designs for the Sala delle Prospettive is reinforced in the alteration of the figure's position from sketch to final fresco. The Walter sketch is imagined after a fragmentary *Statue of a Muse* (Dresden, Sculpturesammlung, Hm241) that is missing both arms and head. In the Walter image, Peruzzi rebuilds this figure as a contemplative, almost melancholic woman, her right elbow resting on her thigh as she lays her head on the back of her hand. In the Sala delle Prospettive fresco, the lower half of the figure stays true to the organization seen in the drawing, yet the upper body has transformed into a near exact echo of Sebastiano's Venus in *Death of Adonis*. The complication with this connection, though is the lack of date assigned to this Peruzzi drawing, a persistent issue throughout his oeuvre.

⁹⁵ Dacos suggests that the figure at the far right of the scene is that which quotes the *Cowering Venus*: "la ninfa che nella stessa storia è inginocchiata in primo piano a raccogliere fiori deriva da una versione della [*Cowering Venus*]" ("Peruzzi," 471). This interpretation is plausible, and indeed Bober mentions different versions of the *Cowering Venus*, for example that housed today in Rome's Museo Nazionale alla Terme with "torso more erect, restored head looking forward" known to the Renaissance (Bober and Rubenstein, *Renaissance Artists*, 63) Thus, perhaps Peruzzi here is quoting both a Venus and a Psyche from antiquity, a fitting blend for the villa's accompanying imagery.

The remaining four vignettes continue to invoke the influence of Raphael and the collaborative nature shared between him and Peruzzi. The scene following *Venus* depicts *The Triumph of Bacchus* (Fig. 105), a scene for which Raphael was renowned for not completing. Part of his infamous commission from Duke Alfonso D'Este, Raphael reportedly completed two preparatory sketches for *The Triumph of Bacchus* between 1517 and 1519, one version of which, *The Triumph of Bacchus in India*, is the sole survivor (Vienna, Graphische Sammlung Albertina, SR 533, inv. 444) (Fig. 106), with one early preliminary study, and several faithful copies after Raphael's designs, remaining.⁹⁶

Even in its preliminary state, Raphael's sketch and Peruzzi's composition of *The Triumph of Bacchus* share important quotations.⁹⁷ Among the most notable, the figure that appears at the center of Raphael's design, kneeling to the ground as he supports the weight of Bacchus, appears again in Peruzzi's version, however transposed and shifted to the lower-right corner to take on the role of processional observer. Also shared are the pipe and cymbal players. In Raphael's sketch these paired figures appear in the lower left hand corner, the torsion of the horn player having been contemplated in earlier Raphael studies of

⁹⁶ Konrad Oberhuber, *Roma e lo Stile Classico di Raffaello* (Milan: Electa, 1999), 142; John Shearman, "Alfonso D'Este's Camerino," in A. Chastel, ed. "*Il se Rendit en Italie*": *Études Offertes à André Chastel* (Paris: Elefante, 1987), 209-230). The version included in the Ashmolean collection (A97) and that attributed to Conrad Martin Metz (British, Museum, 1789) are two examples of such faithful copies.

⁹⁷ As Cieri comments, preparatory sketches in the Louvre (Cabinet de Dessins, no. 592) confirm Peruzzi's hand in the design of this composition. (Cieri, 69).

Michelangelo's *Battle at Cascina*.⁹⁸ In Peruzzi's vignette this pair appears again, however again transposed, perhaps in an effort to avoid the complex anatomical twist that Raphael's arrangement required.

Furthermore, while the overall elements employed between the two compositions differ – an obvious example is the elephants missing in Peruzzi's composition that transect Raphael's scene diagonally – both nevertheless are arranged as if emulating an ancient Roman relief, amplifying their narrative through *all'antica* means. With Raphael's sketch left undated, it is impossible to discern whose designs came first and thus who was copying whom, or if there is a third player in the exchange; nevertheless, these cross-compositional quotations suggest an important artistic exchange between Peruzzi and Raphael concurrent with their other interactions.

This visual exchange between the two artists continues for the three remaining scenes. Adjacent to *The Triumph of Bacchus* and over the fireplace Peruzzi placed *Pelops and Oneomus* (Fig. 107). A classic tale from Greek folklore, Peruzzi's inclusion of this narrative is notable as it is one of only the few not selected from Ovid's writings⁹⁹ and is from all accounts the first revival of the tale since antiquity. As such its inclusion is significant from a literary standpoint, but it also speaks to Peruzzi's expanding interests into the realm of ancient Greece, an interest arguably encouraged by his associations with Raphael.

⁹⁸ Joannides, 171, no. 157v. As Joannides comments in the note accompanying this sketch: "the complex turning soldier . . . was also used much later in Raphael's design, now known only in copies, of the *Triumph of Bacchus*."

⁹⁹ The story came from Philostratus, *Immagines* I. 30, "Pelops".

Seeking Princess Hippodameia's hand in marriage, Pelops was challenged to a duel by Hippodameia's father, King Oenomaos. If Pelops won, he would be able to marry; if he lost, he would be beheaded. With such high stakes in the offing, Pelops preemptively secured his victory with the help of his charioteer, Myrtilos, by replacing the linchpins of King Oenomaos' chariot with those made of wax, rather, than metal. Thus at the moment that the King attempts to pass Pelops' chariot, the heat of the wheel's friction caused the wax to melt, and King Oenomaos was thrown to his death. Peruzzi's composition, though conflating the narrative, is nevertheless concordant with Philostratus' description of the scene. Poseidon appears at the right, positioned as an onlooker to the race as he emerges from the waters with his two *cavalli marini*, a reference no doubt to his appearance in the *Immagines* as "smiling at [Pelops] and honoring the lad with a gift of horses."¹⁰⁰ To Poseidon's left sits a bevy of onlookers, including Hippodameia at forefront, anticipating the race's result.

Opposite this group at left appears the approaching chariots of Pelops and King Oenomaos, captured at the precise moment that Oenomaos' chariot collapses, the King falling backward as Pelops' horses take the lead. Peruzzi also adheres to Philostratus' text in his creation of Pelops, from "the hair of the lad trickling down like golden sprays of water" to his concealing garment "[covering] his arms and lower legs."¹⁰¹

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

Peruzzi's compositional arrangement implied Pelops' victory was imminent, as Peruzzi was careful to include the crumbling wheel of Oneomaos' chariot in the immediate foreground of the scene, amplified by the king's contorted posture. Instead of stressing triumph, however, Peruzzi instead emphasized competition, stressing the tense moment just before the fates of Pelops and Oneomaos would be decided. Furthermore, Peruzzi guaranteed that this competition between king and suitor would never be resolved by leaving a key element of the scene incomplete. As Philostratus recounts:

It requires no small effort, in my opinion to compose four horses altogether and not to confuse their several legs one with another, to impart to them high spirits controlled by the bridle, and to hold them still, one at the very moment when he does not want to stand still, another when he wants to paw the ground, a third when he [wants to lift up his head], while the fourth takes delight in the beauty of Pelops and his nostrils are distended as though he was neighing.¹⁰²

Peruzzi's horses generally fit these characterizations, yet interestingly Peruzzi avoids the confusion of limbs by visually omitting the forelegs of Pelops' horses. This omission could be the fault of maneuvering around the strange angularities of the chimney hood, but as a master draftsman it seems unlikely that Peruzzi would allow such a feature to flummox him. This paralysis of the horses mid-stride in some senses leaves the race between Pelops and Oneomaos forever unresolved. Thus, while no direct visual comparison or quotation links this scene to Sebastiano or Raphael, the inherent theme of competition resonates throughout. What is more, the notion that the competition relayed is eternal, not that unlike the visual allusions included in Sebastiano's *Polyphemus*, as discussed

¹⁰² Ibid.

in Chapter Four, suggests that some inspiration for this composition Peruzzi derived from his exchange, if not competition, with his fellow artists working at the Farnesina.

Following this Greek scene is a vignette most commonly interpreted as *Parnassus* (Fig. 108), an allusion to Chigi's complex as much as it again invokes Raphael and his Vatican scene of the same subject. As discussed in the previous chapter, allusions to Parnassus were often invoked as part of the humanist *vigna* for its ties with mythology and its prominence therein as both the home of the Muses and the sacred haven of Apollo, god of music and poetry.¹⁰³ These allusions, manifested in forms from fresco to fountain, in *vigne* and villas across Rome were also witnessed within the grounds of the Farnesina, not only through Chigi's antiquities collection but also ostensibly with the design of his riverfront casino.

By including a scene of Mount Helicon here, however, Peruzzi reinforced allusions to Parnassus while also carefully distinguishing his scene from it. Mount Helicon was considered in ancient sources the equivalent to Parnassus as the locale for poetic inspiration and divine dwelling as well as the site of the Hippocrene spring, born from the ground by Pegasus' stamping foot.¹⁰⁴ While equivalent in mythological connotations, the selection of Mount Helicon represented another deviation from the overall Ovidian trend of the room's other

¹⁰³ For more on this tradition, see: Stinger, 199; and Christian, *Empire*, 178-182.

¹⁰⁴ Cieri, 70.

iconography. Representations of Mount Helicon had, since antiquity, vanished, making Peruzzi's revival of the landmark undoubtedly significant.

Added to this revival is another notable instance herein of antique quotation, again in the form of two kneeling figures in the foreground. These male figures adopt a strikingly similar pose to that of *L'Arrontino*, also known as the *Scythian Knife Grinder* (Fig. 28) that formed part of Chigi's antique collection. The kneeling figure to the left of the scene, next to the protrusion of the hearth and seemingly projecting from the wall with the careful extension of one knee beyond the implied picture plane, is perhaps the clearest copy of *L'Arrontino's* pose. The position of the legs and the outstretched arms both mimic the sculpture's organization exactly.

The kneeling figure to the right of the composition also echoes *L'Arrontino*, albeit more vaguely, however the unusual placement of the figure immediately behind him serves a function similar to the mirrored river god seen in *Apollo and Daphne*. In other words, this pairing of figures presents two perspectives on this translation of the *L'Arrontino's* form, views one cannot overlook for here again the frontal figure's knee projects beyond the visual picture plane. This crouching male figure is also a repeated motif elsewhere in the frieze cycle, notably the figure of Apollo in the southern wall rendition of *Apollo Weaving a Nuptial Crown* and the crouching male nude in the lower right quadrant of the eastern walls' *Deucalion and Pyrrha*. Differing explanations as to why these figures would reappear deliberately across divergent narratives could be proffered. Perhaps, for

example, Peruzzi wished to reinforce the close ties between these figures and Chigi's antiquities as part of his overarching effort to visually promote Chigi's feigned persona as connoisseur and collector. Or, perhaps Peruzzi's aim was to couch a contemplation of exchanges with Sebastiano and Raphael within the visual language of the antique. Despite not knowing this underlying premise, the fact that these figures do reappear with subtle variations adds a new valence to the description of the room as that of the "Prospettive" as the viewer is presented with multiple views, or perspectives, of these figures. This practice, in some regards, speaks to the act of reassembling and reanimating ancient sculpture, sixteenth-century practices indelibly linked to both archaeology and *all'antica* artistic expression.

Peruzzi's imagery in *Parnassus* is important not only for its *all'antica* references but also for the parallels it drew with contemporary depictions. For example, Claudia Cieri comments on, but doesn't explicate, an inevitable link between this scene and Raphael's *Parnassus*.¹⁰⁵ While the elements owed to Raphael's *Parnassus*, aside from the obvious shared narrative, are not discernable. With references to contemporaneous renditions in mind, in some senses Peruzzi's *Parnassus* is brought even more in line with Raphael's rendition, as it reflects a blending of both antique and contemporary sources. What is more,

¹⁰⁵ Indeed, Peruzzi, though contributing to the revival of the iconography of Mount Helicon, was nevertheless not responsible for its first use. As Cieri comments, "un precedente iconografico per la raffigurazione die due monti è nell'affresco della sala delle Muse della villa La Magliana, attribuito allo Spagna e oggi a Palazzo Braschi, che a sua volta deriva direttamente dal *Parnaso* di Raffaello all Segnatura, dove la compresenza delle Muse e dei Poeti definisce l'affresco come fonte d'ispirazione per il significato della scena nel fregio della Farnesina." (Cieri, 70).

it again hints at a potential competition, as the two competing pinnacles of poetic production could easily be seen as stand-ins for the two terrestrial artists.

The final scene of the five included on the north wall is that of *The Triumph of Venus* (Fig. 109), a vibrant maritime vignette that again simultaneously recalls both classical and contemporary sources. In addition to its compositional arrangement being akin to that of an ancient relief, Peruzzi's *Triumph of Venus* also borrows a subject popular in other contemporary Roman decorative programs.¹⁰⁶ More importantly, Peruzzi's design bears a direct quotation of Raphael's *Galatea*, not only taking with the figure of the conch-blower, at near center of the scene, the *cavallo marino*, at far right, and the flying putti overhead.¹⁰⁷ Thus, just as Raphael's *Galatea* serves as a unique intersection of elements both past and present, Peruzzi's *Triumph of Venus* and arguably all his episodes on this north wall, if not the entire room, represent a similar anachronism. While borrowing across temporal zones, he is also a master pasticheur, piecing together iconographic symbolism with such finesse that he is able to convey not only the overarching propaganda for his patron but also his more subtle engagement with the other artists at work in the Farnesina.

So far without mention is the hearth of *The Forge of Vulcan*, the monumental scene that spreads across the hearth hood and asymmetrically bisects the room. This register bears no immediate connections with prior works

¹⁰⁶ As Cieri comments, the Palazzo delle Valle in Rome also called upon a depiction of *The Triumph of Venus* (Ibid., 70).

¹⁰⁷ Cieri refers to the conch-blower as “una chiara citazione dalla *Galatea* di Raffaello,” (Ibid., 70), however these additional comparative elements are also clearly borrowed.

by Raphael or Sebastiano. It does, however, borrow from the antique. Bober suggests it was a direct quotation from a sarcophagus fragment depicting *Vulcan Forging the Weapons of Achilles*. Though she has been unable to locate it in the early sixteenth century, Bober proposes this fragment was also influential to Raphael's workshop.¹⁰⁸ In addition to this connection with antiquity, *The Forge of Vulcan* served as an essential connection to the Loggia di Amore e Psiche below as it reveals the forging of the arrow of Cupid, an essential element in Raphael's frescoes in the loggia below.

The Loggia di Amore e Psiche

Loosely based on the story recounted in 2nd century CE writer Apuleius' *The Golden Ass*, the Loggia di Amore e Psiche retells the episodic trials and tribulations of the love affair between the mortal and the god. Originally planned by Raphael as an all-encompassing visual program, what is seen today represents only the first stage of this program, consisting of ten narrative spandrels and fourteen accompanying severies that encircle two central planes composed in *quadro riportato*. As such, the division of the ceiling is virtually identical to that employed by Peruzzi in the adjacent astrological ceiling in the Loggia di Galatea.

The story recounts the tale of Psyche, a maiden so beautiful that she is considered more striking than Venus herself. Venus, upset by such claims, sends

¹⁰⁸ Bober, *Renaissance Artists*, 82, no. 43.

Cupid to punish Psyche, however he too falls under the spell of Psyche's beauty and instead falls in love with her. Unwilling to carry out Venus' instructions, Cupid facilitates Psyche's arrival at his luxurious palace, where he meets with her under the cover of darkness to maintain his anonymity. Psyche's sisters, however, jealous of her new lavish lifestyle and secret admirer, encourage her to uncover this mysterious man's identity. And so she does, illuminating Cupid's face by candlelight. Her shock at the sight causes her to drip oil on Cupid, startling him and causing him to fly off in a fury. Psyche then commences a prolonged quest to placate Venus and reunite with Cupid, culminating in a visit to Mount Olympus for a council in front of Jupiter. Jupiter then agrees to mollify Venus, allowing Psyche and Cupid to eventually wed.

This story unfolds around the room, beginning within the eastern wall spandrel depicting *Venus Showing Cupid to Psyche*, as she first seeks her revenge. Following the southern wall are scenes of *Cupid and the Three Graces*, wherein Cupid reveals his newfound passion for Psyche, followed by *Venus, Ceres and Juno*, wherein Venus recounts her plight with Psyche to Ceres and Juno in hopes of finding a solution. Subsequently appears *Venus In Her Chariot*, on her way for council with Jupiter, and finally *Venus Before Jupiter*, where she begs for his assistance but is denied. The spandrel of the western wall punctuates the narrative depicting *Mercury*, as he looks for Psyche, who has become embroiled in tasks assigned by Venus to appease her. The next spandrel on the northern wall, for example, reveals *Psyche Bringing a Vessel to Venus*, as she transports of a

requested vessel of Proserpine's beauty from the Underworld, and the following, *Psyche Before Venus*, illustrates the delivery of that vessel. Adjacent is *Cupid Seeking Council from Jupiter*, as Cupid pleads with Jupiter to intercede on Psyche's behalf, with the final spandrel illustrating *Psyche Borne to Olympus (Mercury and Psyche)*, as Mercury guides Psyche into the heavens for her case to be heard. This hearing takes place in *The Council of the Gods*, the eastern central ceiling panel, and the result, the sanctioned union of Cupid and Psyche, is subsequently celebrated in the western ceiling panel, *The Marriage of Cupid and Psyche*. Each of these spandrel scenes are divided by both floriated festoons and garlands that outline the architectural framework of the loggia and severies that depict various *putti* aloft with the attributes of various deities. Both of the two central ceiling panels are depicted as fictive tapestries shielding the viewer from an imagined sun, suggested only by the bits of blue sky that seep through at its seams.

Shared with Peruzzi's approach in the Sala delle Prospettive was Raphael's reliance on classical models for his scenes, particularly his depiction of *Psyche Borne to Olympus (Mercury and Psyche)*, which scholars have noted borrows directly from wall paintings at the Domus Aurea and at Pompeii.¹⁰⁹ Strikingly similar to the Sala delle Prospettive upstairs, here too the aim was to conjure an entirely fictive edifice, with the walls designed to appear as if they exist only as those of a pergola adorned with variegated floriated festoons, a fitting accompaniment to the gardens outside. In some senses grounding the ethereal pergolated structure that covered the ceiling, the weighty lower register of the

¹⁰⁹ Dussler, 98.

room was originally filled with landscape lunettes,¹¹⁰ various painted marbles¹¹¹ and fictive niches.¹¹²

Initial response to this loggia was mixed – an associate of Michelangelo’s referred to it as a “shameful thing for a grand master,”¹¹³ yet despite this critique it was a remarkable creation for its revival of an antique narrative. Perhaps as complement to his *Galatea* in the adjacent loggia, completed only around five years before yet seemingly distant in terms of his artistic development, Raphael’s designs for the Loggia di Amore e Psiche were again unprecedented in their conjuring of an *all’antica* motif.¹¹⁴ Here the gods appear to be descending from the heavens as they banquet in celebration of Cupid and Psyche’s love.

