

Raphael's Tomb

Tilmann Buddensieg

Qual tomba!

Francesco Gasperoni 1837

Probably no other artist's death was as deeply mourned and lamented as that, on April 6, 1520, of the 37-year-old Raphael. His corpse was bewailed *con universal dolore de tutti et maximamente de li docti*.¹ For days, Rome spoke of nothing else. There was not an artist in Rome who failed to shed tears at his coffin; even Leo X wept with *ismisurato dolore*.²

From various first-hand accounts, we are familiar with the arrangements Raphael made, in view of his death, for his tomb and for his very considerable estate.³ He divided his worldly possessions among his pupils and his relatives. He made it the responsibility of his students, with funds specifically reserved for the purpose, to restore one of the ancient tabernacles in the Pantheon, to erect an altar in it, to place a marble statue of the Madonna above this, and to lay his body there to rest, under the statue and behind the altar.⁴ Raphael was not, that is, buried in the altar, nor in front of it or below it, but inside the pedestal of the statue of the Madonna that the altar itself hid (fig. 1.1). For the maintenance of the *capella* and for the reading of masses, Raphael allocated the hefty sum of 1000 ducats, and on top of this, the income from a house he bequeathed to the church of Santa Maria ad Martyres, the Pantheon.⁵

After the death of the master, his students went about executing his will. To judge from an overlooked remark by Pirro Ligorio, it would seem that Baldassare Peruzzi directed the construction of the tabernacle.⁶ The main task, the execution of an over life-size sculpture of the Madonna, fell to Raphael's student and friend, the brother-in-law of Giulio Romano, Lorenzo Lotti, called Lorenzetto.⁷ Until Raphael's death, Lorenzetto had worked under Raphael's supervision on the sculptural decoration for the funerary chapel of Agostino Chigi in Santa Maria del Popolo.



Figure 1.1 Raphael's tomb, Pantheon, Rome. Archivio Anderson / Alinari Archives-Florence.

Surveying the comments about the shape Raphael's tomb took in the hands of his students between 1524 and 1525, one cannot fail to notice that its centerpiece, the *Madonna del Sasso*, has almost never met with undiluted approval from its viewers. Once the tomb's pernicious 1911 restoration, in striking contrast to Raphael's wishes, exposed a sarcophagus that he did not want, and once the candles and votive offerings before the Madonna, formerly one of the most venerated in Rome, were cleared away, the *Madonna del Sasso* seemed to withdraw into the shadow of the tabernacle.⁸ It is no longer a cult image, the altar has been destroyed, and Raphael's coffin has been untethered from its material connection with the statue, torn away from the concealment that Raphael had expressly desired.

In the modern art-historical literature, Lorenzetto's work has found little appreciation. The Florentine youths of the Cinquecento are more popular than the richly draped Roman matron. Quâtemère de Quincy and Carlo Fea, in 1820 and 1822, called the statue *goffa*.⁹ Passavant, in 1839, perceived in the figure the lofty qualities of the artistic flowering of the first half of the sixteenth century, but also found it lacking in original invention and skillful execution.¹⁰ Ernst Platner, in his 1840 description of Rome, wrote that the work was much weaker than Lorenzetto's *Jonas* in the Chigi Chapel.¹¹ Compared to this, Jacob Burckhardt's judgment seems more carefully weighed. In the first edition of his *Cicerone*, in 1855, he likewise praised the *Jonas* but added that "the prophet *Elijah*, by contrast, reveals Lorenzetto's duller execution, as does the Madonna statue, thought to be rather beautiful, on the altar in the Pantheon that hides Raphael's tomb." Burckhardt, that is, took there to be a gap between the statue's worthy design and "dull execution." With the publication of the fifth edition of the *Cicerone*, Wilhelm von Bode's appraisal of the statue came to the fore: he held it to be "no better than the spiritless *Elias*."¹² Eugène Müntz at least granted the work *un certain charme*; the drapery *ne manque pas de style*.¹³ John Pope-Hennessy, in his 1965 book on the sculpture of the high Renaissance, did not deem the work worthy of a single word.¹⁴

Now, there is hardly a building, statue, or picture in Rome that is so trivial that some viewer, at some point, for reasons of art theory, art history, local patriotism, or private taste, did not explain how good and important it was. The two exceptions among the judges of the *Madonna del Sasso*, nevertheless, have to be granted a bit more significance.

