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This dissertation examines the frescoes of the Vatican Stanze and the altarpiece of the Transfiguration and all the drawings associated with them in an effort to understand the design process in Raphael’s Roman workshop. During the last six years of his life Raphael developed a new way of deploying the talented artists in his shop. He employed specialists to perform specific tasks called for by certain commissions. He also trained assistants to perform specific tasks related to the design of major paintings. By the end of Raphael’s life, Giulio Romano had emerged as a major artistic force. Once the drawings for the Vatican frescoes are examined in the context of all the available documentary evidence, it becomes clear that Giulio designed important parts of the Vatican fresco cycles, sometimes with no apparent intervention by the master and that Giovanni Francesco Penni created modelli of complex compositions that had been worked up by the master or by Giulio. I draw a different conclusion from all previous scholars who always reserved the ideation of the works of art to Raphael’s creative genius alone. Unlike earlier scholars I see the mind, not just the hand, of Giulio Romano and Giovanni Francesco Penni engaged in the design process. This new way of working may have
been suggested to Raphael by his experience working with Pinturicchio on the designs for the frescoes of the Piccolomini Library in Siena. Raphael created original design drawings for this project despite the fact that he was employed by an artist thirty years his senior who had been commissioned to carry out the work. Just as in this case, when Raphael became too busy to attend to every detail of his production himself he did not reserve the design process to himself. In fact, in most cases he seems to have allowed assistants to design and carry through major paintings. He and his shop managed to create innovative and sophisticated works of art while at the same time inviting new ways of working that challenged traditional notions of artistic genius and creativity.
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Chapter 1: The Problem and Review of the Literature

The Western mind has been fascinated with the mystery of literary, musical, and artistic production since antiquity. What inspires the creations of the writer, the composer, or the artist? How does the poet choose the right word? How does a composer invent a new tune? How does the artist see new shapes and forms? What separates the great from the merely ordinary? Why do we still admire Shakespeare, Mozart, and Michelangelo while the work of thousands of writers, musicians, and artists goes unread, unheard, and unseen? The answers usually have something to do with mysterious concepts that we call “taste” and “quality.” These are real things that can be defined and studied, and they lead to larger and more complex problems like “discernment” and “style,” but they are only part of the answer. Another part of the answer lies in our fascination with virtuosity in art. The modern understanding of this idea goes back to Italy in the sixteenth century and authors like Baldassare Castiglione and Giorgio Vasari. But the deepest roots in the West go back to Greek and Roman antiquity. Books such as Aristotle’s treatise on poetry explain not only why Homer’s *Iliad* is a great poem based on its own technical merits, but also why Homer’s poem served as an appropriate model for the great tragic plays of Aeschylus and Sophocles. *On the Sublime*, a first-century C.E. Greek text often attributed in antiquity to the third-century C.E. philosopher Longinus, singled out Sappho for special praise among Greek lyricists on technical grounds to be sure, but also on the grounds that she evoked an
ineffable emotional response that the reader, or hearer, could connect with his own feelings.  

1 Pseudo-Longinus, *On the Sublime*, X, 1-3. The author quotes part of a poem about a lover staring at his or her beloved as she talks to a man:

> He seems to me equal to gods that man
> whoever he is who opposite you
> sits and listens close
> to your sweet speaking

> and lovely laughing—oh it
> puts the heart in my chest on wings
> for when I look at you, even a moment, no speaking
> is left in me

> no: tongue breaks and thin
> fire is racing under skin
> and in eyes no sight and drumming
> fills ears

> and cold sweat holds me and shaking
> grips me all, greener than grass
> I am and dead—or almost
> I seem to me.

> But all is to be dared, because even a person of poverty


Pseudo-Longinus follows this quote with the following observation that addresses not any technical aspect of the poet’s writing style, but rather the reality of the emotional response of the lover in the poem:

> Are you not amazed how at one and the same moment she seeks
> out soul, body, hearing, tongue, sight, complexion as though they
> had all left her and were external, and how in contradiction she
> both freezes and burns, is irrational and sane, is afraid and nearly
dead, so that we observe her in not one single emotion but a
concourse of emotions? All this of course happens to people in
love; but, as I said, it is her selection of the most important details
and her combination of them into a single whole that have
produced the excellence of the poem.

But the ancient author who contributed most to the discussion of the artist’s virtuosity is Pliny the Elder. This is perhaps true because in the course of his great encyclopedia, the *Natural History*, he had more material with which to work than any other ancient author. His discussion of Greek painting is rife with stories about the effect of pictures on the public and about the virtuosity of their painters. Pliny’s discussion of Apelles begins with a story that sets the tone for everything that the author says about the greatest of the Greek painters.² Apelles went to the island of Rhodes to seek out his great rival Protogenes, whose work he knew only through reputation. Finding him not at home, Apelles left him a message only he would understand. He picked up a brush and drew an extremely thin line on panel that had been prepared but not yet painted. When Protogenes returned home, he heard the report of the visitor from his servant, saw the line and knew immediately that Apelles had been there. He told his servant that if the visitor returned she was to tell him that, “This is the person you seek.” He then took a brush and painted an even thinner line on top of the one made by Apelles. Apelles returned, was directed to the panel and, refusing to be beaten, painted an even thinner line on top of the first two, forcing Protogenes to admit defeat.

This story is instructive on many levels. It demonstrates that in antiquity artists were judged not just according to their own level of technical or manual skill, but also according to their ability to judge the works of their fellow artists. The story of Apelles and Protogenes is bracketed in Pliny’s book by general remarks about Apelles’s opinions of his own work in relation to that of other artists and the famous story of Apelles hiding behind his painting to listen to the opinions of passersby. In the first case Apelles is

² Pliny the Elder, *Natural History*, XXXV, 81-83.
shown to know himself and the limits of his own talent and virtues as a painter. He says, for example, that Protogenes’s work may be better than his in many regards, but he is superior to Protogenes in that he, Apelles, knows when to take his hand away from the panel. The implication of this story is that Apelles is to be praised not just for his own skill but also for understanding the limits of his skill since he admits that his own work is far from perfect. After the duel of the lines Pliny told the story of Apelles hiding behind his panel and listening as a cobbler criticized his execution of a sandal in a portrait. The painter corrected the flaw but the next day was subjected to criticism from the same man about the leg around which the sandal was tied. At this point, he popped out from behind the panel and told the cobbler that he should “stick to his last,” or not let his criticism stray into areas about which he knew nothing. This story is also about the discernment of the artist, this time in relation to a member of the viewing public as opposed to another painter.

These related themes, the physical talent of the artist’s hand and the artist’s keen mind, were taken up again in the Renaissance. The tradition, which has never been fully explored, reached its highest expression in the writings of Vasari. Vasari told many stories about virtuosity and the ability to recognize it, which he deemed a virtue in itself. In his life of Giotto, Vasari told a tale of how the great Tuscan painter was invited by the Pope to paint in St. Peter’s. The story is a simple one: Pope Benedict IX, having heard of Giotto’s skill, sent a courtier to Florence to investigate. The man gathered drawings from the artists of Siena before proceeding to Florence and the workshop of Giotto. Once

---

3 Ibid., XXXV, 79-80.

4 Ibid., XXXV, 84-85.
there he asked for a drawing that might be sent with the others to his holiness so that the
best painter might be commissioned. Giotto took a blank sheet and, without the aid of a
compass, drew a perfect circle. The courtier did not understand the gesture but sent the
drawing with the others to the wise pontiff who recognized the virtuosity of the drawing
and brought Giotto to paint in Rome. Condivi, in his life of Michelangelo, told a similar
tale of how Michelangelo came to work in Rome for the first time. Cardinal Riario,
having been duped into purchasing a statue of a sleeping cupid as an antique when it was,
in fact, carved by Michelangelo, sent an emissary to Florence to find the artist. When the
messenger came to the studio of the artist, Michelangelo made a drawing of a hand as
proof of his virtuosity. It is very likely that both stories are fiction, the latter depending
on the former, and the former drawn from Pliny’s famous story of Apelles’s line.

In both tales the hero/artist came to Rome, the center of the artistic universe in the
middle of the sixteenth century when both biographies were written, by virtue of the skill
manifested in his manual dexterity. Vasari was not the first writer of the sixteenth
century to draw a connection between the expression of artistic virtuosity and the virtù of

5 Giorgio Vasari, *Le Vite de’ Più Eccellenti Pittori, Scultori ed Architettori Scritte da

Hellmut Wohl (London, 1976), pp. 19-21. It has long been recognized that Condivi’s
biography is really Michelangelo’s autobiography that he dictated to his young disciple.

7 The connection between the two stories and their poetic and metaphorical significance
has been explicated by Paul Barolsky in “The Artist’s Hand,” in *The Craft of Art:
Originality and Industry in the Italian Renaissance and Baroque Workshop*, ed. Andrew
Ladis and Carolyn Wood (Athens, Georgia and London, 1995), pp. 12-14; *The Faun in
the Garden: Michelangelo and the Poetic Origins of Italian Renaissance Art* (University
Park, Penn., 1994), pp. 148-149; *Why Mona Lisa Smiles and Other Tales by Vasari*
(University Park, Penn., 1991), pp. 10-12; and *Michelangelo’s Nose: A Myth and its
Maker* (University Park, Penn., 1990), pp. 134-137.
the artist. Castiglione used the apparent ease and grace of the hand of the great artist, even alluding to the story of Apelles and his line, as an analogy for the seemingly effortless ease and grace, or *sprezzatura*, of his ideal courtier.⁸ In a sense Castiglione elevated the artist to the level of the noble gentleman three decades before Vasari embarked on his great enterprise to improve the position of the artist and the arts in society, an enterprise that would culminate in the establishment of the Accademia del Disegno in Florence with Michelangelo symbolically, if not actually, at its head.

Castiglione’s equation of the artist and courtier is taken up by Vasari, not in his life of Michelangelo, whom he portrays as a singularly divine figure sent by God to rescue the arts, a sort of artistic messiah, but in the life of Raphael. In this biography Vasari, reversing Castiglione’s analogy, repeatedly emphasized Raphael’s grace, *grazia*, which is manifested in the dexterity of the artist’s hand, *mano*.⁹ This emphasis on Raphael’s personal grace and his own hand in the works that bear his name is in sharp contrast to the modern notion of how Raphael’s shop operated, particularly during the last five or six years of his life. The modern view is that Raphael’s shop assistants had learned to imitate his style so precisely that it is difficult to tell where the hand of the master stops and the hand of an assistant begins. This is particularly true in the large fresco cycles that Raphael and his shop painted in Rome. The frescoes of the Stanze dell’Incendio have been particularly problematic. All scholars have admitted that the lower portions of the walls below the main scenes are not by Raphael himself. But opinion has been sharply divided over who, the master or his assistants, painted the

---


⁹ Vasari/Milanesi, IV, pp. 315-386.
individual scenes in the main field of each wall. It is significant that Vasari, while admitting that Raphael’s assistants had good qualities as artists and men, always said explicitly that the best qualities of the works made by the shop were due to Raphael himself. A good example of this can be seen in the opening paragraph of the life of Giulio Romano. Here he says very plainly that Raphael “used” Giulio to execute works such as the scenes of the creation of Adam and Eve or of the animals from the Loggia di Raffaello and the lower parts of the walls with their faux bronze sculptures in the Stanza dell’Incendio. This notion has shaped perceptions of the production of Raphael’s shop in Rome ever since Vasari’s book was published.

Vasari’s life is filled with references to Raphael’s grace. The very first sentence says, “chiaramente potè vedersi nel non meno eccellente che grazioso Raffael Sanzio da Urbino.” Sprinkled throughout the life there are at least a dozen subsequent references to Raphael’s personal grace, his graceful style, and the grace of the figures in his works. Finally, Vasari states that everyone should imitate Raphael in his ability to deal gracefully with all classes of men. According to Vasari, all who entered his presence were filled with harmony and agreement and began to live as civilized gentlemen and not

---

10 This room will be discussed in detail in chapter 4.

11 “… le quali parti furono cagione che egli fu di maniera amato da Raffaello, che se gli fusse stato figiuolo, non più l’arebbe potuto amare; onde avvenne, che si servì sempre di lui nell’opere di maggiore importanza, …” Vasari/Milanesi, V, pp. 523-524.

12 Ibid., IV, p. 315.

as the coarse craftsmen that the previous age had produced.\textsuperscript{14} Raphael’s own personality, Vasari seems to be saying, is to a large degree responsible for the elevation of the artist in the sixteenth century. In a reiteration of a trope with ancient roots, Vasari says that even animals loved him. Vasari was clearly impressed with the reputation of the artist from Urbino and praised his work in the most lavish terms throughout the biography. But Vasari also took Raphael to task for taking a long time to establish his own style. Raphael, Vasari claims, first imitated the style of his teacher Perugino before coming under the spell of Leonardo, and next tried to match the grandeur of Michelangelo’s conceptions of the nude figure before assimilating the manner of Fra Bartolommeo. Finally, he came to terms with his older contemporaries and succeeded in creating a style that was his own.\textsuperscript{15} This personal style is linked with Raphael’s hand. In a discussion of

\textsuperscript{14} Vasari/Milanesi, IV, pp. 383-386.

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., IV, pp. 373-379.

It is interesting to note that Vasari characterizes this independent style of Raphael by listing the things that the painter could achieve that the sculptor, in this case Michelangelo, could not. He writes of Raphael:

\begin{quote}
Considerò anco quanto importi la fuga de’ cavalli nelle battaglie, la fierezza de’ soldati, il saper fare tutte le sorti d’animali, e sopratutto il far in modo nei ritratti somigliar gli uomini, che pàino vivi e si conoscino per chi egli sono fatti; ed altre cose infinite, come sono abbigliamenti di panni, calzari, celate, armadure, acciocciature di femmine, capegli, barbe, vasi, alberi, grotte, sassi, fuochi, arie torbide e serene, nuvoli, pioggie, saette, sereni, notte, lumi di luna, splendori di sole, ed infinite altre cose che seco portano oguora i bisogni dell’ arte della pittura. Queste cose, dico, considerando Raffaello, si risolvè, non potendo aggiugnere Michelagnolo in quella parte, dove egli aveva messo mano, di volerlo in queste altre pareggiare e forse superarlo. (Vasari/Milanesi, IV, p. 376)
\end{quote}

This passage is obviously taken from section 51 of book 1 of \textit{The Courtier} where in Castiglione’s characters discuss the \textit{paragone}. As part of his long defense of the superiority of painting over sculpture Count Ludovico da Canossa says:

\begin{quote}
Parvi poi che di poco momento sia la imitazione dei colori naturali in contrafar le carnì, i panni e tutte l’ altre cose colorate? Questo far non po già il marmorario, né meno esprimer la graziosa vista degli occhi neri o azzuri, col splendor di que’ raggi amorosi. Non po mostrare il color de’ capegli flavi, non lo splendor dell’ arme, non una oscura notte, non una tempesta di mare, non que’ lampi e
the fresco of the *Fire in the Borgo* in the Stanza dell’Incendio and the scenes in the Loggia di Psiche in the Villa Farnesina, Vasari says that the figures lacked the grace of Raphael because others painted them after the designs of the master.\textsuperscript{16} Statements such as this, as well as Vasari and Condivi’s tales about Giotto and Michelangelo’s advents to Rome and Castiglione’s equation of apparent ease of execution by the artist with *sprezzatura*, make it clear that beginning in the second quarter of the sixteenth century the hand of the master was an increasingly important commodity in the artistic realm.\textsuperscript{17}

In his discussion of the large altarpiece of the *Transfiguration* now in the Vatican Museums, Vasari says, not once but three times, that the entire work is by Raphael’s own hand.\textsuperscript{18}

16 “Perciocchè gl’ignudi che fece nella camera di torre Borgia, dove è l’incendio di Borgo nuovo, ancora che siano buoni, non sono in tutto eccellenti. Parimente non sodisfeco affatto quelli che furono similmente fatti da lui nella volta del palazzo d’Agostin Chigi in Trastevere, perchè mancano di quella grazia e dolcezza che fu propria di Raffaello: del che fu anche in gran parte cagione l’avergli fatti colorire ad altri col suo disegno.”
(Vasari/Milanesi, IV, pp. 377-378)

17 See Barolsky, “The Artist’s Hand.” By contrast to the stories about how the two greatest Florentine artists came to Rome for the first time (Vasari tells the same tale about Michelangelo’s invitation to Rome in the second edition of the lives as does Condivi only leaving out the episode of the drawing of the hand) Vasari tells a very different tale about Raphael. The Urbinate artist does not reach the most important artistic center in the world because of his virtuosity. Rather, Pope Julius II asks him to come because he was recommended by Bramante, the Pope’s architect and, according to Vasari, a relative of Raphael. See Vasari/Milanesi, IV, pp. 328-329.

18 In his main discussion of this painting Vasari says, “la quale egli di sua mano continuamente lavorando.” (Vasari/Milanesi, IV, p. 371) and “il quale pare che tanto si restrignesse insieme con le virtù sua per mostrare lo sforzo ed il valor dell’arte nel volto di Cristo, che finitolo, come ultima cosa che a fare avesse, non toccò più pennelli,
That Raphael himself may have had a more sophisticated approach to the problem of how to accomplish a large amount of high quality work in a short period of time than Vasari’s rather facile statements about the superiority of the hand of the master is supported by certain examples from Raphael’s own lifetime. While these may be of limited utility, they do at least hint at the idea that there were, in the early sixteenth century, more nuanced approaches to the problem of running a large shop than have been considered up to now. Verrocchio, to cite an obvious example, had Leonardo in his workshop from about 1470 to about 1476. There have been many attempts to find the hand of Leonardo in Verrocchio’s works of this period, most famously in the *Baptism of Christ* now in the Uffizi. But even if Leonardo’s hand could be detected in many of Verrocchio’s paintings, these instances would not add up to a picture of a master who used the specific talents of an assistant to accomplish something for the shop that the master could not have achieved on his own.

The same might be said of the perhaps more apt example of Michelangelo and his large shop employed during the difficult commission for the Medici tomb chapel and library in San Lorenzo in Florence between 1520 and 1534. Michelangelo seems to have adopted much more of an entrepreneurial attitude in his deployment of assistants. Here sopraggiugnendogli la morte.” (Vasari/Milanesi, IV, p. 372.) And later, immediately after his claim that the frescoes of the Loggia di Psiche and the *Fire in the Borgo* suffered at the hands of other painters, Vasari says, “dal quale errore ravvedutosi, come giudicioso, volle poi lavorare da se solo e senza aiuto d’altri la tavola di San Pietro a Montorio, della Trasfigurazione di Cristo; nella quale sono quelle parti, che già s’è detto che ricerca e debbe avere una buona pittura.” (Vasari/Milanesi, IV, p. 378.)


we see a master who employed assistants with specific skills to do specific jobs. In this way Michelangelo was able to accomplish much more than he ever could have alone.\textsuperscript{21}

But this example does not make a perfect comparison to Raphael’s situation either. The work at San Lorenzo was architectural as well as sculptural and required large amounts of stone cutting for which the master would not have been responsible.

There is also an important precedent from Raphael’s own career in the years before he reached Rome in 1508. Raphael was employed by Pinturicchio to design some of the major narrative scenes in the Piccolomini Library in the Cathedral of Siena.\textsuperscript{22}

Surviving drawings indicate that Pinturicchio used the nineteen year old Raphael to design paintings that Pinturicchio then painted. Raphael must have been impressed by the older artist’s willingness to relinquish creative control in order to achieve the best result in the shortest time. When pressed later in his own career, Raphael may well have relied on a similar strategy to achieve his goals. The difference is that while Pinturicchio employed an independent master, however young, Raphael trained assistants from within the ranks of his shop to carry out important design work in the Vatican. None of these examples has ever been cited in an effort to understand how Raphael’s workshop operated in the last half of the 1520s. This dissertation will consider the fresco cycles in the Vatican Stanze, the semi-public spaces in the papal apartments on the third level of the apostolic palace. These paintings make a coherent grouping as they were all commissioned under similar circumstances and the patrons would have expected results

\textsuperscript{21} The comparison between Raphael and Michelangelo will be discussed more extensively in chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{22} This phase of Raphael’s career will be discussed in chapter 2.
that were homogenous and high quality. The *Transfiguration* altarpiece is studied in chapter 6 as a case study of a non-Vatican commission.

The first modern art historians to deal with Raphael’s drawings, the focus of this dissertation, did so briefly in the context of monographs on his entire production. Beginning with Passavant in 1839, they accepted Vasari’s focus on the hand of the artist and aimed to distinguish Raphael’s hand as superior to those of the artists of his shop.23 Passavant’s discussion of the relationship between Raphael and Giulio, for example, paralleled Vasari’s almost exactly. He did not mention Giulio as having a direct role in any production of the workshop until he wrote that he would “pass over in silence” the lower parts of the walls of the Stanza dell’Incendio.24 He did go further than Vasari in saying that these figures were after Giulio’s own designs, a subject on which Vasari was silent. Passavant went on to say, again following Vasari, that Giulio played a large role in the painting of the Loggia. He even wrote that all the works there were executed by others, “under the influence of Raphael,” seeming to make Raphael’s connection to these paintings even more distant from the master than Vasari allowed.25 Passavant’s book, originally published in German in 1839, was greatly expanded for the French edition of

---


24 Passavant, *Raphael of Urbino*, p. 163.

25 Ibid., p. 166.
1860. This edition included an extensive catalogue of all of Raphael’s works including all the drawings that were then associated with the paintings. But in the main body of the text, the drawings were mentioned only to support certain points of chronology or the stylistic development of Raphael himself. All the drawings that Passavant identified as integral to the design process of the paintings were attributed to Raphael. He did not assess the drawings for the evidence they might provide about the structure or functioning of the workshop.

Crowe and Cavalcaselle’s monograph, long considered the classic study of Raphael’s art, followed the same course and attributed the same parts of these rooms to Giulio as had Passavant and Vasari.27 They went further than any previous scholars and said that the worst parts of the paintings from these rooms should be attributed to Giulio and the other assistants. Referring to certain figure groups that they attributed to Giulio in The Fire in the Borgo, they wrote, “The charm of the picture is as diminished in these groups as in the fugitives on the left.”28 Like Passavant, Crowe and Cavalcaselle mentioned many drawings, but the great majority of them were included because they were part of the design process of a painting. And also like Passavant, they attributed all the truly creative design sketches to Raphael. In the nineteenth century scholars seem not to have concentrated on the attribution of drawings as a useful tool in and of itself. The


28 Ibid., II, p. 261.
prevailing view was that if a drawing was associated with a major painting by an artist, then it was perforce by the master commissioned to paint the picture.