¹¹⁰ Prints of the Loggia di Amore e Psiche (for example, P. Letarouilly, “Vedute Prospettica dell’interno della loggia” *Édifices de Rome Moderne* (Paris, 1840-1857), tav. 102; Cherubino Alberti, “Loggia di Psiche,” printed 1583, in S. Prospero Valenti Rodinò, in *Raphael Invenit: Stampe da Raffaello nelle Collezione dell’Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica* (Rome: Edizione Quasar, 1985, also illustrated in Francesca Cappellati, “La storia di Psiche, il mito di Raffaello. In margine alla storia dei restauri antichi,” in R. Varoli-Piazza, ed., *Raffaello La Loggia di Amore e Psiche alla Farnesina* (Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 2002), 45) reveal several of the original lunette frescoes. These were destroyed in Carlo Maratti’s controversial restoration of the loggia in 1693 (as evidenced in the prints of the vault included in Nicolas Dorigny’s *Favola di Amore e Psiche* (Rome: Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica, 1693).

¹¹¹ Giorgio Ortolani identifies the following marble types: African, alabaster, giallo da Siena, pavonazzetto, peperino, and verde antico. (“I marmi e le pitture parietali,” in R. Varoli-Piazza, ed., *Raffaello La Loggia di Amore e Psiche alla Farnesina* (Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 2002), 330).

¹¹² Ortolani also suggests that the lower register of the southern wall of the loggia would have had a fictive balustrade painting to mimic that which enclosed the room from the garden on the northern side (Ortolani, “I marmi,” 329).

¹¹³ In a letter to Michelangelo dated January 1st, 1518, Leonardo Sellaio quips that the loggia is a “chosa vituperosa ad un gran maestro, peggio che l’ultima stanza del Palazzo assai.” (Paolo D’Ancona, *Gli Affreschi della Farnesina in Roma* (Milan: Edizione del Milione, 1955).

¹¹⁴ Luisa Vertova counters this argument by claiming a pair of *cassone* panels by an anonymous Florentine in the late -fifteenth century were actually the first revival of this story from antiquity (“Cupid and Psyche in Renaissance Painting before Raphael,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 42 (1979), 104-121). These panels, however, are depicted with a decidedly *quattrocento* style akin to Botticelli, which is what sets Raphael’s innovative version of the narrative apart. A fresco cycle of Cupid and Psyche was also completed in Duke Ercole d’Este’s castle at Belriguardo around 1480, but as Luba Freedman comments: “the frescoes, not preserved, are attributed to Ercole de’ Roberti, who, though representing the fable in the classical form of a painting, did not render the figures in imitation of classical statues. The first representation of the Cupid and Psyche fable in

Considered alongside each other, the Sala delle Prospettive and the Loggia di Amore e Psiche bear striking parallels. Both represent the individual artist's efforts to conjure an *all'antica* visual program. Whereas Raphael's is more literally translating the narratives of antiquity to a contemporary setting, Peruzzi in some senses did the same, desiring to convey the atmosphere of an Imperial Roman villa. In this regard, these two rooms juxtaposed against one another reveal an intriguing parallel between an *all'antica* painter and an *all'antica* architect.

In some senses, in fact, these two rooms illustrate the subtle difference in their approach to architectural renderings, as highlighted in Raphael's letter to the Pope. One is struck, however, that despite this distinction both rooms rely on architecture that is at once both fictive and literal. Literal, in the sense that they are in fact built rooms, yet fictive in the sense that both Peruzzi and Raphael sought to "paint away" the walls upon which they worked. While Raphael's loggia relies upon a visual framework of painted architecture. This is rendered straight on, allowing each wall to appear similar to a one-dimensional elevation drawing. By doing so, the viewer is allowed to focus on the images themselves, arguably the painter's approach to painted architecture.

Peruzzi's room, however, relies essentially on the use of perspective, allowing the mythological imagery to be subsumed within the impressive rendering of *trompe-l'oeil* three-dimensional space. This seemingly, then, would

classical style was in fact done by Raphael and his assistants, Giulio Romano and Giovanni da Udine, for the entrance loggia of Chigi's villa." (Freedman, 165).

exemplify the opposite of what occurs in Raphael's loggia, that is, the architect's approach to painting. It is striking, though, that this use of perspective is exactly what Raphael categorized as the painter's approach to architecture. In this light, it seems that these two spaces speak to each other on more than purely iconographic terms. Rather, the approach of each artist allowed for an expression of *all'antica* narratives couched within a larger discussion of the professional intersections of artist and architect.

This conversation between the two spaces that rely so heavily on painted architecture also necessarily returns to the role of perspective and theatrical design. Peruzzi's Sala delle Prospettive is a study in perspective mastery, as he was able to convey remarkably convincing depth and dimension in an otherwise rectangular room. Raphael's loggia, however, shies away from such perspectival complexity, assuming a *quadro riportato* format, yet this design worked perfectly for the loggia's alternate purpose: that of theatrical backdrop. The dynamism of the loggia's upper register is deliberately hidden above the once open loggia arches (Fig. 110), not only to amplify the level of awe once one entered the loggia but also separate that dynamism visually from the *scaenae frons* just outside.

From an antique perspective, this decision is unusual. As Freedman comments, "the episodes from the [story of Cupid and Psyche] depicted in this villa appear only in the lunettes and on the ceiling, not on the walls, even though the walls might well have been the preferred locations for this type of subject in

antiquity.”¹¹⁵ There is evidence to suggest, however that Raphael did indeed plan to continue the narrative through the lower register scenes. Shearman was the first to examine such a theory, noting that the placement of vault scaffolding, which prevented painting to the base of the spandrels, suggested that the decoration as planned was by far from finished.¹¹⁶ Such was echoed by Dussler,¹¹⁷ seconded by Schwarzenberg,¹¹⁸ and accepted by many scholars since.¹¹⁹ Thus, while the hall appears today to have showcased a collection of antique busts in a series of fictive niches, which in itself would serve as an effective theatrical backdrop for the Farnesina’s forecourt stage, Raphael envisioned a much more complex program that, according to Quinlan-McGrath, was as much about mythological narrative as it was about visual illusionism. As Quinlan-McGrath recounts:

The first thing that is apparent in examining the space is that Raphael chose to use the loggia to create an illusion that the story was occurring

¹¹⁵ Freedman, 166.

¹¹⁶ Shearman, “Die Loggia der Psyche,” 64-66; Shearman, “Raphael’s Unexecuted Projects,” 158-180. As Quinlan-McGrath comments: “this area [at the bottom of the spandrels], along with the lowest portion of Giovanni da Udine’s garlands, was not filled in until the seventeenth century” (Quinlan-McGrath, “The Villa,” 462). To be clear, while Shearman was the first to examine this theory, it was 19th century theorist Antoine Quatremère de Quincy who first noted the incomplete state of the loggia’s decoration (Antoine Quatremère de Quincy, *History of the Life and Works of Raffaello*, trans. by W. Hazlitt from 3rd Parisian edition (London: Bell and Daldy, 1869), 352).

¹¹⁷ Luitpold Dussler, *Raphael: A Critical Catalogue of His Pictures, Wall-Paintings and Tapestries* (NY: Phaidon, 1971), 98-99.

¹¹⁸ Schwarzenberg, “Psychen-Statue,” 110, 115, 118-119.

¹¹⁹ It is important to note that agreement as to the intended final state of the loggia’s decoration is by no means unanimous. Erwin Panofsky suggested that the loggia’s decoration was complete as it remains today, proposing that the limited visual program was reference to neo-Platonic ideology (Erwin Panofsky, *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1960), 191), while Goffredo Hoogewoof and Sydney Freedberg envisioned the cycle to continue, however in tapestry form (Goffredo Hoogewoof, “Raffaello nella Villa Farnesina,” *Capitolium* (1945), 10; Sydney Freedberg, *Painting in Italy: 1500-1600* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993) 74). The rationale for abandoning the remaining scenes is unknown. As Quinlan-McGrath comments: “at Chigi’s death in 1520, only the vault [of the Loggia di Amore e Psiche] was painted” (Quinlan-McGrath, “The Villa,” 437).

there. This particular design challenge does not exits in any of the contemporary examples . . . yet it is characteristic of Raphael that . . . he was not content to start with the walls and work up. . . . He wanted to work the whole room together, moving the observer just once around, and placing all heavenly incidents in his fictive sky. . . . [achieving] a kind of illusionistic apotheosis here, if we can judge from the finished work.¹²⁰

This vision of the loggia as a unified illusionistic masterpiece reinforces its potential as a theatrical space, for had this vision been realized, the lower register panels and lunettes that would have been visible through the archways from the *scaenae frons* forecourt would have revealed the terrestrial portion of the narrative Raphael desired to relay.¹²¹

Reconstructing the Scaenae Frons

In an effort to “reconstruct” what the Farnesina façade would have looked like in full decoration, including those portions of the Loggia di Amore e Psiche visible from the villa exterior, one can begin by returning to Quinlan-McGrath’s interpretation of Raphael’s intended scenes for the southern wall, or that opposite the arcade. Thus, while Quinlan-McGrath labors to reposition all the scenes in the lower registers of the loggia, from *Psyche’s Veneration as the New Venus* beginning at the eastern overdoor panel to *Psyche’s Fourth Labor* in the final

¹²⁰ Quinlan-McGrath, “The Villa,” 469.

¹²¹ Numerous scholars have worked to assemble a tentative plan of what scenes would have been included in the lower lunettes and register, as well as their ordering (Shearman, “Die Loggia der Psyche”; Konrad Oberhuber, *Raphaels Zeichnungen* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1972); Ernst Steinman, “Amor und Psyche, ein Freskenzyklus aus der Schule Raffael’s in der Engelsburg zu Rom,” *Zeitschrift für Bildende Kunst* 13 (1902), 86-93; Hoogewoort, 15; Arnold von Salis, *Antike und Renaissance: Über Nachleben und Weiterwirken der alten in der neueren Kunst* (Erlenbach-Zürich: E. Rentsch, 1947), 198-199; Quinlan-McGrath, “The Villa,” 497-505). These suggestions, however, both hypothetical and tenuous, do not need recounting here.

overdoor panel to the west,¹²² for the purposes of this examination one can focus on those scenes intended for the southern wall only,¹²³ as this would have been that which was viewable from the Farnesina forecourt through the loggia's open arcade.

Pulling narratives derived from Apuleius,¹²⁴ Quinlan-McGrath proposes the southern wall began with a scene of *The Toilet of Psyche in the Palace of Cupid*. She based the inclusion of this scene on Shearman's previous connection between a Raphael sketch of a kneeling female nude (Chatsworth 56)¹²⁵ (Fig. 111) one that was arguably done in preparation for the loggia and an engraving by later sixteenth-century artist Giulio Bonasone (Metropolitan Museum of Art, Accession n. 59.570.297)(Fig. 112).¹²⁶ Also important was Shearman's proposal of a connection between this scene and the accompanying upper right spandrel depicting *Cupid Pointing Out Psyche to the Three Graces*.¹²⁷ Here, Cupid's downward pointed hand, combined with the corresponding gaze of the Three Graces, does indeed suggest that *The Toilet of Psyche* would be the most appropriate wall panel to commence the southern wall.

¹²² In total, Quinlan-McGrath recommended the following series of two overdoor and six wall panel scenes, from east to west: *Psyche Venerated as the New Venus*, *The Oracle at Apollo's Temple*, *The Toilet of Psyche in Cupid's Palace*, *Psyche's Betrayal of Cupid*,

¹²³ For a complete account of her logic of placement and selection of proposed scenes, please refer to: Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 458- 537.

¹²⁴ Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 464-465.

¹²⁵ Joannides, 239, n. 420.

¹²⁶ Shearman, "Die Loggia der Psyche," 69-70. The inclusion of a similar scene, that of *Psyche Asleep Before Cupid's Palace*, was originally proposed for inclusion in the cycle by Steinmann (Steinmann, 92) yet Quinlan-McGrath challenged the presence of this scene, surmising that "while a sleeping Psyche may have been shown in a landscape sidelight here, the real focus would more likely have been Psyche's reception in Cupid's palace and the attentions of Cupid's servants which were lavished upon Psyche" (Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 489).

¹²⁷ Shearman, "Die Loggia," 68-71.

Following this scene she proposed a vignette of *Psyche's Betrayal of Cupid*. She placed this scene on the basis of the accompanying spandrel of *Venus Conferring with Juno and Ceres*, a moment typically depicted in Renaissance conventions following this moment of Cupid's betrayal.¹²⁸ Thus, as Quinlan-McGrath surmises, "it would seem that Raphael intended to place the betrayal in this wall panel just before the doorway, since this is the motivation for the anger and even the direction of the gestures in the spandrel frescoed to the right above it, and therefore just 'after' it in a narrative sense."¹²⁹ Further reinforcing the presence of this scene was its prevalence in contemporary renditions, such as that composed by Perino del Vaga for a *Loves of the Gods* series under commission by Roman printer Baviera in 1527.¹³⁰ Above this panel Quinlan-McGrath places a lunette scene of *The Winds Bearing the Evil Sisters of Psyche to Earth*, foreshadowing the betrayal that is to occur in the wall panel below.

As the story continues, Quinlan-McGrath places a lunette of *Cupid's Escape* above the central door on this southern wall, fitting in that it follows the wall panel of *Psyche's Betrayal* and would lead the viewer to the subsequent two final wall panels of the southern exposure. Quinlan-McGrath offers no exact prescription as to what scenes would have appeared in these final panels, however she proposes several promising options. As these scenes should

¹²⁸ Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 491.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 491.

¹³⁰ For more on this set of engravings, please refer to: Cynthia M. Burlingham, *Perino del Vaga's Designs for the Loves of the Gods* (M.A. Thesis, Oberlin College, 1980).

comprise the remaining earthly events of Psyche's narrative,¹³¹ Quinlan-McGrath suggests the intended scenes to be of Psyche's wanderings, her revenge on her evil sisters, her consolation by Pan, and her respective visits to the temples of Juno and Psyche.¹³²

These narratives, according to Quinlan-McGrath, could have been collapsed into two scenes, perhaps alluded to in the sixteenth-century prints of Michel Coxie, whose *Illustrations to Apulieus* have often been considered as derived from Raphael's preparatory sketches for the loggia (Figs. 113-115). Quinlan-McGrath suggests that one scene each could have been devoted to Psyche's temple visits, however Shearman suggests that the kneeling figure, mentioned previously as a possible design for the *Toilet of Psyche* could have just as easily been a preparation for a combined scene of *Psyche's Visit to the Temple of Juno and Ceres*.¹³³ This would have left the final wall panel to depict Psyche's wanderings and eventual consolation by Pan, again perhaps illuminated by Coxie's engravings.

Perhaps further reflecting how these lower panels were to appear is a final sketch by Raphael, identified by Joannides as a potential preparatory sketch for either the loggia or for his work on the *Transfiguration* (Fig. 116).¹³⁴ Quinlan-

¹³¹ In consideration of the sixth spandrel, wherein Mercury declares the hunt for Psyche for her arrest, Quinlan-McGrath assumes "therefore we would not expect her capture, which occurs just slightly after that announcement, to take place until the first panel of the west wall at the earliest. . . . Raphael could surely tolerate placing her capture on the west wall's first panel, even though that would, by decorative principles, be slightly before Mercury's announcement. But it is unlikely that he would have placed her capture any sooner" (Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 502-503).

¹³² Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 502.

¹³³ Shearman, "Die Loggia der Psyche," 69-70.

¹³⁴ Joannides, 239, n. 421.

McGrath did not identify a connection between this sketch and the proposed scenes of the lower register. Upon comparison of these figures, however, to those seen in Coxie's *Psyche Imploring Her Pardon from Juno* and *Psyche Prostrate Before Ceres*, one could argue Raphael's figures were indeed completed in preparation for a scene of the similar subject. From this perspective, the upward gesture of the left-hand figure would seem particularly appropriate for the loggia, as it would function as a visual cue to continue reading the story above, just as so many figures in the upper register reference those below. Furthermore, these figures bear no visual parallels with any included in the final version of the *Transfiguration*.

While these observations are by no means conclusive, as the inherent nature of preparatory sketches implies adjustment before the final composition, the connection between these figures, Coxie's engravings, and the proposed narratives of the loggia's lower wall panels all seem to suggest that this sketch should be included in the visual record of Raphael's plans for the loggia's continued visual program while also reinforcing Quinlan-McGrath's proposed narrative structure.

Thus, one can reconstruct with some certainty the scenes of the lower wall panels and some of the accompanying lunettes that would have been visible from the *scaenae frons* (Fig. 117), using the prints of Bonasone, Coxie and Perino del Vaga's fresco of *The Betrayal of Psyche* in an attempt to conjure what the visual impact of this series would have been. Furthermore, taken in total, and assuming

Quinlan-McGrath's proposal that the two final scenes both took place at temples, Raphael's lower register scenes in some senses become a study in interior architecture, as each exterior archway would lead the viewer into a different architectural locale (Fig. 117 for reconstruction). Such a concept was introduced by Quinlan-McGrath, who suggested Raphael emphasized "impressive architectural interiors with only partial landscape settings . . . [coinciding] nicely with the tectonic purpose of the wall, and with the suggestion that we are looking into Chigi's palace beyond these surfaces."¹³⁵ This emphasis on creating fictive architectural interiors, immediately juxtaposed against the actual architecture of the loggia would have amplified the stage set feel from the perspective of a viewer in the forecourt. That is, by looking upon a scene that looks into another interior, these lower register scenes would have visually amplified the implied depth of the loggia just as scenography does in a theatrical production.

Added to this observation is the possibility that these scenes were intended to be executed in tapestry, rather than fresco, a hypothesis first proposed by Goffredo Hoogewerff in 1945.¹³⁶ Quinlan-McGrath supports this hypothesis for the practical reason that, due to the frequency of flooding on Chigi's property, tapestry decorations would enjoy a much longer tenure than frescoed ones.¹³⁷ Practicality aside, the use of tapestries on this level would also be of theatrical importance, as, like any scrim in theater, they could be easily

¹³⁵ Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 490.

¹³⁶ Hoogewerff, 10.

¹³⁷ Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 460.

removed or changed for different performances. This notion of a portable visual program amplifies the theatrical qualities of this space and how Raphael and Peruzzi worked together to create one of the most functional theatrical spaces since antiquity.

Quinlan-McGrath was the last scholar to have proposed such a complete design for the lower panel scenes of the Loggia di Amore e Psiche, however her analysis did not take into account how these scenes would have interacted with those on Peruzzi's exterior façade frescoes on the Farnesina's upper level, separate in that they were on an interior plane but nevertheless arguably joined with those images when viewed from the exterior. The fact that these scenes would have been visible from the forecourt during theatrical presentations transforms them into what would have been essential scenography, particularly in regard to Vitruvian prescriptions.