Pirro Ligorio mentions the Madonna around 1560, in connection with a detailed consideration of the Pantheon, in his massive work, the *Antichità di Roma*, now preserved in the state archive in Turin.¹⁵ He provides a fleeting sketch of the statue in the tabernacle, and in his description calls it the *bella figura di marmo della Santissima Vergine*. This word, *bella*, does not seem to me to be an arbitrary judgment of taste; rather, it appears to hold documentary value, for it comes from a man who, despite his slight and infelicitous talent, must in some respects be considered the heir to Raphael – at least, by way of Peruzzi, as a student-descendent of the Urbinate he so glowingly praises. In this

wholly unpolemical appraisal of Lorenzetto's statue, expressed by Ligorio as if it were self-evident, there may be preserved the opinion that was generally accepted among Raphael's students and in the generation after Raphael, the judgment that the sculpture, whatever else, was fitting within the framework Raphael had designed. The testimony from Ligorio can be placed alongside the generally laudatory *Vita* that Vasari dedicated to Lorenzetto, a biography that we cannot yet otherwise fill out, especially with regard to his activity as an architect. Like Ligorio, the painter Vasari appears to have esteemed the *Madonna del Sasso*, for he used it for his figure of *Religio* in the *Sala di cento giorno* in the Cancelleria.¹⁶

Two hundred years after Ligorio, Winckelmann discussed Lorenzetto's Madonna statue in a most remarkable manner. In his *Abhandlung von der Fähigkeit der Empfindung des Schönen in der Kunst*, which appeared in 1763, he contrasted the "perfect" Lorenzetto with the "deficient" Bernini. Bernini could only produce good drawing, without feeling, "which nature had denied him." He was skilled only at imitating beauty, not at discovering or creating it. Lorenzetto, however, was gifted with both "correct drawing and sensitivity, more than the other sculptors of modern times." Winckelmann then proceeded to place the *Madonna del Sasso*, a "perfect work," even above the *Jonas* of the Chigi Chapel, and he lamented that "it is not noticed by anybody." He names Lorenzetto's Madonna and the "even lesser known" *St. Anne*, also in the Pantheon, by the "worthy" Lorenzo Ottone, as "two of the best modern statues."¹⁷ Winckelmann and Ligorio clearly both admired in Lorenzetto's statue that dominant element of the antique that led viewers of the last 100 years to condemn it for lack of fantasy, for a "spiritless" cold classicism.

Given such differences of opinion, a renewed study of Lorenzetto's sculpture seems necessary, in the first place because the question of whether his work is very good, less good, or bad distracts us from Raphael's tomb as a whole, and from the problem of the *Madonna del Sasso* as a Raphael commission. Why was it precisely this form of Madonna that seemed, to the collaborating Raphael pupils Giulio Romano, Penni, Peruzzi, and Lorenzetto, to be the fitting fulfillment of the master's commission? Can we condemn the result, as has the entirety of the modern scholarship – overhastily, it seems to me – as an artistic failure?

Lorenzetto's statue is an astonishingly faithful replica of an ancient statue of Venus in the Vatican, one that today appears as a nymph, with restored arms, with an ancient head that does not belong to it, and with the addition of a partially antique boy Bacchus (fig. 1.2).¹⁸ It is a clothed version of the Aphrodite of Melos – a figure that has best come down to us in the so-called Madrid Venus – with one curious feature that distinguishes it from the large number of variants, the doubled girdle around the hips and under the breast. Not only the composition as a whole, but also the ancient Venus's rich drapery, fold for fold, went into Lorenzetto's Madonna.

[...]

Lorenzetto's statue is not a more or less accurate, more or less veiled or secret adaptation of an ancient statue. The *Madonna del Sasso* must be seen as a



Figure 1.2 Statue of Nymph, Vatican, Cortile della Pigna. Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Rome.

conscious and undisguised reproduction of an ancient statue, in the same material, at roughly the same size, and with a minimum of personal *maniera*. Its deviations from the ancient model do not serve to cancel out this model from Lorenzetto's work, but rather represent that minimum of change that enabled perhaps for the first time the balancing of example and imitation, of ancient and Renaissance statue. Even the head of the Madonna bears the features of an ancient, at present not yet identifiable female portrait, and the Christ child is individualized as little as possible.

It is worth emphasizing that this circumstance, the copying of a nearly life-size ancient sculpture as a very prominent Christian statue in a church (i.e. not on the roof of a palace or in a park) in the same material and at approximately the same size, is, to my knowledge, without parallel before Lorenzetto. Such a statement may provoke objections, but it must in any event be conceded that the effect of the antique, say, in Reims, or with the Pisani, or with Antico, Riccio, or the Lombardi, is fundamentally different from that in Lorenzetto. With Lorenzetto, the moment of the veiling of the ancient model, a model transformed and used only for inspiration, is missing, as is the intention of simulating an authentic antiquity.¹⁹ Lorenzetto's artistic pioneering results in a quite personal accomplishment, that of keeping the ancient sculpture of a goddess visible in the image of the Mother of God.²⁰ Is it possible to explain the premises of this creation with what has been said up to now?

The conclusion that Lorenzetto, for lack of inspiration, sought refuge in an ancient model seems impermissible to me. The fact that in other works he showed himself fully capable of creating his own designs speaks against this. It would, furthermore, have been easy for, say, Giulio Romano to help his brother-in-law with a drawing, had he thought this necessary. One should rather assume that Lorenzetto and the other Raphael students were of the opinion that the unusual merging of the statue of an ancient goddess with the image of the Mother of God was appropriate to Raphael's commission. Raphael must have demanded a *Madonna all'antica* from Lorenzetto. Perhaps Raphael even illustrated his wishes for the design of his tomb with a sketch of the Madonna.

To this point, we have not explained Raphael's extraordinary wish to be buried in the Pantheon, nor have we commented on the form of Raphael's sepulcher within the conservative history of the Renaissance tomb.