Since the 1880s the prevailing view has been that all that we see in the final products produced by Raphael and his assistants comes from the mind of Raphael if not from his hand.29 But among the scholars who have addressed the problem of the workshop structure directly there have been a variety of approaches. I shall try to lay out as clearly as possible the positions of the major scholars who have dealt with the structure of Raphael’s workshop during his years in Rome.

The first of Oskar Fischel’s catalogues of Raphael’s drawings appeared in 1898 in the form of an annotated hand list with Fischel’s attribution at the end of each entry.30 Once again, all the truly creative design drawings, as opposed to copies or variants, were attributed to Raphael. In 1913, the first volume of a true catalogue raisonné appeared.31 Over the next twenty-eight years seven more volumes were published. The catalogue covered the span in Raphael’s career up to the completion of the Stanza della Segnatura. So, most of the problematic late drawings were not included. This catalogue was

29 A few of the major monographs on Raphael will illustrate this point. All these authors take the position that Raphael was responsible for conceiving of the works he and his shop made. This argument is usually not made explicitly; rather it is made by passing over the subject of the ideation of works in the shop in silence and discussing all the works as if they are by Raphael, in both execution and conception. This approach is followed by Eugène Müntz, Raphael: His Life, Work, and Times [Paris, 1882], trans. Walter Armstrong (London, 1888); Oskar Fischel, Raphael [1948], trans. Bernard Rackham (London, 1964); Roger Jones and Nicholas Penny, Raphael (New Haven and London, 1983), and many others.

30 Oskar Fischel, Raphaels Zeichnungen: Versuch einer Kritik der bisher veröffentlichten Blätter (Strasburg, 1898).

31 Oskar Fischel, Raphaels Zeichnungen, 8 vols. (Berlin, 1913-41).
completed by Konrad Oberhuber in 1972, in a volume that is discussed below for chronological reasons. Fischel, in his monograph on Raphael’s paintings published in 1948, discussed drawings in much the same way as had his nineteenth-century predecessors.\(^\text{32}\) He assumed that all the important sheets for the major paintings were by Raphael himself, an attitude that was evident in his first catalogue of the drawings from fifty years earlier.

Frederick Hartt, in his monograph on Giulio Romano, was one of the first scholars to break the model of simply assuming that everything executed by Raphael’s shop was designed by Raphael.\(^\text{33}\) Hartt attributed as many of the drawings from the late Roman period of Raphael’s career as possible to Giulio.\(^\text{34}\) He assigned entire classifications of drawings to Giulio based not on style, but on function, including, “studies of nude or summarily draped figures, single or in groups, done from models posed for known compositions of the later Raphael.”\(^\text{35}\) He was trying to build a case for Giulio as an almost independent subcontractor operating within the workshop and wanted to use particular types of drawings as evidence that Giulio’s role was both specific and central to the shop’s functioning. Oddly, given the expansive nature of Giulio’s role in Hartt’s scenario, Hartt reserved to Raphael the process of inventing compositions in their earliest stages. He even wrote of “summary indications” of compositions so brief that

\(^{32}\) Fischel, *Raphael.*


\(^{34}\) Hartt, *Giulio Romano,* pp. 15-17.

\(^{35}\) Ibid., p. 17.
they are “scrawls” which were then used by Giulio to create sketches from life upon which the final compositional sketches, also often attributed to Giulio, were based. In this way, Hartt created two great artists where only one had existed in the previous literature. He construed Raphael’s role as that of the great inventive genius in full command of his powers of conception, but too busy with other tasks to execute any of his own paintings or even the sketches upon which they were based. He considered Giulio the great court painter of the next generation, able to do everything but prevented from inventing new compositions by Raphael’s role as master and head of the shop. Hartt attributed Giulio’s status in Raphael’s shop to Giulio’s youth, on the basis that at age sixteen Giulio had been too young to be given officially the responsibilities Raphael assigned to him once he was a little older. Hartt considered the demarcation point age seventeen, when he opined that a precocious artist might well have been allowed to design compositions on his own.36 Likewise he noticed, but did not deal with the fact, that Giulio is not mentioned in relation to his production as an artist in any document from Raphael’s lifetime. But the biggest question he left open was how the shop managed to operate with an absent master and a teenager in charge. This last issue is probably why Hartt assigned the important inventive work, the intellectual heavy lifting of artistic production, to Raphael.

S.J. Freedberg also reserved all the inventive work to Raphael.37 But he held more to the traditional line of art historians by calling the contribution of the shop

36 Ibid., p. 13.

“mechanical.” Freedberg saw the shop’s production as having a negative impact on the style of the painting produced in the last years of Raphael’s life. In his analysis, all that was good in the late style of Raphael came from Raphael and all that was bad derived from the workshop members. He even claimed that the styles of the members of the shop represented a “dissolution of the classical style” that had characterized Raphael’s painting before the rise to prominence of various members of his shop.

The next major statement on Raphael’s way of working came in the form of two chapters in *The Complete Works of Raphael* edited by Mario Salmi. Alessandro Marabottini contributed a long chapter on Raphael’s coworkers in the last years of his life in Rome. His ideas about the way the workshop functioned were not at all innovative. He reserved all creative activity to Raphael and concentrated on identifying the contributions of the various workshop members in the execution of Raphael’s designs. He did discuss many of the late drawings, but always attributed creative designs to Raphael with two notable exceptions. He attributed a group of black chalk studies for


39 “All these processes we have described as successive to Raphael’s faulting of classicism participate, however, in a generic dissolution of the synthesis of classical style, and they prepare, within the body of the last phase of this style, the groundwork of the classicistic Mannerism that would, after Raphael’s death, so rapidly replace it,” Ibid., p. 270. Notice that the final death of classical painting in Rome requires that Raphael die first.


The Fire in the Borgo to Giulio Romano,\textsuperscript{42} and a group of red chalk studies for the Loggia di Psiche in the Villa Farnesina to Giovanni Francesco Penni.\textsuperscript{43} Marabottini’s chapter is followed by one on the drawings by Anna Forlani Tempesti.\textsuperscript{44} She discussed and catalogued most of the pre-Roman and early Roman drawings. But she passed over in silence almost all of the problematic drawings from the later Roman years, perhaps because of their presence of Marabottini’s chapter in the same volume.

Konrad Oberhuber, like Freedberg and most other earlier scholars, also considered Raphael to have been the sole guiding force behind all that was good in the shop style of the late period.\textsuperscript{45} In his completion of Oskar Fischel’s \textit{catalogue raisonné} of Raphael’s drawings, his attributions paralleled those of Paul Joannides\textsuperscript{46} and Luitpold Dussler (who did not make any sweeping statements about the way the shop worked and so is not included here). In a 1999 exhibition catalogue Oberhuber claimed that virtually all the drawings that survive are by Raphael himself, thereby rendering moot any discussion of the origins of style or invention in the workshop. He attributed drawings to Raphael that have been given to other artists by every single scholar of the twentieth

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., pp. 223-226.

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., pp. 238-247.

\textsuperscript{44} Anna Forlani Tempesti, “The Drawings,” in Ibid., pp. 303-428.


\textsuperscript{46} Joannides’s volume will be discussed subsequently.
century.\textsuperscript{47} He claimed that drawings for minor programs in ancillary spaces in the Vatican were by Raphael.\textsuperscript{48} This approach is a little like the other side of the Hartt coin. If Hartt wanted to build up Giulio into a major figure very early, Oberhuber intended to banish the workshop to virtual nonexistence by claiming that its members made nothing. He also ignored major problems with his own approach. He did not explain, for example, why the Duke of Mantua was so desperate to hire Giulio, the most important artist in Raphael’s shop if that artist had never produced anything before Raphael’s death.\textsuperscript{49} Oberhuber claimed that he based his argument solely on the evidence of the drawings, which he attributed to Raphael in virtually every example relating to any project associated with Raphael and his followers in Rome.

John Shearman took a more strictly historical approach than any scholar had before him. He looked at the entire body of evidence and tried, for the first time in the

\textsuperscript{47} An example is the set of twelve drawings now in Chatsworth of standing figures of the Apostles. Two of these sheets were included in the exhibition and were attributed to Raphael along with the other ten. They have not been attributed to Raphael since Carl Ruland did so in 1876 in his catalogue of the Raphael drawings in the Royal Library at Windsor (Carl Ruland, \textit{The Works of Raphael Santi da Urbino as Represented in the Raphael Collection in the Royal Library at Windsor Castle} (London, 1876), p. 233). See Oberhuber and Gnann, \textit{Roma e lo stile classico}, 15 and 18. For a summary of the aftermath of Oberhuber’s exhibition see Linda Wolk-Simon, “He Says, She Says: Giulio Romano’s Early Graphic Oeuvre and the Fine Art of Attribution,” \textit{Quaderni di Palazzo Te}, new series, 8 (2000): 20-33 and by the same author, “Raphael Drawings, Pro-Contra,” in Marcia Hall, ed., \textit{The Cambridge Companion to Raphael} (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 207-219.

\textsuperscript{48} An example is a drawing of Pan and Syrinx now in the Louvre (inv. no. 4035). This drawing is for the stufetta of Cardinal Bibbiena and had not been attributed to Raphael before. See Oberhuber and Gnann, \textit{Roma e lo stile classico}, 47.

\textsuperscript{49} For other problems in his methodology, see chapter 5 below.
scholarship on Raphael, to address directly the question of how the shop functioned.\textsuperscript{50}

He considered the documents, the demands on Raphael’s time, the style shifts in works produced by the shop, the attribution of individual drawings. In the end he came to much the same conclusion as other scholars before him, “While Raphael was a very pragmatic artist, he was not systematic. Nevertheless, he followed one natural principle: that the inventions at all costs should be his. Otherwise, how can he be master in his own workshop? At some later point, he could subcontract or delegate some of the definitive work at an assistant.”\textsuperscript{51} Unfortunately, Shearman never explored further the intriguing possibility he admitted in the last sentence.

That Raphael reserved the invention of compositions to himself was again cast as the initial presumption, repeating that it is only “natural,” the same attitude taken by all scholars who have looked at the issue. Shearman’s presumptions gained added authority because he was the first scholar to consider all the different types of evidence in a systematic way. But since Shearman never wrote a unified monograph on Raphael, his complete view of all the evidence of the drawings is difficult to pin down. His opinions about individual drawings are spread out in dozens of articles and book chapters published over the course of forty years.\textsuperscript{52}


\textsuperscript{51} Shearman, “The Organization,” p. 47.

Paul Joannides did look at all the drawings and considered the implications of the attribution of each.\textsuperscript{53} Yet he did not evaluate other evidence such as the documents and historical circumstances for individual commissions. In this way his approach is not unlike Hartt’s. Except where Hartt found evidence for Giulio’s profound impact on the shop, Joannides concluded that Raphael always retained absolute creative control. He characterized the “‘studio’ years” of 1514-18, when the Stanza dell’Incendio and the Psyche Loggia in the Villa Farnesina were produced, as the low point in the shop’s output. He even went so far as to call the paintings of the Incendio, save for the \textit{Fire in the Borgo} which he saw as being entirely the work of Raphael, something of a failure, concluding that Raphael never again made the mistakes he made there: “The overall result has many weaknesses of design as well as of execution, and Raphael nowhere subsequently abdicated personal responsibility so completely, though it remains inexplicable that he did not correct the more glaring errors in his pupils’ work.”\textsuperscript{54}

Although Oberhuber, Shearman, and Joannides each had his own particular approach to Raphael and his shop, none made a definitive statement about the way the shop operated, taking into account all the documents and drawings as well as the

\begin{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{53} Paul Joannides, \textit{The Drawings of Raphael, with a Complete Catalogue} (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1983), pp. 23-25.

\end{flushleft}
historical circumstances surrounding each. Joannides still may undertake such a book. However, the sort of holistic approach that considers all the evidence presented in this dissertation is the first effort along these lines. I have decided to attempt it because of the lacunae in earlier scholars’ evaluation of the drawings and because it seems to offer the best chance to determine how Raphael’s Roman workshop operated.

The scholar to consider the problem of Raphael’s workshop most recently is Bette Talvacchia. In a short essay she approached the issue in terms of many different types of resources deployed by the master in order to complete a large amount of commissions in a short amount of time. She deemed Raphael a sort of master builder orchestrating men and materials but rarely doing all the work himself. While she reserved to Raphael all inventiveness in creating the compositions of the paintings, she argued that Raphael turned the necessity of using collaborators into a virtue. According to Talvacchia’s assessment, Raphael used collaborators in a way that created the best possible result, a better outcome in some cases that Raphael could have achieved on his own, “My contention is that Raphael turned the necessity of collaboration into an impetus for innovation, both in terms of the way his shop functioned, as well as the style of the finished product.” In other words, Raphael knew that, if he turned over a particular painting to Giulio, he was going to get a painting that bore the unmistakable personal style of Giulio. And this, according to Talvacchia, is what he wanted and why he organized his shop in the way he did.


56 Ibid., p. 167.
In a recent monograph on Raphael Talvacchia examined both the problem of the late drawings and the issue of how Raphael worked with his assistants separately but in greater detail than she had in her earlier essay.\textsuperscript{57} Certain drawing techniques and a flexible assignment of roles within the shop allowed the master to complete more work and bring more of his ideas to fruition than he ever could have using the traditional techniques that he employed earlier in his career. Yet, she always reserved the ideation of the work, the \textit{concetto} to use the term for this process that she favored, to Raphael alone. As she stated, “As his art progressed, Raphael increasingly relied upon his aptitude for virtuoso drawing, a skill put to use both for rigorous analysis of compositional problems and to establish his idea or \textit{concetto}, which would give rise to the work of art.”\textsuperscript{58} This process, according to Talvacchia, always originated with Raphael. She saw the master turning over responsibility to assistants only to carry the ideas through to completion. She did admit that Raphael was less involved in some projects than others. The Loggia di Raffaello and the Loggia di Psiche in the Farnesina are two that she singled out as having been given over to the workshop at an early stage in the process.\textsuperscript{59} She did not deal with the Stanze as a direct part of the discussion of the role of the assistants in the work.

What is significant here is that, while she went further than any other scholar in saying that the style evident in the shop’s late production was intentional and the result of the deliberate use of the shop members by Raphael to achieve particular ends, she still


\textsuperscript{58} Ibid., p. 158.

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., pp. 190-202.
reserved the ideation, the process of invention, to the master. This dissertation will argue that Raphael went further than Talvacchia claims. He allowed his assistants, especially Giulio, to design paintings. The drawings will be examined according to their functions. In the drawings by Giulio and Penni, we can see their minds as well as the hands.

There have also been a few recent monographs which each examined some portion of the Vatican commission in isolation. These include two books by Joachim W. Jacoby on the Stanze dell’Incendio. Jacoby does attribute certain parts of the decoration of this room to Raphael’s workshop and discusses Giulio and Penni’s participation. But he does not make an overall statement about how the shop functioned over the entire sweep of years from 1512 to Raphael’s death. Flavia Dietrich –England has undertaken a study of the dado of the Stanze d’Eliodoro. But once again she does not address the question of the shop. This is an iconographic study of dado of this room. There are also recent publications on the Loggia di Psiche in the Villa Farnesina that make reference to the role of the workshop in that project. But these studies once again don’t present a synthetic approach to understanding how the design process worked.

Even the book chapter by Bruno Marocchini and Fabio Piacentini discussed only the

---


painting of the Loggia and examined no drawings, relying instead on small details of the frescoes to assign tasks to various workshop assistants.

A word should be said about the most important catalogues raisonnés of Raphael’s drawings. These are the places where the greatest amount of stylistic evidence for the shop’s functioning has been brought together, although these monographs often contain only the most cursory statements about the shop’s functioning. Oskar Fischel’s great corpus of Raphael drawings never reached the later Roman years. Forlani Tempesti’s essay and catalogue ignored the more troubling aspects of the late Roman work. Oberhuber, in his continuation of Fischel, characterized the workshop in a short statement, claiming that it functioned under the direct control of Raphael. His catalogue left it to the reader to piece together a picture of workshop practice based on individual attributions. Joannides’s catalogue did the same. But neither Oberhuber nor Joannides marshals all the evidence from the drawings to draw a carefully substantiated conclusion about the workshop’s functioning.

Conclusion:

Taken together, the methods and conclusions of all these scholars indicate that the view of Raphael’s relationship with his assistants and collaborators has not changed substantially since Vasari reserved all the great works of Raphael’s Roman career to the

---


66 Joannides, *The Drawings of Raphael*. 
mind and hand of the master himself. What is needed is a comprehensive overview of all the documents and drawings in order to discover how the workshop functioned. This dissertation aims to fill that lacuna in the historiography of Raphael’s career. As a result of my study of the drawings and their relationship to commissions awarded Raphael in the Vatican Stanze, I shall argue that the shop functioned in two modes. Sometimes Raphael used his workshop to assist him, while in other situations he entrusted various workshop members to take on the role of semi-independent collaborators. He made these decisions depending on the project and how much of the ideation or the execution he intended to carry out himself. In some instances like the Loggia, Raphael used Giulio as an independent subcontractor. In other later commissions, Raphael treated Giulio as an assistant whose job it was to execute his designs. But even then, for example, in the Stanza dell’Incendio, Raphael allowed Giulio to do some of the fundamental design work. Raphael’s choices seem to have been demand-driven. He thought and acted like a entrepreneur, deploying all the resources available to him to achieve his goals as quickly as possible while still maintaining a high level of quality.

**Explanatory Note:**

Throughout the dissertation, at the first mention of each drawing, the accompanying note will contain a brief attribution history consisting of the standard catalogue, if there is one, of the collection in which the drawing is housed, followed by the most significant *catalogues raisonnés* using the following abbreviations:


Unless otherwise indicated, citations are to catalogue numbers. In each case the attribution given there follows in parentheses. “R” stands for “Raphael.” The names of other artists are given in short form: Giulio, Penni, etc. A question mark after the attribution indicates that the author of the catalogue was not certain about the attribution, not that the present author was not sure of the cataloguer’s intentions. If the author did not address the issue of attribution, no attribution will be indicated here.
Chapter 2: Before Rome (1483-1508) and the Stanza della Segnatura (1508-11)

Raphael encountered a complex situation when he arrived in Rome in the summer or fall of 1508 to work in the Stanze on the third level of the Apostolic Palace in the Vatican.¹ The Stanze were being decorated so that they might become the new state apartments of Pope Julius II, who had moved to these rooms from the Borgia Apartments on the second level of the palace before November 1505. The renovation of the papal bedchamber and other associated rooms took place while the Pope was away in Bologna from August 26, 1506, to March 28, 1507.² After the Pope’s return to Rome, he ordered the redecoration of the suite’s semipublic rooms, now referred to as the Stanze. Painters at work in the rooms included Pietro Perugino, Sodoma, Johannes Ruysch, and Luca Signorelli.³ Raphael’s initial role in the collaboration seems to have been to paint part of the Stanza della Segnatura, the middle of the three smaller rooms in the suite, with Sodoma and Ruysch. Sometime during 1509 the project for the Stanza della Segnatura, and possibly for the entirety of the remainder of the Stanze, seems to have devolved to Raphael and his shop.

¹ For the date of Raphael’s arrival in Rome see John Shearman, Raphael in Early Modern Sources: 1483-1602, 2 vols. (New Haven, 2003), docs. 1508/1 and 1509/1, which place Raphael in Florence on April 21, 1508 and in Rome on January 13, 1509.


During his first few years in Rome Raphael’s working method was very much like that of the workshops of Umbria and Tuscany in the late Quattrocento, such as the shop of Perugino in which he may have trained. From 1508 until 1511, when the main scenes in the Stanza della Segnatura were completed, Raphael was mainly engaged with the frescoes in this room and a few panel paintings including some major altarpieces. The drawings reveal a shop headed by a single master who, once he had secured a commission, invented the designs to be used and then proceeded to work them up in a series of compositional and single and group figure studies until he was ready to prepare a full-scale cartoon to be transferred onto the wall or panel. At this point, his assistants prepared the surface for painting and the pigment to be used. They may have also done some of the other more mundane tasks that were indispensable to the creation of a major painting, such as prickling the cartoon for transfer and pouncing the design. Raphael, as head of the shop, painted at least the main figures. Following traditional practice, Raphael allowed assistants to participate in the painting’s execution only after they had worked many years in his shop learning to imitate his style so closely that an observer would not be able to tell the assistant’s hand from his.

Beginning around the year 1514 there was a fundamental change in the Raphael shop. As circumstances at the Papal court changed, Raphael’s time was taken up with duties other than making paintings for the Pope’s rooms. The circumstances surrounding these changes will be discussed in the next chapter. Suffice it to say here that the enormous increase in Raphael’s personal and courtly responsibilities, and the activities of the shop as a whole, beginning in the summer of 1514 initiated a gradual change in the way in which the commissions in the Vatican Stanze were carried out. After 1514,
Raphael began to share with his collaborators in his workshop all of the major responsibilities for the production of paintings, including their design and execution. The evidence for this new procedure is found in the surviving drawings that change radically, beginning at this time. This appears to have been a unique situation in an art world that valued above all the hand of the master and required that master to be responsible for inventing the designs produced in his shop. All of the projects commissioned to Raphael are affected to some degree by this infusion of the hands and inventive power of artists other than Raphael. These include, at one extreme, the cartoons for the Sistine tapestries in which the master seems to have taken a sustained and comprehensive role to, at the other extreme, the Vatican Loggia on the third level of the Apostolic Palace, in which Raphael’s participation is barely detectable at all. Other commissions, such as the Psyche Loggia for the Farnesina, the Spasimo di Sicilia, the Transfiguration, and many others, can be seen as distributed along a “continuum of participation” by Raphael, with the master more involved in some projects and less involved in others.