Vitruvius recommended three types of scenography: that for the tragic, the comic and the satiric. Without the advantage of *periaktoi*, and assuming this imagery was fixed (e.g., not in tapestry form), Raphael's imagery thus had to serve all three functions without disrupting the façade's overall visual scheme and effectively it would have done so. Vitruvius advocated for the use of columns, pediments and architectural forms to support tragic theater, and in effect, to accommodate this, Raphael's lower register scenes in some senses become a study in interior architecture, as each exterior archway would lead the

viewer into a different architectural locale.¹³⁸ The comic, according to Vitruvius, should come with a backdrop of houses and balconies, which again Raphael's imagery would have conveyed, each scene taking place in a domestic interior and visually separated from the audience by balustrades, the implication of a balcony. Vitruvius' prescription for the satiric was the use of landscape elements, which perhaps was hinted at in Raphael's imagery but came into full force with Peruzzi's additional façade frescoes along with the extensive gardens that enveloped the theatrical space. Thus, a combination of Quinlan-McGrath's analysis with Frommel's recent examination of Peruzzi's façade sketches will provide the basis for a novel reading of the façade, combining its theatrical intentions with collaboration between Raphael and Peruzzi.

In his 2003 monograph on the Farnesina, Frommel points to several sketches that hint at which scenes Peruzzi's intended to emblazon on the façade. Frommel actually proposes that Peruzzi intended to include decoration in every bay panel, which he totaled at 56,¹³⁹ however it seems very unlikely that the intention was to include such decorations on the entire exterior. This assumption comes from the purely practical consideration that southern façade, previously noted for its austerity, exhibits no evidence of past fresco work. Nor would it make sense for Chigi to endure such an expense for a portion of the villa that few

¹³⁸ Such a concept Quinlan-McGrath implies, suggesting Raphael emphasized "impressive architectural interiors with only partial landscape settings . . . [coinciding] nicely with the tectonic purpose of the wall, and with the suggestion that we are looking into Chigi's palace beyond these surfaces" (Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 490).

¹³⁹ According to Frommel's account: "Qui Peruzzi avrebbe dipinto e fatto dipingere 56 riquadri con figure in grandezza natural di scene mitologiche, oltre a 112 pansichi, maschere e putti laterali e a 24 *Allegorie* nei pennacchi del arcate" (Frommel, "La Villa," 79). He offered no compelling rationale for this accounting.

would see, as this was not the main entrance nor was it a main attraction for a visitor navigating the grounds. Aside from the few sketches identified for the main entrance façade (Figs. 118 and 119), no additional drawings have been solidly linked to the façade preparation, nor is there remaining evidence on the villa façade itself that these scenes enveloped the perimeter of the building. This is perhaps most notable on the eastern façade, facing the river, where the remnants of the spandrel *Allegories* are perhaps the best preserved, yet no visual remnants can be ascertained in the upper level bay panels.

Thus, it seems more promising to focus on the scenes that were to be included on the main, or north, entrance façade in an attempt to piece together a more complete picture of how this imagery came together. Frommel mentions first a sketch that shows designs for two panels, one depicting *Venus and Mars Entrapped in Vulcan's Web*, below which appears the design for *Daedalus Presenting the Cow to Pasiphae* (Fig. 118). Frommel proposes that both were to be independent scenes on the *pianoterreno* of the Farnesina façade, as indicated by the *amorini* depicted beneath what appears to be window cut-outs.¹⁴⁰ His other source for these scenes are included in the anonymous French sketch of the Farnesina façade, wherein two of the upper level bays have been adorned with preparatory sketches (Figs. 119 and 126). Frommel is unable to identify the first scene, located in the central upper bay of the main facade, although he describes

¹⁴⁰ As Frommel comments: “Due scene per il pianterreno . . . permettono l'introduzione nella tematica del programma e nella sua trasposizione figurale. . . . In entrambe le scene amorini volanti sorreggono le finestre quadrate del mezzanino mediante un bancone di nuvole, disposto come un festone” (Frommel, “La Villa,” 80).

it as a series of togated figures that seem to be gazing at a central tree, upon which alights a bird. While he offers no suggestion as to what narrative this scene is relaying, one potential explanation would be that this panel intended to relay the story of Apollo and Daphne. Apollo figured repeatedly throughout the Farnesina's decorations and the story, wherein Daphne is transformed from mortal human to tree, would provide a parallel to the lavish grounds that surrounded the villa.

The second scene included in this sketch Frommel again avoids naming by narrative, but he nevertheless identifies it as a scene from the life of Iphigenia, wherein a deer is sacrificed.¹⁴¹ Based on this preliminary analysis, it would seem that this was intended to relay the story of *Iphigenia's Rescue*, wherein she is rescued from a sacrificial death at the last minute by Artemis and replaced on the sacrificial altar by a deer.¹⁴² This interpretation is corroborated by the presence of two women exiting the scene in a chariot at upper left.

If these two interpretations are correct, one must then work to piece together what additional scenes would have appeared on this entrance façade. Frommel offers no proposal of what scenes would have been added to these initial four, commenting only that these four identified scenes illustrate Peruzzi's "willingness to push further into the uncharted territory of reconstructed

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁴² Frommel identifies this figure as Minerva rather than Artemis, recounting: "sullo sfondo a destra sono strettamente raggruppati cinque uomini vestiti con le toghe, ma non è chiaramente riconoscibile se sul bordo sinistro si tratti di Ifigenia rapita da Minerva e condotte nei cieli" (Frommel, "La Villa," 80). All accounts of Iphigenia's rescue, however, center around Artemis.

mythological scenes.”¹⁴³ Thus, one is left to look to other sources for the imagery of these façade scenes. Frommel suggests, for example, that the scene of Vulcan ensnaring Venus and Mars includes in, a cloudbank above, a depiction of Apollo ascending into the heavens in his Chariot of the Sun. This inclusion would serve as a reference to Helios and Homer’s narrative of the *Odyssey*, which apparently was a favorite of Chigi’s,¹⁴⁴ a point reinforced by the fact that Polyphemus, featured so prominently in the Loggia di Galatea, also appears in the narrative of the *Odyssey*. Little scholarship exists to establish a precedent of popular imagery borrowed from Homer’s *Odyssey* in the early *cinquecento*,¹⁴⁵ yet, if one were to reintroduce Homer into a *cinquecento* visual program, Peruzzi would be a likely choice to do so. Peruzzi was actually well versed in the popular narratives of the *Odyssey*, having completed in 1503 one of the first frescoed facades in Rome, that for the palazzo of Ulisse da Fano, with scenes from the life of Ulysses. Vasari described these Ulyssean scenes as “work [by which Peruzzi] greatly increased

¹⁴³ “Comunque le quattro scene mostrano quanto fosse estesa la tematica illustrata in questi quadri e quanto Peruzzi si addentrasse ulteriormente in territori inesplorati per la ricostruzione di scene mitologiche” (Frommel, “La Villa,” 80).

¹⁴⁴ “Dalle nuvole pende il cielo del letto, e sopra alle nuvole gli dei dell'Olimpo accalcati aspettano con impazienza la cattura. Apollo, sul carro del Sole, si dirige verso lo zenito del cielo, per mettere la scena nella luce giusta. La scena deriva dall'*Odissea* e apparentemente piaceva molto a Chigi, poiché la fece raffigurare anche nella sua casa ai Banchi” (Frommel, “La Villa,” 80); Freedman, 174.

¹⁴⁵ R. Sowerby went so far as to consider Italian Renaissance treatment of Homer as a “failure” (R. Sowerby, “Early Humanist Failure with Homer,” *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 4 (1997-1998), 37-63 and 165-194, however the more recent work of Filippomaria Pontani attempts to reassert Italy’s early role in Homer’s interpretation (Filippomaria Pontani, “From Budé to Zenodotus: Homeric Readings in the European Renaissance,” *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 14 (3/4)(December, 2007), 374-430). Specifically, Pontani points to Poliziano’s efforts to translate several books of Homer’s *Illiad* in his *Homericus adulescens* (Pontani, 377). For more on Poliziano’s fifteenth-century Homeric translation, please see: A. Cerri, “La traduzione omerica di Angelo Poliziano (gli epiteti degli dèi e degli eroi),” *Acme* 30 (1977), 143-174.

his name and reputation,"¹⁴⁶ but he does not offer any further description, and the frescoes have long since vanished,¹⁴⁷ save for a singular preparatory sketch identified by Tessari (Oxford Ashmolean Museum, WA1928.1) Fig. 120).¹⁴⁸ With only one of these scenes identified, determining the additional images Peruzzi might have employed becomes rather difficult. One could also return to Ovid or Apulieus, as the *Metamorphoses* and *Cupid and Psyche* provided such a wealth of imagery elsewhere in the villa. Quinlan-McGrath's account of the Raphael's imagery for the Loggia di Amore e Psiche accounts for the majority of the popular imagery of the Apuliean tale, as are the scenes derived from Ovid.

One could also review the scenes included within the villa to formulate a hypothesis of what images could have appeared on the entrance façade. The vaults of the Raphael's Loggia di Amore e Psiche, for example, include a series of *amorini*, each of which hold the attributes of significant divinities, beginning on the eastern wall with the attributes of Cupid and proceeding around the room as follows: Jupiter, Neptune, Pluto, Mars, Apollo, Mercury, Bacchus, Pan, Minerva, an unidentified warrior god, Hercules, Vulcan, and another unidentified deity signified by the attributes of a sea horse and lion. The majority of these deities are featured prominently in the overall imagery of the villa. For example, a very similar series of deities appear in Peruzzi's over-window niches in the upper level Sala delle Prospettive. A handful also appear directly in the imagery of Raphael's loggia, specifically including Cupid, Jupiter and Mercury. If one

¹⁴⁶ Vasari, 2: 685.

¹⁴⁷ Freedman, 174.

¹⁴⁸ Tessari, 36.

accounts for the additional deities already identified within the façade decoration – namely, Vulcan, Mars, Apollo and Minerva – one can propose that Raphael’s vault *amorini* were in some senses paralleling the important deities of the narratives not only within the Loggia di Amore e Psiche but also on the Farnesina façade.

If one takes into account Frommel’s suggestion that each bay panel of both levels was to be frescoed, this would result in nine scenes across the upper level, and, if one subtracts the two sketched scenes recorded by the sixteenth-century French draftsman, seven scenes are then yet unaccounted for. This number, however, is conveniently the same number of deities alluded to in Raphael’s loggia vaults that had yet to be represented. Specifically, this would include scenes of Neptune, Pluto, Apollo, Bacchus, Pan and Hercules, in addition to the scene of *Iphigenia’s Rescue*, the unidentified sketch, and the necessary relocation of *Mars and Venus Entrapped in Vulcan’s Web* (Fig. 121). As mentioned earlier, Frommel placed this scene on the ground floor façade, based on the accommodation for the upper window included on this level. It seems unusual, however, that a divine scene would be included on the same level as scenes of mortal activities, namely that of Daedalus and Pasiphaë and Raphael’s vignettes of Psyche’s earthly endeavors as visible through the loggia archways.

Of these deities depicted in the upper level panels, several would have borne particular resonance within the villa’s visual motifs. The inclusion of Hercules, for example, would allude to his labors as depicted in Peruzzi’s Sala

del Fregio, and an undated preparatory drawing of *Hercules and Cerberus*, held in the Ashmolean collection (Fig. 122), depicts a scene fittingly monumental for the Farnesina façade. Including Neptune in this façade design would also follow, not only with Gallo's extensive reference to him in his laudatory verse but also in the indelible allusions between Chigi's palace and that of Neptune.¹⁴⁹ Furthermore, a depiction of Neptune would allude to Chigi's antique river god, arguably in the riverfront casino, and Triton fragment, part of a fountain within the grounds, as would a depiction of Pan parallel the ancient sculptural group of *Pan and Daphne* who resided in the garden.¹⁵⁰ Indeed, the potential for such parallels between antique sculpture and contemporary painting were already established with the relation between the *Cowering Psyche* and the adjacent loggia. The inclusion of Pluto would of course draw reference to Psyche's voyage to the Underworld, a scene originally intended for the Loggia di Amore e Psiche, and Bacchus, whose presence on the Farnesina grounds was already established through Chigi's antiquities and thus would have served as another visual connection between the *all'antica* façade and the Farnesina's ancient collection.¹⁵¹

Other preparatory sketches attributed to Peruzzi, however, are worth mention, as they too would fit within the façade conception. A prime example is his sketch of *Europa and the Bull* (Fig. 123), which shares a sense of dynamism with sketches Frommel has associated with the Farnesina façade. Furthermore,

¹⁴⁹ See note 293.

¹⁵⁰ See Chapter Three.

¹⁵¹ See Chapter Three.

the narrative of Europa and the bull would undoubtedly draw parallels with Peruzzi's depiction of Taurus in the Loggia di Galatea's astrological ceiling.

One can also look a contemporaneous example of such façade frescoes, such as those emblazoned on the Casino del Bufalo, to suggest additional plausible subjects and perhaps help to identify that which remained elusive in Frommel's analysis (Figs. 74 and 75). The Casino frescoes provide a fitting source of comparison not only because they were executed by Polidoro da Caravaggio and Maturino, two of Peruzzi's workshop artists, who contributed as well to the Farnesina façade, but also because the Casino del Bufalo was completed at roughly the same time as the Farnesina façade, if not in immediate succession to it.¹⁵² Thus the surviving imagery from the Bufalo *vigna* is merits potential inclusion in the litany of images originally viewable on the Farnesina façade.

Rolf Kultzen, the first to closely analyze these frescoes, identified the Casino del Bufalo façade as depicting the advent of the Hippocrene spring, an allusion to the close proximity of the del Bufalo property to the ancient Aqua Virgo aqueduct, collapsed within the story of Perseus and Andromeda. This theme allowing for the inclusion of a scene of *The Gathering of the Poets and Muses on Mount Helicon (Parnassus)*, appearing to the upper right of the central nymph fountain and identified through images by Cherubino Alberti and Andrea

¹⁵² For more discussion of Maturino's and Polidoro da Caravaggio's involvement, please see: Nicole Dacos, "Ni Polidoro, ni Peruzzi: Maturino," *Revue de l'Art*, 57 (1982), and "Peruzzi. Dalla Farnesina alla Cancelleria. Qualche Proposta per la Bottega della Pittore." In Marcello Fagiolo and Maria Luisa Madonna, *Baldassarre Peruzzi: Pittura, Scena, e Architettura nel Cinquecento* (Rome: Enciclopedia Italiana, 1987), 469-490.

Boscoli (Figs. 124 and 125), along with different scenes incorporating Perseus and Andromeda.

In addition to fostering connections with the nearby ancient water source, the image of *The Gathering of the Poets and Muses on Mount Helicon* was no doubt also aimed at encouraging associations with the del Bufalo *vigna* as a “new Parnassus.”¹⁵³ As Alberti’s engraving and Boscoli’s drawing reveals, here the Muses and Poets have gathered around the bountiful spring, with a rearing Pegasus in the background to symbolize the treasured spring’s source. Considering the popular desire to have one’s *vigna* compared to the splendors of Parnassus, it would seem that a similarly themed scene would be included on the Farnesina façade.

With this in mind, one can return to the unidentified fresco sketch in the central upper bay of the main facade, that which Frommel described as a series of togated figures seemingly gazing at a central tree, upon which alights a bird. A comparison of this sketch to Alberti’s and Boscoli’s images reveals significant similarities, suggesting that this panel would have depicted a similar *Gathering of the Poets and Muses on Mount Helicon/Parnassus* (Fig. 125). Here we see only three figures as compared to the densely populated images of Boscoli and Alberti, however their actions are clear. The quick pen strokes emerging from the left-hand side of the tree and flowing to the ground imply a rushing spring,

¹⁵³ Interestingly, Kultzen refers to the del Bufalo image of Parnassus as “eine Verbindung antiker Vorstellungen mit raphaelesken Anregungen zeigt endlich auch die Parnass-Darstellung vom Gartenhaus Bufalo, die hier ebenfalls durch einen Nachstich Chuerbino Albertis veranschaulicht wird” (“Die Malereien,” 111).

accentuated by the figure at left extending a hand as if to touch the waters, not unlike the two figures doing the same in both Boscoli's drawing and Alberti's engraving. The figure on the far right of the anonymous sketch assumes a similar pose as Boscoli's drawing of Terpsichore, identifiable by the harp she holds. This attribute is not clearly visible in the anonymous Farnesina sketch, however the similar pose makes connection between these figures plausible, and the hastily sketched in pleats of drapery, seemingly extended on second thought from the knee to the floor, reinforces the interpretation of this figure as one of the Muses on Parnassus. Perhaps, then, what Frommel interpreted as a bird in the tree is indeed a most preliminary outline of Pegasus, whose inclusion would firmly secure the reading of this panel.

The inclusion of a scene of Parnassus on the Farnesina façade would, of course, be significant from several perspectives. On one had, it would evoke the desired parallels with the Farnesina grounds as a new Parnassus and would potentially further strengthen ties with both the garden's antique holdings and Raphael's riverfront casino. On the other hand, it could be read as a direct commentary on Raphael's *Parnassus* in the Stanza della Segnatura, not as a direct visual quotation, but rather as a comment on the iconographic significance of Parnassus and the evocative ability of Raphael's (and Peruzzi's) imagery so carefully cultivated to relay such as message.

Having established this connection between the del Bufalo *Parnassus* and previously unidentified Farnesina façade panel, one can return to the other

images illustrated on the Casino del Bufalo, including *The Liberation of Andromeda*, depicted at the uppermost left register of the façade, and *The Wedding of Perseus and Andromeda*, in the uppermost right corner.¹⁵⁴ Henning Wrede interpreted this emphasis on Perseus as an allusion to the heroic lineage of the del Bufalo family.¹⁵⁵ He based this interpretation on the proximity of these frescoes to the *Farnese Atlas*, then part of the Bufalo *vigna*, which depicts Perseus' defeat of the sea monster within the realm of Taurus, the symbolic zodiacal sign of the del Bufalo name. Christian has since discounted this interpretation, "particularly," as she points out, "how easily visitors could have overlooked the details of the constellation map."¹⁵⁶

While Christian's interpretation of this astrological connection in the case of the del Bufalo *vigna* is most logical, it brings into question whether the conspicuous constellation map on display at the Farnesina, that seen in Peruzzi's astrological ceiling in the Loggia di Galatea, might have played a role in the imagery illustrated on the Farnesina exterior. For example, if perhaps efforts were made to tie this interior astrological chart with the exterior decoration, it would follow that perhaps Ceres, featured prominently indeed throughout the villa interior, would also be included in the façade decoration. Or, perhaps

¹⁵⁴ Kultzen, 106-109. Christian also notes that the adjacent del Bufalo stables, attached to the casino via loggia, was also frescoed on the garden interior wall, including scenes such as *The Transformation of Atlas Into Stone*, the *Garden of the Hesperides*, and scenes from the life of Danaë. This leads one to speculate as to whether or not frescoes appeared on the façade of Raphael's stables, further linking it visually to the Farnesina façade.