When Raphael died, he was the master builder responsible for St. Peter's, the successor to his promoter, Bramante, in the office. What would have been more obvious than to be laid to rest, like Bramante, in the basilica, close to the papal palace that held his most important paintings? The Pantheon, before Raphael, had never been a preferred burial place for anyone but the canons of the Rotonda.²¹

The tomb's design ultimately adds to the existing complex only a statue of the Madonna, an altar, a distich, and an epitaph. The rich figural and decorative ornamentation common on prominent Renaissance tombs has been omitted. We find neither an allegory of fame, immortality, or redemption – which are at hand in the presence of the Virgin – nor a pictorially expounded biography of

the deceased, nor pictures or emblems of sorrow and transience.²² Raphael's arrangements apparently averted his students from any allegorizing, monumental glorification of his person and his fame, from anything like what Michelangelo's disciples celebrated on the catafalque reconstructed by Wittkower.²³ One might counter that an artist, even the most acclaimed artist, was not entitled, as spiritual and worldly dignitaries were, to elaborate tomb decorations. The Pope's highly unusual permission for Raphael to erect his tomb in the Pantheon, though, means that Raphael would have been given a certain amount of freedom with its figural program. Finally, Raphael had formulated his critique of the traditional, highly figured Renaissance sepulcher – and with this, surely, also his critique of Michelangelo's project for Julius II – in the extremely sober Chigi tomb; the criticism was directed not only at the formal and figural arrangements of these works, but also at their endless production process.

The conjunction of niche, statue, altar, inscription, and tabernacle, which was already offered by the Roman Rotunda, was proper to it; these were not imposed foreign bodies. The elements of Raphael's tomb are found in ancient burial constructions: suffice here a reference to a drawing made by Bramantino around 1500 of an ancient tomb near S. Sebastiano in Rome, where one sees, in a tabernacle, a tomb altar with an inscribed tablet and, immediately above it, a statue in a rectangular niche.²⁴ Raphael's plan for his tomb focused exclusively on inserting the tomb into the existing setting. His commission to his students avoided all elements alien to the ancient building. The *Madonna del Sasso* appears in the form of an ancient goddess, and it thus accommodates itself to the ancient niche. From this point of view, one should take Vasari's report about Raphael's commission quite literally. Vasari specifies that the builders "restored" a tabernacle of the Rotonda. "Restoration" is surely not only to be understood as the repair of the building's damaged parts.²⁵ The Madonna enters an empty niche of the Pantheon and does so, simultaneously, as an ancient goddess. One of the ancient tabernacles, which had stood empty since the year 609, was thereby restored; one of the wounds that early Christianity had inflicted on the pagan building was healed. The gods that had been chased out of the temple returned, transmuted, into the church, in the form of a cult image of the Mother of God.

In the year 609, the pagan temple had been converted by Pope Boniface IV into a church; from a house of the Devil was made first a church consecrated to all saints and then one dedicated to the Madonna.²⁶ For medieval chroniclers after Bede and for visiting pilgrims, the splendor of the ancient sculptural decorations turned into a host of devils and demons, which, at the moment the church was dedicated, fled through the hole that opened in the vault.²⁷ There is no more telling illustration of this medieval notion of the Pantheon as the *Templum omnium idolum* than the oldest representation of the building known to me, in the Apocalypse commentary in Cambridge by the Minorite Alexander from the middle of the thirteenth century.²⁸ It shows the moment when the pagan temple was rededicated as a Christian church by Boniface IV. While the pope swings his

holy water baton and raises his left hand, the deacon next to him, the *Romani stantes et factum respicientes* and the *Imperator Focas*, with his companion outside the building, all look in amazement at two devils who slip out of tabernacles and seek to flee through the opening, which itself looks like damage done to the circle and quatrefoil. Given that his means of representation remain so thoroughly within the realm of the medieval imagination, the painter's art must be admired here, for he is able to illustrate, in perfect Gothic style, the circle, the quatrefoil, the tabernacles, the opening, and the foyer: all of the main features of the building.

Petrarch brought about a fundamental change in the understanding of the Pantheon, one that could be described as a reconciliation with the pagan building that the church of Santa Maria ad Martyres had subjugated. In his late work, the 1366 "De remediis utriusque fortunae," Petrarch mentions the Pantheon in a memorable manner. While the ruins of the famous buildings of ancient Rome appear to him as *exempla* of the vanity of all human accomplishment, he nevertheless praises the Madonna because she, through the marvelous power of her sacred name, preserved the venerable Pantheon as the single famous intact building of Antiquity.²⁹ Behind the poetic image of the building saved by the Madonna lies a feeling of wonder at the preservation of the huge ancient edifice – a feeling that, so far as we know, was alien to the medieval encounter with the Pantheon, but which, after Petrarch, would become a universally accepted judgment to the Renaissance and to Modernity.