**Raphael and Giovanni Santi**

Raphael’s solution of turning over more and more responsibility for the invention and design stages of large-scale commissions was perhaps not as unusual as it might first appear. There were some experiences in his past that may have suggested this solution to managing an expanding workload. Raphael’s mode of production in Rome tends to be seen in light of his Florentine period. After all, prior to coming to Rome he was in Florence for four years, beginning in the fall of 1504. It is safe to say that Raphael,
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4 Vincenzo Golzio, *Raffaello nei documenti, nelle testimonianze dei contemporanei e*
whose portraits and easel-size panels of the Madonna or Holy Family were popular enough among the Florentine aristocracy, never “caught on” among Florentine civic or ecclesiastic patrons of major public projects. But there were important experiences before his arrival in Florence, in the earliest phase of his career that could have prepared the way for Raphael’s working method in Rome, during what would turn out to be the final stage of his career.

Raphael was born in Urbino in 1483. His father, Giovanni Santi, was a painter of some reputation attached to the Montefeltro court in that city. Raphael’s first training was in his father’s shop. Giovanni died on August 1, 1494 when his son was only eleven years old. The earliest documented commission Raphael received was on December 10, 1500 for the altarpiece of St. Nicholas of Tolentino for the chapel of Andrea Barlongio in Sant’Agostino in Città di Castello. In this document, Raphael is described as “magister” and was therefore, at age seventeen, already an independent master. Nothing is known about Raphael’s activities during the six years between 1494 and 1500. After his father’s death, he is mentioned in two documents of 1494 that deal with the wills of his maternal grandparents. In the earlier of these, dated August 8, 1494, he is described

\[nella\ \textit{letteratura\ del\ suo\ secolo}\ (\text{Vatican\ City,}\ 1936),\ pp.\ 9-10.\ \text{This\ letter\ may\ not\ be\ authentic.}\ \text{See\ below,\ note\ 15.}\]

\[5\ \text{See\ Ranieri\ Varese,}\ \textit{Giovanni\ Santi}\ (\text{Florence,}\ 1995).\]

\[6\ \text{Raphael\ shared\ this\ commission\ with\ the\ painter\ Evangelista\ da\ Pian\ di\ Mileto,\ another\ Urbinate,\ who\ is\ listed\ after\ Raphael\ and\ described\ as\ “magister.”}\ \text{See\ Shearman,}\ \textit{Raphael\ in\ Early\ Modern\ Sources},\ \text{doc.\ 1500/2.}\ \text{The\ surviving\ fragments\ of\ this\ panel\ are\ now\ in\ Naples,\ Brescia,\ and\ the\ Louvre.}\ \text{See\ Luitpold\ Dussler,}\ \textit{Raphael:\ A\ Critical\ Catalogue\ of\ his\ Pictures,\ Wall-Paintings\ and\ Tapestries}\ [\text{Munich,}\ 1966],\ \text{trans.}\ \text{Sebastian\ Cruft}\ (\text{London\ and\ New\ York,}\ 1971),\ \text{pp.}\ 1-3\ \text{and\ Roger\ Jones\ and\ Nicholas\ Penny,}\ \textit{Raphael}\ (\text{New\ Haven\ and\ London,}\ 1983),\ \text{pp.}\ 9-12.}\]
as “pupillo et filio ol. Joannis Sancti.”\(^7\) His guardian was his paternal uncle Bartolomeo, a priest who was involved in litigation with Raphael’s stepmother, Bernardina.

Documents from 1495, 1497, and 1499 regarding this proceeding name Raphael as a son of Giovanni but do not indicate whether Raphael was in Urbino during these years.\(^8\) A final document dated May 13, 1500 describes Raphael as absent from Urbino.\(^9\) It is possible that he had already left for Città di Castello. Save for the use of the word *pupillo* in the 1494 document, when Raphael was eleven years old, none of the available information sheds any light on Raphael’s training as an artist.

**Raphael and Perugino**

Vasari created a myth about Raphael’s origins that does not fit the available evidence.\(^10\) He claimed that Raphael began his training with his father, a fact borne out by the document from a week after Giovanni’s death in which the boy is described as “pupil.” According to Vasari, when Giovanni realized that he had no more to teach his son, he resolved to place him with the best painter of the day, Pietro Perugino. He went to Perugia and, after waiting for Perugino to return from Rome, became friends with him and then asked that he train his son. Giovanni then returned to Urbino to bring Raphael, after a tearful farewell from his mother, to Perugia where he learned to imitate Perugino’s

\(^{7}\text{Shearman, *Raphael in Early Modern Sources*, docs. 1494/5 and 1494/6.}\)

\(^{8}\text{Ibid., docs. 1495/1-1499/1.}\)

\(^{9}\text{Ibid., doc. 1500/1.}\)

style so perfectly that telling their works apart was impossible.

Since there is clearly a tremendous stylistic affinity between Perugino and Raphael during this period, Vasari’s tale must have some basis in fact. Many of Raphael’s earliest altarpieces are so close in style to Perugino that the two artists are close to indistinguishable. An obvious example is Raphael’s *The Betrothal of the Virgin* (*Sposalizio*) in Milan (fig. 1).\(^{11}\) This painting is very similar in style as well as composition to Perugino’s altarpiece of the same subject now in Caen (fig. 2). The two pictures were both finished in 1504. Both paintings share a certain stiffness and formality in the figures as well as the way the figures are arranged in tight groups close to the picture plane. There is also a generic quality to the faces, particularly those of the females, in both paintings. All the female figures in both works share a sweetness of expression that is common to both painters in this period.

Yet, despite the close stylistic relationship between the two painters, some details of Vasari’s account are surely false. Raphael’s mother had died in 1491, and so could not have been present when Raphael left his parents’ house.\(^{12}\) The tale that Vasari tells is designed to make his father, Giovanni Santi, appear to be a man of intelligence (“buono ingegno”) and therefore, since he was not a good painter (“pittore non molto eccellente”), a worthy and noble ancestor to the great Raphael.\(^{13}\) It also links Raphael to Perugino, one of the most important painters of the end of the fifteenth century, and the head of a
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\(^{12}\) Shearman, *Raphael in Early Modern Sources*, doc. 1491/1, p. 52.

\(^{13}\) Vasari/Milanesi, IV, p. 316.
permanent workshop in Florence from the early 1470s. Perugino was, however, an
Umbrian and an outsider to Vasari’s beloved Florence and therefore not praised as highly
as some Tuscan artists. He did not establish a workshop in Perugia until 1502, after
Raphael was an independent master. There is no indication that Raphael was in
Florence before October 1, 1504. On this date, Giovanna Felicia Feltria della Rovere,
sister of the reigning Duke of Urbino, Guidobaldo I, wrote a letter of recommendation on
Raphael’s behalf to Pier Soderini, Gonfaloniere of the Florentine Republic. In this
letter Giovanna stated that Raphael had determined to spend some time in Florence
studying (“ha deliberato stare qualche tempo in Fiorenza per imparare”). This would
hardly have been necessary had Raphael already spent time in a major workshop in
Florence. Vasari’s highly embellished tale may reflect facts known to him, but now lost,
about a formal relationship between Perugino and Raphael. Or it may be pure fiction
invented by Vasari to explain the close stylistic affinity between the two painters.

Raphael’s documented commissions during the first four years of the sixteenth
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14 Rosaria Mencarelli, “The Role of Drawings and Compositional Arrangements in
Perugino’s Work,” in Joseph Antenucci Becherer, et al., Pietro Perugino: Master of the
Italian Renaissance, exh. cat. (Grand Rapids, MI, 1997), p. 68.

15 Golzio, Raffaello nei documenti, pp. 9-10. This letter may not be authentic. See
Shearman, Raphael in Early Modern Sources, doc. F7. Shearman, following many 19th-
century scholars, does not believe the letter is authentic because it contains passages
that make it clear that the letter writer had consulted Vasari.

16 On the stylistic relationship between Perugino and Raphael, see most recently Rudolf
Hiller von Gaertringen, Raffaels Lernerfahrungen in der Werkstatt Peruginos (Munich,
1999) and idem, “Nuove ipotesi sulla formazione di Raffaello nella bottega del
Perugino,” Accademia Raffaello: Atti e studi (n.s. 2006, no. 2): 9-44; Kim E. Butler,
“Riconsiderando il primo Raffaello,” Accademia Raffaello: Atti e studi (n.s. 2006, no. 1):
63-87; and Tom Henry, “Nuove prospettive per Raffaello prima di Roma,” Accademia
century give us a clearer picture of his movements during these years. He seems never to have left the Marche and Umbria, working in Città di Castello, Urbino, Perugia, and possibly Fano. This is hardly the itinerary an ambitious young painter would have chosen had he already been in Florence. So, Raphael cannot have been attached to Perugino’s permanent workshop during the years between his father’s death and 1500, although it is not beyond the realm of possibility that Raphael did work with Perugino in some capacity during these years.

The closeness of Raphael’s earliest paintings to Perugino’s style and technique around the turn of the century indicates that Vasari’s story, although embellished in the details, is essentially correct. Sometime after Giovanni Santi died, Raphael may have gone to work for Perugino. Perhaps, after working in Urbino for a time with the court artists there, Raphael sought out Perugino, who was in Perugia between 1495 and 1500 fulfilling various commissions, including a large polyptych for the Benedictine monks of San Pietro and the frescoes in the Sala di Udienza in the Collegio del Cambio. Given Raphael’s young age, perhaps his guardian, Bartolomeo, placed him with Perugino. As no extant document links Raphael and Perugino, the likelihood is that the younger artist went to Perugia to seek employment in an informal capacity, and not as a pupil. That
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17 See Jones and Penny, *Raphael*, pp. 5-20.


he was associated with Perugino for a period of time seems beyond debate. Raphael’s earliest style, particularly in his large altarpieces from before his arrival in Florence, is heavily dependent on Perugino’s.20

Perugino seems to have organized his shop along the same lines as other successful and prolific painters of the period.21 As master he took responsibility for securing commissions, negotiating the terms of contracts, inventing compositions, organizing and overseeing production, assigning tasks, and producing the most important paintings and the most prominent figures in paintings in which other members of the shop participated.22 He also made virtually all of the preparatory drawings for a painting. These include, but are not limited to, compositional sketches, nude and clothed studies of

that Giovanni Santi had singled out Perugino for special praise in his rhymed chronicle celebrating the life of Duke Federico da Montefeltro. Raphael would have known from a very early age of his father’s high opinion of Perugino. See Bradshaw, “Pietro Perugino: An Annotated Chronicle,” p. 266.

20 These paintings include the Crucifixion and the Virgin and Child enthroned with Sts. John the Baptist and Nicholas of Bari in the National Gallery, London, the Coronation of the Virgin in the Vatican Museum, and the Marriage of the Virgin in the Brera, Milan.


individual figures, drapery studies, studies of heads and hands and other small details, *modelli*, drawings of complete compositions which act as guides to the assistants as they prepare the cartoon or as presentation drawings shown to the patron to give a clear idea of what the finished painting will look like, and cartoons themselves, full-scale drawings made to aid the transfer of the design to the wall or panel by means of pouncing or scoring.23 Unlike other heads of workshops, Perugino’s use of drawing was apparently rather limited. He seems to have drawn compositional sketches, studies of single figures, and studies of heads.24 There is also ample evidence that he used cartoons extensively, although only a few fragments have survived.

Perugino and his shop produced many panel paintings and frescoes during his long career. To facilitate this large production, Perugino reused single figures and entire compositions two, three, and even more times.25 The figure of Lucius Sicinius from the group of famous men in the Collegio del Cambio frescoes, to cite just one example, is repeated as the Archangel Michael in the *Assumption of the Virgin* in the Galleria


25 Ibid., pp. 73-78.
dell’Accademia in Florence, as the Archangel Raphael in the triptych of the *Virgin Adoring the Child* in the National Gallery, London, and in many other paintings by Perugino or his shop.\textsuperscript{26}

In addition to having long-term workshops in Florence and Perugia where he worked for years, Perugino would have set up temporary shops wherever he was engaged in a major project.\textsuperscript{27} He also would have had a variety of assistants and collaborators in each of these locations, who ranged in experience and responsibility from independent masters brought in to collaborate on a large project as an equal or nearly equal partner, to young boys, referred to as *fattorini*, employed to run errands and perform menial tasks. Sometimes painters would even subcontract entire paintings to other masters, often, but not always, former students.\textsuperscript{28} Some *fattorini*, depending on their abilities and their employment conditions, could expect to rise in the ranks, taking on ever more responsibility until they were eventually allowed to participate in the actual painting or even to create copies or variants of the master’s pictures for sale under the master’s name.\textsuperscript{29} During the last stages of training, an apprentice was often referred to as a *garzone* or *discepolo*. The distinction between these two titles is not clear. What does seem certain, however, is that a *garzone* was very far along in his training. There are

\textsuperscript{26} For a listing of some of the copies and variants of this figure by Perugino and by his students see Martin Davies, *National Gallery Catalogues: The Earlier Italian Schools* (London, 1986), p. 404.

\textsuperscript{27} See Wackernagel, *The World of the Florentine Renaissance Artist*, pp. 308-313 and Thomas, *The Painter’s Practice*, pp. 27-43.

\textsuperscript{28} Wackernagel, *The World of the Florentine Renaissance Artist*, p. 310 and Thomas, *The Painter’s Practice*, pp. 75-81.

\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., pp. 81-88.
even cases of an independent master being referred to as a *garzone* while in the employ of another artist.\textsuperscript{30} While conditions varied from shop to shop and from project to project, these titles and schemes of hierarchies seem to have been universal throughout Tuscany and central Italy in the last half of the fifteenth century. There is every reason to suppose that Perugino’s workshops, whether permanent or temporary, were organized similarly. This is the type of organization Raphael was exposed to as a young painter. It is also, we may safely assume, the type of organization that Raphael built in Florence, and, at least initially, in Rome.

**Raphael and Pinturicchio**

No matter what roles or tasks the assistants took on in the shop of the master artist, the development of new *invenzioni* was almost always reserved to the master. Or so almost all critics, beginning with Vasari, imply or claim explicitly in their rare discussions of the subject.\textsuperscript{31} According to them, if a Renaissance artist signed a contract,

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., pp. 81-88.

\textsuperscript{31} Vasari speaks of “invention” as an abstract concept at several points in the *Lives*. In the preface to the third part he names this idea as one of the qualities that separate the artists of the High Renaissance from those of earlier periods. Vasari/Milanesi, IV, pp. 8-9. In his coda on technique he once again expresses the importance of good “invention.” Vasari/Milanese, I, pp. 168-170, translated in Giorgio Vasari, *Vasari on Technique*, trans. Louisa S. Maclehose (New York, 1907), pp. 205-206. He gives numerous specific examples of the idea that the artist must invent new compositions throughout the *Lives*. A prominent example occurs in the life of Perugino. Vasari says that after Perugino returned to Florence after completing the Collegio di Cambio in Perugia in 1500, his style had become stale and the Florentines, including Michelangelo, ridiculed him for using the same figures over and over. Vasari/Milanesi, III, pp. 586-587. Vasari often privileges the act of invention of a composition over other aspects of artistic production such as style, color, or *disegno*. In his life of Pontormo, Vasari castigates the artist for adopting the “German manner” of Dürer while at the same time he praised him for copying Dürer’s “inventions.” Vasari/Milanesi, VI, pp. 266-267. This idea clearly has its origins
then that person conceived the image, regardless of who actually executed the work of art. In this interpretation, the master used the shop assistant as a tool to complete a task. The trainee had nothing to do with the *invenzione*. While there seems little reason to doubt that this scenario holds true for the vast majority of Renaissance works of art, there are rare cases in which we know that the master did not take the lead in conceiving the idea of the work of art.

One of the most prominent occurred early in Raphael’s own career when he was associated with Pinturicchio. Two of Pinturicchio’s works were designed, at least in part, by Raphael. In 1502 Pinturicchio was commissioned to paint eleven large-scale frescoes in the Piccolomini Library in the Cathedral of Siena. The ten on the interior of the library represent scenes from the life of Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, both before and after he was elected to the Papacy as Pope Pius II. Three surviving design drawings and perhaps four other sheets which may relate to the project, clearly show that Raphael, rather than Pinturicchio, was responsible for the *invenzione* of some of the scenes.\(^{32}\) Raphael’s involvement with this project was first mentioned by Vasari. He states that Raphael made all the sketches and cartoons for the scenes and he himself possessed some of the

---

sketches.\textsuperscript{33} And while the attributions of two of the \textit{modelli} (those in New York and Chatsworth discussed below) have been disputed in the past, Raphael’s authorship of the \textit{modello} in the Uffizi and the sketches has rarely been questioned.\textsuperscript{34} This is probably due at least in part to Vasari’s statement.

The first scene in the series depicts the young Aeneas departing for the Council of Basel in 1431 (\textbf{fig. 3}); the third represents the Emperor Frederick III crowning Aeneas with laurel in the Capitoline, the fourth records Aeneas’ ordination by Pope Eugenius IV, and the fifth, Frederick III being presented to Eleonora of Portugal in 1452 (\textbf{fig. 4}). There is a \textit{modello} by Raphael for the first fresco in the Uffizi (\textbf{fig. 5}).\textsuperscript{35} A figure study, also by Raphael, for the group of youths in the middle distance of the third fresco is in the Ashmolean Museum (\textbf{fig. 6}).\textsuperscript{36} And a second \textit{modello}, this one for the fifth fresco in the cycle and also by Raphael, is in the Morgan Library (\textbf{fig. 7}).\textsuperscript{37} These three sheets are proof that Raphael was inventing the compositions of at least three of the frescoes, numbers one, three, and five in the series.

The Uffizi and Oxford sheets, in particular, are unquestionably preparatory to the

\textsuperscript{33} Vasari/Milanesi, III, p. 525.


\textsuperscript{35} Florence, Uffizi 520E. Annamaria Petrioli Tofani, ed., \textit{Gabinetto disegni e stampe degli Uffizi: Inventario 1, Disegni esposti} (Florence, 1986), 520E (R); F62 (R); F-T34 (R); KMO29 (R); J56 (R).

\textsuperscript{36} Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 510. K.T. Parker, \textit{Catalogue of the Collection of Drawings in the Ashmolean Museum, II: Italian Schools} (Oxford, 1956), 510 (R); F63 (R); F-T33 (R); KMO62 (R); J58 (R).

\textsuperscript{37} New York, The Pierpont Morgan Library 1996.9. F65 (R); F-T34 (R); KMO28 (R); J59 (R).
paintings. There are many differences between the Uffizi *modello* and the finished painting. There are several elements in the painting that Raphael did not include in the drawing. These range from the prominent dog in the left foreground of the painting which is absent in the drawing, to differences in the costumes of the most prominent figures and in the town in the right distance, to the addition of a storm in the distance at the fresco’s left side which, despite being an important part of the narrative of the story, is not included in Raphael’s drawing. This storm, as the inscription below the scene tells us, drove Aeneas’ ship toward Libya. Indeed, despite the fact that the sheet is squared for transfer, the figure group takes up a much larger percentage of the picture surface in the drawing than in the painting. The figure study in Oxford for the scene of Aeneas’ coronation on the Capitoline speaks for itself in this regard. It is a fairly quick study for the group of young soldiers in the painting. But only three of the four figures on the sheet were used in the painting, where they are rearranged and wear more elaborate clothing. The Morgan drawing, although closer to the final composition than the Uffizi *modello*, is also by Raphael and also displays enough difference from the painting, especially in the costumes of the principal figures and the landscape, to indicate that it too is preparatory to the painting.

There are four other sheets that show a more tenuous connection either to the Piccolomini Library or to Raphael. These include an apparent *modello* at Chatsworth for the scene of Aeneas before Eugenius IV.\(^{38}\) This sheet is most often called a copy after Raphael and, while there are significant differences between the drawing and the

painting, the drawing does have the stiffness and lack of energy that often characterize a copy. Two sheets in the Louvre are connected to the commission by the presence on the verso of one sheet of a sketch for one of the painted putti that make up part of the fictive architectural frame for the Library’s narrative scenes. Two more of these putti are on the verso of the Ashmolean sheet. A last sheet is certainly by Raphael but cannot be connected to the Library. This is a drawing in the Uffizi that may be related to the horseman on the left of the other Uffizi drawing, the *modello* for the scene of the departure for Basel, thus suggesting that Raphael’s role began early in the design process when the final composition was far from settled.

The second of Pinturicchio’s projects that was at least partially designed by Raphael is the *Coronation of the Virgin* now in the Vatican Museum (fig. 8). The rectos of the two drawings in the Louvre show kneeling clergymen which seem to be for this painting (figs. 9 & 10). If the attribution to Raphael of these drawings is sustained, they indicate that Raphael’s work for Pinturicchio extended beyond the confines of the Piccolomini Library to an altarpiece.

The evidence of these few drawings seems to indicate that Raphael was employed by Pinturicchio, an artist thirty years his senior, to make original compositional designs

---


40 Florence, Uffizi 537E. Petrioli Tofani, *Gabinetto disegni e stampe degli Uffizi*, 537E (R); F60 (R); F-T36 (R); KMO30 (R); J57 (R).

for a major fresco cycle and perhaps for an altarpiece as well. This precocious accomplishment, achieved around Raphael’s twentieth year, was certainly not usual for the time. Nor has a satisfactory explanation been offered for why it happened. Art historians do not recognize Raphael’s production of designs for an older and more established artist, the man commissioned to carry out the work, as an extraordinary event. This may be because hindsight tells us that Raphael turned out to be the more important of the two artists. Indeed, within a decade of their collaboration, Raphael would literally supersede the older painter by painting the apartments of Julius II on the third level of the Vatican Palace above those of Alexander IV decorated by Pinturicchio. Employing a much younger or less experienced artist to invent visual compositions for commissions does not seem to have been a common practice for Pinturicchio or any artist of the fifteenth or sixteenth century, despite the fact that Pinturicchio was no stranger to collaboration. One of his earliest major commissions was as Perugino’s collaborator for the frescoes of the Journey of Moses and the Baptism on the walls of the Sistine Chapel in 1481-82.  