¹⁵⁵ Henning Wrede, *Der Antikengarten der del Bufalo bei der Fontana Trevi*. Trierer Winckelmannsprogramme IV (Mainz am Rhein: Philip von Zabern, 1983) and "Perseus als Heros der del Bufalo, in Franz George Maier, ed., *Alt-Paphos auf Cypern* (Mainz am Rhein: Phillip von Zabern), 52-54.

¹⁵⁶ Christian, *Empire*, 284.

Perseus would appear as well, his heroic traits complementing his noteworthy placement within Peruzzi's ceiling. Indeed, when one considers the intricate interlacing Peruzzi accomplished in the astrological ceiling, it would follow that the same interweaving of themes and imagery would carry on throughout the Farnesina's façade.

One must also consider the possibility that, instead of frescoed bay panels on the upper level, perhaps Peruzzi's intention was to create stucco reliefs akin to ancient relief panels. As Frommel comments in his analysis of these sketches, for the entrance façade Peruzzi "channeled the triumphal arches of antiquity, as exemplified by Giuliano da Sangallo in his designs for the loggia of the Papal Cantors."¹⁵⁷ Indeed, the positioning of the frescoed spandrel figures on the Farnesina facade (Fig. 24) are a direct quotation of ancient triumphal arches, such as the Roman Forum's Arch of Titus (Fig. 127). With this desire to draw imagery from the triumphal arches of ancient Rome, it seems one could look to an earlier instance of Sangallo's work, that at the Florentine Palazzo Scala, known today as the Palazzo della Gherardesca (1472-1473) (Fig. 128). Here, Sangallo incorporated a sculptural frieze between the fresco work of the upper and lower levels combined with frescoed spandrels above the lower arcade. These spandrels bear close resemblance to those included by Peruzzi on the Farnesina.

Peruzzi's façade design would have allowed for such a frieze register of relief work, albeit above the upper level windows and thus inverting Sangallo's

¹⁵⁷ "Per quanto riguarda lo schema decorativo, egli si orientò principalmente verso gli archi dell'antichità, come già esemplificato da Giuliano da Sangallo nel suo progetto per la loggia dei tibicini papali" (Frommel, "La Villa," 80).

scheme, amplifying not only connections with the ancient world but also the theatrical quality of the façade. As Sabine Frommel comments in regard to Peruzzi's colleague, Sangallo, "both the sculptural frieze and the theatrical motifs of the courtyard – the combination of arches, piers, and half columns as in Roman amphitheaters – are references to the antique house."¹⁵⁸ Peruzzi could have hoped for the same sentiment to resonate from his Farnesina façade, coming together as a blend of antiquity and theatricality through an unprecedented collaboration with Raphael. With Raphael's mortal story of Psyche being revealed through the open archways of the entryway, the *scaenae frons* would ascend with Peruzzi's carefully curated imagery of the gods, designed, as the astrological ceiling had been, to convey a complex visual message incorporating theater, antiquity, and, above all, Chigi, all that conjured in visual harmony.

In this light, one could proffer no better example of the impact of co-opetition. Here two artists/architects working in friendly collaboration with one another created arguably one of the most revolutionary spaces of early sixteenth-century Rome. Peruzzi designed a villa whose façade translated Vitruvian prescriptions for a *scaenae frons* with near exactitude, creating an unprecedented theatrical space. Raphael built on this by carrying the theatricality indoors, incorporating into his program for the Loggia di Amore e Psiche a permanent

¹⁵⁸ Sabine Frommel, "Giuliano da Sangallo between Florentine Quattrocento and Roman High Renaissance," in J. Burke, ed., *Rethinking the Renaissance: The Culture of the Visual Arts in Early Sixteenth-Century Rome* (UK: Ashgate, 2012), 197.

theatrical backdrop that would have undoubtedly made stage presentations at the Farnesina all the more impressive.

At the same time, Raphael's original plan for the Loggia di Amore e Psiche would have invoked some of the same illusionistic tools that had been put in place in the adjacent Loggia di Galatea. As mentioned previously, the play there between the art and nature, as reinforced with Sebastiano's Earth and her deliberate finger point and the juxtaposition of water features with the marine tale of Polyphemus and Galatea, allowed the blending not only of ancient with contemporary but also of outdoor gardens with the interior splendors. Shearman and Schwarzenberg suggest a similar interpenetration occurring in the Loggia di Amore e Psiche, suggesting that, in orienting his lower register of terrestrial scenes, Raphael actually relied on the open archways of the loggia to the garden in place of fictive, painted ones. Thus, it seems not without coincidence that a similar reference to the garden, as seen in Sebastiano's lunette (Fig. 51), also occurs in the Raphael's neighboring loggia. The central spandrel of the eastern wall of the Loggia di Amore e Psiche reveals Venus showing Cupid to Psyche. Venus points out of the spandrel frame, to what scholars have assumed was to be a rendition of Psyche in Raphael's eventual lower terrestrial realm. While such a connection is possible, it seems another plausible intent for this deliberate gesture is to point to the ancient sculpture of Psyche, which scholars have placed in Chigi's forecourt.¹⁵⁹ This interpretation gains strength in light of Sebastiano's use of the similar visual cue in the Loggia di Galatea and thus would have served

¹⁵⁹ Schwarzenberg, "Psychen-Statue," 115,119.

a similar purpose to both blur the line between indoor and outdoor spaces and to further the engagement between the ancient and contemporary world.

In closing, just as one is left with unanswered questions in the Loggia di Amore e Psiche, it is impossible not to ponder what could have been had Chigi's original intentions for his *camera* adjacent to the Sala delle Prospettive been realized. Oberhuber argues that Raphael's sketch of the *Nuptials of Alexander and Roxane* was a preparatory drawing for Chigi's bedchamber, but one Raphael was never able to realize (Fig. 88). With Chigi's wedding date of August 28th, 1519, rapidly approaching and the Loggia di Amore e Psiche still left unfinished, Chigi handed the project for his bedroom to Sodoma,¹⁶⁰ who perhaps gave a nod to the composition's creator by inserting a figure quoted from *Fire in the Borgo* into the nuptial narrative Raphael had crafted (Fig. 129).

Raphael's sketch focuses on the figures and leaves no hints as to what backdrop he envisioned for the scene. Sodoma's creative license resulted in a dramatic sweep of fictive architecture in the background, yet Raphael's concurrent work in the downstairs loggia could have influenced this composition as well, resulting in a composition of diminished perspective not that different from the loggia's *Council of the Gods* and the *Marriage of Cupid and Psyche* (Fig.

¹⁶⁰ As Oberhuber summarizes: "*Le Nozze di Alessandro e Rossana* di Raffaello furono dipinte nel'ambito della decorazione della camera da letto di Agostino Chigi all Farnesina, affidata all'Urbinate. Il 28 agosto 1519 si festeggiava del Chigi con Francesca Ordeaschi, di umili origini: la disparità sociale tra gli sposi trovava un parallelo storico nelle nozze di Alessandro e Rossana. Raffaello realizzò probabilmente anche i disegni per altre scene ma, forse per mancanza tempo, non arrivò a eseguire gli affreschi. Agostino Chigi incaricò della decorazione della stanza il Sodoma, che dipinse questa scena apportandovi però numerose variazioni." (Oberhuber, *Roma e lo Stilo Classico*, 140). The additional designs Oberhuber suggests Raphael created are illustrated in: Nikos Chatzēnikolau, *Alexander the Great in European Art: 22 September 1997-11 January 1998* (Thessaloniki: Organisation for the Cultural Capital of Europe, 1997), vol. 2, 226, no. XVIII 1).

130). Perhaps this room was intended to be Raphael's last comment at the Farnesina, in direct visual conversation with Peruzzi's Sala delle Prospettive outside. How different this space would have been conceived, how pointed the juxtaposition of the two masters would have felt, how similar this interaction would have been to that initially experienced between Raphael and Sebastiano years before yet only feet away, cannot be known. Regardless, one is left to marvel at the conversations in which Raphael did participate at the Farnesina, all of which were so transformative on the impressionable artist that perhaps, in hind sight, it was best for him not to have the last "word."

Though Peruzzi would go on to enjoy a longer career following his days at the Farnesina, Raphael's days were numbered. Though he has already assumed a primarily supervisory role in the loggia's creation by the time of Chigi's tremendous wedding reception in the space,¹⁶¹ the overall design was left unfinished at the time of his death. Having since suffered several problematic restorations, little can safely be said about the exactitudes of Raphael's visual program, the styling of its figures, nor whether or not the presence of his hand is discernable. The design, however, was concretely Raphael's and, unlike other projects, went relatively unchanged in its realization by his workshop assistants Giovanni da Udine and Giulio Romano. Thus drawing such parallels with Peruzzi's concurrent work at the Farnesina is not only reasonable but due, as it

¹⁶¹ He married her in 1519 and the Pope legitimized their four children: the decree is published by Montenovisi, *Agostino Chigi*, p. 124, Document III.

revealed the passion for ingenuity that followed Raphael until his death and its power to translate artistic collaborations into feats of greatness.

Chapter Seven: Conclusion

“You too, Raphael, have moved the jealousy of the gods, while restoring Rome, her whole corpse dilapidated, with your miraculous art, and recalling to life and pristine glory the remains of a city maimed by arms, fire and age; as you did so, death’s indignation was aroused by your gift of returning to life what had long been extinct, and of renewing once more, disdainingly the way of all flesh, what the long days of time had slowly taken away.”
- Baldassarre Castiglione, *De morte Raphaelis pictoris*, 1520¹

As church bells rang on April 6th, 1520, to commemorate the celebration of Good Friday, Raphael took his final breath.² Having fallen ill only a week before, Raphael’s sudden death was a shock to all, and in many ways did it foreshadow the imminent demise of artistic *largesse* that defined the first decades of the *cinquecento*. Agostino Chigi, the flamboyant patron who had secured Raphael’s iconic Roman status, died only five days later at the age of 54;³ Renaissance Rome would soon die too, in a sense. The Sack of Rome in 1527 sent artistic

¹ “Tu quoque dum toto laniatam corpore Romam Composit miro, Raphael, ingenio, Atque Urbis lacerum ferro, igni, annisque cadaver ad vitam, antiquum jam revocasque decus; Movisti superum invidiam, indignataque mors est te dudum extinctis reddere posse animam, et quod long dies paulatim aboleverat, hoc te mortali sprete lege parare iterum. Sic mise heu! prima cadis intercepte juventa, deberi et morti nostraque nosque mones.” (Golzio, 232).

² The dating of Raphael’s death is based on the interpretation of a letter written by Marcantonio Michiel in 1520: “Morse a hora 3 di note di venerdi santo venendo il soltanto giorno della sua natività” (Shearman, *Raphael in Early Modern Sources*, 1520/15, 48).

³ Chigi apparently suffered from dropsy, better defined by today’s medical community as congestive heart failure. According to Frommel, Chigi was aware he was succumbing to the condition prior to his death, encouraging his creation of a will so soon before his death (Frommel, *Die Farnesina*, 14). This last will and testament, signed just prior to his wedding on August 28th, 1519, laid out a very detailed inheritance of the Farnesina that made every effort to secure the villa under the ownership of his heirs for as long as possible, but as previously mentioned his efforts were for naught. As Felix Gilbert surmised, “the purpose of this testament is clear: Chigi had many other houses and possessions, but his *villa suburbana* was meant to be the family seat, the center of the Chigi family. Chigi’s arrangements – short-lived as they were because, even before the sixteenth century ended, Chigi’s legal conditions were set aside and the villa was sold to the Farnese, becoming the Villa Farnesina – suggests that he felt sure he had raised the Chigis to the rank of the great Roman families and that he wanted all the Chigis to be aware that he, Agostino, was the founder of the family fortunes.” (Gilbert, *The Pope, His Banker, and Venice*, 95).

masters fleeing to the far reaches the Italian peninsula, halted many projects, and caused archaeology, as defined by Raphael and espoused by Leo X, to vanish.⁴

At the time of his death, Raphael had, on many counts, succeeded at becoming one of the most multifaceted artists of his day. His fascination with antiquity and his aspirations for intellectualism developed his own antiquarian circle. Furthermore, his dedication to the development of a workshop system made him one of the most noted teachers of his day, “an attribute,” according to Talvacchia, “seldom, if ever, ascribed to his contemporary practitioners.”⁵ As the years passed, larger currents subsumed Raphael’s contributions to the artistic and particularly architectural canons, and by the subsequent century his architectural imprint on Rome had begun to vanish. Palazzo Branconio dell’Aquila was demolished in 1660 to make way for Gian Lorenzo Bernini’s massive colonnade for Saint Peter’s, and the Palazzo of Jacopo da Brescia (1515-1519) was also destroyed in 1936 to make way for the Via della Conciliazione.⁶

Though the Palazzo Vidoni-Caffarelli still stands, its main portal facade underwent a major reconstruction at the end of the nineteenth century, removing the primacy of Raphael’s work, and of course the Villa Madama, halted with the Sack in 1527 and since doomed to an incomplete existence, was Raphael’s in

⁴ As Nesselrath comments: “the dormancy of archaeology for several centuries after Raphael might be connected with the fate of the Pope who was his patron: after all, Leo X met almost every day with Raphael and Fra Giocondo for scholarly discussions; Clement VII was to favour another style: the ‘stile mescolato.’” (Nesselrath, “Raphael’s Archaeological Method,” 369). Such a sentiment is echoed by Morolli: “una visione così complessa, organica e totalizzante da richiedere per la sua compiuta restituzione formale forse forse per così dire ancora maggiori rispetto a quelle dello stesso grande Urbinate . . . anche dopo il traumatico Sacco di Roma che spazzò . . . avrebbe conosciuto nei secoli a venire.” (Morolli, 33).

⁵ Talvacchia,

⁶ The Palazzo Jacopo da Brescia was rebuilt shortly thereafter along the Via dei Corridori.

conception only, as the actual building process was overseen by Giovanni da Udine and Giulio Romano (both of whom altered the plans significantly). The same goes for Raphael's designs for the Church of Sant'Eligio (carried out posthumously by Peruzzi) and Chigi's Chapel in Santa Maria del Popolo (completed only at the behest of Chigi's great nephew, Fabio, who became Pope Alexander VII in 1655). The list of Raphael's remaining architectural remnants is short and made even shorter when trimmed of those edifices where Raphael was present in idea only.

Unfortunately, the evanescence of Raphael's architectural offerings at the Villa Farnesina was even more rapid. Passed between numerous owners over subsequent generations following Chigi's death,⁷ the villa's grounds were in need of significant restorations as early as 1579, as reported in documentation from the time of Alessandro Farnese's purchase of the property.⁸ All that remains of two of his most storied structures on Chigi's property is a mere fragment of the lower story of the stables, which reads to the unobservant passerby as simply another section of seemingly mundane brick wall. Thus we are left to piece together what small tidbits of information are still available to ascertain all we

⁷ Chigi's carefully built empire crumbled rapidly following his demise. His wife Francesca died only months after Chigi, as did two of their three sons. Their one remaining son "was finally declared incompetent to manage his own affairs, and in spite of Agostino's careful stipulations to the contrary, Chigi's beautiful villa eventually lost even a nominal connection with its original lord" (Quinlan-McGrath, "The Villa," 1546). Frommel reports that as early as 1533 a battle for ownership of the villa had ensued, with the property changing hands seemingly constantly until the Farnese's official purchase in 1579. For a more complete account of the properties multiple transitions, please see Frommel, *Die Farnesina*.

⁸ Archivio Stato Capitolino, Roma, Archivio Urbano, Sez. I, not. Iohannes Finalis, prot. 318 fol. 354-355r (v. *Appendice documentaria III*); Cremona, 545). In addition to recounting specific plantings in the garden, this document also verifies that the pergolated walkways that dissected the garden were still intact, yet there was no direct mention of the riverfront casino.

can about these structures. By doing so in conjunction with a consideration of these works in the context of Raphael's contemporary painterly pursuits and patronly demands, these time-ravaged structures emerge anew.

As this examination aimed to reveal, Raphael's contributions to the Farnesina, yielded through both competition and collaboration, resulted in watershed moments in early *cinquecento* artistic and architectural design that coincidingly marked significant moments in Raphael's development. His dynamic portrayal of *Galatea*, a visual response to both Sebastiano's *Polyphemus* as well as artistic predecessors ancient and contemporary, revealed a deeply intellectual and intuitive artist who could meld artistic traditions with an uncanny facility.

His subsequent work on the riverfront casino, which for the first time here has been reinterpreted as one of the first revivals of the antique nymphaeum designed in close collaboration with Peruzzi, not only launched his architectural career but firmly established his indebtedness to ancient forms that he nevertheless continued to challenge in his following commissions, as witnessed in his later work on the Farnesina stables. Although tinged with speculation where facts are absent, these new readings of these initial architectural designs by Raphael potentially reveal his willingness to explore the bounds of architecture as a professional practice in the early years of the field's codification. Raphael's designs melded ancient forms with contemporary practice and reflected a careful study of Vitruvius, Alberti and arguably his colleague Peruzzi.

That these architectural explorations were matched by Raphael's equally dynamic artistic production at the Farnesina implies the extent to which Chigi's grounds served, for Raphael and also to some extent for Peruzzi and Sebastiano as well, as an incubator for artistic novelty and an ideal case study for the emergent concept of co-opetition in relation to large scale decorative programs. The collaborative spirit Raphael established to some extent with Sebastiano but realized more fully with Peruzzi during the initial Farnesina projects carried over into Raphael and Peruzzi's final work at the Farnesina both in their parallel programs of fictive interior architecture and in their shared efforts to create a dynamic *scaenae frons*. The effort to re-establish the complete visual program of the Farnesina *scaenae frons* is only presented here in its preliminary stages and thus requires additional research to further materialize. Nevertheless, what this initial examination aimed to reveal is the level to which Raphael and Peruzzi worked collaboratively through their shared interests in archaeology, architecture and theatrical design to render a theatrical façade unlike any other.

Building on these contributions to Raphael scholarship, this study has hopefully also expanded the overall discourse on Raphael's architectural career by shedding additional insight into his two Farnesina architectural commissions. With so little of his contributions to the history of architecture still extant and thus putting him at risk for exclusion from the canon of Renaissance architectural masters, this examination will have succeeded if it at least

encourages a revisiting of Raphael's architectural pursuits and the novelty of his designs during his early Roman years.

Reconstituting Raphael's projects at the Farnesina offers the opportunity for unique insight into the artist's career. As the singular project that spanned the entirety of his time in Rome, the Farnesina represents essential benchmarks in his evolution as artist, architect and archaeologist. In addition to bringing about these revelations regarding Raphael, the remarkable exchanges at the Farnesina also illustrate the need for a more nuanced term than "competition" to describe the nature of interaction between him, Peruzzi and Sebastiano. Thus, what one witnesses from the earliest days in the Loggia di Galatea is the maturation of "co-opetition," wherein competition and cooperation blend between artists across integrated pictorial programs, resulting in a greater overall professional achievement.