Around the same time, a student of Petrarch, Fazio degli Uberti, even outstrips his master. In his "Dittamondo," Fazio celebrates the Mother of God's succession to the presumed ancient mistress of the Pantheon, the gods' mother Cybele, as a harmonious *translatio* of power. His play on words with the pagan "gods' mother" and the Christian "mother of God" conceptualizes a concord between paganism and Christianity like the one that would later be seen in Lorenzetto's Madonna, above Raphael's tomb.³⁰

The Roman and Florentine humanists began to lament the circumstances that led to the early Christians' destruction of ancient statues.³¹ The early Christian image of the Madonna was cut down to a small panel, submerged under numerous repaintings, and surrounded by a bright Cosmatesque tabernacle.³² Beginning with Flavio Biondo, antiquarians examined the ancient texts for information about which statues could have stood in the empty niches, then decorated with bad paintings. Probably in 1513, Domenico de Clarellis, called Menichantonio, an architect from the Bramante circle, drew the interior of the Pantheon.³³ As if obvious, he filled the empty niches with ancient sculptures. The medieval history of the Pantheon was erased. With his tomb, Raphael completed this thought. The *Madonna del Sasso* appears in the image of an ancient statue. The early Christian icon is as foreign to this classicizing Madonna as it is to the statues of the gods it displaced.

Lorenzetto's works do not show the pallor of the Antiquarian, because Raphael did not trouble himself with an archaeological reconstruction of the building's

ancient condition. The statue above his tomb is simultaneously an ancient goddess and one of the most venerated cult images of the Madonna in Rome, the statue's tabernacle simultaneously a *capella* in front of which masses for the soul were to be read. Christian church and ancient temple merge with one another: the medieval dominance and prepotency of the church over the temple vanishes, the classicizing detachment of the temple from the church is avoided. This vivid synthesis is one of the most moving achievements of that short epoch that Wölfflin called "classic art." With Raphael's death, seven years before the sack of Rome, this epoch had already come to an end.

How completely Raphael's thoughts could be misunderstood and indeed destroyed is demonstrated by the restoration of the tomb that Muñoz oversaw in 1911.³⁴ The *Madonna del Sasso* was extracted from its cult context, a sarcophagus that was not even part of the original construction was brought into the open and the altar was destroyed. This created a hybrid of tomb and monument, and it spurred an aesthetic beatification of Raphael of a sort that had scared off the classicism prevailing at the elevation of his bones in 1833. While Raphael had declined any reference to his person, and while his friends had added just his name in an inscription, the Baroque first intervened in the original composition of the tomb, when Maratta had a portrait bust inserted to the left of the tabernacle in 1674. Bellori describes clearly the motivation for this: almost 150 years had passed without the visitors who had come to the tomb to pray for Raphael's salvation and to honor his memory being able to take consolation by looking at his picture. One visited the tomb *per pregarli requie e venerare la sua memoria*.³⁵

Nothing about this character of Raphael's tomb changed in 1833 either. All that was erected was a powerful, temporary catafalque after a sketch by Pietro Camporese the Younger, and it was decided, after some discussion, to return things to their original condition.³⁶ Today Raphael's tomb is broken into two parts; of these, at least the sarcophagus, with incidental organ and choir music, will remain a tourist attraction.

[. . .]

Raphael's unimaginably rich activities in his last years included not only the Chigi Chapel, the rebuilding of St. Peter's, the completion of the Stanze, the Loggie, the Loggetta, the Farnesina frescoes and numerous panels, but also Leo X's commission for a painted and drawn reconstruction of ancient Rome. Nothing from this enormous undertaking has come down to us; we know about it only from Raphael's letter to Leo X and from the testimony of Raphael's friends and contemporaries. After Raphael's death, these witnesses did not so much lament the interruption of work on St. Peter's, on the Stanze, on the *Transfiguration* or other undertakings. Such things could be completed by his pupils or continued by successors. What they unanimously regarded as the greatest and most irredeemable cultural loss was that Raphael could no longer carry out this reconstruction of ancient Rome.³⁷

The observations assembled above allow us to see only in a general way the previously unappreciated extent to which such an image of *Roma antica* might have driven Raphael to realize his architectural works on paper. His drawing in the Uffizi of the interior of the Pantheon, however, offers the most unmediated impression of his concrete work on the project.³⁸ Here, for the first time, after a century of labors by earlier draftsmen, we find the architectonic space of a historical building drawn in such a way that the observer supposes himself to be standing inside the structure. The number of copies made after this drawing testifies to the admiration contemporaries had for the accomplishment. Two closely related drawings in Vienna³⁹ and Kassel⁴⁰ of the interior of the Pantheon, to judge from their pictorial and spatial composition, originated in Raphael's ambit. These may document the work of Raphael's collaborators on the Master Plan of Rome.

In Raphael's Pantheon drawing, we can still feel what the Venetian Marcantonio Michiel wrote from Rome to Marsilio in Venice five days after Raphael's death: Raphael had begun a plan of ancient Rome that was so extraordinary that everyone who saw it supposed himself to be standing in *Roma antica*. The city's cadaver had been brought back to life.

With his tomb, Raphael wanted to do in and for the Pantheon what Castiglione, in his epigram on the death of his friend, set into verse:

Te dudum extinctis reddere posse animam.

[You were able to bring the dead back to life.]