Throughout his career Pinturicchio made extensive use of a very active workshop. His most important mature works, aside from the Piccolomini Library, are the fresco decorations of the Borgia apartments, which are below the Stanze in the Vatican Palace, and the scenes from the life of the Virgin in the Baglioni Chapel in S. Maria Maggiore, Spello. For these commissions Pinturicchio made extensive use of workshop assistants to carry out the execution of his designs. Indeed, he seems to have painted very little of the Borgia apartments himself and managed to complete the extensive program, which

covers the upper parts of the walls in five rooms, in just two years, between 1492 and 1494. And like the ceiling at Spello, Pinturicchio seems to have had at least some help in Siena. The scene of the coronation of Aeneas as Pope Pius III on the outside wall of the library in the nave of the cathedral has been attributed to Pinturicchio with the collaboration of Peruzzi. And the assistance of collaborators has also been detected in some of the major scenes inside the library, such as the fresco depicting the presentation of Frederick III being presented to Eleonora of Portugal. So he, like most artists of the period, was able to use assistants in various capacities to achieve his goals. But Pinturicchio’s dependence on an assistant, or even an independent master painter as Raphael was in 1503, to design a major fresco or altarpiece is an innovation.

Pinturicchio was very busy from 1502 until 1504, the time of the initial phase of the Library’s commission. He seems to have been dividing his time between Siena and Perugia, and it is probably in the latter city that he came into contact with Raphael. Only after Pinturicchio settled in Siena permanently in 1504 did he begin the project of actually painting the scenes, a process which lasted for about four years. This slight delay in turning the designs made by Raphael into paintings could explain why Pinturicchio painted the frescoes himself. It may have been his intention to employ

---


assistants to do much of the actual painting, as he had done in the Borgia apartments. If this was the case, Pinturicchio may have intended that his role be something of a facilitator with the skills and knowledge to intervene in the process during the design and execution stages of the work. But his permanent move to Siena in 1504 allowed him to take over the painting of the frescoes himself. This hypothesis explains why Pinturicchio, a master thirty years older than Raphael, ended up executing frescoes designed by the younger artist.

This one example may signal the vast differences in priority and aesthetic judgment that separate us from the Renaissance. Recently some scholars have begun to reevaluate the history and criticism of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries that place a premium on the hand of the master and on new solutions to artistic problems. They are reassessing the premise that solutions, in order to be considered important, must lie along an evolutionary path of development from the primitive to the advanced, as has long been believed. It is so unusual that Raphael, only nineteen years old when the Piccolomini library was begun, was employed to design several of the major scenes that a modern historian might imagine that Raphael had been elevated above Pinturicchio. This was clearly not the case. Rather what we are witnessing may be a case of a thorny issue in the aesthetic judgment on the part of Renaissance viewers of a work of art hiding in plain sight. It may be that Raphael’s very status as a super-artist has caused us to misinterpret his very specific, and limited, role in Pinturicchio’s shop around 1502. He was a tool

---

used by the older painter to accomplish certain goals, namely the design of the first four or five monumental frescoes of the cycle inside the library. Pinturicchio’s judgment was what mattered most. He chose the young Raphael to prepare the designs and evaluated and changed Raphael’s conceptions, clearly seen in the differences between the drawings and the finished frescoes. Pinturicchio’s reputation was at stake, not Raphael’s. Even though Raphael invented new solutions to the design problems presented by the Piccolomini library commission, he should not be viewed as Pinturicchio’s master in this case any more than Raphael’s own students and shop assistants should be viewed as masters of their master years later in Rome.46

46 There is one other apparent contact between Raphael and another senior artist that might be worth at least mentioning in this context. In the Ashmolean Museum there is a drawing by Raphael of a group of soldiers that is certainly from the time Raphael is known to have been in Florence between 1504 and 1508, because the central figure is a variant of Donatello’s statue of St. George. (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 523. Parker, Italian Schools, 523 [R]; F87 [R]; F-T75 [R]; KMO165 [R]; J88 [R].) But there is also a pricked design for a head in profile on the sheet. Bambach has identified the design as a so-called “substitute cartoon,” and connected it to the Disputa and various other paintings by Raphael, such as the Expulsion of Heliodorus (Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop, pp. 286-289). But Tom Henry connected it to a figure emerging from a grave in the lower foreground of the Resurrection of the Flesh painted by Luca Signorelli in the Cappella Nuova in the Cathedral of Orvieto (“Signorelli, Raphael and a ‘Mysterious’ Pricked Drawing in Oxford,” Burlington Magazine 135 [1993]: 612-619). That a drawing by Raphael from around 1504-06 was placed on a sheet that already contained the substitute cartoon for the Signorelli painting in Orvieto which dates from 1499-1504 could mean that the two artists worked together at Orvieto with Raphael in the employ of Signorelli. It is not necessarily true that the sheet was transferred from Signorelli in Orvieto to Raphael in Florence (Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop, pp. 474-475, n. 33).

While contact between Raphael and Signorelli early in the younger artist=s career must for the time being remain highly speculative, it must be remembered that we know almost nothing about Raphael’s life and career before about 1500 and very little until he reached Rome in 1508. He can be placed in various cities at various times but there is no way to know if he worked for, or collaborated with, Perugino or Pinturicchio in Perugia or worked for, or collaborated with, Signorelli in Orvieto.
The Stanza dell Segnatura

It does not seem that Raphael employed *garzoni* or *discepoli* in Florence. He arrived in the city in late 1504 and departed for Rome in 1508. During this time, he worked almost exclusively on portraits, small religious pictures, and altarpieces, all on panel. There is no evidence that any other artist participated in these paintings. Raphael was certainly busy and would have employed *fattorini* to prepare panels, grind colors, make brushes, and do other chores, but he does not seem to have had any advanced students who could imitate his style well enough to be trusted with painting any part of his commissions.

We first hear of Raphael’s activity in Rome in a document that records a payment of 100 ducats on January 13, 1509, to him for work in the “painted rooms” of the Pope.\(^{47}\) The first of the painted rooms in which Raphael painted was the Stanza della Segnatura, the room that Julius II intended to use as his private library (fig. 11).\(^{48}\) These frescoes were begun sometime in 1508 and the main scenes were finished by 1511.\(^{49}\) There has

---

\(^{47}\) Shearman, *Raphael in Early Modern Sources*, doc. 1509/1, pp. 122-123.

\(^{48}\) On the use of these rooms on the third level of the Vatican Palace see Shearman, “The Vatican Stanze,” pp. 369-424.

been virtually universal agreement among critics since Vasari that the eight principal scenes on the vault are by Raphael. The decorative scheme and the nine smaller scenes including the central octagon with putti holding aloft the papal coat of arms are the work of Sodoma and date from 1508, before Raphael’s arrival. Similarly scholars agree that the Disputa (fig. 12), the Parnassus (fig. 13), the School of Athens (fig. 14), and the scene in the upper register of the so-called Jurisprudence wall which depicts the three cardinal virtues, Fortitude, Prudence, and Temperance (fig. 15), are all by Raphael’s own hand. The two scenes in the lower zone of the Jurisprudence wall, Pope Gregory IX Handing the Decretals to St. Raimund of Peñafores (fig. 16) and The Emperor Justinian Handing the Pandects to Trebonianus (fig. 17) have occasionally been attributed to Raphael’s shop, but they have more often been given to the master. An examination of the surviving drawings for the painted decorations of this room reveals that not only are all of the major paintings by Raphael’s own hand, but all of the inventions of the figures and compositions are also his.

Of the sixty-three sheets that survive, only three have ever been ascribed to any artist other than Raphael. Two of these drawings whose authorship is disputed are

---

50 Jones and Penny, Raphael, p. 56.


compositional studies for the two paintings in the lower zone of the Jurisprudence wall; the paintings themselves are not universally accepted as by Raphael. The third is a highly controversial drawing that appears to be for the south wall of either the Stanza della Segnatura, which is now the Jurisprudence wall, or for the south wall of the Stanza d’Eliodoro, which now contains the Mass at Bolsena. This sheet, which apparently depicts a miraculous event at a mass, is either a modello for an early project that was never executed or a copy of such a modello (fig. 18). The two other disputed drawings are for the fictive reliefs beneath the Parnassus fresco. These are a compositional sketch for Augustus Preventing the Burning of Virgil’s Books (fig. 19), which is to the right of the window, and a modello for Alexander the Great Placing the Works of Homer in the Sarcophagus of Achilles (fig. 20), which is to the left. These drawings, and the

53 Both Frankfurt, Städelisches Kunstinstitut 381r and 382. F255 and 256 (both R); F-T 128 (not R); KMO380 and 381 (both R); J255 and 256. Crowe and Cavalcaselle give the drawing for the Pope Gregory IX Handing the Decretals to St. Raimund of Peñafore (inv. no. 381r) to “Raphael (?)” and the one for the Emperor Justinian Handing the Pandects to Trebonianus (inv. no. 382) to “pupil of Raphael” (Crowe and Cavalcaselle, Raphael, vol. 2, p. 95). Anna Forlani Tempesti says the former of the two is not by Raphael without offering an alternate attribution (Anna Forlani Tempesti, “The Drawings,” in The Complete Works of Raphael, ed. Mario Salmi (New York, 1969), p. 423, n. 128).


55 Haarlem, Teylers Museum A56. Carel van Tuyll van Serooskerken, The Italian Drawings of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries in the Teyler Museum (Haarlem, 2000), 228 (R). F255 (school of R); F/O416 (R); KMO492 (R); J258 (R). Oxford, Ashmolean 570. Parker, Italian Schools, 570 (Penni?); F/O417 (R); J259 (Penni?).
paintings they plan, date from about 1513 to 1514 when the room was redecorated by Leo X and so do not speak to Raphael’s methods of production in his earliest days in Rome.\footnote{On the paintings see Dussler, \textit{Raphael}, pp. 76-77.}

The paintings and drawings that are securely attributed to Raphael’s own hand provide a clear picture of the way he went about organizing the production of the shop in Rome before the avalanche of other responsibilities necessitated a change in 1513/14. Of the fifty-eight sheets now under consideration, thirty are for the \textit{Disputa}, eight are for the \textit{School of Athens}, eleven are for the \textit{Parnassus}, eight are for the vault, and one is for two scenes in the window embrasure of the Jurisprudence wall. There are no drawings for the three cardinal virtues in the upper register of the Jurisprudence wall, the only part of this wall that is universally attributed to Raphael.\footnote{See Joannides, \textit{The Drawings of Raphael}, cat. nos. 197-259.} Raphael made all the drawings and painted all the frescoes with his own hand. These sheets indicate that Raphael’s workshop structure immediately after his arrival in Rome, a period when his activity was restricted to the decoration of the Segnatura, did not differ from the one he employed in Florence. The earliest Roman works outside of the Segnatura date from about 1511, the end of the period Raphael was at work in the room. These include the large engraving by Marcantonio Raimondi of \textit{The Massacre of the Innocents}, the \textit{Alba Madonna}, the \textit{Madonna di Loreto}, and the \textit{Madonna di Foligno}, all of which date from late in 1511 or 1512.\footnote{Luitpold Dussler, \textit{Raphael: A Critical Catalogue of his Pictures, Wall-Paintings and Tapestries} [Munich, 1966], trans. Sebastian Cruft (London and New York, 1971), pp. 35-36, 27-28, and 31-32.}
To discover the way Raphael worked up a composition, it will be most effective to examine selected examples of the drawings arranged according to purpose rather than to discuss the room one wall at a time. It has been suggested that, in order to make sure that the paintings created a visually unified whole, Raphael may have worked up the designs for the major frescoes more or less simultaneously. But given the larger number of sheets for the Disputa, and assuming that survival parallels production, it is clear that this fresco was the first to be painted and served as a test case for the others. And it should be noticed that as work progressed, Raphael became more economical in his use of drawings while still doing all of them himself.

The drawings for the Segnatura may be divided into broad categories. Compositional studies, both nude and clothed, are drawings that take in many figures or groups of figures in a single composition and may also include landscape or architectural settings. Studies of figure groups take in a smaller area of the total painting and fewer figures, most often in a cohesive grouping. Most numerous are studies of individual figures, such as the figure of Adam in the upper register on the left of the Disputa. Then there are studies of smaller details such as a piece of anatomy or drapery. The last step in the working up of a composition is the modello, a highly finished rendering of the entire composition. It is this last stage that was normally used to create the cartoon, the full-size drawing that was transferred to the painting surface. There are no modelli extant from the Segnatura, a fact that may be significant in and of itself. There are, however, two cartoons that survive. The cartoon of the entire lower section of the School of Athens,

including all the figures, is in the Ambrosiana in Milan (fig. 21), and a head of God the
Father, a small fragment of what must have a much larger cartoon taking in at least the
upper part of the Disputa, is in the Louvre (fig. 22). Raphael sometimes added yet
another step after the cartoon was complete. Occasionally he would transfer the design
of a head onto a new sheet of paper and rework the composition creating a so-called
“auxiliary” cartoon.61

There are more drawings for the Disputa than for any other painting by Raphael.
This may be an accident of survival. But if we assume that the drawings for the various
paintings survive in approximately the same percentages, then there were originally more
for this fresco than for the others. This may reflect the fact that this was the first fresco
that he painted in Rome and he wanted to be sure it would succeed. Raphael began to
work up the composition in a series of brush and wash drawings over either stylus or
black chalk or both. These compositional sketches take in large areas of the painting and
reflect multiple concerns such as lighting and coloristic effects as well as massing of
figures in the arched space. The earliest of these drawings may be the study for the left

60 Milan, Ambrosiana 126. F313 (R); F-T122 (R); KMO362 (R); J234 (R). Paris,
Louvre 3868. Cordellier and Py, Inventaire général, 138 (R); F303 (R); J 226 (R).

61 This is a somewhat problematic phrase. See Oskar Fischel, “Raphael’s Auxiliary
Raphael, pp. 36-38. The “substitute” cartoon is a different type of object. Unlike an
“auxiliary” cartoon, the paper often remains blank and is meant to carry only the pricking
and not a reworking of any part of the composition. This is done to preserve the cartoon
which would otherwise be destroyed during the transfer of the design to the painting
Drawings 30 (1992): 9-30; Bambach, Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance
Workshop, pp. 283-295.
half of the composition now at Windsor Castle (fig. 23). The provision in the drawing for a doorway to cut into the lower left of the painting, a doorway that is actually on the right, indicates that Raphael is thinking like an architect and created only half of the final composition in which to study the whole. There are other drawings that fall into this same category. But there is another kind of compositional study that reflects a later stage in the development of the painting. Two of these later studies, both for the lower left part of the Disputa and both in pen and ink over stylus, survive from the Segnatura (figs. 24 & 25). One in the British Museum is fairly close to the arrangement of figures in the painting except that the stance of the figure in the left foreground next to the balustrade is different and the figure in blue and green standing on the steps near St. Gregory is missing. The drawing in Frankfurt repeats basically the same composition as

---

62 Windsor, Royal Collection 12732. A.E. Popham and Johannes Wilde, *The Italian Drawings of the XV and XVI Centuries in the Collection of His Majesty the King at Windsor Castle* (London, 1949), 794 (R); Martin Clayton, *Raphael and his Circle: Drawings from Windsor Castle*, exh. cat. (London, The Queen’s Gallery, 1999), cat. no. 16 (R); F258 (R); F-T111 (R); KMO278 (R); J197 (R).

63 Chantilly, Musée Condé 45 (old inv. FR.VIII. 53). Dominique Cordellier and Bernadette Py, *Dessins italiens du Musée Condé à Chantilly II: Raphaël et son cercle*, exh. cat., Chantilly, Musée Condé (Paris, 1997), 6 (R); F260 (R); F-T112 (R); KMO282 (R); J199 (R). Windsor, Royal Collection 12733. Popham and Wilde, *The Italian Drawings*, 795 (R); Clayton, *Raphael and his Circle*, cat. no. 17 (R); F261 (R); KMO280 (R); J200 (R). Vienna, Albertina 4883 (SR 273). Veronike Birke and Janine Kertész, *Die italienischen Zeichnungen der Albertina*, 4 vols. (Vienna, 1992-97), 4883 (R); F305 (R); KMO346 (R); J227 (R). Oxford, Ashmolean 553r. Parker, *Italian Schools*, 553r (R); F311 (R); F-T147 (R); KMO347 (R); J228r (R).

64 London, British Museum 1900-8-24-108. Philip Pouncey and John A. Gere, *Italian Drawings in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum: Raphael and his Circle*, 2 vols. (London, 1962), 33 (R); F267 (R); F-T114 (R); KMO289 (R); J204 (R). Frankfurt, Städelisches Kunstinstitut 379. Lutz S. Malke, *Italienische Zeichnungen des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts aus eigenen Beständen*, exh. cat. (Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt, 1980), 76 (R); F269 (R); F-T114 (R); KMO290 (R); J205 (R).
the British Museum sheet, except all the figures are nude. This “nude study” may
indicate that these later compositional studies are the result of a long process that
included studies, often nude, for individual figures. There is a study of a nude man seen
from behind in the British Museum that is for the standing figure third from the left in the
Frankfurt drawing (fig. 26).65

So, the making of compositional studies took place at more than one stage of the
creation of the composition and the creation of figure studies, and group studies, took
place while the ideation of the entire composition was taking place. And just as different
types of compositional studies served different purposes, so too did different types of
figure studies serve different functions. A nude study like the one in the British Museum
for the figure on the left in the Disputa was clearly intended as an analysis of the
anatomy. It is interesting to note that while the British Museum nude is clearly for a later
stage in the development of the composition, this figure was not included in the final
painting. This indicates that Raphael expended time and effort making drawings that
seem to be from live models for important and prominent figures even before he settled
on the final disposition of those figures. Other single figure drawings were clearly made
to examine aspects of the fall of drapery, such as the study for Christ in Lille (fig. 27), or
lighting and coloristic effects, such as the St. Stephen in the Uffizi (fig. 28), both for the
upper register of the Disputa.66

---

(R); KMO288 (R); J206 (R).

66 Lille, Musée des Beaux-Arts 471. Barbara Brejon de Lavergnée, *Catalogue des
dessins italiens: Collections du Palais des Beaux-Arts de Lille* (Paris, 1997), 534 (R);
F289 (R); KMO314 (R); J212r (R). Florence, Uffizi 1342F. Annamaria Petrioli Tofani, ed.,
*Gabinetto disegni e stampe degli Uffizi: Inventario, Disegni di figura 2* (Florence,
It is often difficult to tell whether drawings such as these were created after the first stage of compositional studies or after the second, more finished, compositional studies. And indeed this ambiguity demonstrates that any categories classifying these drawings must be rather fluid. This is also the case with figure groups. Some, like a pen study at Lille for the figures to the left of the bottom tier of the Disputa (the same area in the Frankfurt and British Museum compositional studies), are clearly from early in the inventive process (fig. 29). Others parallel the finished painting so closely that they must be from relatively late in the process, such as a silverpoint drawing in Oxford for the two philosophers on the steps in the right middle distance of the School of Athens (fig. 30). It is also often difficult to locate studies for individual anatomical features, pieces of drapery, and other details in the inventive process. Many of these types of drawings for the Segnatura, however, are fairly close to the paintings and so would seem to be from late in the process. Two drapery studies, one brush and wash and the other black chalk, both in Oxford, for the figure in the lower left of the Disputa are fairly close to the final painting, but neither is an exact match (figs. 31 & 32). It would be hard to say which came first. The greater fluidity and sketchiness of the chalk study would seem to indicate that it is first. Yet this drawing is closer to the final painting than the wash drawing,

---

67 Lille, Musée des Beaux-Arts 447. Brejon de Lavergnée, Catalogue des dessins italiens, 533r (R); F266 (R); F-T109 (R); KMO285 (R); J201r (R).

68 Oxford, Ashmolean 550. Parker, Italian Schools, 551 (R); F308 (R); F-T120 (R); KNO351 (R); J231 (R).

69 Oxford, Ashmolean 544r and 545v. Parker, Italian Schools, 244r and 245v (both R); F275 and 281 (both R); KMO297 and 302 (both R); J223r and 218v (both R).
indicating that it may be later. Some detail studies demonstrate a fussiness and exactitude that clearly indicate that they come from the last stages of the inventive process. This is the case with a pen and ink study in Lille of the feet of Horace who stands on the far right of the *Parnassus* (fig. 33).\(^{70}\)

While there are no certain *modelli* for any of the paintings in the Segnatura, there is one possible *modello* for the lower left section of the *Disputa*. A drawing in Vienna has all the hallmarks of a *modello*; it is highly finished and includes details of architecture and drapery, as well all the lighting effects of the fresco (fig. 34).\(^{71}\) But differences in the drapery and stances of some of the figures, particularly the two prominent standing figures who wear blue in the painting, may indicate that this sheet should be considered a compositional study rather than a *modello*. The lack of *modelli* among the numerous drawings for the Segnatura’s scenes may tell us the most about Raphael’s working method. It is often assumed that the function of a *modello* was to demonstrate to the patron what the completed painting would look like.\(^{72}\)

There may be no *modelli* relating to frescoes in this first room because Raphael possibly obtained approval of his designs based on highly-finished compositional studies before he himself transferred the designs directly to the cartoon. And indeed the two cartoons, or parts of cartoons, that survive for the decoration of this room, the cartoon in

\(^{70}\) Lille, Musée des Beaux-Arts 446. Brejon de Lavergnée, *Catalogue des dessins italiens*, 538v (R); F242 (F); KMO367 (R); J236r (R).

\(^{71}\) Vienna, Albertina 224 (SR 270). Birke and Kertész, *Die italienischen Zeichnungen*, 224 (R); F273 (R); KMO295 (R); J222 (R).

\(^{72}\) Ames-Lewis, *Drawing in Early Renaissance Italy*, pp. 128-131.
Milan and the fragment in the Louvre, are by Raphael himself.73

There is one so-called auxiliary cartoon from the Segnatura. This is a drawing for
the head of the third standing muse to the right of Apollo in the Parnassus (fig. 35).74
This full-size black chalk study for the head of the muse third from Apollo on the right of
the painting is executed over pounce marks. This indicates that the full-size cartoon was
pricked for transfer and that the outlines of this head were pounced onto a new sheet of
paper. Raphael used this as the beginning point of a brand new drawing for this head. It
is this second version which was used to create the fresco. Raphael was apparently
willing to keep making changes to his compositions right up to the very last moment,
even after the final cartoon had been made. This attitude would serve Raphael well in the
coming years. As he turned over to other artists in his workshop more and more
responsibility for the design of important paintings, he needed a way to correct their work
at all stages of completion. The auxiliary cartoon, which Raphael was already using in
the in the Stanza della Segnatura, provided one more tool to make the process of revision
possible.