In some senses, the notion of co-opetition summarizes Raphael's entire experience at the Farnesina, as it was his dialogues with both Sebastiano and Peruzzi, one competitive and the other collaborative, that can be seen as encouraging Raphael's rapid diversification. While his interactions with both talents differed in timbre, the instances at which they were working in parallel at the villa nevertheless represented crucial moments in Raphael's artistic evolution. Just as his competition with Sebastiano resulted in his landmark *Galatea*, his later work in the Loggia di Amore e Psiche, completed in tandem with Peruzzi's Sala delle Prospettive, serves as the capstone to the long-term

collaborative study of archaeology, architecture and theater he shared with the Sienese master.

By introducing the repurposed term of co-opetition, this examination aims to expand scholarly discussion and also encourage the re-evaluation of these interactions experienced between Raphael, Sebastiano and Peruzzi. Building from Campbell's concept of artistic grafting, which he argues is a relatively identifiable divide between painterly styles within the same work, co-opetition works to explain how these three artists, whose approaches were visually distinctive, were nevertheless able to come together at the Farnesina and create compositions that were visually harmonious and fed into a monumental program that reinforced Chigi's exalted Roman status and undoubtedly dazzled Chigi's visitors.

In some regard, the Farnesina commissions can be seen as a transition from Campbell's grafting to a co-opetitive format. Though two separate compositions as opposed to one unified canvas, the distinguishable styles visible between the closely-paired *Polyphemus* and *Galatea* seems to be modeling a similar tension to that found in, for example, the Dresden *Sleeping Venus*. The numerous quotations, however, of alternate sources by both Sebastiano and Raphael in these works, as outlined in the previous pages, suggests the beginning of a co-opetitive approach that becomes increasingly refined as work at the Farnesina continued. By the time work commenced on the Peruzzi's Sala delle Prospettive and Raphael's Loggia di Amore e Psiche nearly a decade later, a new

dynamic had been struck. By this time, each artist's works communicated with one another in a more seamless blend of references and narrative, the capstone of which would have been the elaborate visual program for the *scaenae frons* façade.

In addition, this study aimed to offer a new approach to the study of Raphael's oeuvre, as it presents the first combined synthesis of Raphael's contributions to the villa. As such it should yield a beneficial contribution to the body of scholarship on the influential artist by presenting a novel navigation of Raphael's Roman artistic production and evolution. With the close ties between Raphael's projects at the Farnesina and subsequent milestones in his artistic, architectural, and archaeological development, this examination has pushed away from the traditional "compartmentalization" of Raphael's accomplishments, for example "Raphael as Painter" versus "Raphael as Antiquarian" versus "Raphael as Architect" in an effort to rather synthesize his achievements and examine the overlap between these roles and how they came to influence one another. Thus, this study has worked to situate Raphael's work at the Villa Farnesina as some of his most important, not in the establishment of his celebrity but rather in the ongoing study of his work.

In addition to contributing to Raphael scholarship, this study has also offered additional insights into the Farnesina itself. It has sought to expand present scholarly discussion on the riverfront casino and the stables, as well as offering a penetrating analysis of how the Loggia di Amore e Psiche was intended to have functioned within the context of the collaborative *scaenae frons*.

Furthermore, it has aimed to shed new insight on to the engagements between the artists working within the space while further securing the Farnesina's overall status as a pivotal landmark of Renaissance Rome.

Future Explorations

A necessary area of research greater than this examination is that to better define and conceptualize co-opetition. The purpose of its use herein was to establish its groundwork and to use Raphael as a preliminary example of how the powers of competition and collaboration can combine to yield wholly new artistic approaches. The potential of this term, however, to find essential applications within the body of scholarship that examines inter-arts rivalries, from the well known dictum "ut pictura poesis" onward, still requires greater development through a wider range of commissions and artists.

Relatedly, also meriting further research is the impact of the co-opetitive approach within the workshop system of artistic training. As mentioned in the previous pages, Raphael and Peruzzi's workshops arguably followed a co-opetitive model, wherein collaboration dominated the evolution of commissioned works. How this model impacted overall artistic exchange in Rome during these early decades of the sixteenth century and how this influences our present-day understanding of *cinquecento* artistic ingenuity deserves greater exploration and discussion. Is, for example, the individual

genius of Raphael advanced or diminished by the notion that a significant portion of his later commissions were the product of these collaborative workshop exchanges? It would seem past scholarship considers this collaborative element as detracting from Raphael's achievements. The minimal attention paid to portions of the Loggia di Amore e Psiche, for example, because they were executed by the hands of Raphael's workshop rather than the master himself, reiterates past scholarship's efforts to downplay the importance of these workshop productions. From the present perspective, however, it would seem that this collaborative approach, remarkably innovative in Raphael's day, can be seen as bolstering this ingenuity. This is not to return Raphael to his pedestal of celebrated genius, but rather to highlight his (and Peruzzi's) novel approach to artistic exchange within the context of the workshop system. In doing so, the hope is to encourage future, deeper examinations of those workshop artists, such as Polidoro da Caravaggio, Maturino, Giovanni da Udine and, to some extent, Marcantonio Raimondi as well, as they similarly engaged in this revolutionary system of artistic production.

A related avenue of further inquiry is a deeper investigation of the artistic relationship between Raphael and Sebastiano in a larger examination of the relations between Roman and Venetian painting at the beginning of the sixteenth century. On the one hand, this study would invoke the polemical debate between *colorito* and *disegno*, as it is known, as reflected in earlier pages, that Raphael wished to capture the vibrant color for which Venice was known. On the other

hand, it seems more can be said regarding the manner in which both Raphael and Sebastiano were contemplating the process behind painting. As has been argued herein, Sebastiano's paintings dating to his earliest days in Rome, such as *Death of Adonis* and *Portrait of Ferry Carondelet*, suggest the transplant was aware of the divergent styles between Venice and Rome and was consciously working to develop his own style somewhere between those two traditions. At the same time, the close parallel between Venetian grafting, as seen in the work of Titian and Giorgione, à la the Dresden *Sleeping Venus*, and what Sebastiano seeks in these compositions suggests that the young painter might have brought more than Venetian color, but rather an entirely new methodology for painting, to Rome, more specifically the Farnesina. This potential transfer, along with the knowledge that Raphael was indeed fascinated with the Venetian painting tradition, proposes yet another valence to Raphael's and Sebastiano's engagement that speaks to the root process of art "making" that merits much greater analysis.

Also, as mentioned previously, further examination is due both Chigi's collection of antiquities and continued elaboration upon this thesis's novel reinterpretation of the riverfront casino. This study provided the most complete account of Chigi's antique collection to date, but the topic deserves a more thorough analysis, not only to determine additional pieces that were in his collection but also, and perhaps more importantly, ascertaining where these pieces were placed on his grounds and how they functioned within the garden

layout. There is potential, for example, that just as *Cowering Psyche* was placed in proximal conversation with the visual program of the Loggia di Amore e Psiche, or just as the *Head of a Triton* fountain was placed to create a connection with the Loggia di Galatea, as argued herein, other ancient sculptures and fragments assumed similar roles that could be teased out with additional research.

Additional examination regarding the riverfront casino is also merited, not only to further refine the role of the grotto and its potential involvement with the garden's elaborate waterworks but also to consider the connections made preliminarily within this examination between the casino and the designs for the nymphaeum at the Villa Colonna. With this riverfront structure having been lost so soon after its construction, this new application of research presents the opportunity to further illuminate this building's design, which would benefit the fields of both Farnesina and Raphael studies.

Raphael has stood at the center of a great number of scholarly studies and yet, as this examination illustrates, there is still more to uncover about the man. The overwhelming popularity of those considered his greatest works has nevertheless marginalized those elements of his career less documented or understudied. His time spent at the Villa Farnesina, often reduced to a gloss of *Galatea*, is arguably one of the most pivotal moments of his career, and thus merits greater scholarly attention. It is a unique moment in his career wherein a confluence of interests met the catalytic, competitive environment that was early *cinquecento* Rome. Raphael entered as a promising artist and left a celebrated

intellect, a transformation that was indelibly tied to his experience at the Villa Farnesina.

APPENDIX A

PART I: Excerpt from Jacopo Mazzochi's *Epigrammata antiquae urbis* (Rome: Mazzochi, ed. 1521), 162v

De Regione Transtyberina: Extra Porta Septimiana in domo D. Agustinis Chisii de Senis.

DIS MANIBUS
CAESIAE DAFHNI DIANAЕ INVENTIA NAE SANCTISSIMAE COLUGIS
OPTIMUS MARITUS.

DIS MANIBUS
MARCUS VIPIO AUG. LIB, NARCISSO FECIT ATTEIA FILICIA AMICO
OPTIMO DE SE BENEMERENTI VIXIT ANNIS.

DIS MANIBUS
P. N. AEUIUS FORTUNATUS VIX. ANN. VXII. MENS. XI.
M. CALIGIUS MARITIMUS VIX. ANN. IIII. MENS. V.
P. MANLIUS FULUIANUS ET NAEVIA SCATILLA FECERUNT FRATRI
PISSIMO ET FILIO DULCISSIMO.

[Gaudenzio Roberti cites a nearly identical inscription (swapping the FILIO seen above for FRATRI) as being near the Campo de Fiore. (*Miscellanea Italica Erudita*, 1) [Parma, 1690), 95-96.]

PART II: Excerpt from Ulisse Aldrovandi, *Delle Statue Antiche di Roma* (1556 ed.):

Nel giardino del Reverdiss. Farnese, che è di là dal Tevere, al dritto del suo Palagio nuovo:

In un giardinetto, che si trova prima si vede sopra una pila antica una Venere ignuda da mezzo corpo in fu; e si tiene fra le coscie ristretti i panni: ha le treccie sparse sul collo, e tiene in mano una conca marina: Da i lati di questa statua sono due putti ignudi con le vesti ranolte in spalla, è di sopra vi tengono due urne, e stanno in atto di versare acqua.

Vi è un'altra gra[nde] pila antica, dove sono di mezzo rileno iscolpite d'ogni intorno varie figure di huomini, da donne, e di leoni.

Nel giardino poi, presso al portico, che sopra sta al Tevere, si vede una pila antica iscolpita in figure di huomini, leoni, e canalli.

Su l'entrare del giardino si trova una antica pila; ne la quale sono iscolpite di mezzo rileno nove Muse vestite: fra le quale due ne tengono una maschera per una; una tiene una testadine, l'altra una palla in mano.

Dal altro canto si vede un'altra pila, dove sono le feste di Bacco iscolpite: e tra le alter cose vi si veggono molti Fauni, e Satiri, e alcuni di loro hanno in mano le faci accese; due altri di loro conducono Sileno ebbrio, che fu colui, che allenò Bacco: vi si vede medesimamente un Priapo; un che giace; un Siatro, che esce di una camera: Nel fronte di quella pila si veggono duo, che portano in una cistella un puttino; da l'altra parte sono due donne, una de le quali ha in mano un vasetto. E sotto à queste pile si veggono iscolpite le fasci antiche, che solenano portare in Rome I sergente e ministry de' confoli.

Nel cortile prima, che nel giardino s'entri, si vede una grande e bella pila, adorna d'ogni intorno di varie figure: perche vi sonole feste di Bacco; e quasi tutti i compagni di questo idio portano in mano, e ne'vasi, grappi di una: e vi sono molti puttini, che giacciono loro à piedi cone vasetti con uva. Fu questa pila ritrovata à Tiboli.

Vi si vede ancho una colonna in tre pezzi bellissima con molte antiche inscrittioni greche, che male si possono leggere. Fu ritrovata in Tiboli; e vogliono alcuni, che vi fosse di Hierusalem trasferita.

In una camera, che è in questo luogo, si vede una Venere maggiore del natural, ignuda da mezzo corpo in fu, e si tiene la veste ristretta fra le coscie: non ha mani.


Si vede appresso una statua d'huomo assiso: li manca la testa, un braccio, una mano, e la gamba dritta: a le arme, che li giacciono à i piedi. Poi si vede una mano poggiata al luogo, ove siede: e tiene la veste attaccata a con un bottone fu la spalla: le manca il braccio dritto, e i piedi.

APPENDIX B

PRINCIPAL MEASUREMENTS - VILLA FARNESINA

These measurements were derived from two surveys of the Villa Farnesina performed by Pierre Letrouilly (*Les Edifices de Rome Modernes* (Paris: 1849-68), vol 1, 100-102) and M.C. Grossi and E. Piccione (*Il Rilievo della Villa Farnesina Chigi* (Rome, 1984)). Their tabulation, as well as additional measurements, were presented in grouping by Mark Wilson Jones (*"Palazzo Massimo and Baldassarre Peruzzi's Approach to Architectural Design,"*). In place of Jones' average of Letrouilly and Grossi/Piccione's measurements in *palmi* I have instead included these averages in meters to reinforce their adherence to the Vitruvian scheme, a point further reiterated with my added supplement of the right-hand column that reflects the incredibly minute differences between a hypothetical Vitruvian layout and Peruzzi's realized structure.

Elevation		Vitruvius'		Grossi/ Piccioni	Average	Difference
		Scheme if HU = 15.47 m	Letrouilly (m)			
hS	height of socle + pedestal	2.105	2.142	2.100	2.1235	0.019
hpII	height of lower pilasters	6.315	6.264	6.250	6.2895	-0.026
hentI	height of lower entablature	1.260	1.253	1.250	1.2565	-0.004
hd2	height of upper pedestals	1.050	0.900	0.960	0.975	-0.075
hpl2	height of upper pilasters	4.740	4.820	4.850	4.78	0.040
HU	height of entablature off of ground	15.470	15.502	15.440	15.486	
hent2	height of top entablature	0.943	2.168	2.260	2.214	1.271
H	Existing Height of Building		17.670	17.700	17.685	
H*	Original Height of Building	≈17.800				



APPENDIX C


PRINCIPAL MEASUREMENTS – CHIGI’S STABLES

These measurements were derived from Christoph Luitpold Frommel’s survey (*Die Farnesina und Peruzzis Architektonisches Frühwerk* (Berlin: DeGruyter, 1961), 57). I have supplemented his measurements with a Vitruvian proportional scheme similar to that presented by Jones for the Farnesina to illustrate the extent to which Raphael’s stables deviate from it, a point emphasized by the remarkable magnitude of difference reflected in the right-hand column. Please note that Jones identifies one *palmi* as equivalent to 0.223 m while Frommel sets it at 0.224 m, however this slight difference in figure should not impact the overall analysis without converting the two to a common measurement.

<i>Elevation</i>		<i>Vitruvius'</i> <i>Scheme if</i> <i>HU =</i>	<i>Frommel (m)</i>	<i>Difference</i>
hS	height of socle + pedestal	2.133	2.055	≈ 1:1
hpII	height of lower pilasters	6.370	5.683	≈ 1:√2
hentI	height of lower entablature	1.271	1.700	≈ 1:2.3
hd2	height of upper pedestals	1.059	1.247	≈ 1:1
hpl2	height of upper pilasters	4.783	4.925	≈ 1:1
HU	height of entablature off of ground	15.61	15.61	

APPENDIX D

TABLE OF NICHOMACHUS



- Any number in this sequence is the arithmetic mean of the two numbers that brace it diagonally from above, e.g., 9 is the arithmetic mean of 6 and 12 (grey triangle).

$$c = \frac{a + b}{2}$$


- Any number of this sequence is the harmonic mean of the two numbers that diagonally brace it from below, e.g., 32 is the harmonic mean of 24 and 48 (black triangle).

$$c = \frac{2ab}{a + b}$$

APPENDIX E

PROPORTIONAL RATIOS BETWEEN THE FARNESINA (PERUZZI) AND THE STABLES (RAPHAEL) WITH FIGURES

The following reflects a merger of the measurements of the Farnesina (Appendix B) and its accompanying stables (Appendix C) to illustrate the proportional relationship between the two (reflected in the right-hand column).



Where 1 *palmo antico* (p) = 0.223 m

<i>Elevation</i>		<i>FARNESINA</i>	<i>STABLES</i>	PROPORTIONAL RELATIONSHIP
hS	height of socle + pedestal	2.1235	2.055	≈ 1:1
hplI	height of lower pilasters	6.2895	5.683	≈ 1:1
hentI	height of lower entablature	1.2565	1.700	≈ 3:4
hd2	height of upper pedestals	0.975	1.247	≈ 3:4
hpl2	height of upper pilasters	4.78	4.925	≈ 1:1
HU	height of entablature off of ground	15.486 (70 p)	15.61 (70 p)	≈ 1:1
hent2	height of top entablature	2.214	2.353	
H	Existing Height of Building	17.685	n/a	
H*	Original Height of Building	≈17.800 (80 p)	≈21.631 (97 p)	8:9 (?)
L	length of front	35.66 (160 p)	42.482 (190 p)	1:1.2 or 6:7

Bibliography

- Ackerman, James S. "The Tuscan/Rustic Order: A Study in the Metaphorical Language of Architecture." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 42 (1) (Mar., 1983), 26.
- _____. "The Villa as Paradigm." *Perspecta*, 22. Paradigms of Architecture (MIT Press, 1986), 10-31.
- Alberti, Leon Battista. *On Painting and On Sculpture: The Latin texts of De Pictura and De Statue*. Trans. by Cecil Grayson (London: Phaeton, 1972).
- _____. *On the Art of Building in Ten Books*. Trans. by Joseph Rykwert, Neil Leach, and Robert Tavernor (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1988).
- Alcuni palazzi demaniali in Rome: il Quirinale, Palazzo Madama, Montecitorio, Palazzo Chigi* (Rome: Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, 1995).
- Aldrovandi, Ulisse. *Delle statue antiche di Roma* (Rome: 1556).
- Alvarez, Frank Joseph. "The Renaissance Nymphaeum: Its Origins and Its Development in Rome and Vicinity" (PhD diss., Columbia University, 1981).
- Ames-Lewis, Francis. *The Draftsman Raphael* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986).
- D'Ancona, Paolo. *Gli Affreschi della Farnesina in Roma* (Milan: Edizione del Milione, 1955).
- Apuleius, *The Story of Cupid and Psyche from the Golden Asses*. Trans. by E.J. Kenny. (NY: Penguin Classics, 2006).
- Aretino, Pietro. *Lettere sull'arte di Pietro Aretino*, ed. E. Camesasca, I (Milan, 1537).
- _____. *Tutte Le Opere di Pietro Aretino. Lettere. Il Primo e Secondo Libro* (Milan: Arnoldo Mondadori, 1960).
- Arias, Paolo Enrico. *Skopas, a cura di Paolo Enrico Arias* (Roma: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1952).

Badt, Kurt. "Raphael's 'Incendio del Borgo,'" *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 22 (1/2) (Jan.-Jun. 1959).

Baldassarre Peruzzi, 1481-1981: *Commemorazione V Centenario Della Nascita* (Sovicille: Comune di Sovicille, 1981).