As Wilhelm Heinse wrote in a letter to Gleim, "Raphael's beauty lay more in his mind than in his colors." Accordingly, we should understand Raphael's tomb as his last work.

Notes

I presented the findings of this essay in preliminary form in my inaugural lecture, on November 10, 1965, at the Freie Universität in Berlin, at a session at the Bibliotheca Hertziana in Rome, at the Art Historians' Club at Harvard University, and at New York University's Institute of Fine Arts. I owe thanks for many leads to the possibility I had of working in the Hertziana, and to discussions there. Carlo Bertelli was especially helpful to me in making new photos of the *Madonna del Sasso*.

- 1 Letter from Marcantonio Michiel to Antonio Marsilio in Venice, 11 April 1520, in Jacopo Morelli, *Notizia d'opere di disegno, da un Anonimo* (Bassano, 1800), 210 n. 128; published also by P. E. Visconti, *Notizie riguardanti il testamento di Raffaello, il luogo della sua sepoltura e la Maria Bibiena a lui fidanzata* – a very rich study, which appeared together with the most important source on the opening of the tomb on 14 September 1833: Pietro Odescalchi, *Istoria del ritrovamento delle spoglie mortali di Raffaello Sanzio* (Rome, 1836), 146ff. J. D. Passavant, *Rafael von*

- Urbino und sein Vater Giovanni Santi*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1839), 321ff. and (Paris, 1860), 281ff. Vincenzo Golzio, *Raffaello nei documenti, nelle testimonianze dei contemporanei e nella letteratura del suo secolo* (Vatican City, 1936), 120ff. (cited in what follows as “Golzio”).
- 2 Same letter, loc. cit.; see also Golzio, 115 and 230 for Vasari’s testimony.
 - 3 The text of Raphael’s orally recorded will is published in Visconti, 91ff., Passavant 1860, 278ff. and 368ff., Golzio, 116ff.; see also Vasari, *Vite*, ed. Milanesi, vol. IV, 382 and 579, and Golzio, 229ff.
 - 4 Golzio, 154ff., publishes the “supplica di Baldassarre da Pescia, esecutore testamentario di Raffaello a Clemente VII,” from 20 November 1520: “. . . in ecclesia beate Marie rotunde de Urbe, in qua sepulturam eligerat (sic), unam capellam et sibi sepulturam fieri et fabricari voluit et mandavit.” Letter from Pandolfo Pico in Rome to the Duchess of Mantua, from 7 April 1520, in Golzio, 114ff.: “Detto Raffaello honoratissimamente e stato sepolto a la Rothunda ove lui ha ordinate chel se ghe fazi a sua memoria una sepoltura da mille ducati et altri ha lassato per dottare la capella ove sarà detta sepoltura.” Vasari’s testimony is the most elaborate; *Vita*, ed. Golzio, 229ff.: “Per che fece testamento; e prima, come cristiano, mandò l’amata sua fuor di casa e le lasciò modo di vivere onestamente; dopo divise le cose sue fra’ discepoli suoi, Giulio Romano, il quale sempre amò molto, Giovanni Francesco Fiorentino detto il Fattore, ed un non so chi prete da Urbino suo parente. Ordinò poi che delle sue facultà in Santa Maria Ritonda si restaurasse un tabernacolo di quegli antichi di pietre nuove, ed un altare si facesse con una statue di Nostra Donna di marmo; la quale per sua sepoltura e riposo dopo la morte s’elesse; e lasciò ogni suo avere a Giulio e Giovan Francesco, facendo esecutore del testamento messer Baldassarre da Pescia, allora datario del papa.”
 - 5 Cf. the letter from Pandolfo Pico, cited in n. 4.
 - 6 Pirro Ligorio, “Antichità di Roma,” Turin, State Archive, Cod. I a. III. 15 (vol. 13), fol. 48v: “Et uno d’essi (that is, one of the interior tabernacles) sendo stato ristaurato da M. Baldassar Peruzzo Architetto senese, et da Raphael d’Urbino pittore miracoloso in natura, è stata cagione si fatta rinovatione, che alcune altri hanno fatto il simile, e nelli Fianchi dell’Altare prima ristaurato, dove è la Bella Figura di Marmo della santissima Vergine col figliuolo in braccio Bambino, sono le intitulationi delli sudetti ristauratori quivi appiedi sepulti di Raphael et di Baldassar.” On Ligorio’s Pantheon studies, see now the exhaustive essay by Howard Burns, “A Peruzzi Drawing in Ferrara,” *Mitteilungen des kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 12 (1966), 246ff. and esp. 260ff. See also Lanciani, *Storia di Scavi* II, 237.
 - 7 Vasari, *Vite*, ed. Milanesi, IV, 579; Golzio, 239: “Dovendosi poi eseguire il testamento di Raffaello, gli (i.e., Lorenzetto) fu fatto fare una statua di marmo alta quattro braccia d’una Nostra Donna per lo sepolcro di esso Raffaello nel tempio di Santa Maria Ritonda, dove per ordine suo fu restaurato qual tabernacolo.” On Lorenzetto, cf. F. Schottmüller’s 1929 article in Thieme and Becker’s *Künstlerlexikon*; Adolfo Venturi, *Storia dell’arte italiana* 10 (1935), 312ff. An encomiastic but not very productive discussion of the statue can also be found in Carlo Astolfi, *Raffaello Sanzio Scultore* (Rome, 1935), 29ff. (also in *Rassegna Marchigiana* 12 [1934], 315ff.). For an overview, see now John Pope-Hennessy, *Italian High Renaissance and Baroque Sculpture* (London, 1963), text volume, 43ff. (with no mention of the *Madonna del Sasso*). New material is in Michael Hirst, “The Chigi Chapel in