The picture that emerges from the many different types of drawings for the
Segnatura is of an artist who is used to doing by himself all of the inventive work and
execution of his commissions. Raphael could afford to be responsible single-handedly
during his early years in Rome. He neither attracted nor accepted patronage from outside
the Vatican until at least 1511 when the Segnatura was either completed or rapidly
drawing to a close. The situation had changed radically by the time he became fully

73 See note 60 above. A detailed study of the School of Athens cartoon can be found in
74 London, Private Collection. F253 (R); F-T127 (R); KMO378 (R); J245 (R).
immersed in his next major project for the Pope, the Stanza d’Eliodoro, which he and his shop painted between 1511 and 1514. By the time that project was winding down, Raphael was forced to call upon his pre-Roman experiences with Pinturicchio, and possibly with Perugino, to reorganize his method of working in all stages of the creation of a commission completely. This change is reflected not just in the finished painting but also in the surviving drawings. Just as the drawings for the Segnatura show us how Raphael worked when he first arrived in Rome, these drawings tell us a great deal about how the shop functioned after Raphael became a major figure on the Roman artistic landscape sought after by many patrons.
Chapter 3: The Stanza d’Eliodoro (1511-14)

The commission for the Stanza d’Eliodoro (fig. 36) seems to have followed directly upon the completion of the Stanza della Segnatura, although it is not known exactly when work was finished in one room or begun in the other.\(^1\) Two identical inscriptions painted in the window embrasures of the north and south walls in the Stanza della Segnatura state: “IVLIVS.II. LIGUR PONT MAX ANN CHRIST MDXI PONTIFICAT.SVI VIII”. In order to fall in the eighth year of Julius’ reign these must have been made between January 1 and November 25, 1511, as the latter date is the eighth anniversary of the Pope’s coronation.\(^2\) They do not, however, indicate that the painting was finished during this span of months. Work could have been finished in 1510 and the inscription not added until later. Indeed work could have continued into 1512.

The first indication of work in a second room of the Stanze is a report sent to Isabella d’Este in Mantua about the visit by Alfonso d’Este to the Vatican Palace. The report indicates that Alfonso saw the incomplete Sistine ceiling, but did not visit, “le

---


This reference to “the rooms” could mean that the second room was well underway. In any case there is an inscription similar to the two in the Segnatura in the window embrasure of the south wall which reads, “IVLIVS.II. LIGVR. PONT. .MAX. ANN CHRIST .M.D.XII. PONTIFICAT.SVI .VIII.”

So this inscription was placed in the Stanza d’Eliodoro between January 1 and November 25, 1512. The traditional date of 1511 for the completion of the Stanza della Segnatura and the beginning of work on the Stanza d’Eliodoro would then seem to be well justified.

The inscription in the window embrasure of the north wall of the Stanza d’Eliodoro states, “LEO.X.PONT MAX. ANN CHRIST M.D.XIII PONTIFICAT SVI.II”. The year 1514 and the second year of Leo’s reign overlap between March 19 and December 31, 1514. This inscription, like the others, does not indicate much about the dates of the surrounding paintings. There are other documents which can establish at least a terminus ante quem for the completion of the Stanza d’Eliodoro. A document records a payment “a messer Rafaelo da Urbino ducati cento per resto della pittura di la camere nove” of the Pope. This is a year-to-date compilation of expenses made on August 1, 1514, and so could refer to payment made any time in the previous seven months. The payment is, however, clearly for the “resto,” the remainder of the painted work in the rooms. It seems clear the first two rooms, the Segnatura and the Eliodoro,

3 Ibid., doc. 1512/3.
5 Ibid., doc. 1514/2.
6 Ibid., doc. 1514/7.
were substantially complete by at least July of 1514. Another document indicates that the third Stanza, the Stanza dell’Incendio, was underway before July.\textsuperscript{7}

So the Stanza d’Eliodoro was begun around the winter or spring of 1511 and the Stanza dell’Incendio was begun sometime in the spring or early summer of 1514. These were eventful years for the Roman Church and for Raphael. On the night of February 20-21, 1513, Julius II died. On March 11 Cardinal Giovanni de’ Medici, the son of Lorenzo the Magnificent, was elected Pope as Leo X. The following year Bramante died. On April 1, 1514, the Pope, in accord with the wishes of Bramante, appointed Raphael chief architect of St. Peter’s.\textsuperscript{8} The magnitude of this commission cannot be overestimated. Evidence suggests that he worked on a succession of different schemes, in collaboration with Antonio da Sangallo the Younger, for both the structure of the new basilica and the exterior decoration.\textsuperscript{9} Another enormous responsibility was given to Raphael on August 27, 1515, when he was appointed superintendent of all the antiquities in the city of

\textsuperscript{7} See below, chapter 4 at note 1.

\textsuperscript{8} Shearman, \textit{Raphael in Early Modern Sources}, doc. 1519/24. On August 1, 1514, Raphael was formally appointed architect in a letter to him from the Pope which mentions Bramante’s wish that Raphael succeed him. The relevant part of this letter reads in translation, “To Raphael of Urbino. Since in addition to the art of painting in which all men understand you excel, you were held by the architect Bramante to be the same in building, so while dying he rightly judged that to you should be entrusted the construction, begun by him, of the Roman church of the Prince of Apostles.” (Shearman, \textit{Raphael in Early Modern Sources}, doc. 1514/8.) For Raphael’s impact during his short tenure as head of the St. Peter’s project and his influence among the followers of Bramante see Christoph Luitpold Frommel, “St. Peter’s: The Early History,” in \textit{The Renaissance from Brunelleschi to Michelangelo: The Representation of Architecture}, eds. Henry A. Millon and Vittorio Magnago Lampugnani, exh. cat. (New York, 1994), pp. 417-421 and Christoph Luitpold Frommel, “San Pietro: Storia della sua costruzione,” in Christoph Luitpold Frommel, Stefano Ray, and Manfredo Tafuri, eds., \textit{Raffaello Architetto}, exh. cat., Rome, Palazzo dei Conservatori (Milan, 1984), pp. 241-309.

Rome. Michelangelo’s absence from Rome beginning in 1516 to work on various projects for Leo X in Florence left Raphael as the principal painter in the eternal city. At least partly due to the departure of his rival, Raphael and his shop were engaged in an ever-expanding series of commissions for paintings and other decorative programs in addition to responsibilities that were unconnected to Raphael’s profession as painter. His work for the Pope included the continuation of the decoration of the Stanze, the painting of the loggie on the east side of the Vatican Palace, the creation of full-scale cartoons for the tapestries used to cover the lowest register of the walls of the Sistine Chapel, as well as numerous panel paintings including various altarpieces and portraits. It is also worth noting that Raphael’s other principal patron, Agostino Chigi, the Sienese shipping magnate and papal financier, was also making ever increasing demands on the painter’s time during the years that he was engaged with the Stanza d’Eliodoro and the Stanza dell’Incendio. Raphael’s frescoes for the Chigi Chapel in Santa Maria della Pace were completed during 1511 and 1512, while work was beginning on the Stanza d’Eliodoro. Chigi seems to have kept Raphael continuously busy on a succession of projects from this time until the artist’s death. The commission for the Chigi family funeral chapel in Santa

10 Shearman, Raphael in Early Modern Sources, doc. 1515/8. The purpose of this appointment was to give the head of the St. Peter’s project knowledge of and access to the cut marble contained in the ancient buildings. The famous letter from Raphael to Leo X makes it clear that this role also included the careful description and conservation of important works and inscriptions. See Vincenzo Golzio, Raffaello nei documenti, nelle testimonianze dei contemporanei e nella letteratura del suo secolo (Vatican City, 1936, rept. ed. Westmead, England, 1971), pp. 78-92; Francesco P. Di Teodoro, Raffaello, Baldassar Castiglione e la lettera a Leone X (Bologna, 1994); and Shearman, Raphael in Early Modern Sources, doc. 1519/70.

Maria del Popolo followed immediately after the work in Santa Maria della Pace and occupied Raphael until about 1516.12 And the designs for the frescoes of the ground floor of Chigi’s home in Trastevere, now the Villa Farnesina, were begun even before work on the second Chigi chapel was complete. Indeed, the association of Raphael with Chigi goes back even further than the commission at Santa Maria della Pace. In late 1510, Chigi made a down-payment to a goldsmith for two bronze roundels to be designed by Raphael.13

The evidence of the frescoes in the Stanza d’Eliodoro and the drawings for them suggest that the design process for the wall frescoes between 1511 and 1513 proceeded much as it had in the Stanza della Segnatura. Most all of the drawings that survive for The Expulsion of Heliodorus from the Temple (fig. 37) and The Mass of Bolsena (fig. 38), of which there are precious few compared to the large number of sheets that survive for the painting of the Stanza della Segnatura, are by Raphael himself. These two paintings each contain a portrait of Julius II and so must have not only been planned but substantially completed by the time Julius died in late February of 1513. In both of these pictures, Julius is depicted with a long white beard. It is known that Julius grew his beard

---


13 Shearman, *Raphael in Early Modern Sources*, doc. 1510/1.
while on campaign in northern Italy in late 1510 and shaved it in the spring of 1512.\textsuperscript{14} 

_The Repulse of Attila from Italy by Pope Leo I_ (fig. 39) contains a portrait of Leo X. He is depicted in the role of Leo I entering the composition from the left astride a white horse and directly confronting the reeling Attila on his black horse near the center of the composition. It is clear then this fresco at least was painted after Leo X became Pope on March 11, 1513. _The Liberation of Saint Peter from Prison_ (fig. 40) has always been placed chronologically third in the sequence of wall frescoes, before _The Repulse of Attila_, mainly on the grounds of style and the inscription in the window embrasure that refers to the date 1514 and the second year of Leo’s pontificate (see above at note 5).\textsuperscript{15}

Julius II was likely involved in the choice of all of the subjects in the room. All four of the wall frescoes narrate episodes of the salvation of the Catholic faith, of the Roman Church as an institution, or of the Pontiff himself through divine intervention, and are particularly appropriate for the apartment of a Pope actively engaged in military operations to free Italy from foreign invaders, reassert and stabilize his hold over the Papal States, and counter attempts to challenge the very legitimacy of the Pope through use of ecclesiastical councils.\textsuperscript{16} The last two frescoes, _The Liberation of Peter_ and _The Repulse of Attila_, are particularly well suited to Julius even though they were executed under Leo X. The first, which shows Peter being freed from the custody of Herod


Agrippa I in Jerusalem, might be seen to refer to Peter’s later imprisonment in Rome.

Giuliano della Rovere, the future Pope Julius II, had been created Cardinal Bishop of San Pietro in Vincoli in 1471 by his uncle Pope Sixtus IV, a bishopric that the Sixtus had held before becoming Pope.17 “San Pietro ad Vincula” or simply “in Vincoli” were the most common names used by Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere before he became Pope.18 So this scene might be said to have a special connection to Julius. The Repulse of Attila also had a very personal connection to Julius and his policy of aggressive ejection of foreign invaders from Italy, a policy not followed with nearly the same level of ferocity or personal involvement by Julius’s successor, Leo X.

There is a series of copies of modelli for the main frescoes of the Stanza d’Eliodoro that reveal how the last stages of the design process worked. The pen and wash copy by Beccafumi after a modello for The Expulsion of Heliodorus shows that the original plan did not include the Pope and his retinue (fig. 41).19 This copy cannot, of course, demonstrate which artists were involved in the planning of the fresco. All of the other sheets for this painting, the only fresco in the room for which more than one or two drawings survive, are all universally attributed to Raphael himself.

These include two sheets of figure studies for the women in the left foreground

---

17 Ibid., p. 11.

18 Ibid., p. 11.

kneeling or crouching on the floor in front of the Pope’s litter (figs. 42, 43, & 44),20 detail studies for the heads of the two angels who accompany the figure of divine vengeance on horseback (figs. 45 & 46),21 and a cartoon fragment for the head of this last figure’s horse. This last drawing is a true cartoon fragment and, unlike the two independent auxiliary cartoons in the Louvre, shows every sign of being cut down from a larger cartoon (fig. 47).22 The double-sided sheet in Oxford for the frightened women in the left foreground of this painting is particularly interesting because it contains very free sketches in black chalk which are clearly first ideas for these complex figures. This is especially clear on the verso of the sheet where the artist is concentrating on working out the position of the figure’s head and shoulders. These five sheets have all been universally attributed to Raphael and represent both the early and late stages of design.

There is also a copy of an early modello for The Mass of Bolsena (fig. 48).23 This stiff and rather mechanical copy shows that the original composition was a reverse image of the painting and included from the outset a portrait of Julius II as Pope Urban IV who in

20 Zurich, Kunsthau N.56 III. F-T139 (R); O/F397 (R); KMO428 (R); J332 (R). Oxford, Ashmolean 557. K.T. Parker, Catalogue of the Collection of Drawings in the Ashmolean Museum, II: Italian Schools (Oxford, 1956), 557 (R); F-T138 (R); J333 (R).

21 Paris, Louvre 3852 and 3853. Dominique Cordellier and Bernadette Py, Inventaire général des dessins italiens V: Raphaël, son atelier, ses copistes (Paris, 1992), 314 and 316 (both R); F-T140 (both R); O/F400 and 401 (both R); KMO431 and 432 (both R); J334 and 335 (both R). These two sheets are actually cartoons which are pricked for transfer and so may be some sort of auxiliary cartoon and represent the last stages of the design of this painting.

22 Oxford, Ashmolean 556. Parker, Italian Schools, 556 (R); F-T140 (R); O/F402 (R); KMO433 (R); J336 (R).

23 Oxford, Ashmolean 641. Parker, Italian Schools, 641 (copy of R). There are also two other later and inferior copies of the lost modello in the same collection (cat. nos. 642 and 643).
1263 witnessed the miraculous appearance of blood from a Eucharistic wafer after a German priest had doubted the truth of transubstantiation. The only other sheet associated with this picture is a probable copy of a study for the praying Pope.\textsuperscript{24}

There are no surviving figure studies for \textit{The Liberation of Saint Peter}. Raphael did, however, reuse a drawing that he had made in 1511 or 1512 for the never-executed \textit{Resurrection} intended as the altarpiece for the Chigi Chapel in Santa Maria della Pace (\textbf{fig. 49}).\textsuperscript{25} This drawing was used for the soldier in the left background outside the prison. There is also a \textit{modello} for an early stage of the design in the Uffizi that has always been attributed to Raphael himself (\textbf{fig. 50}).\textsuperscript{26} This \textit{modello} was made before Raphael had decided to incorporate the figure in the drawing in Windsor Castle into the fresco.

The drawings for the last fresco in this room, \textit{The Repulse of Attila}, do not

\textsuperscript{24} Haarlem, Teylers Museum A.78r. Carel van Tuyll van Serooskerken, \textit{The Italian Drawings of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries in the Teyler Museum} (Haarlem, 2000), 249v (copy of R); O/F404 (copy of R); KMO447 (R or copy of R); J337r (copy of R). This is very likely a copy based not only on style but also on the fact that the drawing on the reverse of this sheet is a copy after a figure study by Raphael for the Sistine tapestry \textit{The Conversion of Saul}, formerly Chatsworth, Devonshire Collection 905. Michael Jaffè, \textit{The Devonshire Collection of Italian Drawings}, 4 vols. (London, 1994), 314 (R); F-T171 (R); O/F447 (R); KMO521 (R); J362 (R).

\textsuperscript{25} Windsor, Royal Collection 12735r. A.E. Popham and Johannes Wilde, \textit{The Italian Drawings of the XV and XVI Centuries in the Collection of His Majesty the King at Windsor Castle} (London, 1949), 798r (R); Martin Clayton, \textit{Raphael and his Circle: Drawings from Windsor Castle}, exh. cat. (London, The Queen’s Gallery, 1999), cat. no. 22r (R); F392 (R); F-T152 (R); KMO481 (R); J307r (R).

\textsuperscript{26} Florence, Uffizi 536E. Annamaria Petrioli Tofani, ed., \textit{Gabinetto disegni e stampe degli Uffizi: Inventario I, Disegni esposti} (Florence, 1986), 536E (R); F-T141; O/F408 (R); KMO448 (R); J338 (R). There is a copy of this drawing in the National Library in Rio de Janeiro; see Deoclecio Redig de Campos, “Un disegno raffalessesco per la Liberazione di San Pietro a Rio de Janeiro [1940],” in idem, \textit{Raffaello e Michelangelo: Studi di storia e d’arte} (Rome, 1946), pp.75-79.
provide much more illumination than the meager number of drawings for The Mass of Bolsena and The Liberation of Saint Peter. In this case there are two early stages of the design of the entire composition known through copies of modelli. The earlier of the two designs is reflected in a drawing in the Ashmolean that is usually considered to be a copy and that shows Pope Leo I being carried on his sedia gestoria on the left (fig. 51).27 The Pope has a long beard which indicates that Leo I was at first intended to have the features of Julius II and that this first design for the composition was made before the Pope shaved his beard in the spring of 1512. The second, a modello in the Louvre that is considered either an autograph drawing by Raphael or a copy of a lost drawing, was quite different from both the earlier composition and the finished fresco (fig. 52).28 Pope Leo I and his retinue have been removed to the far distance on the left and Attila has been placed closer to the center of the composition than in any other design for this painting.29 This version emphasizes the miraculous appearance of Saints Peter and Paul. In the final painting Leo I, depicted with the features of Leo X, is restored to his prominent position.


29 The papal party is very difficult to make out. It is located above the left arm of the second horseman on the left. This is much easier to see in an anonymous seventeenth-century engraving after this drawing or, if this is a copy, after the original. See Dominique Cordellier, Bernadette Py, et al., Raffaello e i Suoi: Disegni di Raffaello e della sua cerchia, exh. cat. (Rome, Villa Medici [Académie de France], 1992), p. 177.
in the left foreground of the composition. But he is now astride a white horse and no longer being carried in a sedia gestoria as he was when he played the role of Leo I in the first modello. There are also two sheets of studies for this fresco. One is a figure study for a soldier on horseback (fig. 53). This drawing is certainly by Raphael and seems to be for the first project because the soldier’s right arm is extended as it is not in either the drawing in the Louvre or the painting. The other, a study in silverpoint for the head of horse, has only recently been attributed to Raphael (fig. 54). The drawing is for the horse in the right background, a figure that does not appear in either the Paris modello or the fresco. It has been associated, like the only other study for this fresco, with the first stage of development of the composition seen in the Ashmolean copy.

All of the visual evidence for the four main wall frescoes of the Stanza d’Eliodoro does not then contradict the pattern established in the Stanza della Segnatura. Raphael seems to have worked out all the compositions and made all of the surviving studies for them, from relatively free figure studies such as the double-sided sheet in Oxford for The Expulsion of Heliodorus to the last stages of the design process reflected in the cartoon fragment in Oxford and the apparent auxiliary cartoons in the Louvre. It is impossible to know from the copies of what seem to be modelli if any artists employed in the shop were responsible for this stage of the work. But the composition study for The Liberation of Saint Peter in the Uffizi is by Raphael himself. This indicates that at this stage Raphael

---

30 Frankfurt, Städelisches Kunstinstitut 1797. F-T155 (R); O/F406 (R); KMO557 (R); J339 (R). This figure does not appear in the fresco. It is present, however, in the first modello, a copy of which is in the Ashmolean Museum, inv. no. 645. See note 27 above.

was still making these large compositional studies, some of which could have been used as *modelli*.

The situation with the vault and the dado is, however, very different. This is the only ceiling in the Stanze that Raphael and his assistants decorated in its entirety. Perugino had painted the vault of the Stanza d’Incendio, and this decoration was left intact by Raphael. The dado of the Incendio shares a similar attribution history to that of the Eliodoro, as we will see in the next chapter. Most historians have dated these parts of the decoration of the Stanza d’Eliodoro to the last phase of work in this room, a position confirmed by a sheet of studies in the Uffizi for *The Burning Bush*, one of the four fictive tapestries of Old Testament subjects that cover the ceiling (Fig. 54a). The right side of the recto and the entire verso of this drawing have sketches and studies of vault construction related to St. Peter’s (figs. 55 & 56). Since we know that Raphael took over Bramante’s duties for the construction of the basilica on April 1, 1514, and that the next of the Stanze, the Stanza dell’Incendio, was underway by July 1 of that year, it is reasonable to assume that this drawing dates from around the spring of 1514. This may then indicate an approximate date for the ceiling of this room. Since it is the ceiling and dado of this room where we have the earliest indications of the participation of members of Raphael’s workshop in the design process of the frescoes, it may be useful to consider

---


33 Florence Uffizi 1973F. Annamaria Petrioli Tofani, ed., *Gabinetto disegni e stampe degli Uffizi: Inventario, Disegni di figura 2* (Florence, 2005), 1973Fr and v (both R); F-T143 (both R); O/F409 and 409a (both R); KMO483 and 484 (both R); J342r and v (both R).
what we know of the men who were Raphael’s closest associates during the last six years of his life.

Vasari mentioned several names of artists employed by Raphael during his last years. But none is more important than Giulio Pippi, called Giulio Romano, and Giovanni Francesco Penni, called il Fattore. Vasari identified these two men as Raphael’s heirs and indicated that they were responsible for finishing commissions left incomplete at the master’s death in 1520, something that will concern us in our discussion of the Sala di Costantino in Chapter 5. Giulio was born in Rome around 1499. His origins as an artist are undocumented. In fact, his name does not appear in any document related to his activity as a painter until June 4, 1520, two months after Raphael’s death. Overwhelming stylistic evidence supports the universally held view that by the date of this document Giulio had spent many years in Raphael’s shop. During the thirteen years Raphael worked in Rome, there are only two documents that refer in any way to his assistants. The first, dated July 1, 1517, records a payment of twenty ducats to the “gioveni di Raphaello” for work done in the Stanza dell’Incendio. The


35 Ibid., V, p. 525.

36 Vasari gives Giulio=s age as fifty-four when he died in Mantua in 1546, placing his birth in 1492. See Vasari/Milanesi, V, p. 555. The record of his death, however, states that he died in Mantua on November 1, 1546 after 15 days in the hospital and at age 47. See Daniela Ferrari, ed., Giulio Romano: Repertorio di fonti documentarie (Rome, 1992), pp. 1167-68. He was therefore born in 1499, the date preferred by most scholars. See Frederick Hartt, Giulio Romano (New Haven, 1958), I, p. 3, n. 1.