Barbieri, Costanza. "The Competition between Raphael and Michelangelo and Sebastiano's Role In It." In M.B. Hall, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Raphael* (NY; Cambridge, 2002), 141-166.

Barkan, Leonard. "The Beholder's Tale: Ancient Sculpture, Renaissance Narratives." *Representations*, 44 (Autumn, 1993), 133-166.

_____. *Unearthing the Past: Archaeology and Aesthetics in the Makings of Renaissance Culture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999).

Barrochi, Paola, ed., *Scritti d'Arte del Cinquecento* (Milano-Napoli: R. Ricciardi, 1971-1977), 3 vols.

Bartalini, Roberto. "Due Episodi del Meccenatismo di Agostino Chigi e le Antichità della Farnesina." *Prospettiva* 67 (1992).

_____. *Le Occasioni del Sodoma: dalla Milano di Leonardo alla Roma di Raffaello* (Saggi. Rome: Donzelli, 1996).

_____. "Sodoma, the Chigi and the Vatican Stanze". *The Burlington Magazine*. 143 (1182) (2001), 544.

Bartoli, Cosimo. *L'Architettura di Leon Battista Alberti tradotta in lingua fiorentina da Cosimo Bartoli . . . con l'Aggiunta de Disegni* (Florence: Lorenzo Torrentino, 1550).

Bell, John. "Introduction." In J. Bell and T. Willette, eds., *Art History in the Age of Bellori: Scholarship and Cultural Politics in Seventeenth-Century Rome* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 1-54.

Bellori, Gian Pietro. *Descrizione delle Imagini Dipinti da Raffaello d'Urbino nelle Camere del Palazzo Vaticano* (Rome, 1695).

Beloe, William. *Anecdotes of Literature and Scarce Books*. 6 vols. (London: Rivington, 1807- 1812).

- Beltramini, Maria, Elam, Caroline, and Burns, Howard, eds. *Some Degree of Happiness: Studi di Storia dell'Architettura in Onore di Howard Burns* (Pisa: Edizione della Normale, 2010).
- Bembo, Pietro. *Prose della volgar lingua*, ed. M. Marti (Padua: Liviana, 1955).
- Benocci, Carla, ed. *I giardini Chigi tra Siena e Rome: dal Cinquecento agli inizi dell'Ottocento* (Siena: Fondazione Monte dei Paschi di Siena, 2005).
- Bentvoglio, Enzo. "Per la Conoscenza del Palazzo della Cancelleria: la Personalita e l'Ambiente Culturale del Cardinale Raffaele Sansoni Riario." *Quaderni dell'Istituto di Storia dell'Architettura: Saggi in onore di Renato Bonelli* (1990-1992), 15-20, 367-74.
- _____. "La Presenza di Baldassarre Peruzzi nei Lavori della Casa di Blosio Pallasio." In Marcello Fagiolo and Maria Luisa Madonna, eds., *Baldassarre Peruzzi: Pitture Scena e Architettura nel Cinquecento*. (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1987), 193-204.
- _____. "Nel Cantiere del Palazzo del Cardinale Raffaele Riario (La Cancelleria): Organizzazione, materiali, maestranze, personaggi," *Quaderni dell'Istituto di Storia dell'Architettura*, 174 (1983), 27-34.
- Bentz, Katherine M. "Cardinal Cesi and His Garden: Antiquities, Landscape and Social Identity in Early Modern Rome" (PhD Diss., The Pennsylvania State University, 2003).
- Betts, Richard J. "Si come dice Vitruvio: Images of Antiquity in Early Renaissance Theory of Architecture." In Alina Payne, Ann Kuttner and Rebekah Smick, eds., *Antiquity and its Interpreters*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 244-257.
- Bialostocki, J. "A Broad Humanistic Outlook." *American Art Journal*, 3 (1) (Spring, 1971), 95-100.
- Bigot, Charles and Mary Healy. *Raphael and the Villa Farnesina* (London: Trench & Co., 1884).
- Bignamini, Ilaria. *Archives & Excavations: Essays on the History of Archaeological Excavations in Rome and Southern Italy from the Renaissance to the Nineteenth Century* (London: British School at Rome, 2004).
- Bober, Phyllis Pray, and Ruth Rubenstein. *Renaissance Artists and Antique Sculpture: A Handbook of Sources*. Second, rev. ed. (London: Miller, 1987).

- Boccaccio, Giovanni, *Decameron* (Firenze, 1353).
- Boissard, Jean Jacques. *Romanae urbis Topographiae & antiquitatum, qua succincte, breviter describuntur Omnia quae tam publice quam privato videntur animadversione digna* (Frankfurt, 1597-1062).
- Bolgar, R. R. *Classical Influences on European Culture, A.D. 1500-1700: Proceedings of an International Conference Held at King's College, Cambridge, April 1974* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1976).
- Bonito, Virginia Anne. "The Saint Anne Altar in Sant' Agostino, Rome" (PhD Diss., New York University, 1983).
- _____, "The Saint Anne altar in Sant' Agostino: Restoration and Interpretation," *The Burlington Magazine*, 124 (950) (May, 1982), 268-273, 275-276.
- _____, "The St Anne Altar in Sant' Agostino in Rome: A New Discovery," *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol. 122 (933) (Dec., 1980), 805-812.
- Boucher, Bruce. "Bernini e l'architettura del Cinquecento: la lezione di Baldassarre Peruzzi e di Sebastiano Serlio." *Bollettino del Centro internazionale di Studi di Architettura Andrea Palladio* (23) (1981), 27-43.
- _____, *The Sculpture of Jacopo Sansovino*. 2 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991).
- Brandenburger, Adam, and Nalebuff, Barry. *Co-opetition: A Revolutionary Mindset that Combines Competition and Cooperation : The Game Theory Strategy That's Changing the Game of Business*. New York: Currency Doubleday, 1998).
- Brentano, Robert. *Rome Before Avignon: A Social History of Thirteenth Century Rome* (New York: Basic Books, 1914).
- Britton, Piers Dominic. "A Peruzzi Drawing and the Nymphaeum at Genazzano." *Notes in the History of Art*, 19 (4) (Summer 2000), 1-6.
- Brown, Sterling Scott. *The Lira Da Braccio* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995).
- Bruschi, Arnaldo. *Bramante* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977).
- de Brosse, Charles. *Viaggio in Italia: Lettere Familiare* (Rome: Laterza, 1973).

- Bull, Malcolm. *The Mirror of the Gods:: How Renaissance Artists Rediscovered the Pagan Gods* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
- Burckhardt, Jacob. *The Architecture of the Italian Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985).
- Burlingham, Cynthia M. *Perino del Vaga's Designs for the Loves of the Gods* (M.A. Thesis, Oberlin College, 1980).
- Burke, Jill, "Inventing the High Renaissance, from Winkelmann to Wikipedia: An Introductory Essay," in J. Burke, ed., *Rethinking the High Renaissance: The Culture of the Visual Arts in Early Sixteenth-Century Rome* (UK: Ashgate, 2012), 1-23.
- _____, ed., *Rethinking the High Renaissance: The Culture of the Visual Arts in Early Sixteenth-Century Rome* (UK: Ashgate, 2012).
- Burns, Howard. "Baldassarre Peruzzi and Sixteenth Century Architectural Theory." In Jean Guillaume, ed., *Les Traités d'Architecture de la Renaissance* (Paris: Picard, 1988), 207-26.
- _____, "I disegni di Francesco di Giorgio agli Uffizi di Firenze." In F.P. Fiore and M. Tafuri, eds., *Francesco di Giorgio architetto* (Milan: Electa, 1993), 330-358.
- Butler, Kim E. "Reddita Lux Est: Raphael and the Pursuit of Sacred Eloquence in Leonine Rome." In Stephen J. Campbell and Evelyn S. Welch, eds., *Artists at Court: Image-Making and Identity, 1300-1550* (2004), 135-142.
- Cafà, Valeria. "Divinità a pezzi: Prove di restauro di scultura antica nei disegni di Baldassarre Peruzzi." In M. Beltramini and C. Elam, eds., *Some Degree of Happiness: Studi di Storia dell'Architettura in Onore di Howard Burns* (Pisa: Edizione della Normale, 2010), 155-171 and 697-702.
- Calvo, Marco Fabio. *Antiquae Urbis Romae cum Regionibus Simulachrum* (Basileae, 1532).
- Camesasca, Ettore. *Tutta La Pittura di Raffaello* (Milan, 1956).
- Campbell, Ian. "Rescue Archaeology in the Renaissance," in Ilaria Bignamini, ed., *Archives & Excavations: Essays on the History of Archaeological Excavations in Rome and Southern Italy from the Renaissance to the Nineteenth Century*, (London: British School at Rome, 2004).

- _____. "Scamili Inpares: A Problem in Vitruvius." *Papers of the British School at Rome*, Vol. 48 (1980), 17-22.
- Campbell, Stephen J. "Naturalism and the Venetian 'Poesia': Grafting, Metaphor, and Embodiment in Giorgione, Titian, and the Campagnolas" in Alexander Nagel and Lorenzo Pericolo, eds., *Subject as Aporia in Early Modern Art* (VT: Ashgate, 2010).
- _____. and Welch, Evelyn S., eds., *Artists at Court: Image-Making and Identity, 1300-1550* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).
- Caneva, Giulia. *Il Mondo di Cerere nella Loggia di Psiche: Villa Farnesina, Sede dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei* (Rome: Fratelli Palombi, 1992).
- Cappellatti, Francesca. "'Sentirsi ospite di un umanista dei giorni sereni di Raffaello': Agostino Chigi e la decorazione della Farnesina 1505-1520." In R. Varoli-Piazza, ed., *Raffaello: La Loggia di Amore e Psiche alle Farnesina*. (Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 2002), 31-39.
- _____. "La Storia di Psiche, il Mito di Raffaello. In Margine alla Storia dei Restauri Antichi," in R. Varoli-Piazza, ed., *Raffaello La Loggia di Amore e Psiche alla Farnesina* (Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 2002).
- _____. "L'Uso delle metamorfosi di Ovidio nella decorazione ad affresco della prima metà del Cinquecento. Il caso della Farnesina." In Hermann Walter and Hans-Jürgen Horn, eds., *Die Rezeption der Metamorphosen des Ovid in der Neuzeit: der antike Mythos in Text und Bild. Internationales Symposium der Werner Reimers-Stiftung* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1995), 115-128.
- Castagnoli, F. "Il Campo Marzio nell'antichità." *Atti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei* (ser. VIII, 1.4) (1946), 190-193.
- Castiglione, Baldassarre. *The Book of the Courtier*, trans. by George Anthony Bull (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1976).
- Celio, Gaspare. *Memoria dei Nomi dell'Artefici delle Pitture che sono in Alcune Chiese, Facciate e Palazzi di Roma* (Napoli, 1638), reprinted by Emma Zocca (Milan: Electa, 1967).
- Census of Ancient Art and Architecture Known to the Renaissance*. Bibliotheca Hertziana, Rome and Warburg Institute, London. Cerutti Fusco, Annarosa. "La Restituzione Grafica di Teatri Antichi nei Primi

- Decenni del Cinquecento: Interesse Antiquario, Studi Vitruviani e Invenzioni." *Quaderni dell'Istituto di Storia dell'Architettura* (1-10) (1983-87), 301-312.
- Cerri, A. "La traduzione omerica di Angelo Poliziano (gli epiteti degli dèi e degli eroi)," *Acme* 30 (1977), 143-174.
- Cesariano, Cesare. *Di Lucio Vitruvio Pollione de Architectura libri dece Traducti de Latino in Vulgare Affigurati: Comẽtati: & con Mirando Ordine Insigniti.* (Como: Gotardo da Ponte, 1521).
- Chapman, Hugo, Henry, Tom, Piazzotta, Carol, Nesselrath, Arnold and Penny, Nicholas, *Raphael: from Urbino to Rome* (London: National Gallery, 2004),
- Chastel, André, ed., *"Il se Rendit en Italie": Études Offertes à André Chastel* (Paris: Elefante, 1987).
- _____. *Raffaello a Rome: Il Covegno del 1983* (Rome: Edizioni dell'Elefante, 1986).
- _____. "Raffaello e Leonardo," in Micaela Sambucco Hamoud and Maria Letizia Strocchi, eds., *Studi su Raffaello: Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Studi (Urbino-Firenze, 1984)*, 2 vols (Urbino, 1987), vol. 1, 335-343.
- Chatzēnikolau, Nikos. *Alexander the Great in European Art: 22 September 1997-11 January 1998* (Thessaloniki: Organisation for the Cultural Capital of Europe, 1997).
- Chigi, Agostino. *The Correspondence of Agostino Chigi (1466-1520) in Cod. Chigi R.V.c.* Annotated by Ingrid D. Rowland. (Città di Vaticano: Bibiloteca Apostolica Vaticana, 2001), *Studi I Testi* 399.
- Chigi, Fabio. *Chisiae Familiae Comentarij* (Biblioteca Vaticana, MS Chigi a. 1.1, 1618).
- Christian, Kathleen Wren. "The De' Rossi Collection of Ancient Sculptures. Leo X, and Raphael." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 65 (2002),132-200.
- _____. *Empire without End: Antiquities Collections in Renaissance Rome, c. 1350-1527* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010).

- _____. "Raphael's 'Philemon' and the Collecting of Antiquities in Rome," *The Burlington Magazine*, 146 (1220) (Nov., 2004).
- Cian, Vittorio. *Nel Mondo di Baldassarre Castiglione: documenti illustrate* (Milano, 1942).
- Cieri, Claudia. "Sala delle Prospettive: Via, Storia e Funzione della Sala." In Sergio Rossi and Luciana Cassanelli, eds., *Di Luoghi di Raffaello a Roma* (Rome: Multigrafica Editrice, 1983), 66-73.
- Claridge, Amanda. *Rome*. Oxford Archaeological Guides. (NY: Oxford University Press, 1998).
- Clarke, Georgia. *Roman House-Renaissance Palaces: Inventing Antiquity in Fifteenth Century Italy* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- Coarelli, Filippo. *Roma*. Guide Archeologiche Laterza (Rome: Laterza, 1997).
- Coffin, David R. *Magnificent Buildings, Splendid Gardens* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008).
- _____. "The Plans of the Villa Madama." *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 49 (2) (Jun., 1967).
- _____. *The Villa in the Life of Renaissance Rome*. Princeton monographs in art and archaeology, 43 (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1979).
- Colonna, Francesco. *Hypnertomachia Poliphili*. trans. By J. Godwin. (London: Thames and Hudson, 2005).
- Comes, Natalis. *Mythologiae sive explicationis fabularum libri decem, in quibus omnia prope Naturalis & Marlis Philosophiae dogmata contenta fuisse deomonstatur* (Padua, 1616).
- Cortesi, Paolo. *Tres libri De cardinalatu at Julium Secundum Pont[ifem] per Paulum Cortesium Protonotarium Apostolicum* (Castel Cortesi: Symeon Nardi, 1510)
- Cremona, Alessandro, *Felices Procerium Villulae: Il Giardino della Farnesina dai Chigi all'Accademia dei Lincei* (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 2010).

- Cropper, Elizabeth. "Introduction," to Craig Hugh Smyth, *Mannerism and Maniera* (Vienna, Austria: ISRA, 1992), 12-21.
- Crowe, J.A. and Cavalcaselle, G.B. *A History of Painting in Italy, Umbria, Florence and Siena from the Second to the Sixteenth Century* (London: J. Murray, 1903-1914). 6 vols.
- Cugnoni, Giuseppe. *Agostino Chigi il Magnifico* (Rome: A cura della Società Romana di Storia Patria, 1878).
- Curran, Brian A. "Ancient Egypt and Egyptian Antiquities in Italian Renaissance Art and Culture." (PhD Diss., Princeton University, 1997).
- Dacos, Nicole. "Ni Polidoro, ni Peruzzi: Maturino," *Revue de l'Art*, 57 (1982).
- _____. "Peruzzi. Dalla Farnesina alla Cancelleria. Qualche Proposta per la Bottega della Pittore." In Marcello Fagiolo and Maria Luisa Madonna, *Baldassarre Peruzzi: Pittura, Scena, e Architettura nel Cinquecento* (Rome: Enciclopedia Italiana, 1987), 469-490.
- Danti, Ignazio. *Le Due Regole della Prospettiva Pratica* (Rome: Francesco Zannetti, 1583).
- Davidson, B. "A Study for the Farnesina 'Toilet of Psyche.'" *The Burlington Magazine*, 129 (1013) (Aug., 1987), 510-513.
- Di Teodoro, Francesco P. *Raffaello, Baldassar Castiglione e la Lettera à Leone X* (Bologna: Nuova Alfa, 1994).
- Dollmayr, Herman. "Raffaels Werkstätte," *Jahrbuch des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, XVI (1895).
- Dorigny, Nicholas. *Favola di Amore e Psiche* (Rome: Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica, 1693).
- Du Pérac, Etienne and Lafréry, Antoine. *Nova Urbis Romae Descriptio* (Rome: Antonius Lafreri, 1577).
- Dussler, Luitpold. *Raphael: A Critical Catalogue of His Pictures, Wall-Paintings and Tapestries* (NY: Phaidon, 1971)
- _____. *Sebastiano del Piombo* (Basel: Holbein-Verlag, 1942).
- Egger, Hermann, Hülsen, Christian, and Michaelis, Adolf, *Codex Escorialensis*:

- ein Skizzenbuch aus der Werkstatt Domenico Ghirlandaios [1449-1494]* (Vienna, 1906).
- Ettlinger, Leopold D. "The Emergence of the Italian Architect during the Fifteenth Century." In Spiro Kostof, ed., *The Architect: Chapters in the History of the Profession* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 96-123.
- Fabricius, Georg. *Roma* (Basel: per Ioannem Oporinum, 1550).
- Fagiolo, Marcello. *Natura e Artificio: L'Ordine Rustico, le Fontane, gli Automi nella Cultura del Manierismo Europeo* (Rome: Officina Edizioni, 1979).
- Falomir, Miguel eds. *Late Raphael*. Proceedings of the International Symposium (Madrid: Museo Nacional del Prado, 2013).
- Farago, Claire J. *Leonardo da Vinci's Paragone: A Critical Interpretation with a New Edition of the Text in the Codex Urbinas* (NY: E.J. Brill, 1992).
- Fehl, P.P., "Imitation as a Source of Greatness," in Görel Cavalli-Björkman, ed., *Bacchanals by Titian and Rubens* (Stockholm: Nationalmuseum, 1987) 107-132.
- Felletti Maj, B.M. "La Tetide della Stazione Termine," in *Archaeologica Classica*, 1 (1949), 46-68.
- Fermor, Sharon, *The Raphael Tapestry Cartoons: Narrative, Decoration, Design* (UK: Scala, 1996).
- Fischel, Oskar. *Raphael* (London: K. Paul, 1948).
- Fiore, Francesco Paolo. "Il complesso chigiano de 'Le Volte'." *Rilievi di fabbriche attribuite a Baldassarre Peruzzi* (Siena: Ministero per I Beni Culturali e Ambientali, 1982), 97-119.
- _____, "La Villa Chigi a 'Le Volte' e il linguaggio architettonico peruzziano nella tradizione di Francesco di Giorgio, in M. Fagiolo and M. L. Madonna, *Baldassarre Peruzzi: Pitture, scena e architettura nel Cinquecento* (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1987), 133-167.
- _____, "Villa Chigi a Le Volte," in F.P. Fiore and M. Tafuri, eds., *Francesco di Giorgio architetto* (Milan: Electa, 1993), 318-325.