- S. Maria della Pace," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 24 (1961), 275ff. The height of the statue is 2.77 m.
- 8 See Golzio, 121, and Antonio Muñoz, *La tomba di Raffaello nel Pantheon* (Rome, 1920).
- 9 Quàtremère de Quincy, *Istoria della vita e delle opere di Raffaello Sanzio* (Milan, 1829; first edition Paris, 1820), 287. Carlo Fea, *Notizie intorno Raffaele Sanzio da Urbino* (Rome, 1822), 6.
- 10 Passavant (Paris, 1860), 533.
- 11 E. Platner, C. Bunsen et al., *Beschreibung der Stadt Rom*, vol. 3 (Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1842), 355.
- 12 Jacob Burckhardt, *Der Cicerone* (Basel, 1855), 642 (reprint of the first ed. Stuttgart, 1953, 607). Bode's judgment in the 10th edition (Leipzig, 1910), 555.
- 13 Eugène Müntz, *Histoire de l'art pendant la Renaissance*, vol. 3 (Paris, 1895), 434.
- 14 J. Pope-Hennessy, op. cit. (cf. n. 7).
- 15 Cf. n. 6.
- 16 Most recently, Armando Schiavo, *Il palazzo della Cancelleria* (Rome, n.d.), plates 16, 18.
- 17 J. J. Winckelmann, *Abhandlung von der Fähigkeit der Empfindung des Schönen in der Kunst, und dem Unterrichte in derselben* (Dresden, 1763), in *Winckelmanns Werke*, ed. C. L. Fernow, vol. 2 (Dresden, 1808), 394ff. Italian ed., ed. Carlo Fea, vol. 6 (Prato, 1831), 539ff.
- 18 The statue stands today in the portico of the Braccio Nuovo, on the southern side of the Giardino della Pigna. Here, too, I would like to thank Frau Dr. Speier for her help in locating the statue. The oldest illustration of the statue is that in the Codex Escorialensis, ed. H. Egger (Vienna, 1906), fol. 31, 94ff. A. Michaelis recognized the Venus statue in the Nike drawn there. On de Cavealleriis's engraving, see Johannes Baptista de Cavealleriis, *Antiquae Statuae urbis Romae* (Rome, 1561/62), plate 35, ed. 1584/85, plate 44, and on this, Thomas Ashby, "Antiquae Statuae Urbis Romae," *Papers of the British School in Rome* 9 (1920), 106ff., esp. 147, as well as Hülsen, *Antikengärten*, no. 109. The statue also appears (without mention in the text) in Erasmo Pistolesi, *Il Vaticano descritto ed illustrato*, vol. 4 (Rome, 1829), plate LVII. Having been moved frequently in the 19th and 20th centuries, the statue, so far as I can see, has not appeared in any of the Vatican catalogues. See also A. Reinach, *Répertoire de la Statuaire*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1897), 338, and E. Ravaisson, "Vénus de Milo," *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 34 (1892), 72, plate 6, 2. The height of the statue is 2.05 m. Cf. the measurements of the *Madonna del Sasso*, n. 7.
- 19 A discussion of the problem of the copy and its different possibilities and limits can be found in Heinz Ladendorf, *Antikenstudium und Antikenkopie* (Berlin, 1953), 62ff., without reference to Lorenzetto.
- 20 Matthias Winner is wholly correct in referring me to Dürer's equation of Apollo with Christ, Venus with Mary, and Hercules with Samson, which the artist voiced when sketching the introduction to his *Lehrbuch der Malerei*: "Thus, in the same way that they (that is, the artists of Antiquity) allotted the most beautiful human form to their idol Abblo, do we want to use the same measurement for Christ, the man who was the most beautiful in all the world. And as they used Venus as the most beautiful women, so do we want chastely to set forth the same delicate form