37 Ferrari, Giulio Romano, pp. 6-7.

38 Ibid., p. 3.
second, dated June 11, 1519, records a payment of twenty-five ducats to the “garzoni” who painted the so-called Loggia di Raffaello facing the Cortile di San Damaso and immediately adjacent to the Stanze. It makes no reference to Raphael. These two documents, which will be discussed in the next chapter, are meager evidence upon which to construct a picture of Giulio’s activity in Raphael’s shop. All they tell us is that young men (“gioveni”) painted in the Stanza dell’Incendio and that workshop assistants (“garzoni”) painted in the second floor Loggia. They do not indicate that Giulio Romano was one of these assistants or to what degree Raphael himself was involved in the execution of the paintings in these two spaces. They also do not tell us what role any of Raphael’s assistants may have played in designing the frescoes in these rooms.

Giovanni Francesco Penni does not seem to have had an independent career. He is mentioned in conjunction with other artists throughout his career. Vasari wrote that the nickname “il Fattore” came from the fact that Penni’s function within the Roman shop of Raphael was to copy drawings by the master and that he was able to imitate Raphael’s style very closely.

The fact that Vasari mentions these two men as working particularly closely with Raphael during these years has led to a great deal of speculation about what their precise

---

39 Ibid., p. 4.

40 For *garzone* as a term often used to refer to the more advanced apprentices or assistants of artist see Anabel Thomas, *The Painter’s Practice in Renaissance Tuscany* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 81-88.


42 Vasari/Milanesi, IV, p. 644.
roles within the shop were. It has also led scholars to attribute specific frescoes in the Stanze to artists in the immediate circle of Raphael and his principal assistants. But scholars have also occasionally attributed works often associated with Raphael’s name to artists who were not a part of his workshop. This is probably because the complex workshop situation leads to a certain amount of instability in the attribution of paintings and this in turn leads art historians to sometimes think creatively about possible attributions. Recently Arnold Nesselrath convincingly suggested that Lorenzo Lotto executed the four scenes on the vault of the Stanze d’Eliodoro (Fig. 54a). Nesselrath, however, reserved the invention of all the designs for the vault to Raphael. And indeed there are two sheets for The Burning Bush that are either by Raphael or copied from a design by Raphael. These include the sheet in the Uffizi that has architectural designs for the vault of St. Peter’s on both sides (figs. 55 & 56). The recto also contains a seated figure of St. Helen that was later engraved by Marcantonio Raimondi. The glory of angels surrounding God in the Moses fresco is indicated only by two angels and a part of the cloud. God himself and most of the flaming clouds that appears in the fresco are missing. This drawing has the freedom and feeling of experimentation that are characteristic of Raphael’s pen studies for multiple figures from a large composition. One may compare a drawing now in London for the left side of The Disputa (fig. 24) or a pen study such as the Uffizi drawing to a black chalk study. A black chalk drawing in Oxford for the women on the left of The Expulsion of Heliodorus shows the freedom of

43 Nesselrath, “Lotto as Raphael’s Collaborator.”

44 London, British Museum 1900-8-24-108. Pouncey and Gere, Italian Drawings, 33 (R); F267 (R); F-T114 (R); KMO289 (R); J204 (R).
line that Raphael’s drawings often display when he is working out an idea for the first time.\textsuperscript{45} This is especially true of the drawing on the verso of this sheet (fig. 44). This can be seen in the Uffizi drawing as well. And while the differences in media does prevent direct comparison of details of personal style such as the handling of close hatching, the openness and rapidity of line does indicate that the Uffizi drawing is by Raphael.\textsuperscript{46}

Another drawing for this painting that has often been attributed to Raphael is much more problematic. This is a pen drawing in Oxford for God and the glory of angels that surrounds him (fig. 57).\textsuperscript{47} The lower parts of this composition are very similar to the parts of the glory of angels sketched in on the Uffizi sheet, indicating that the two drawings were made at around the same time. But both are unlike this part of the fresco and so apparently reflect an early stage in the ideation of the composition. In the painting the glory of angels around God is reduced to two angels with bodies, one in the right foreground of the painting and one peeking around the clouds under God’s right arm, and a few red seraphim which make up the lower parts of the cloud and float free of the cloud to the left.

Because many scholars in the last century and a half have attributed the ceiling frescoes to Peruzzi, they have also considered the Oxford drawing to be by him.\textsuperscript{48} But

\textsuperscript{45} Oxford, Ashmolean 557r. Parker, \textit{Italian Schools}, 557r (R); F-T138 (R); O/F398 (R); KMO429 (R); J333r (R).

\textsuperscript{46} This drawing, attributed to Parmigianino until identified as a Raphael by Oberhuber in 1966, is accepted as Raphael by most scholars. See note 33 above.

\textsuperscript{47} Oxford, Ashmolean 462r. Parker, \textit{Italian Schools}, 462r (Peruzzi); O/F410 (school of R); KMO485 (R); J343r (R).

\textsuperscript{48} Parker, \textit{Italian Schools}, pp. 230-231 gives a summary of older opinions.
these paintings are now attributed to Raphael or a member of his immediate circle such as Penni or Giulio, or to Lotto by Nesselrath, and so the attribution of the drawing has often shifted to Raphael himself. But Robinson’s attribution of it to Giulio in the catalogue of the Ashmolean’s Raphael drawings in 1870, subsequently taken up by Crowe and Cavalcaselle in 1882, is most plausible. This drawing has none of the freedom of line characteristic of Raphael’s pen studies from this period, for example the Uffizi drawing for the same project. The Oxford drawing has much more in common with Giulio’s earliest pen drawings as in a drawing in Vienna of a seated male nude facing to the left (fig. 58). Both display Giulio’s rather shallow spatial field in which figures are flattened, giving the compositions a relief-like quality. Also both drawings exhibit Giulio’s characteristic hatching technique of closely-spaced hatching lines, which often terminate in tiny hook-shaped return strokes, both inside and outside the figure.

49 See Nesselrath, “Lotto as Raphael’s Collaborator,” 732-741 for an overview of opinions regarding these frescoes.


These features appear in almost every pen drawing by Giulio from all periods of his career. Although the figure of God in the Oxford drawing does not display the characteristic anatomical awkwardness and lack of three-dimensionality in the upper body that is seen in many of Giulio’s secure drawings, it must be kept in mind that Giulio, if he is the author of this drawing, was probably working directly from a drawing by Raphael very much like the one now in the Uffizi.

The drawing on the verso of the Oxford drawing for The Burning Bush is one of a pair of drawings after the winged Victories on the east face of the Arch of Titus in Rome (figs. 59 & 60). The attributions of these pen sketches have often paralleled the disputed attribution history of the drawing for God on the recto of the Oxford sheet. And like the drawing of God, these two drawings have rarely been attributed to Raphael. The two Victories are by the same hand and they appear to be by the same person as the Oxford sketch of God. They show signs of Giulio’s hand, including a degree of awkwardness in the anatomy, especially the relationships of the shoulders to the upper torsos, and the handling of the hatching in the tight folds of drapery. If these three pen studies are by Giulio Romano, they are among his earliest drawings that can be dated by direct association with a specific project.

In the spring and summer of 1514, Giulio was at least fifteen and may have been

---

54 Oxford, Ashmolean 462v and 465. Parker, Italian Schools, 462v and 465 (both Peruzzi); O/F410 (school of R; inv. no. 465 discussed under 410 and attributed to the school of R); KMO486 and 487 (both R or Giulio); J343v (R?; inv. no. 465 not included). Nesselrath, “Lotto as Raphael’s Collaborator,” 740, fig. 37.

even older. This is unusually young for an artist in the sixteenth century to be making
design drawings for a major commission, even if he was not the lead artist. But it may
not have seemed so from Raphael’s point of view. Raphael’s earliest documented
painting is the now-fragmentary altarpiece of St. Nicholas of Tolentino for the Church of
Sant’Agostino in Città di Castello, commissioned on December 10, 1500, when Raphael
was seventeen years old.56 In the contract Raphael is referred to as “magister,” so he was
an independent master at the time, notwithstanding the fact that an older artist,
Evangelista da Pian di Meleto, was an equal partner with Raphael in the contract. So
Raphael may not have considered seventeen, sixteen, or even fifteen to be too young to
take on responsibility for part of an important commission. It must also be kept in mind
that the part I am arguing Giulio played in the design process of the Stanza d’Eliodoro’s
ceiling was, according to the meager evidence that survives, relatively minor. He seems
to have worked up the figure of Moses before the burning bush from sketches provided
by Raphael.

Giulio may also be responsible for the last drawing associated with the Burning
Bush, the cartoon for the figure of Moses which is now in Naples (fig. 61).57 This
cartoon is very different from the cartoons attributed to Raphael for the wall frescoes in
the Stanza d’Eliodoro of the heads of the two angels and the horse’s head in the Louvre

56 This painting is listed first in both of the most important modern catalgues raisonnés of
Raphael’s work: Dussler, Raphael, pp. 1-3 and Jürg Meyer zur Capellen, Raphael: A
Critical Catalogue of his Paintings: Volume 1, The Beginnings in Umbria and Florence,
ca. 1500-1508 (Landshut, 2001), cat. no. 1. Although both of these authors list the date
of the contract for the altarpiece, neither considers Raphael’s age as a separate issue. See
also Shearman, Raphael in Early Modern Sources, doc. 1500/2.

57 Naples, Capodimonte 86653. F-T145 (R); O/F411 (R); KMO488 (R); J344 (R?).
and at Oxford (figs. 45-47). The Louvre and Oxford cartoons show signs that the artist was working through some of the details as the drawing developed on the page. This is particularly true of the drawing in the Louvre of angels where small details of anatomy, noses, and inner folds of ears are worked over again and again (figs. 45 & 46). The execution of the Moses cartoon, while a fluent drawing without any hesitation, seems rather flat and uninspired. The strong fall of light and the play of shadows in this cartoon make it particularly clear and easy to read. This not typical of cartoons executed by Raphael. The figure is conceived as a series of massive forms which recede into space as opposed to turning in space leading the eye into the picture.

Unlike Raphael’s usual practice of using a cartoon as a working drawing and as a last opportunity to make adjustments, as he does with the cartoon for the lower part of the School of Athens that is now in Milan with its many pentimenti, the cartoon in Naples seems uncharacteristically tight and clean. It looks very much like a cartoon worked up from finished designs rather than a working drawing. Moses’ hair in this drawing has a lumpy solidity that looks very much like Giulio’s method of drawing hair as a collection of solid masses, rather than Raphael’s method of drawing hair as individual strands that collectively make up the overall impression desired. Compare the hair of the angel cartoons in the Louvre, universally attributed to Raphael, to the Moses cartoon. On the other hand, the Moses cartoon reveals the lumpy handling of hair typical of Giulio’s earliest drawings, for example, that of a bust of a young man in profile (fig. 62).

---

There is only one other pair of drawings related to the ceiling of this room. These are two drawings of the *Binding of Isaac* in Oxford and Los Angeles.\(^{59}\) The figures of Abraham and Isaac are in different poses in each drawing and in a completely different relationship to each other. The drawing in Oxford shows Abraham on the right with his foot on the altar on which Isaac has been placed (fig. 63). Isaac is on the left with his hands bound behind him. The Getty drawing reverses all of these elements: Abraham is on the left, his foot is not on the altar and Isaac’s hands are crossed and bound in front of his chest (fig. 64). Neither drawing looks very much like the fresco on the Stanza d’Eliodoro’s ceiling suggesting that neither is related to that project. But the drawings and painting do all share a strong vertical emphasis and the motif of the small flying angel that catches Abraham’s arm by the wrist to prevent the sacrifice of the boy.

The drawing in Oxford is in very poor condition, making a secure attribution very difficult. It is rarely given to Raphael,\(^{60}\) and more frequently attributed to his circle. Many scholars simply say that the drawing is not by Raphael without offering any other suggestions.\(^{61}\) Joannides attributed it to Penni with a question mark.\(^{62}\)

---


\(^{60}\) Shearman, “Raphael’s Unexecuted Projects,” p. 175.


Cavalcaselle, John Gere, and Nicholas Turner thought it might be by Giulio. I agree that it seems to be by Giulio and point to the awkward massing of forms in the middle of the sheet. Abraham’s right knee gives the figure a clumsy appearance as it is raised almost to a height that would interfere with the blow from the knife.

If the Binding of Isaac in Oxford is by Giulio, as seems likely, it may be the first awkward attempt to invent a composition for the fresco on the ceiling of the Stanza d’Eliodoro. If so, then here in the spring of 1514 we have the first instance of Raphael relinquishing control of the invention of a major composition at the very beginning of the design stage.

But it is not at all certain that this drawing should be connected with the fresco. It has long been recognized that both the Oxford sheet and the fresco are related to an engraving by Agostino Veneziano. In 1988, John Gere published a highly finished red chalk drawing, now in the Getty, that is identical to the engraving in virtually every detail, which virtually all scholars have attributed to Giulio (fig. 64). The existence of

63 Crowe and Cavalcaselle, Raphael, vol 2, p. 139, “The slight mannered pen stroke points to the authorship of Giulio Romano.” John A. Gere and Nicholas Turner, Drawings by Raphael from the Royal Library, the Ashmolean, the British Museum, Chatsworth and other British Collections, exh. cat. (London, British Museum, 1983), cat. no. 146, pp. 180-181 with a discussion of the attribution history, including a citation of a note by Philip Pouncey in the Ashmolean print room’s copy of Parker’s catalogue which calls the drawing a “fine Giulio Romano.”


the engraving could explain both drawings. The sheet in Oxford is probably an early idea for Agostino’s engraving and the drawing at the Getty the final *modello*. All three, while ultimately derived from the fresco in the Stanza d’Eliodoro, may have been made later in the decade as a separate commercial enterprise. During Raphael’s Roman period he and the members of his shop supplied Agostino, Marcantonio Raimondi, Marco Dente and other engravers with a steady stream of drawings, often after or based on paintings, which were turned into engravings.\(^6^6\) Given that they may not even be contemporaneous with the fresco, the evidence for the participation of artists other than Raphael in the design process in the Stanze presented by the two drawings related to the *Binding of Isaac* is at best ambiguous.

The drawings for the dado follow the same trajectory as the main wall frescoes and the ceiling and reveal the growing participation of members of the shop, especially Giulio and Penni.\(^6^7\) The dado of the Stanza d’Eliodoro shows eleven fictive sculptured caryatids standing on a narrow ledge. They are all allegorical figures and seem to be holding up the bottom edge of the main painted scenes on the walls. There are two extant drawings associated with these figures. A two-sided sheet in Oxford has figures that are probably related to the dado of this room, but were not used there (figs. 65 & 66).\(^6^8\) The

---

\(^6^6\) *Raphael Invenit*, exh. cat. (Rome, 1985) is a detailed examination of this phenomenon.

\(^6^7\) On the dado of this room see Dietrich-England, *Die Sockelzone*.

caryatid on the recto of this sheet does not carry any attributes to identify her as one of the allegorical figures painted in the room. This could mean that this sheet, attributed to Raphael by most scholars, could be a sketch of the general type of figure the master wanted for the frescoes. This idea could have then been handed to assistants, such as Penni, who worked out the final designs for the individual allegories. This final stage is reflected in a highly finished sketch in the Louvre for the figure of Commerce which is painted on the extreme right of the north wall, under the Liberation of Saint Peter (fig. 67). This drawing was attributed to Penni by both Joannides and Shearman.

There is one other drawing for this room, a black chalk study for a small putto carrying the ring and feathers of the Medici impresa on the pendentive to the left of the Release of Saint Peter (fig. 68). This drawing has been attributed to Raphael by almost all scholars since it first came to light in the 1920s. Joannides raised the question of why Raphael would make such a careful and fully-realized drawing for this small figure while seeming to relinquish so much of the design work in less prominent parts of this

569Br and v (both R); O/F413 and 414 (both R); KMO490 and 491 (both R); J346r and v (both R).


70 Paris, Louvre 3877. O/F415 (R); KMO493 (R); J347 (Penni).


72 Haarlem, Teylers Museum A.57. Tuyll van Serooskerken, The Italian Drawings, 229 (R); O/F412 (R); KMO489 (R); J345 (R).

room to his assistants. He theorized that the reason may be that the putto holds the elements of the Medici impresa.\footnote{Ibid., p. 114.} The unstated implication is that Raphael wished to keep control of certain parts of the decoration of this room because they might draw particular scrutiny from his patron, the Pope. This idea may be extended to explain Raphael’s level of participation on other projects that lie outside the scope of this dissertation. For example, the vast majority of drawings for the cartoons of the tapestries of the lives of Saints Peter and Paul that were destined for the Sistine Chapel are usually attributed to Raphael. On the other hand, there are very few drawings by Raphael for the frescoes in the Loggia in the Villa Farnesina depicting the legend of Psyche. The majority of these drawings is usually attributed to Raphael’s assistants, especially Giulio Romano.\footnote{See Rosalia Varoli-Piazza, ed., Raffaello: La loggia di Amore e Psiche alla Farnesina (Milan, 2002); Michael Rohlmann, “Von allen Seiten gleich nacht: Raffaels Kompositionskunst in der Loggia di Psiche der Villa Farnesina,” Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch 63 (2002): 71-92; and Christoph Luitpold Frommel, ed., La Villa Farnesina a Roma (Modena, 2003).}

Raphael began to decorate the Stanza d’Eliodoro in 1511 following the same procedures that he had followed in the Stanza della Segnatura. He did all the designs for the wall frescoes himself. When it came time to decorate the ceiling and the dado, however, he began to turn some of the design responsibilities over to some of his more talented assistants. This happened because Raphael was taking on more and more responsibilities in this period.
Chapter 4: The Stanza dell’Incendio (1514-17) and the Loggia di Raffaello (1516-17)

During the years between 1514 and 1517, Raphael radically altered the way the workshop functioned in order to keep up with demands on his time that had expanded out of all proportion compared to his early years in Rome. He was appointed architect of St. Peter’s on August 1, 1514.\footnote{John Shearman, \textit{Raphael in Early Modern Sources: 1483-1602}, 2 vols. (New Haven, 2003), doc. 1514/8.} He was engaged in the design of the cartoons for the Sistine Chapel tapestries from at least the spring of 1515 and continuing throughout 1516.\footnote{Ibid., docs. 1515/6 and 1516/31.} During 1515-16, Raphael was also engaged in the design of the both the building and the mosaic decorations for the funeral chapel of Agostino Chigi in Santa Maria del Popolo.\footnote{John Shearman, “The Chigi Chapel in Santa Maria del Popolo,” \textit{Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes} 24 (1961): 129-130.} In addition, Raphael was involved in several major altarpieces including the \textit{Madonna del Pesce} (c. 1514),\footnote{Luitpold Dussler, \textit{Raphael: A Critical Catalogue of his Pictures, Wall-Paintings and Tapestries} [Munich, 1966], trans. Sebastian Cruft (London and New York, 1971), p. 38.} the \textit{St. Cecilia} (c. 1515-16),\footnote{Shearman, \textit{Raphael in Early Modern Sources}, docs. 1514/14, 1515/9, and 1516/27. Dussler, \textit{Raphael}, pp. 39-41.} and \textit{Christ Carrying the Cross (Lo Spasimo)} (c. 1515-16).\footnote{Shearman, \textit{Raphael in Early Modern Sources}, docs. 1517/34. Dussler, \textit{Raphael}, p. 44.}

As a result of all this work, Raphael had to deploy the members of the shop in a new way. He began to use Giulio, an excellent and inventive draughtsman, to design
individual figures and figure groups and Penni to make *modelli* of finished compositions.

What is not clear from the evidence is who stands at the beginning of the process of ideation for the frescoes in the Stanza dell’Incendio. There are no “first idea” sketches for whole compositions or for groups of figures as there are for the paintings of the Stanza della Segnatura. What is clear, however, is that the workshop “assistants” are beginning to show up at all stages of the design process for which evidence survives. This is true according to anyone’s reading of the evidence. Corroborating the assistants’ major role are documented records that the workshop began to be paid directly for the execution of the decoration of the Stanza dell’Incendio and the Loggia di Raffaello.

**The Stanza dell’Incendio**

Just as had happened with the Stanza d’Eliodoro, the commission for the Stanza dell’Incendio (fig. 69), which adjoins the Stanza della Segnatura to the west, seems to have followed directly after the completion of the Stanza d’Eliodoro in the spring of 1514. We know that Raphael was at work in the Stanza dell’Incendio at least as early as July 1, 1514, from a letter the painter wrote to his uncle on that day in which he says he is

---

at work on “another” room for the Pope.\(^8\) This Pope was Leo X, Giovanni de’ Medici, who ascended to the Papal throne on March 11. The ceiling of this chamber was painted by Perugino. This decoration, unlike Sodoma’s for the vault of the Stanza della Segnatura, was left untouched by Raphael and his shop. The large wall paintings show scenes from the lives of two of Leo’s eponymous predecessors, Leo III (795-816) and Leo IV (847-855). As with the other Stanze, there are very few documents which tell us anything about the order of work in the room. There is an inscription in the room that, very much like those in the two previously painted rooms, seems to mark the end of the work there. It says, “LEO.X. PONT. MAX. ANNO.CHRISTI .M.CCCCC.X.VII. PONTIFICAT SVI.ANNO IIII.”\(^9\) This inscription was placed in the room between January 1 and March 11, 1517, the period when that year and the fourth year of Leo’s reign overlapped.

On July 1 of that year a document records a payment of twenty ducats to “li gioveni di Raphaello da Urbino che hanno dipinta la stanza avanti la guardaroba.”\(^10\) Since the guardaroba was in the Torre Borgia to the west of the suite of rooms now referred to as the Stanze, this must refer to the Stanza dell’Incendio, the room farthest to the west.\(^11\) This document records a payment directly to “the young men of Raphael” and not to the master artist. This is the same formula, although not the same language, as a

---


\(^9\) Ibid., doc. 1517/4.