- Forster, Kurt W. "Discussion: The Palazzo Rucellai and Questions of Typology in the Development of Renaissance Architecture," *The Art Bulletin*, 58 (1) (Mar., 1976), 109-113.
- Förster, Richard. *Farnesina-Studien: ein Beitrag zu Frage nach dem Verhältnis der Renaissance zur Antike* (Rostock: Stiller, 1880).
- Fosi, I. "Fra Siena e Rome: Famiglie, Mercanti, Pontefici, fra Cinquecento e Seicento." In C. Benocci, ed., *I Giardini Chigi tra Siena e Roma dal Cinquecento agli Inizi dell'Ottocento* (Siena: Fondazione Monte dei Paschi, 2005), 13-38.
- Foster, Phillip. "Raphael on the Villa Madama: The Text of a Lost Letter," *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 11 (1967), 111-122.
- Francesconi, D. *Congettura che una Lettera Creduta di Baldessar Castiglione sia di Raffaello* (Florence, 1799).
- Freedman, Luba. *Classical Myths in Italian Renaissance Painting*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- Freedberg, Sydney J. *Painting in Italy: 1500-1600* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993) 74).
- _____. *Raphael, Michelangelo, and Others: Raphael and His Contemporaries in Rome* (NY: Vassar College, 1983).
- Frittelli, Ugo. *Albero genealogico della nobil famiglia Chigi, patrizia senses* (Siena: Arto grafiche Lazzeri, 1922).
- Frommel, Christoph Luitpold. *Architettura alle Corte Papale nel Rinascimento* (Rome: Electra, 2003).
- _____. *The Architecture of the Italian Renaissance*. (London: Thames and Hudson, 2007).
- _____. *Baldassarre Peruzzi als Maler und Zeichner* (Vienna: Anoton Schroll, 1967-1968).
- _____, "Bramante and the Origins of the 'High Renaissance,'" in J. Burke, ed., *Rethinking the Renaissance: The Culture of the Visual Arts in Early Sixteenth-Century Rome* (UK: Ashgate, 2012), 147-176.

- _____. "Bramantes 'Ninfeo' in Genazzano," *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 22 (1969) 137-160.
- _____. *Die Farnesina und Peruzzis architektonisches Früwerk* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1961).
- _____, Stefano Ray, Manfredo Tafuri, Howard Burns, and Arnold Nesselrath, *Raffaello Architetto* (Milan: Electra, 1984).
- _____. "Raffaello e la sua carriera architettonica." In Christoph Frommel, Stefano Ray, Manfredo Tafuri, Howard Burns, and Arnold Nesselrath, eds., *Raffaello Architetto* (Milan: Electra, 1984).
- _____. "Raffaello e il teatro alla Corte di Leone X," *Bollettino del Centro internazionale di Studi di Architettura Andrea Palladio*, XVI, (1974).
- _____. "Raffaele Riario, committente della Cancelleria." In Arnold Esch and Christoph Luitpold Frommel, eds., *Arte, Committenza ed Economia a Roma e Nelle Corti del Rinascimento (1420-1530)* (Rome: Piccola Biblioteca Einaudi, 1995).
- _____. *Der Römische Palastbau der Hochrenaissance*, Vol. 2 (Tübingen: Wasmuth, 1973).
- _____. "La Villa Farnesina," in C.L. Frommel, G. Caneva, and A. Angeli, *La Villa Farnesina a Roma = The Villa Farnesina in Rome. Mirabilia Italiae*, 12 (Modena: F.C. Panini, 2003), 2: 9-144.
- _____, Giulia Caneva, and Alessandro Angeli. *La Villa Farnesina a Roma = The Villa Farnesina in Rome. Mirabilia Italiae*, 12 (Modena: F.C. Panini, 2003), 2 vols.
- Frommel, Sabine. "Giuliano da Sangallo between Florentine Quattrocento and Roman High Renaissance," in J. Burke, ed., *Rethinking the Renaissance: The Culture of the Visual Arts in Early Sixteenth-Century Rome* (UK: Ashgate, 2012), 195-222.
- Fulvio, Andrea. *Antiquitates urbis per Andream Fulvium Antiquarium* (Rome, 1527).
- Gaffori, Franchino. *Theorica musicae* (NY: Broude, 1967).
- Gallo, Egidio. *De viridario Augustini Chigii, Patritii Senen[sis]* (Rome: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Codici Chigi III, 1511).

- Gerlini, Elsa. *Giardino e Architettura nella Farnesina* (Rome: Reale Istituto di Studi Romani, 1942).
- _____. *La Villa Farnesina in Roma* (Rome: La Libreria dello Stato, 1949).
- Geymüller, Enrico di, *Raffaello Sanzio studiato come architetto con l'ajuto di nuovi documenti* (Milan: Hoepli, 1884).
- Gilbert, Felix. *The Pope, His Banker, and Venice* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980).
- Gill, Meredith J. "The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries." In M.B. Hall, ed., *Artistic Centers of the Italian Renaissance: Rome* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 27-105.
- Giovio, Paolo. *De Vita Leonis Decimi Pont. Ma. Libri IIII* (Florence, 1551).
- _____. *Lettere*, ed. by G.G. Ferrero (Rome, 1958).
- _____. *Pauli Iovii novocomensis episcopi nucerini Elogia virorum literis illustrium, quotquot vel nostra vel avorum memoria vixere* (Basel: Petri Pernae typographie, 1577).
- Gnann, Achim. "Peruzzi oder Raphael? Zu den Entwürfen für die Fresken der *Volta Dorata* in der Cancellaria," in C.L. Frommel et al., eds., *Baldassarre Peruzzi 1481-1536* (Venice: Marsilio, 2005), 199-212.
- Gnoli, Domenico. "Orti letterari nella Roma di Leon X." *Nuova Antologia* 7 (269)(Jan.1, 1930), 3-19.
- Goffen, Rona. "Raphael's Designer Labels: From the Virgin Mary to La Fornarina," *Artibus et Historiae*, Vol. 24 (4) (2003), 123-142.
- _____. *Renaissance Rivals: Michelangelo, Leonardo, Raphael, Titian* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002).
- Golzio, Vincenzo. *Raffaello: nei documenti nelle testimonianze dei contemporanei e nella letteratura del suo secolo* (Città del Vaticano: Pontificia insigne Accad. Artistica dei Virtuosi al Pantheon, 1936).
- Gombrich, E.H. "The Style All'Antica: Imitation and Assimilation," in *Norm and Form: Studies in the Art of the Renaissance* (NY: Phaidon, 1966)122-128.

Greene, Thomas M., *The Light in Troy* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982).

_____. "Resurrecting Rome: the Double Task of the Humanist Imagination." *Rome in the Renaissance: The City and the Myth*. Ed. P.A. Ramsey (Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval & Early Renaissance Studies, 1982), 41-54.

Grimm, Hermann. *The Life of Michelangelo*, 2 vols. Trans. by F.E. Bunnett (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1899), 1: 461, 553-555.

Günther, Hubertus. "The Renaissance of Antiquity." In H.A. Millon and V.M. Lampugnani, eds. *The Renaissance from Brunelleschi to Michelangelo: The Representation of Architecture* (New York: Rizzoli, 1997) 259-306.

Hall, Marcia B. "Introduction," In M.B. Hall, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Raphael* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Hall, Marcia B. ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Raphael* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

_____. *After Raphael: Painting in Central Italy in the Sixteenth Century* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Hamoud, Micaela Sambucco and Strocchi, Maria Letizia, eds., *Studi su Raffaello: Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Studi (Urbino-Firenze, 1984)*, 2 vols (Urbino, 1987).

Hart, Vaughan, and Peter Hicks, eds., *Paper Palaces: The Rise of the Architectural Treatise*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1998).

_____. *Sebastiano Serlio on Architecture*. New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press, 1996-2001).

Haskell, Francis and Penny, Nicholas, *Taste and the Antique: the Lure of Classical Sculpture, 1500-1900* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981).

Haus, J.J. *Riflessioni di un ultramontano sulla creduta Galatea di Raffael d'Urbino* (Palermo: n.p. 1816).

Hayum, Andrée M. "A New Dating for Sodoma's Frescoes in the Villa Farnesina." *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 48(2) (Jun., 1966), 215-217.

- _____. *Giovanni Antonio Bazzi – “Il Sodoma”* (NY: Garland Publishing, 1976).
- Henning, Andreas. *Raffaels Transfiguration und der Wettstreit um die Farbe: koloritgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur römischen Hochrenaissance* (München: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2005).
- Hermanin, Federico. *La Farnesina* (Bergamo: Istituto Italiano d’Arti Grafiche, 1927).
- Hibbert, Christopher. *Rome: The Biography of a City* (Penguin Books, 1996).
- Hirst, Michael. *Sebastiano del Piombo* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981).
- Hochmann, Michel. *Venise et Rome 1500-1600: deux écoles de peinture et leurs échanges*. (Genève: Droz, 2004).
- Hofmann, Theobald, *Raffael in seiner Bedeutung als Architekt 1, Villa Madama zu Rom* (Zittau: Menzel, 1908).
- De Holanda, Francesco. *I Trattati d’Arte*, ed. by Grazia Modroni (Livorno: Sillabe, 2003).
- Hoogewerff, Goffredo. “Raffaello nella Villa Farnesina.” *Capitoleum* (1945), 1-3, 9-15.
- Hülsen, Christian. *Römische antikengärten des XVI. Jahrhunderts* (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1917).
- Huppert, Ann C. “The Archaeology of Baldassarre Peruzzi’s Architectural Drawings.” (Ph.D. Diss., University of Virginia, 2001).
- _____. “Baldassarre Peruzzi as Archaeologist in Terracina,” in Frommel et al., *Baldassarre Peruzzi, 1481-1536* (Venice: Marsilio, 2005), 213-224.
- _____. “Envisioning New St. Peter’s: Perspectival Drawings and the Process of Design,” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, Vol. 68 (2)(June 2009).
- _____. “The Lessons of Rome,” *Becoming an Architect in Renaissance Italy: Art, Science and the Career of Baldassarre Peruzzi* (London and New Haven: Yale University Press, forthcoming 2015).

- Janni, Ettore. *Il Signore della Farnesina* (Bergamo: Istituto Italiano d'Arti Grafiche, 1927).
- Joannides, Paul. *The Drawings of Raphael: with a Complete Catalogue* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983).
- Jones, Mark Wilson. "Palazzo Massimo and Baldassarre Peruzzi's Approach to Architectural Design." *Architectural History*, Vol. 31 (1998), 59-106.
- _____. "The Tempietto and the Roots of Coincidence," *Architectural History*, 33 (1990).
- Jones, Roger and Penny, Nicholas. *Raphael* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983).
- Joost-Gaugier, Christiane L., *Raphael's Stanza della Segnatura: Meaning and Invention* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- Joyce, Hetty. "Grasping at Shadows: Ancient Paintings in Renaissance and Baroque Rome." *The Art Bulletin*, 74 (2) (Jun., 1992), 219-246.
- Kent, William Winthrop. *The Life and Works of Baldassarre Peruzzi of Siena* (New York: Architectural Book Publishing Company, 1925).
- Kleinbub, Christian K. "Raphael's Quos Ego: forgotten document on the Renaissance *paragone*," *Word & Image*, 28 (3) (July-September 2012), 287-301.
- Koortbojian, Michael. "Classical Antiquity: Discovery of Classical Antiquity." *Encyclopedia of the Renaissance*. Ed. Paul F. Grendler. 6 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, (II) (1999), 1-7.
- Krautheimer, Richard. "Alberti and Vitruvius." *Studies in Western Art: Acts of the Twentieth International Congress of the History of Art, II: The Renaissance and Mannerism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.), 42-52.
- _____. *Rome: Profile of a City 312-1308*. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980).
- _____. "The Tragic and Comic Scene of the Renaissance," *Gazette des Beaux- Arts*, XC (1948).
- Kwakkelstein, Michael W. "The Model's Pose: Raphael's Early Use of Antique and Italian Art." *Artibus et Historiae*, 23 (46) (2002).

Kultzen, Rolf. "Die Malerei Polodoros da Caravaggio im Giardino del Bufalo in Rom, *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz*, 9 (2) (Feb. 1960), 99-120.

Lanciani, Rodolfo Amedeo. *The Golden Days of the Renaissance in Rome, from the Pontificate of Julius II to that of Paul III* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1906).

_____. *The Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome* (New York: Benjamin Blom, 1897).

_____. *Storia degli Scavi di Roma e Notizie Intorno le Collezioni Romane di Antichità* (Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 1989).

Leach, Eleanor Winsor. "Polyphemus in a Landscape: Traditions of Pastoral Courtship," in John Dixon Hunt, ed., *The Pastoral Landscape* (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1992).

Lefevre, Renato. *Palazzo Chigi* (Rome: Editalia, 1973).

_____. *Villa Madama* (Rome: Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato, 1964).

LeSaige, Jacques and Duthilloeul, H.R. *Voyage des Jacques le Saige de Douai à Rome, Notre-Dame-de-Lorette, Venise, Jérusalem, et autres Saints Lieux* (Douai: Adam d'Aubers, 1851).

Letarouilly, Pierre, "Vedute Prospettica dell'interno della loggia," *Édifices de Rome Moderne* (Paris, 1840-1857).

Leto, Pomponio. "De vetustate urbis." *De Roma prisca et nova* (Rome, 1523).

Licht, Meg, ed., *L'Edificio a pianta centrale: Lo sviluppo del disegno architettonico nel Rinascimento* (Florence, 1984).

Lingo, Stuart. *Federico Barocci: Allure and Devotion in Late Renaissance Painting* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008)

Lippincott, K. "Two Astrological Ceilings Reconsidered: The Sala di Galatea in the Villa Farnesina and the Sala del Mappamondo at Caprarola." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 53 (1990), 185-207.

Lucco, Mauro. *L'Opera Completa di Sebastiano del Piombo* (Milan: Rizzoli, 1980).

- Lucian, *Herodotus and Aëtion*, trans. by H.W Fowler and F.G. Fowler (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1905).
- Mack, Charles Randall, "The Rucellai Palace: Some New Proposals," *The Art Bulletin*, 56 (4) (Dec., 1974), 517-529.
- Maj, B.M. Felletti. "La Tetide della Stazione Termine," in *Archaeologica Classica*, 1 (1949), 46-68.
- Majanlahti, Anthony. *The Families Who Made Rome: A History and Guide* (London: Chatto & Windus, 2005).
- Malafarina, Gianfranco. *La Villa Farnesina a Roma* (Modena: Franco Cosimo Panini Editore, 2003).
- O'Malley, John. "The Vatican Library and the School of Athens, a Text of Battista Casali, 1508." *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, Vol. 7 (1977), 271-287.
- Mandowsky, Erna and Mitchell, Charles, *Pirro Ligorio's Roman Antiquities: The Drawings in MS XIII. B 7 in the National Library of Naples* (London: Warburg Institute, University of London, 1963).
- Mazzochi, Jacopo. *Epigrammatica antiquae urbis* (Rome: Mazzochi, 1521).
- McDougall, Elizabeth. *Fountains, Statues and Flowers: Studies in Italian Gardens of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1994).
- _____, "The Sleeping Nymph: Origins of a Humanist Fountain Type," *The Art Bulletin*, 57 (3)(Sep., 1975), 357-365.
- Meiss, Millard. "Raphael's Mechanized Seashell: Notes on a Myth, Technology and Iconographic Tradition," *The Painter's Choice: Problems in the Interpretation of Renaissance Art* (New York: Harper and Row, 1976), 203-211.
- Menapace, Luigi. *Il Banchiere di Tre Famosi Pontificati: il Magnifico Agostino Chigi* (Milan: Giuffrè, 1970).
- Meyer zur Capellen, Jürg and Polter, Stefan B. *Raphael: A Critical Catalogue of his Paintings* (Landshut: Arcos, 2001), 3 vols.
- Michiel, Marcantonio. *Notizie d'opere di disegno nella prima metà del secolo XVI*,

esistenti in Padova, Cremona, Milano, Pavia, Bergamo, Crema e Venezia. Scritta da un anonimo di quell tempo. Pubblicata e illustrata da D. Iacopo Morelli (Bassano, 1800).

Milizia, Francesco. *Memorie degli Architetti Antichi e Moderni* (Parma, 1781).

Montenovesi, Ottorino. *Agostino Chigi Banchiere e Appaltatore dell' Allume di Tolfa*. Archivio della Società Romana si Storia Patria, vol. 60 (Rome: 1938), 107-147.

Morolli, Gabriele. *"Le Belle Forme degli Edifici Antichi": Raffaello e il Progetto del Primo Trattato Rinascimentale sulle Antichità di Roma*. Florence: Alinea, 1984).

Nagel, Alexander. *Michelangelo and the Reform of Art* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Nagel, Alexander and Wood, Christopher, *Anachronic Renaissance*. (New York: Zone Books, 2010).

_____. "Towards a new model of Renaissance Anachronism." *Art Bulletin* 87 (2005), 403-32.

Nesselrath, Arnold. "Lorenzo Lotto in the Stanza della Segnatura," *The Burlington Magazine*, 142 (1162) (Jan., 2000), 4-12.

_____. "Lotto as Raphael's Collaborator in the Stanza di Eliodoro," *Burlington Magazine* 146 (1220, Raphael) (Nov. 2004), 732-741.

_____. "Raphael and Pope Julius II," in Hugo Chapman, Tom Henry, Carol Piazotta, Arnold Nesselrath and Nicholas Penny, *Raphael: from Urbino to Rome* (London: National Gallery, 2004), 281-293.

_____. "Raffaello Archaeologo." *Bolaffi, Rivista Mensile di Arte, Cultura, Informazione*, 134 (Oct. 1983), 50-51.

_____. "Raphael's Archaeological Method," in André Chastel, ed., *Raffaello a Rome: Il Covegno del 1983* (Rome: Edizioni dell'Elefante, 1986).

Von Neumann, John and Morgenstern, Oskar. *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, reprinted 1953).

Oberhuber, Konrad, *Raphael: The Paintings* (NY: Prestel Verlag, 1999).