- in the purest Virgin Mary, the Mother of God. And out of Samson, we want to make Hercules, and to do the same with all the others. See K. Lange and F. Fuhse, *Dürers schriftlicher Nachlass* (Halle, 1893), 316; Hans Rupprich, *Dürer, Schriftlicher Nachlass*, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1966), 104.
- 21 The tomb inscriptions are in Vincenzo Forcella, *Iscrizioni delle Chiese e d'altri edifici di Roma*, vol. 1 (Rome, 1873), 287ff., and Giovanni Erolì, *Raccolta generale delle Iscrizioni pagane e cristiane etc. nel Pantheon di Roma* (Narni, 1895), 415ff.
 - 22 Erwin Panofsky, *Grabmalplastik* (Cologne, 1964), esp. 74ff. Also André Chastel, "La glorification humaniste dans les monuments funéraires de la Renaissance," in *Umanesimo e Scienza politica. Atti del Congresso internaz. di Studi umanistici 1949* (Milan, 1951), 477ff.
 - 23 Rudolf and Margot Wittkower, *The Divine Michelangelo* (London, 1964), fig. 8, 9, and the reconstruction on p. 148. See also Hans Ost, "Ein Ruhmesblatt für Raphael bei Maratti und Mengs," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 28 (1965): 288ff.
 - 24 Giuseppe Mongeri, *Le rovine di Roma, Studi del Bramantino* (Milan, 1880), plate 3.
 - 25 Here it should be noted that Ligorio names Raphael and Peruzzi as the two *ristauratori* of the Pantheon. See n. 6.
 - 26 In what follows, I depend on my unpublished *Habilitationsschrift*, "Studien zum Nachleben antiker Architektur und Skulptur in Rom," Berlin, 1965. Cf. above all the short synopsis of the first chapter in the *Sitzungsberichten der kunstgeschichtlichen Gesellschaft zu Berlin* 13 (1964/65), 3ff. ("Das Pantheon in der Renaissance").
 - 27 In the *Kaiserchronik* from ca. 1150, ed. E. Schröder, MGH, D. Chron. I (1892), it says that, with Boniface IV, "dem wâren gote gemahelte er daz hûs, / die Tievel brâsten oben uz, / sumelîche in daz abgrunde. / des ist ze Rôme noch hiute urchunde." Hermann von Fritzlar depicted the reconsecration of the Pantheon still more drastically in his 1343–49 *Lives of the Saints*: "Dô vorstôrete der bâbist di apgote. Der wâren zwêne und sibentzic, und di tûvele furen ûz den bilden, und der Rômer apgot, der tûvel, nam den tynaphel obene von der Kirchen, der ist von erze gegozzen un ist kunstic heidenisch werc und ist wol alsô grôz alsô ein bakoven. Disen furte her vor sente Pêters munster, dâ her noch hûte dises tages stêt, und daz loch an der Kirchen, dô der tynaphel ûffe stunt, daz stêt noch offen, unde enmac nimant vorbûwen. Wanne die Kirche ist gar grôz und enhât nirgen kein sule in ir." Franz Pfeiffer, *Deutsche Mystiker des 14. Jahrhunderts*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1845), xiv, text pp. 230ff. This text includes a remarkable and extremely rare medieval description of an ancient building from the perspective of Gothic architecture. Compare this story with the representation of the Pantheon, discussed here, by the Minorite Alexander.
 - 28 Cambridge, University Library, MS. Mm V 31, fol. 74, North German, after the middle of the 13th century. See M. Huggler, "Der Bilderkreis in den Handschriften der Alexander-Apocalypse," *Antonianum* 9 (1934), 85ff., 269ff. (without illustrations of the Pantheon scene), and Alois Wachtel, "Alexander Minorita, Expositio in Apocalypsim," MGH, *Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters*, vol. 1 (Weimar, 1955), xiv ff. and 257. I owe thanks to Christian Klamt for the reference to this manuscript.
 - 29 De remediis I, 118, *Opera Omnia* (Basel, 1554), 42: "Nec vero solum templa Deorum quae paraverat, in ipsos aedificantes ruere, sed pia etiam loca hac ipsa aetate