\(^11\) Ibid., doc. 1517/11.
payment made directly to members of Raphael’s shop in 1519 for work done in the Loggia. This document is discussed below. The meaning of these documents is not clear. Raphael could have subcontracted primary responsibility for these projects to other artists, members of his shop on whom he knew he could rely to complete the project to the satisfaction of his patron, the Pope. If that were the case, one might expect to find the names of the artists involved. Or it could be that, regardless of who was in charge of the work, the “young men” of Raphael were present at the Vatican to receive the payment while Raphael himself was occupied elsewhere. Although there is no evidence of Raphael’s absence from Rome during this time, he was beginning the frescoes in the villa of Agostino Chigi, the present Villa Farnesina, and could have been occupied outside the Vatican. But in any case, these documents do not tell us much about who was working on these projects beyond the fact that the gioveni of Raphael were involved. And they tell us nothing about which artists, including Raphael, were engaged at which stage of the planning and execution of the painting in each case. No document exists that makes any artist’s role in the design process clear.

Unlike the payment for the Loggia which is an isolated document, in the case of the Stanza dell’Incendio there are other indications of what was happening in the room as the project drew to a close in the late spring and summer of 1517. These are a series of dispatches to Alfonso d’Este, Duke of Ferrara, from his agent in Rome, Beltrame Costabili, Bishop of Adria.\(^{12}\) The Duke was trying to get Raphael to paint a picture for his Camerino d’Alabastro. This commission, left unfulfilled at Raphael’s death, was

\(^{12}\) Ibid., docs. 1517/6 (March 30), 1517/9 (June 16), 1517/10 (June 25), and many subsequent communiqués extending to August 24, 1520, four months after Raphael died (Ibid., doc. 1520/55).
eventually awarded to Titian who produced the *Bacchus and Ariadne* now in London.\textsuperscript{13} But Costabili, in an effort to reassure the Duke, gave reports of the progress of work on the Stanza dell’Incendio in the final phases of the room’s decoration. On March 30, 1517, he reported that Raphael was hurrying to finish the work he was doing for His Holiness.\textsuperscript{14} On June 16 Costabili added that Raphael told him that he had only two days work remaining on the Pope’s room.\textsuperscript{15}

Are we to assume from this document that the Stanza dell’Incendio was finished on June 18 since Costabili claimed he heard the information from Raphael’s own lips? On June 25, nine days later, Costabili wrote that Raphael had finished the Pope’s room.\textsuperscript{16} Given the urgency in these letters, it seems correct to assume that Costabili would have sent a report about the completion of Raphael’s obligation to the Pope as soon as this was a reality. Since the payment to the “gioveni” came just six days after this, it seems certain that the room was completed during the last two weeks of June. What is more interesting is not the tone or content of Costabili’s letters to the Duke, but rather the sources on which he relied for his information about the progress of the work. Costabili stated that he had spoken to Raphael, and so it seems that Raphael was directly involved


\textsuperscript{14} “Raphael da Urbino attende ad experdirse de questo lavoro de N.S.,” Shearman, *Raphael in Early Modern Sources*, doc. 1517/6.

\textsuperscript{15} “Raphael da Urbino me ha dicto havere anchor che fare dui di ne la camera del Papa,” Ibid., doc. 1517/9.

\textsuperscript{16} “Raphael da Urbino ha fornito la camera de N.S.,” Ibid., doc. 1517/10.
with the work in the Stanza.

But is this really how we should interpret these letters? They are the dispatches of an agent of a powerful Duke, whose job was to tell the Duke what he wanted to hear. Raphael’s objective was to try as best he could to satisfy all his patrons’ desires. So, one might surmise that Raphael was making an excuse for not having started the Duke’s picture, and that as Costabili passed this excuse on to the Duke, it morphed into a glowing report of work about to begin. In the end, we cannot tell much from these documents about what was happening in the Pope’s rooms except that their frescoes were considered to be Raphael’s creations. This is entirely appropriate since Raphael was the master artist and the paintings were commissioned from him. On the other hand, members of the shop were so deeply involved that what appears to be the final payment for the entire project was paid not to Raphael, but to other artists in his employ.¹⁷

Once again the drawings tell a much more complete story of who was involved in the design process of the paintings, and at what stages, than do the meager documents. The relatively few surviving drawings consist mainly of nude and clothed studies for single figures or figure groups. In addition, there is one auxiliary cartoon and two modelli, or more precisely, one modello and part of another. These drawings do not show the orderly progression of work that we find in the previous two rooms. In the Stanza d’Eliodoro the walls were painted first, followed by the ceiling and dado. Raphael seems to have been entirely responsible for the walls. He then relinquished much of the control

¹⁷ Compare the documents of August 1, 1514, the final payment for the Stanza d’Eliodoro, and July 1, 1517, what appears to be the final payment for the Stanza dell’Incendio. In the case of the former one hundred ducats are paid directly to Raphael, in the latter twenty ducats are paid to the “gioveni “ of Raphael. Ibid., docs. 1514/7 and 1517/11.
over the execution of the ceiling and dado, and over their design as well. Raphael and his
shop seem to have begun the third room in the same fashion that they finished the second,
with all members of the shop working simultaneously on different parts of the room and
at various stages of the design process.

That Raphael was involved in the process himself can be seen by the fact that
there are at least two, and possibly three, red chalk figure studies by him. These are for
*The Fire in the Borgo* (fig. 70) and *The Victory at Ostia* (fig. 71), usually considered to
be the earliest wall paintings in the room.\(^{18}\) The drawing that has the best claim to being
autograph is a red chalk study for the soldier standing on the extreme left of the fresco
with his right arm extended (fig. 72).\(^{19}\) This drawing was sent by Raphael to Albrecht
Dürer and is inscribed, “1515 Raffahell de Vrbin der so hoch peim popst geacht ist
gewest hat der hat dyse nackette bild gemacht vnd hat sy dem albrecht dürer gen
nornberg geschickt Im dein hand zw weisen.”\(^{20}\) Dürer had sent Raphael a painted self-
portrait and this drawing was apparently Raphael’s idea of a return gift in equal
exchange. The painting is probably lost since it cannot be identified with any known
self-portrait by Dürer. The history of the attribution of both the drawing and the
inscription is complex.\(^{21}\) The inscription is now universally recognized to be in Dürer’s

---

\(^{18}\) Dussler, *Raphael*, pp. 82-86.

\(^{19}\) Vienna, Albertina 17575 (SR 282). Veronike Birke and Janine Kertész, *Die
italienischen Zeichnungen der Albertina*, 4 vols. (Vienna, 1992-97), 17575 (R); F-T160
(R); O/F426 (R); KMO504 (R); J371 (R).

\(^{20}\) “Raphael of Urbino, who stands in high honor with the Pope, made this nude picture
and sent it to Albrecht Dürer of Nuremburg as a demonstration of his hand.”
Transcription from Birke and Kertész, *Die italienischen Zeichnungen*, vol. 4, p. 2158.

\(^{21}\) For a history of the controversies see Arnold Nesselrath, “Raphael’s Gift to Dürer,”
own hand, but the meaning of the date not clear. The year 1515 could refer to the date of
the drawing, the date of the gift, or both. In either case Dürer understood the drawing to
be a demonstration of Raphael’s style in 1515. The inscription and the circumstances of
the exchange of gifts make the attribution of the drawing to Raphael himself a certainty,
and conversely an attribution to any member of the workshop a virtual impossibility,
since Dürer can only have been told of the purpose of the gift, to “demonstrate”
Raphael’s hand, by the giver.22 So it may be possible to use this sheet as a standard
against which to judge the other red chalk figure studies for the Stanza dell’Incendio.

The drawing may also contribute to the question of the way the shop was
operating between 1514 and 1517. It does yield unique information not provided by the
drawings for the previous two Stanze. A complete cleaning of the wall frescoes of the
Stanza dell’Incendio was completed in 1992. The overlap of the giornate in the room
seem to indicate that The Victory at Ostia was the last large painting executed, not the
first or second, as had been thought.23 So, if the date 1515 placed on the drawing by
Dürer indicates the date of the gift and serves as a terminus ante quem, then the drawing
arrived in Germany two years before the fresco was painted, probably in the spring of

---

22 And indeed almost all scholars have attributed the drawing to Raphael with the notable
exception of Frederick Hartt who attributed it to Giulio without commenting on the
inscription. See Frederick Hartt, Giulio Romano, 2 vols. (New Haven, 1958), pp. 24 and
287.

23 Nesselrath, “Raphael’s Gift to Dürer,” 376-389 and Fabrizio Mancinelli and Arnold
Nesselrath, “The Stanza dell’Incendio,” in Carlo Pietrangeli, et al., Raphael in the
Apartments of Julius II and Leo X, trans. Colin J. Bailey, et al. (Milan, 1993), pp. 293-
337.
1517, and was therefore not available during the planning stages of this painting. It has been suggested that Raphael’s students designed the fresco using a copy of the master’s drawing that survived in the shop, but the existence of such a copy is only conjecture. Other examples of “fair” copies, made to record a design and not part of the design process itself, of Raphael’s designs by his workshop do exist. It is equally likely that the design process of the painting was more complex than we imagine, and may have happened months or even years before a fresco was painted. This was certainly the case with the designs for the Loggia di Raffaello, which seem to have been created all at once at the beginning of the project. The figure for which the Albertina sheet is the nude study could have been incorporated into the design, which may have even reached the stage of the *modello* by 1515, two years before the fresco was begun. This means that the sheet, made by Raphael, could have outlived its usefulness to the design process and been available to be given to Dürer long before the painting was even started. So this sheet’s unique history may in some small way indicate that the working procedure of the shop was not a strict top-down process in which the master, or even the leading assistant on a

---

24 Nesselrath, “Raphael’s Gift to Dürer,” 381.

25 Two drawings related to this very fresco make this point clearly. There is a drawing in Chatsworth (Devonshire Collection 68) for the prisoners being brought before Pope Leo IV who are in the left foreground of the fresco. Michael Jaffé (*The Devonshire Collection of Italian Drawings*, 4 vols. [London, 1994], cat. no. 329) believed this sheet to be a studio copy of a lost drawing by Raphael. Luitpold Dussler (*Raphael*, p. 84) considered it a replica of part of the *modello* in the British Museum (discussed below). The Uffizi has a version of the entire *modello* that Dussler (*Raphael*, p. 84) thought it was a replica of the British Museum drawing. It could also be the case that rather than the Uffizi and Chatsworth drawings being based on the British Museum drawing, all three are based on a lost original *modello*.

26 See below.
project, designed the overall scheme and then worked up the major figures to the point where the designs could be handed over to specialists within the shop who executed modelli, cartoons, and then the completed frescoes. Here we have either a recycled design made by the master in 1515, and not included in the composition until 1517, or a design by the master from 1515 that was worked into a modello soon after it was made while other frescoes for the room were being designed by Raphael and other members of the workshop. In either case, the process would have resulted in substantial savings in both time and manpower as compared to the way the frescoes for the Segnatura were designed. In the first Stanza, Raphael designed each major fresco and the ceiling in turn. He himself made dozens of studies for figures and groups and worked these up into the final compositional studies and finally into the cartoons.

There are two drawings that likely copy the lost modello for The Victory at Ostia. The style of the first, a copy of the entire composition now in the British Museum, indicates that it was probably made in Raphael’s shop (fig. 73). It differs from the final painting in many details of both the foreground figures and the ships in the background. These differences may indicate that there was a delay between the making of the modello and the painting of the fresco. This could mean that the composition was designed by one person and then reworked by that same artist or by someone else. The second copy, possibly by Giorgio Vasari and now in the Louvre, is after the figure of the bound

---

prisoner in front of Leo IV, or after a study for this figure (fig. 74).²⁸ That this drawing copies a sketch may be indicated by the differences in the angles of the man’s head to his torso and the changed relationships between the figures’ chins and their shoulders. There is also a certain looseness of execution, especially in the contour of the left shoulder and the musculature of the left arm, which may show that Vasari was copying a sketch rather than the very tightly defined composition of the painting. On the other hand, we know that Vasari saw and sketched in the Stanze in 1531 so this sheet may have been made from the painting.²⁹ If this drawing is after a study, it does suggest that there were figure studies that are now lost, possibly even many of them.

There are three or four drawings related to The Fire in the Borgo, the fresco in the room with the best claim to being the first painted and the only one that most scholars attribute in its composition and execution to Raphael himself.³⁰ But the painting in the Stanza dell’Incendio that presents the greatest range of evidence for its design process is The Coronation of Charlemagne (fig. 75), which is on the wall opposite The Victory at Ostia. A study for a single figure, sketches for three figure groups, a modello, and an auxiliary cartoon exist.

I begin my analysis with the single figure study as this would be the traditional


³⁰ For the attribution history of this fresco see Dussler, Raphael, pp. 82-83.
next step in the design process after the rough compositional sketch. In this case, the study is by an assistant, probably Giovanni Francesco Penni. The drawing is a red chalk study for the figure of a porter carrying a table on his back in the bottom left of the fresco (fig. 76).31 This drawing is clearly a preparatory study. There are major differences between it and the finished fresco. In the drawing the man’s hands are both visible, the stance is more closed, and he carries what appears to be a generic piece of cornice whereas in the painting he holds an inverted table with a distinctive scroll design. This drawing is assigned to Raphael (or Raphael?) in the latest catalogue of the Italian drawings at Chantilly, but almost all previous scholars attributed it to the shop and to Penni in particular.32 I agree with the majority of scholars on the basis of the stiffness of the contours of the figure and the drawing’s lack of spontaneity. There are no corrections or pentimenti. It is very much a perfunctory drawing that compares best with drawings like the modello for this fresco than with any red chalk figure study by Raphael himself, for example the Albertina drawing of two nude men that was sent to Dürer (fig. 72).

The modello for The Coronation of Charlemagne is a typical Penni drawing (fig. 77).33 Since the purpose of a modello is to serve as the final “proof” of both the

31 Chantilly, Musée Condé 57 (old inv. FR. IX 48 bis.). Dominique Cordellier and Bernadette Py, Dessins italiens du Musée Condé à Chantilly II: Raphaël et son cercle, exh. cat. Chantilly, Musée Condé (Paris, 1997), 7 (R, or shop of R); O/F429 (R); KMO505 (R); J373 (Penni?).


33 Venice, Querini Stampalia 547. O/F430 (Penni); J374 (Penni). See also Shearman,
composition and the use of light and shadow within the painting, these drawings must be very clear and easy to understand. Penni’s stiff and somewhat brittle style serves this function very well, as we shall see when we examine the modelli for the Loggia di Raffaello. But this drawing is more than merely a mechanical rendition of the last stage of the design before the making of the cartoon. There are many major differences between this drawing and the finished painting. This is especially true in the background center of the fresco where a row of dignitaries and soldiers in armor has been added behind the bishops. A cloth screen has also been added between the people and the architecture of the background. So this sheet, while it clearly is a modello and is even squared for transfer to a larger surface such as the large sheet of the cartoon, is not the final phase of the design process.

Two of the remaining three drawings are for groups of figures. The first is a two-sided sheet in red chalk for the bishops on either side of the fresco (figs. 78 & 79).34 Most scholars attribute this drawing to Raphael, with the exception of John Shearman who thought it was by Penni.35 The two drawings on this sheet certainly appear to be fresh, spontaneous ideas for these groups of figures. The drawing on the recto prepares the large group of bishops on the right of the picture and shows some degree of inventiveness in solving the problem of presenting two ranks of seated figures seen in three-quarter view from the back while still showing the figures to be individual living

“Raphael’s Unexecuted Projects,” p. 176, note 84 (Penni).

34 Düsseldorf, Graphische Sammlung FP11r and v. O/F427 and 428 (both R); KMO507 and 509 (both R); J372r and v (R?).

35 Shearman, “Raphael’s Unexecuted Projects,” p. 176, note 84.
beings. This indicates that it comes before the Venice *modello.*

The second of the two group studies is a pen study with white heightening in the Albertina (fig. 80).\(^{36}\) This sheet prepares the singers in the choir loft in the upper left corner of the fresco. Unlike the study for the bishops on the recto of the Düsseldorf sheet, this drawing differs a great deal from the same figures in the Venice *modello.* All scholars attribute this sheet to Raphael or call it a copy after him.\(^{37}\) The great difference between this drawing and the *modello* led Joannides to claim it was a revision of the *modello.*\(^{38}\) This is clearly not the case, given that the *modello* is very close to the fresco, in this part of the composition at least, whereas the study is different in every regard. The implication of Joannides’s statement is that this is a sort of final revision drawing done by Raphael after the *modello* had been made and before the cartoon was created. The existence of an auxiliary cartoon attests to the fact that there was a final revision stage in the creation of this fresco. But the Albertina sketch was not part of the final stage of the design process. Rather it seems to be an idea by Raphael that was incorporated into the final painting in a somewhat more staid form that he originally imagined it. The upper left of the sketch shows the two singers that are most visible in the foreground of the choir loft in the *modello* and the painting, while the lower right seems to show the more forward of the two figures again. In the sketch they seem to lean farther toward the

\(^{36}\) Vienna, Albertina 227 (SR 273). Birke and Kertész, *Die italienischen Zeichnungen,* 227 (Penni?); O/F431 (copy of R); KMO508 (copy of R); J375 (R).

\(^{37}\) For the theory that this drawing is a copy after Raphael see Konrad Oberhuber, *Raphaels Zeichnungen: Entwürfe zu Werken Raphaels und seiner Schule im Vatikan 1511/12 bis 1520,* vol. IX of Fischel, *Zeichnungen,* 1913-42 (Berlin, 1972), 431.

\(^{38}\) Joannides, *The Drawings of Raphael,* 375.
viewer and toward the center of the composition as if they were straining to see and hear
the action taking place at the papal throne in the right center of the composition. This
dynamic pose gives all three figures in the sketch a sense of life and energy that is largely
missing from both the modello and the painting.

The auxiliary cartoon is for the head of the bishop immediately to the left of the
steps that lead to the Papal throne (fig. 81).\(^{39}\) Since an auxiliary cartoon, by definition,
comes after the cartoon itself is made, we may always assume that its purpose is to
correct small details such as heads and hands.\(^{40}\) And in most cases, such as the six
auxiliary cartoons for heads in the lower part of the Transfiguration altarpiece, Raphael
executed them as the final stage before committing a design to paint. In this case most all
scholars agree that, while the bishop’s head has been reworked, the underlying drawing is
by Raphael. Joannides is the most notable exception to this opinion; he considered the
drawing “more likely to be by a pupil than the master,” but did not identify whether
Penni or Giulio Romano was the more likely candidate.\(^{41}\)

The drawings for The Coronation of Charlemagne indicate that Raphael stepped
back from the active role he played in all stages of the design process of the main
frescoed scenes in the first two stanze. In this case, we find that Giovanni Francesco
Penni either took the lead in designing the painting or was Raphael’s equal partner in
creating the first ideas for figures in the painting. Penni did turn those designs into a

---

\(^{39}\) Paris, Louvre 3983. Cordellier and Py, *Inventaire général*, 516 (R); O/F432 (R,
reworked); KMO506 (R); J376 (pupil of R, reworked).

\(^{40}\) Oskar Fischel, “Raphael’s Auxiliary Cartoons,” *Burlington Magazine* 71 (1937): 167-
168.

\(^{41}\) Joannides, *The Drawings of Raphael*, 376.
modello for the entire composition. Raphael was also involved in the last stage of the process using an auxiliary cartoon to correct one of the heads in the fresco. This pattern was replicated in the other paintings in the room. Raphael was always involved in the design to some degree. But he allowed his assistants to play increasingly important roles in the design process.

Next we come to the most problematic group of studies for any of the Stanze frescoes, the red chalk studies for single figures or small groups in The Fire in the Borgo. Scholars attribute these drawings to Raphael or to Giulio. This is interesting because no other drawings for this room have been associated with Giulio other than the sheet with nude studies for The Victory at Ostia with Dürer’s inscription. This drawing, like those for The Fire, is red chalk and prepares a single figure in the foreground of the painting.

The so-called Aeneas and Anchises is actually a sketch for the young man carrying an older man on his back at the far left of the composition (fig. 82). This drawing is clearly preparatory to the painting as the relationship between the heads of the figures is different in each. In the painting more of the lower part of the face of the man being carried can be seen. This drawing has been given to Raphael by Dussler, Oberhuber, and Joannides, among others, and to Giulio by Fischel and Hartt. Opinion is similarly divided about the other drawings in the group. Each of the scholars listed

---

42 Vienna, Albertina 4881 (SR 283). Birke and Kertész, Die italienischen Zeichnungen, 4881 (R); F-T159 (not R); O/F422 (R); KMO497 (R); J367 (R).

43 Dussler, Raphael, p. 83; Oberhuber, Raphaels Zeichnungen, 422; and Joannides, The Drawings of Raphael, 367.

above, with the exception of Dussler, attributed the study for the man hanging from the wall on the left of the composition to the same artist to which he attributed the *Aeneas and Anchises* (fig. 83).\(^{45}\) Dussler switched artists in this case and attributed the man hanging on the wall to Giulio.\(^{46}\) The study of the two women with a child in the center foreground of the painting received precisely the same attribution from each scholar as the *Aeneas and Anchises* (fig. 84).\(^{47}\) Dussler admitted, however, that the drawing could be by Penni, not Giulio. Everyone attributed the study for the kneeling woman with raised arms in the center foreground of the painting to Giulio, although Dussler maintained a dual attribution to Giulio or Penni for the study of the two women, and Oberhuber claimed this sheet was either by Raphael or a pupil (fig. 85).\(^{48}\)

All of these drawings are clearly preparatory to the painting as they exhibit the typical major differences in regard to it, as in the case of the “Aeneas and Anchises” drawing. Were these drawings by Raphael they would present a picture of a master artist creating the sketches from which the final composition of the major mural painting was

\(^{45}\) Vienna, Albertina 4882 (SR 275). Birke and Kertész, *Die italienischen Zeichnungen*, 4882 (R); O/F423 (R); KMO500 (R); J368 (R). See also Fischel, *Raphael*, p. 365 (Giulio).

\(^{46}\) Dussler, *Raphael*, p. 83.