- _____, "Lo Stile Classico di Raffaello e la sua Evoluzione a Roma fine al 1527," in K. Oberhuber, ed., *Roma e lo Stile Classico di Raffaello* (Milan: Electa, 1999), 17-30.
- _____, ed., *Roma e lo Stile Classico di Raffaello* (Milan: Electa, 1999).
- Onians, John. *Bearers of Meaning*. NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988).
- Oppian, *Halieutica* (Loeb Classical Library, 1928).
- Orlando, Saverio, ed., *Poesie Italiane* (Milan: Rizzoli, 1988).
- Ortolani, Giorgio. "I marmi e le pitture parietali," in R. Varoli-Piazza, ed., *Raffaello La Loggia di Amore e Psiche alla Farnesina* (Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 2002).
- Packer, James E. "Report from Rome: The Imperial Fora, A Retrospective." *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. 101 (2) (Apr., 1997), 307-330.
- Panofsky, Erwin. *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art* (NY: Harper & Row, 1960).
- von Pastor, Ludwig. *Geschichte der Päpste im Zeitalter der Renaissance und der Glaubensspaltung: von der Wahl Leos X. bis zum Tode Klemens' VII. (1513-1534), Vol. 1 Leo X* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1907).
- _____. *Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Freiburg, 1885-1933), vol. 28.
- Payne, Alina A. *The Architectural Treatise in the Italian Renaissance: Architectural Invention, Ornament, and Literary Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- _____, Kuttner, Ann, and Smick, Rebecca, eds., *Antiquity and its Interpreters*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- Pellechia, Linda. "The Contested City: Urban Form in Early Sixteenth-Century Rome." In M.B. Hall, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Raphael* (Hong Kong: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 59-94.
- Philostratus, *Immagines*. trans. by Arthur Fairbanks (London: W. Heinemann, 1931).
- Platner, Samuel Ball. *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (London: Oxford

University Press, 1929), 109).

Plesters, J. "Raphael's Cartoons for the Vatican Tapestries: A Brief Report of the Materials, Techniques, and Condition." In John Shearman and Marcia Hall, eds., *The Princeton Raphael Symposium. Science in the Service of Art History* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990), 111-124.

Poggi, Giovanni, Barocchi, Paola, and Ristori, Renzo. *Il Carteggio di Michelangelo* (Firenze: Sansoni, 1965-83).

Pontani, Filippomaria. "From Budé to Zenodotus: Homeric Readings in the European Renaissance," *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 14, 3/4 (December, 2007), 374-430).

Quatremère de Quincy, Antoine. *History of the Life and Works of Raffaello*, trans. by W. Hazlitt from 3rd Parisian edition (London: Bell and Daldy, 1869).

Quinlan-McGrath, Mary. "Aegidius Gallus, De Viridario Agustini Chigii Vera Libellus. Introduction, Latin Text and English Translation." *Humanistica Lovaniensia – Journal of Neo-Latin Studies*, Vol. 38 (1989), 1-100.

_____. "The Astrological Vault of the Villa Farnesina Agostino Chigi's Rising Sun." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 47 (1984), 91-105.

_____. "Blosius Palladius, *Suburbanum Agustini Chisii*. Introduction, Latin Text and English Translation." *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 39 (1990), 93-156.

_____. "A Proposal for the Foundation Date of the Villa Farnesina." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 49 (1986), 245-250.

_____. "The Villa of Agostino Chigi: The Poems and The Paintings" (PhD Diss, University of Chicago, 1983).

_____. "The Villa Farnesina, Time-Telling Conventions and Renaissance Astrological Practice." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 58 (1995), 53-71.

Ray, Stefano. *Raffaello architetto: Linguaggio artistico e ideologica nel Rinascimento Romano* (Rome: Laterza, 1974).

_____. "Opere per Agostino Chigi," in C.L. Frommel, S. Ray, and M.

- Tafuri, eds., *Raffaello Architetto* (Milan: Electra, 1984), 199-124.
- _____. "Il Volo di Icaro," in C.L. Frommel, S. Ray, and M. Tafuri, eds., *Raffaello Architetto* (Milan: Electra, 1984), 47-58.
- Reilly, Patricia. "Raphael's *Fire in the Borgo* and the Italian Pictorial Vernacular." *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 92(4) (Dec. 2010).
- Reiss, Sheryl, "Cardinal Giulio de' Medici as a Patron of Art, 1513-1523" (PhD Diss, Princeton University, 1992).
- _____, "Raphael and His Patrons: From the Court of Urbino to the Curia and Rome, in M.B. Hall, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Raphael* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 36-59.
- Reist, Inge Jackson. "Raphael and the Humanist Villa," *Source: Notes in the History of Art*, 3 (4) (Summer 1984), 13-28.
- Repetti, Emanuele. *Dizionario geografico fisico storico della Toscana: contenente la descrizione di tutti i luoghi del Granducato, Ducato di Lucca, Garfagnana e Lunigiana*. 6. Appendice (1846).
- Richter, Irma A. *Paragone: A Comparison of the Arts* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1949).
- Rijser, David. *Raphael's Poetics: Art and Poetry in High Renaissance Rome*. (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2012).
- Rodinò, S. Prospero Valenti, *Raphael Invenit: Stampe da Raffaello nelle Collezione dell'Istituto Nazionale per a Grafica* (Rome: Edizione Quasar, 1985).
- Rosenfeld, Myra Nan. *Sebastiano Serlio on Domestic Architecture: Different Dwellings from the Meanest Hovel to the Most Ornate Palace : the Sixteenth-Century Manuscript of Book VI in the Avery Library of Columbia University* (New York: Architectural History Foundation, 1978).
- Rossi, Sergio and Cassanelli, Luciana, eds., *Di Luoghi di Raffaello a Roma* (Rome: Multigrafica Editrice, 1983).
- de Rossi, Domenico, and Maffei, Paolo Alessandro. *Raccolta di statue antiche e moderne* (Rome: 1704).
- Rowe, Colin and Satkowski, Leon. *Italian Architecture of the 16th Century* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2002).

- Rowland, Ingrid D. "The Birth Date of Agostino Chigi: Documentary Proof." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 47 (1984), 192-193.
- _____. *The Correspondence of Agostino Chigi* (Vatican: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 2001).
- _____. "Cultural Introduction to Renaissance Rome." In *Artistic Centers of the Italian Renaissance: Rome*, ed. by M. B. Hall (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 1-14.
- _____. "From Vitruvian Scholarship to Vitruvian Practice." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, 50 (2005), 15-40.
- _____. "Il Giardino *Trans Tiberium* di Agostino Chigi." In C. Benocci, ed., *I Giardini Chigi tra Siena e Roma dal Cinquecento agli Inizi dell'Ottocento* (Siena: Fondazione Monte dei Paschi, 2005), 57-72, 421.
- _____. "Raphael, Angelo Colocci and the Genesis of the Architectural Orders." *The Art Bulletin*, 76 (1)(March, 1994), 81-104.
- _____. "Render Unto Caesar the Things Which are Caesar's: Humanism and the Arts in the Patronage of Agostino Chigi." *Renaissance Quarterly*, 39 (4) (Winter, 1986), 673-730.
- _____. "Some Panegyrics to Agostino Chigi." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 47 (1984), 194-199.
- _____. *The Culture of the High Renaissance: Ancients and Moderns in Sixteenth-Century Rome* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- _____. *The Roman garden of Agostino Chigi: the Thirteenth Gerson Lecture held in Memory of Horst Gerson (1907-1978) in the Aula of the University of Groningen on the 17th of November 2005* (Groningen: Gerson, 2005).
- _____. "The Vatican Stanze." In M.B. Hall, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Raphael* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 95-119.
- _____ and Howe, Thomas Noble. *Vitruvius: Ten Books on Architecture* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- Rubin, Patricia Lee. *Giorgio Vasari: Art and History*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).

- _____, "Il Contribuo di Raffaello allo sviluppo della Pala d'Altare Rinascimentale," *Arte Cristiana*, 737-738 (March-June, 1990), 169-182.
- Sacré, Dirk. "Notes on Fabio Chigi's Chigiae Familiae Commentaria," *Humanistica Lovaniensia – Journal of Neo-Latin Studies*, vol. 54 (2005), 371-379.
- Sadoletus, Jacobus. *Epistolai quotquot extant* (Rome: Salomonius, 1760).
- von Salis, Arnold. *Antike und Renaissance: Über Nachleben und Weiterwirken der alten in der neueren Kunst* (Erlenbach-Zürich: E. Rentsch, 1947).
- Samaltanou-Tsiakma, Ekaterini. "A Renaissance Problem of Archaeology," *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, 78 (1971).
- Sankovitch, Ann-Marie. "Anachronism and Simulation in Renaissance Architectural Theory." *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics*, 49/50 (Spring-Autumn 2006), 188-203.
- Sannazaro, Jacopo. *Arcadia & Other Piscatorial Eclogues*. trans. by R. Nash. (Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University Press, 1966).
- Io Sardo, Mara. "Raffaello e l'odometro," *Rivista on line di storia dell'arte*, 1 (2004), no page numbers.
- Saxl, Fritz. *La fede astrologica di Agostino Chigi: interpretazione dei dipinti di Baldassarre Peruzzi nella sala di Galatea della Farnesina* (Rome: Reale Accademia d'Italia, 1934).
- Scandiani, Giuseppe, ed., *Sebastiano del Piombo, 1485-1547*. (Milan: Motta, 2008).
- Schard, Alfred. *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bühnenbildes vom 15. Zum Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Ph.D. diss, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1925).
- Schwarzenberg, Erkinger. "Raphael und die Psyche-Statue Agostino Chigis," *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien*, 73 (1977), 107-136.
- Sebregondi, Giulia Ceriani. *Architettura e committenza a Siena nel Cinquecento: L'attività di Baldassarre Peruzzi e la storia di Palazzo Francesconi* (Siena: Aska Edizione, 2011).
- Serlio, Sebastiano. *The Five Books of Architecture* (New York: Dover Publications, 1982).

- Shearman, John K.G., "Alfonso D'Este's Camerino," in A. Chastel, ed. *"Il se Rendit en Italie": Études Offertes à André Chastel* (Paris: Elefante, 1987), 209-230.
- _____. "The Chigi Chapel in S. Maria del Popolo." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 24, No.3/4 (Jul-Dec. 1961), pp. 129-160.
- _____. "Die Loggia der Psyche in der Villa Farnesina und di Probleme der Letzten Phase von Raffaels graphischem Stil," *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien* 60 (1964), 129-159.
- _____. "A Functional Interpretation of the Villa Madama," *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, Vol. 20 (1983).
- _____. *Mannerism* (NY: Penguin Books, 1967).
- _____. "Il mecenatismo di Giulio II e Leone X." In Arnold Esch and Christoph Luitpold Frommel, eds., *Arte, Committenza ed Economia a Roma e Nelle Corti del Rinascimento (1420-1530)* (Rome: Piccola Biblioteca Einaudi, 1995).
- _____. *Only Connect: art and the spectator in the Italian Renaissance*. The A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts, 1988 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992).
- _____. "The Organization of Raphael's Workshop," *Art Institute of Chicago Museum Studies*, 10 (1983), 40-57.
- _____. "Raphael as Architect," *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, 116 (5141) (April 1968).
- _____. *Raphael in Early Modern Sources* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003).
- _____. *Raphael's Cartoons an the Tapestries for the Sistine Chapel* (NY: Phaidon, 1972).
- _____. "Raphael's Unexecuted Projects for the Stanze," in Georg Kauffmann et al., eds., *Walter Friedlaender zum 90. Geburtstag: eine Festgabe seiner europäieshcn Schüler, Freund und Veherer* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1965), 158-180.
- _____. "Raphael, Rome, and the Codex Escorialensis," *Master Drawings*, Vol. 15 (2) (Summer 1977), 107-146.

- _____. *The Vatican Stanze: Functions and Decoration* (London: Oxford University Press, 1971).
- Smyth, Craig Hugh. "Mannerism and *Maniera*." In *the Renaissance and Mannerism*, ed. by M. Meiss, R. Krautheimer, G. Kubler, R.W. Lee, R. Wittkower, and I.E. Rubin (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1963).
- Sowerby, R. "Early Humanist Failure with Homer," *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 4 (1997-1998), 37-63 and 165-194.
- Springer, Anton. *Raffael und Michelangelo*, vol. 2 (Leipzig: Seemann, 1895).
- Steinman, Ernst. "Amor und Psyche, ein Freskenzyklus aus der Schule Raffael's in der Engelsburg zu Rom," *Zeitschrift für Bildende Kunst* 13 (1902), 86-93.
- Stinger, Charles L. *The Renaissance in Rome* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998).
- Stumpo, E. "Prima e Dopo il Pontificato di Alessandro VII: I Chigi, Famiglia Senese tra Roma e Firenze." In C. Benocci, ed., *I Giardini Chigi tra Siena e Roma dal Cinquecento agli Inizi dell'Ottocento* (Siena: Fondazione Monte dei Paschi, 2005), 39-56.
- Tagliolini, Alessandro. *I Giardini di Rome: Foclore, Poesia e Storia della Città Attraverso l'Evoluzione delle <<Isole Verdi>>: la Riscoperta di una Rinascimentale Bellezza in un'Idealesintesi tra Natura e Arte*. (Rome: Newton Compton, 1980).
- Talvacchia, Bette. *Raphael* (London: Phaidon, 2007).
- _____. "Raphael's Workshop and the Development of a Managerial Style." in M.B. Hall, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Raphael* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 2005) 167-185.
- Tantillo, Alma Maria Mignosi. "Restuari alla Farnesina," *Bolletino d'Arte* 57 (1972), 33-43.
- Tavernor, Robert. *On Alberti and the Art of Building* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).
- di Teodoro, Francesco P. *Raffaello, Baldassar Castiglione e la Lettera a Leone X* (Bologna: Nuova Alfa, 1994).

- Tempesti, Anna Forlani. *Rafaello e Michelangelo*, exhibition catalogue. Florence: Casa Buonarroti, 1984).
- Temple, Nicholas. *Renovatio Urbis: Architecture, Urbanism, and Ceremony in the Rome of Julius II*. (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2011).
- Tessari, Cristiano. *Baldassarre Peruzzi: il progetto dell'antico* (Milan: Electa, 1995).
- Thoenes, Christoph. "Note sul 'ninfeo' di Genazzano," *Studi Bramanteschi* (Rome, 1974), 575-583.
- _____. "Renaissance Saint Peter's," in W. Tronzo, ed., *St. Peter's in the Vatican* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 64-92.
- _____. "Zu Raffaels Galatea," in Lucius Grisebach and Konrad Renger, eds., *Festschrift für Otto von Simson zum 65. Geburtstag* (Vienna: Propyläen Verlag, 1977), 231-244.
- Tizio, Sigismondo. *Historiae Senenses*. (Rome: Istituto Storico Italiano per l'Età Moderna e Contemporanea, 1510).
- Tuckerman, B. *Planetary, Lunar and Solar Positions, A.D. 2 to A.D. 1649* (Philadelphia, 1964).
- Ubal dini, Federigo, *Vita di mons. Angelo Colocci*. ed. by Vittorio Fannelli (Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1969).
- Vacca, Flaminio, *Memoriae di varie antichità trovate in diversi luoghi della città di Roma* (Rome, 1594).
- Vahland, Kia. "Sebastiano and Raphael," in Giuseppe Scandiani, ed., *Sebastiano del Piombo, 1485-1547*. (Milan: Motta, 2008), 133-139.
- Valtieri, Simonetta, "La Fabbrica del palazzo del Cardinale Raffaele Riario (La Cancelleria)," *Quaderni dell'Istituto di Storia dell'Architettura*, 174 (1983), 3-26.
- Varoli-Piazza, Rosalia. "Il Fregio nella Sala delle Prospettive. Un 'Ipotesi per la Bottega del Peruzzi." In Marcello Fagiolo and Maria Luisa Madonna, eds., *Baldassarre Peruzzi: Pittura, Scena, e Architettura nel Cinquecento* (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1987), 363-398.
- _____. "Un Esempio di Concinnitas," in Rosalia Varoli-Piazza,

- Raffaello: La Loggia di Amore e Psiche all Farnesina* (Cinisello Balsamo, Milan: Silvana, 2002).
- _____. *Raffaello: la loggia di Amore e Psiche alla Farnesina*. (Cinisello Balsamo, Milan: Silvana, 2002).
- Vasari, Giorgio, *Lives of the Painters, Sculptors and Architects*, trans. by Gaston du B. de Vere (NY: Alfred Knopf, 1996), vols. 1 and 2.
- del Vecchi, Pierluigi. *Raphael* (New York: Abbeville, 2002).
- Vermeule, Cornelius, "Sarcophagus: Revelers Gathering Grapes," in A. Chong, *Eye of the Beholder* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 2003), 12-13.
- Vertova, Luisa. "Cupid and Psyche in Renaissance Painting before Raphael," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 42 (1979), 104-121.
- Visconti, P.E. *Lettera sulla Antichità di Roma Scritta da Raffaello d'Urbino a Papa Leone X* (Rome, 1833).
- de Vos, Mariette. "I monumenti rinvenuti nel giardino della villa rinascimentale di Agostino Chigi: la villa romana della Farnesina," in C.L. Frommel, G. Caneva, and A. Angeli, *La villa Farnesina a Roma = The villa Farnesina in Rome*. *Mirabilia Italiae*, 12 (Modena: F.C. Panini, 2003), 2: 155-162
- Warburg, Aby. *The Renewal of Pagan Antiquity: Contributions to the Cultural History of the European Renaissance*. Trans. by David Britt. (CA: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1999).
- Weiss, Roberto. *The Renaissance Discovery of Classical Antiquity*. (Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1969).
- Winternitz, Emanuel, "Archaeologia musicale del Rinascimento nel Parnaso di Raffaello," *Reconditi della pontificia Accademia roman di archeologia*, XXVII (1952-1954).
- _____, "Il Parnaso di Raffaello," *Gli strumenti musicali e il loro simbolismo nell'arte occidentale* (Turin, 1982).
- Wittkower, Rudolf. *Born Under Saturn* (NY: Norton, 1963).
- Wrede, Henning. *Der Antikengarten der del Bufalo bei der Fontana Trevi*. *Trierer Winckelmannsprogramme IV* (Mainz am Rheim: Philip von Zabern, 1983).

_____, "Perseus als Heros der del Bufalo, in Franz George Maier, ed., *Alt-Paphos auf Cypern* (Mainz am Rhein: Phillip von Zabern), 52-54.

Yuen, Toby. "Illusionistic Mural Decorations of the Early Renaissance in Rome" (PhD Diss., New York University, 1972).

Ziefer, Anka. "*Marte e Venere sorpresi da Vulcano*: la fortuna iconografica di un affresco perduto di Baldassarre Peruzzi per la Villa Farnesina a Roma," in M. Beltramini and C. Elam, eds., *Some degree of happiness: Studi di storia dell'architettura in onore di Howard Burns* (Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore, 2010), 207-233.

Zimmerman, T.C.P. *Paolo Giovo: The Historian and the Crisis of Sixteenth-Century Italy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995).