- in eadem urbe alia ceciderunt, alia tremuerunt, et nunc vix ponderibus suis stant, praeter unum Pantheon Agrippae, quod diis erectum sancti possident, et Maria, quae antiquissimam illam domum sui nominis virtute sustentat. Crede mihi alius quam lapideis fundamentis eget gloria ut mansura sit." See Prince d'Essling and Eugène Müntz, *Pétrarque, ses études d'art, son influence sur les artistes etc.* (Paris, 1902), 24ff.
- 30 Fazio degli Uberti, "Il Dittamondo," ed. G. Corsi, *Scrittori d'Italia* 206–7, (Bari, 1952), I, 104ff. (II, VI, 52ff.): "Il Pantheon dentro dal grembo mio / allor fu fatto in nome d'una dia / la qual si disse madre d'ogni dio. / Di questa cosi bella profezia / non m'accorsi io allora, ma or ne godo, / Ché veggio s'intese di Maria."
 - 31 Tilmann Buddensieg, "Gregory the Great, the Destroyer of Pagan Idols etc." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 28 (1965), 44ff.
 - 32 Carlo Bertelli, "La Madonna del Pantheon," *Bollettino d'Arte* 46 (1961), 24ff. Antonio Muñoz, "La decorazione medioevale del Pantheon," *Nuovo Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana* 18 (1912), 25ff., plate vi.
 - 33 Sketchbook in the Mellon Collection, Washington, fol. 33. Hans Nachod, "A Recently Discovered Architectural Sketchbook etc.," *Rare Books*, published for the Friends and Clients of H. P. Kraus, New York, VIII, June 1955, 1, fig. 1.
 - 34 Antonio Muñoz, *La tomba di Raffaello nel Pantheon* (Rome, 1920). The reconfiguration of the tomb seems immediately to have provoked criticism; cf. Muñoz, 29: "Qualche anima pia esprese i suoi dubbii sulla convenienza di esporre sotto un altare il corpo di un personaggio, degnissimo sì di venerazione, ma non santificato dalla Chiesa. Ma è bene ricordare che ciò fu fatto col pieno consentimento delle autorità ecclesiastiche." Cf. also Golzio, 120f.
 - 35 Giovanni Pietro Bellori, *Descrizione delle imagini dipinte da Raffaello d'Urbino etc.* (Rome, 1695), 102: "Ma era quasi compito il giro di cento cinquanta anni dalla morte di Raffaello, senza che quelli, che visitavano il suo sepolcro per pregarli requie, e venerare la sua memoria, potessero consolar la vista con l'effigie dei quell venerabil volto, quando l'anno 1674 il Signor Carlo Maratti con animo grato, e generoso verso sì gran Maestro . . . e per sodisfare insieme al commune desiderio de gli studiosi di esso, fece il modello del suo ritratto cavato dalla scuola di Atene, scolpito dopo nel marmo per mano di Paolo Naldi sino al busto, e collocato in un nicchio al monumento in Santa Maria Rotonda." See also Hans Ost, "Ein Ruhmesblatt für Raphael bei Maratti und Mengs," in *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 28 (1965), 281ff.
 - 36 The catafalque is in Muñoz, op. cit., 17, illustrated 23; Camporese's words on his sketch are cited in n. 1. For a fuller discussion see Francesco Gasparone, *Sul ritrovamento delle obbliate Reliquie di Raffaello Sanzio e sul progetto di funebre Catafalco ideato in quella occasione al Cav. Pietro Camporese Architetto* (Rome, 1837). Sarti, Canina and P. Anzani also made sketches; cf. Golzio, 121. Antonio Sarti's sketch, as Manfred F. Fischer alerted me, is preserved in the Cooper Union Museum in New York. The question of whether the sarcophagus containing Raphael's mortal remains should be left visible or should be re-enclosed was also discussed in 1833; see Pietro Odescalchi, op. cit. (n. 1), 58f. The founding of the Presidents of the Virtuosi del Pantheon, which led to the restoration of the Pantheon to its old condition, deserves to be cited briefly here, as it indicates a deep understanding of Raphael's tomb: "Piacque a Raffaello (e fu sublime l'idea) che la statua di Nostra

Donna del Sasso fosse parte principale del suo sepolcro, nè altro, da quella statua in fuori, ci mostrasse agli occhi de' riguardanti. Ora sarebbe cosa disconvenevole, per non dire irreligiosa, opporsi al volere di lui . . . Ad un sacro tabernacolo che invita a devozione e a preghiere per l'anima di quell grande [sarebbe surrogata] un luogo tutto profane: imperocchè il render sacra quella cella, divenuto unicamente sepolcrale, terrebbe all'idolatria. La beata Vergine . . . che Raffaello si elesse per suo sepolcro, quella che forma il vero e parlante coperchio della ossa di lui . . . sarebbe indecorosamente negata alla vista di coloro che visitassero l'urna . . . essendochè alle sole ossa de' santi congedasi sì fatto onore."

- 37 The most recent overview is Oskar Fischel, *Raphael* (Berlin, 1962), pp. 151ff. See the literature cited in note 1 for the texts.
- 38 Wolfgang Lotz, "Das Raumbild in der italienischen Architekturzeichnung der Renaissance," *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* VII (1956), pp. 215ff., with references to the older literature. An extensive discussion of this and the following Pantheon drawings can be found in my *Habilitationsschrift*, see n. 26.
- 39 Hermann Egger, *Kritisches Verzeichnis der stadtrömischen Architekturzeichnungen* I, Vienna 1905, AH 7, attributed by him to a "Master C from 1515." The correct date of 1519 is given in my essay on the Constantinian basilica in the *Münchener Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst* 15 (1962), 44, no. 11.
- 40 Unfortunately, heavy overdrawing and wash was added to the sheets by their later owner, the Dutch architect Pierre Jacques Roman (there is an entry in the codex from 1755). The Pantheon sheet is conceived in a similar way to that of the Viennese Master C and has been measured with the same rule (the Bolognese foot?). The Pantheon drawings in the Codex Coner (Ashby, plate 35, 56), along with those by Menichantonio, by Viennese Master C, and by the anonymous Kassel master, belong closely together and lead back to Raphael's Uffizi drawing. I take a woodcut exterior view of the Pantheon, which appeared in the *Epigrammata Antiquae Urbis* assembled in 1517 by Andrea Fulvio and published in 1521 by Mazochius, fol. 6v, to belong to the circle of Raphael. The perspectival distortion of the dome, the reduction of the porch to six columns, and the overly narrow Rotunda ought to be attributed to the woodcutter's indelicate cutting of the significant sketch. As has been frequently remarked (see Fischel, op. cit., p. 153), Andrea Fulvio mentions that Raphael often collaborated on his topographical studies.