\(^{47}\) Vienna, Albertina 4878 (SR 274). Birke and Kertész, *Die italienischen Zeichnungen*, 4878 (R); O/F425 (R); KMO498 (R); J369 (R). See also Fischel, *Raphael*, p. 365 (Giulio); Hartt, *Giulio Romano*, p. 287 (Giulio); and Dussler, *Raphael*, p. 83 (Giulio or Penni?).

\(^{48}\) Paris, Louvre 4008. Cordellier and Py, *Inventaire général*, 500 (R); O/F424 (R or pupil of R); KMO499 (R); J370 (Giulio?). See also Hartt, *Giulio Romano*, p. 287 (Giulio); Dussler, *Raphael*, p. 83 (Giulio or Penni?).
worked up.\textsuperscript{49} This is precisely what we saw in the case of the Stanza d’Eliodoro. However, in my opinion, they are all by Giulio. We find, therefore, that the situation that prevailed in the ceiling and dado of the Stanza d’Eliodoro has carried over to the walls of the Stanza dell’Incendio. All four sheets share attributes that are characteristic of Giulio’s early style. They all show some awkwardness in the anatomical details and a bit of flatness in the execution of the compositions.

These characteristics can be seen in Giulio’s undisputed early pen drawings such as the two sided sheet with drawings of Venus in Toronto (\textbf{fig. 86}) or the seated male nude in the Albertina (\textbf{fig. 58}), as well as Giulio’s chalk drawings from both before and after his departure from Rome in October 1524 to take up the post of court painter to Federico Gonzaga, the Duke of Mantua, such as the black-chalk study in Windsor Castle of a nude boy holding a stone above his head for the \textit{Stoning of St. Stephen}, painted in about 1520 and now in Santo Stephano in Genoa (\textbf{fig. 87}) or a study in Berlin for the ceiling frescoes of the Gabinetto dei Cesari in the Ducal Palace in Mantua begun in 1536 (\textbf{fig. 88}).\textsuperscript{50} Raphael’s pupils Giulio and Penni seem to have taken over primary responsibility for designing the frescoes. Raphael’s role has been reduced, or elevated, depending on your point of view, to that of a master who intervened in the design process.

\textsuperscript{49} Only Oberhuber attributes them all to Raphael and then with reservations in the case of the Louvre study. Oberhuber, \textit{Raphaels Zeichnungen}, 422-425.

at various stages but who did not single handedly design a single painting.\footnote{There is one other drawing for, or after, this fresco that is worth mentioning, Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 652. This is related to the figure of a woman with a jug on her head in the extreme right of the fresco. It is either a study for, or a copy after, the painting. But most scholars ignore this sheet apparently not believing it to be contemporary with the fresco. Luitpold Dussler (\textit{Raphael}, p. 83) thinks that is a study by either Giulio or Penni while Parker, \textit{Italian Schools}, 652 thinks that, despite the fact that the figure is nude in the drawing and draped in the painting, it is a copy after the fresco.}

The last of the four large wall paintings for this room is \textit{The Oath of Leo III} (\textit{fig. 89}). Like \textit{The Victory at Ostia}, there are very few surviving drawings for this painting. There is a \textit{modello} for the upper left portion in the Horne Foundation in Florence that scholars have attributed to Penni (\textit{fig. 90}).\footnote{Florence, Horne Foundation 5547. O/F432 (Penni); KMO506 (R); J, p. 25 (Penni). See also Fischel, \textit{Raphael}, p. 365 (Penni).} This attribution makes perfect sense in light of Penni’s emerging role within the workshop during these years. He seems to have been the artist responsible for taking all the figure studies, regardless of who drew them, and combining them to make a \textit{modello} of the complete or nearly complete composition, and this seems to be what we see here. But so few drawings survive for this painting that it is impossible to tell who took the lead in designing it.

The only other drawings associated with the painting may, in fact, have nothing to do with it. There is a study for a draped figure that has been linked to this fresco on a sheet in Zurich alongside a study for \textit{The Expulsion of Heliodorus} (\textit{fig. 42}).\footnote{Zurich, Kunsthau N. 56 III. F-T139 (R); O/F397 (R); KMO428 (R); J332 (R). This drawing was associated with the painting by John Shearman (rev. of Frederick Hartt, \textit{Giulio Romano}, 2 vols., New Haven, 1958, \textit{Burlington Magazine} 101 (1959): 457, n. 8) where it was also attributed to Raphael. An attribution that is followed by Luitpold Dussler (\textit{Raphael}, p. 86).} The study for the \textit{Expulsion} is by Raphael, while the draped figure is clearly by another hand. This
drawing does not seem particularly close to any figure in *The Oath of Leo III* and may not be connected to the fresco. Another drawing that also may not be related to this painting is a small study for the head of the deacon in the center of the group to the left of the altar in this fresco.\(^{54}\) Most other scholars have not noticed the drawing, but Oberhuber attributed it to Penni.

So, there are very few drawings for the wall paintings in the Stanza dell’Incendio and those that have survived are either studies for either individual figures or small groups of figures or they are *modelli* for entire paintings. There are no extant “first idea” sketches. As a result we cannot see the very beginning of the design process in the room as we can, for example, in the Stanza della Segnatura. We cannot tell what role Raphael, or any member of the shop, played in the first stages of the ideation process. But the existing drawings do demonstrate beyond doubt that more than one artist participated in all the stages of the design process from the studies of individual figures to the creation of the *modelli*.

The situation concerning the design of the dado is clearer. Three of the four surviving drawings, one for a herm and two for the seated figures of protectors of the Church, are attributed to Giulio more often than to anyone else. The fourth drawing, for the herm to the left of Astolph of England under *The Fire in the Borgo*, is in Haarlem and has been often attributed to Raphael (fig. 91).\(^{55}\) There is such consensus that it seems

---


\(^{55}\) Haarlem, Teylers Museum A64. Tuyll van Serooskerken, *The Italian Drawings*, 232 (R); O/F434 (R); KMO501 (R); J377 (R). See also John Shearman, “Die Loggia der
very unlikely that this drawing is by Guilio. In my opinion, the drawing displays a thorough understanding of the internal forms of the human body, especially the muscles of the abdomen and the upper arms to both the neck and upper torso. Also, the artist of this drawing used the light hatching with which the figure is modeled with great economy. There is no excess of hatching lines and none stray beyond the contour line of the figure. These characteristics seem to indicate the Raphael is the author of this drawing.

The other herm drawing, this one for the figure to the right of Astolph, is more often attributed to Giulio than Raphael (fig 92). In contrast to the other herm drawing, here the artist has failed to grasp fully the relationship between the shoulders, especially the figure’s left one, and the head and upper torso. Giulio always displayed this awkwardness in the anatomy of his nude figures, both drawn and painted. An obvious example is the figure in the foreground of The Marriage of Cupid and Psyche in the Palazzo Te in Mantua, completed in 1528 (fig. 93). Also, the hatching on this sheet is not nearly as tightly controlled as that of the other drawing. The hatching lines are heavier and stray far outside the contours of the figure, thus obviating their effectiveness in modeling the figure in light and shadow. The drawing for King Lothair, a nude study of

---

56 Haarlem, Teylers Museum A65. Tuyll van Serooskerken, The Italian Drawings, 233 (R); O/F435 (R); KMO503 (R); J378 (Giulio). See also Hartt, Giulio Romano, p. 287 (Giulio); Shearman, “Die Loggia der Psyche,” 83-84 (Giulio); Dussler, Raphael, p. 86 (Giulio). The only scholar to maintain an attribution to Raphael in this case is Oberhuber, Raphaels Zeichnungen, 435 (R).
a young study model, is given to Giulio by all scholars (fig. 94). There is one other study that is not often discussed owing to the fact that it is often considered to be a copy. This drawing is a pen study of a seated nude man. These few surviving drawings indicate that, while he may have been involved at some stage of the design process, Raphael was not the lead artist here. Giulio seems to have done more to design the figures for the dado of this room. This is what we would expect given the trend away from the direct involvement of the master in the later Stanze, especially in the less important areas of the painted decoration.

The Loggia di Raffaello:

The decoration of the Loggia di Raffaello on the third level of the Vatican Palace facing the Cortile di San Damaso and immediately adjacent to the Stanze was probably begun in 1518 (fig. 95). Vasari gives us a laundry list of involved artists that includes virtually all of the figures associated with Raphael: Giovanni da Udine, Giulio Romano, Barbara Brejon de Lavergnée, Catalogue des dessins italiens: Collections du Palais des Beaux-Arts de Lille (Paris, 1997), 589 (attr. to Giulio); O/F437 (Giulio); J379 (Giulio). See also Hartt, Giulio Romano, p. 287 (Giulio); Shearman, “Die Loggia der Psyche,” 83-84 (Giulio); Dussler, Raphael, p. 86 (Giulio); and Paul Joannides, Raphael and his Age: Drawings from the Palais des Beaux-Arts, Lille, exh. cat., The Cleveland Museum of Art and Palais des Beaux-Arts, Lille (Paris, 2002), cat. no. 49 (Giulio).

Chatsworth, Devonshire Collection 903v. Michael Jaffé, The Devonshire Collection of Italian Drawings: Roman and Neapolitan Schools (London, 1994), 208 (Giulio after Raphael); O/F, p. 56 (R); J380v (Giulio?). Most other scholars ignore this drawing while attributing the recto, a scene from the Trojan War, to Giulio.

Giovanni Francesco Penni, Tommaso Vincidor, Perino del Vaga, Pellegrino da Modena, Vincenzo Tamagni, Polidoro da Caravaggio and “molti altri pittori.” And the decorative scheme is, indeed, varied and rich. It includes fifty-two narrative scenes from the New and Old Testaments in the vaults of thirteen bays, illusionistic architectural settings for these scenes, *all-antica* grotesques, stuccoes of various subjects, as well as a now-destroyed richly colored tile floor by the Della Robbia workshop and elaborately carved doors. The only document concerning the decoration of this space in the Vatican records is a payment of 25 ducats made on June 11, 1519, “a li garzoni hanno dipinta la logia” and makes no reference to Raphael, revealing nothing about Raphael’s involvement in the execution of the paintings in the Loggia. It also does not tell us what role Raphael’s assistants played in designing the frescoes.

Further references to the Loggia decorations do not tell us much more. The first is a letter dated May 4, 1519, from Marcantonio Michiel to a friend in Venice, in which he recorded that Raphael painted four rooms and a long loggia in the Vatican Palace. The second is a letter from June 16 of the same year, only five days after the payment to

---

60 “Raffaello fece i disegni degli ornamenti di stucchi e delle storie che vi si dipinsero, e similmente de’ partimenti; e quanto allo stucco, ed alle grottesche, fece capo di quella opera Giovanni da Udine, e sopra le figure Giulio Romano, ancora che poco vi lavorasse; così Giovan Francesco, il Bologna, Perino del Vaga. Pellegrino da Modena, Vincenzo da San Gimignano, e Polidoro da Caravaggio, con molti altri pittori che feciono storie e figure, ed altri cose che accadevano per tutto quel lavoro,” Vasari/Milanesi, IV, pp. 362-363.


the garzoni, from Castiglione to Isabella d’Este, the Duchess of Mantua and Castiglione’s patron, whose business had brought him to Rome. The wording of both letters implies that the decoration of the Loggia was finished when they were written, so by the late spring of 1519. The letters reveal that contemporaries considered the Loggia to be by Raphael, regardless of who did the actual painting. Beyond these meager facts contemporary accounts tell us nothing further about the decoration of the Loggia.

Two questions of who invented the compositions and who conceived of the grotesques that decorate almost every surface are left open. The second is almost impossible to answer. Vasari reported that Giovanni da Udine was placed in charge of the stuccoes. Given that this artist was a specialist in imitating Roman stuccoes, painted garlands and the like, it seems certain that he also had charge of the painted all’antica decor. There are a number of paintings on paper by Giovanni that demonstrate his skill in this type of decoration (fig. 96). Giovanni seems to have been employed by Raphael to make this type of decorations for several spaces, including the Loggetta completed in 1516 directly above the south end of the Loggia on the fourth level of the palace, as well as the Loggia di Raffaello.

The forms of the Loggia di Raffaello’s decorative scheme are more tightly interrelated than those in the Loggetta. The panels of grotesques also respond directly to

---

63 "... e va sempre facendo qualche cosa nova in questo Palazzo. Et hor si è fornita una loggia dipinta ...," Shearman, Raphael in Early Modern Sources, doc. 1519/41.

64 On this problem see Dacos, Le Logge di Raffaello, pp. 44-45.

65 Vasari/Milanesi, IV, p. 362.

the architectural elements in the later decoration. In the earlier Loggetta, the distribution of the forms and their relationship to the architecture of the room are more authentically Roman, whereas these same aspects of the Loggia are more High Renaissance in character. The Loggetta decorations have something of the character of fourth-style wall paintings from Pompeii or the grotesques of the Domus Aurea with large expanses of flat wall covered with impossibly thin, almost wispy, architectural forms that are completely independent of the real architecture of the room they inhabit. The Loggia, on the other hand, has more visually substantial painted decorations with each thin pilaster or window frame decorated in a distinctive manner. For example, the fruit garlands that frame the false windows on the interior wall are visually substantial, made up as they are of large forms that almost fill the available wall space. Even the grotesques on the pilasters that mark the junctions between bays of the Loggia are densely packed and leave very little sense of the wall itself. But we do not know, and we shall probably never know, what role Raphael played in the conception of the decorative scheme of stuccoes and painted garlands.

It seems that when Raphael needed a specialist in a specific type of decoration, he turned to the man who was best known for it. Giovanni da Udine, who was born in 1487, was an independent master by the time he joined Raphael’s workshop in Rome.67 This fact alone reveals that Raphael viewed the composition of his workshop with a entrepreneurial eye much the way Michelangelo operated while producing the Medici

---

Chapel in San Lorenzo in Florence between 1520 and 1534. Michelangelo had been at work at San Lorenzo since 1516 when he left Rome to take up the commission of the new façade for the church for Leo X.\textsuperscript{68} Even though architectural projects are by their very nature collaborative and no architect executes all, or any, of the building fabric himself, the façade was supposed to contain a great many sculptures by Michelangelo’s own hand. This commission was never carried beyond the design phase.

The Medici Chapel was, on the other hand, brought almost to completion before the sack of Rome in 1527 intervened, and it was brought to its present state during a resumption of work between 1530 and 1534.\textsuperscript{69} The chapel includes both architectural carving as well as several major sculptures by Michelangelo. In this case, as with many of the late Vatican commissions to Raphael, it is appropriate to ask how Michelangelo divided the work in the room among his assistants and what parts he reserved for himself. He designed all of the sculptures and, it seems, all of the architectural details himself. Michelangelo also spent a great deal of time on site supervising production. He was on site at the church almost every day during the years 1524-27.\textsuperscript{70} But his assistants, especially a succession of \textit{capomaestri} such as Stefano di Tommaso Lunetti and Meo delle Chorte had control over many of the small details of the decorative stonework.\textsuperscript{71} These men were specialists on whom Michelangelo could rely to execute his designs. Michelangelo could also rely on them to supervise others while still remaining loyal to


\textsuperscript{69} Ibid., p. 5.

\textsuperscript{70} Ibid., p. 184.

\textsuperscript{71} Ibid., pp. 75-134.
his intentions.

An even closer analogy can be drawn between Raphael’s assistants in the Loggia and the sculptors who assisted Michelangelo in the Medici Chapel during the second campaign of 1530-34. Michelangelo had sided with the Republicans during the brief collapse of Medici power in Florence that followed the Sack of Rome of 1527. When the Republic fell in 1530, Michelangelo was granted an amnesty by Pope Clement VII on the condition that he had to resume work on the Chapel. He fulfilled the promise, but his heart was no longer in it. He began to spend more time in Rome and less in Florence. He allowed assistants such as Niccolò Tribolo, Raffaello da Montelupo, and Giovanni da Montorsoli to take on more and more major responsibilities in the Chapel. Michelangelo charged Giovanni and Raffaello with making the figures of Saints Cosmas and Damian which flank Michelangelo’s *Virgin and Child* on the otherwise unfinished tomb of Lorenzo the Magnificent and his brother Giuliano. The political situation in Florence compelled Michelangelo to complete the commission for Clement, but the Pope made competing demands that the Chapel be finished quickly and that Michelangelo attend him in Rome for increasing long periods during these years. Each man, and other lesser assistants, worked from sketches provided by Michelangelo, and independently from each other almost as subcontractors. Almost exactly the same situation prevailed in the Loggia di Raffaello: Raphael, who was occupied elsewhere, hired a combination of

---

72 Ibid., pp. 128-134.

73 Condivi wrote that he was motivated by fear rather than love. See Paola Barocchi and Renzo Ristori, eds., *Il Carteggio di Michelangelo*, 5 vols. (Florence, 1965-83), vol. 2, p. 65.

assistants he had trained and independent masters to carry out a complex decorative scheme for an important patron. The only difference between these two almost contemporary situations is that Raphael, unlike Michelangelo, seems to have allowed his assistants to participate in the design process.

Raphael’s and Michelangelo’s entrepreneurial spirit is not unlike the attitude taken by Rubens, and many other artists, in the seventeenth century. Rubens employed painters who were specialists at creating certain effects in painting. He collaborated with many painters over the course of his career. Frans Snyders painted animals in several of Rubens’s paintings such as the *Prometheus Bound* in Philadelphia or *The Crowning of Diana* in Potsdam. Jan Brueghel the Elder painted the flowers in *The Virgin and Child Surrounded by Flowers* in the Louvre. If Raphael employed Giovanni da Udine, an independent master and a specialist, it is not difficult to imagine that he might have divided all aspects surrounding the creation of complex commissions among his assistants, assigning each the task for which he was best suited. Giulio and Penni were younger than Giovanni and so should not be thought of as Raphael’s subcontractors. But on some commissions, such as the Loggia, they seem to have been fairly independent from the master.

The situation with the biblical narratives is entirely different from that of the *all’antica* decorations owing to the large number of related drawings. These drawings allow us some insight into the design process used by Raphael’s *garzoni*. They include

---


76 The development of this entrepreneurial idea after Raphael will be discussed more fully at the end of chapter 6.
nineteen finished drawings that give every appearance of being the modelli upon which the painters of the individual scenes relied,\(^\text{77}\) copies of a further six modelli that do not survive,\(^\text{78}\) and five studies or copies of studies that precede the modelli.\(^\text{79}\) There are indications that the modelli were made as a group before the paintings were begun. The frescoes in the fourth and tenth bays, the stories of Abraham and Joshua respectively, have arched tops while all of the drawings for these scenes are rectangular.\(^\text{80}\) In one case,
the scene of David and Bathsheba in the eleventh bay, an arched drawing (fig. 97) prepares a rectangular fresco (fig. 98). 81 One rectangular drawing for a rectangular painting, the modello in the Uffizi for the scene of Moses Striking the Rock, has an arched line through the upper part of the composition indicating that the maker of the modello did not know what shape the fresco would take (fig. 99). 82 These discrepancies between the formats of the paintings and drawings suggest that the modelli were made all at once close to the beginning of the design process for the entire project and before the formats, arched or rectangular, had been determined for the individual frescoes.

I choose to discuss the nineteen modelli before the figure studies because almost all of these sheets show an evolution of an idea from first compositional sketch to a finished squared modello on a single page. This means that each is a sort of a drawn palimpsest with early stages of the design process in black chalk preserved under the ink and wash final version of the design. Within this group of drawings there is a range of manners. Some, like that for Abraham and the Angels, are tightly drawn and show little evidence of the creative process and few pentimenti (fig. 100). 83 The figures are stiff and the contour lines are not at all sketchy. For example, Abraham’s back is indicated with

---

81 London, British Museum 1900-6-11-2. Pouncey and Gere, Italian Drawings, 66 (Penni); O/F469 (Penni). See also Dacos, Le Logge di Raffaello, pp. 198-199, plate 45 (Penni?).


just two pen strokes. This could be because all the experimentation took place in the black chalk underdrawing and the pen lines were just meant to reinforce the lines and make the composition easier to read before it was squared and then transferred to the wall. On the other hand there are many modelli which show a great deal of evolution at the stage of the pen and wash drawing. These are more loosely drawn and often have pentimenti. The modello for Moses Striking the Rock, is a good example (fig. 99). The underdrawing of this sheet has a figure on the left that was not worked up in the pen and wash. The pen lines also show a great deal of freedom and seem to have been gone over more than once.

One modello of the extant nineteen, the Moses Receiving the Tablets of the Law in the Louvre, is by a different hand than the others (fig. 101). Its many pentimenti and great freedom, especially in the black-chalk underdrawing, clearly show signs of the creative process. The struggle and experimentation in this sheet have led all critics to attribute it to Raphael. In my opinion, the drawing possesses a sense of sureness and clarity despite the somewhat messy tangle of forms in the center of the page. Raphael could build up forms using large areas of wash without a contour line, just the pen line itself, or both depending on the effect he wants to achieve. This means that, no matter how many forms he added to the composition, each line or area of wash has a specific purpose. This same effect can be seen in some of Raphael’s earlier and secure pen and wash studies and modelli. An excellent example is the study in Windsor Castle for the left side of the Disputa (fig. 23).

It seems probable that all of the remaining eighteen authentic modelli are by the

---

84 Paris, Louvre 3849. Cordellier and Py, *Inventaire général*, 698 (R); O/F465 (R); KMO584 (R); J389 (R). See also Dacos, *Le Logge di Raffaello*, p. 186, plate 35 (R).
same draftsman, and that he is not Raphael. The styles of these eighteen sheets are very close to one another and all were created in exactly the same media applied in the same manner: pen and brown ink and brush and brown wash highlighted with white over an underdrawing in black chalk. All are squared for enlargement in black chalk. The squares range in size from around fifteen to thirty-one millimeters depending on the varying sizes of the sheets, although the proportions of the sheets and the squaring lines are close enough to counter any doubt that all the drawings belong to a single group. All these drawings have been attributed to Giovanni Francesco Penni. Penni’s role within the workshop was to make clean design drawings and modelli based on the sketches of others. This may be the origin of his nickname, il Fattore (the maker). All the drawings share a rather mechanical quality and exactly the same media. There are few if any pentimenti. The application of the ink wash is especially bland. It is not used to build a sense of three-dimensionality and solidity of form, as Raphael does in his modelli that include wash, such as the one for the Jurisprudence wall of the Stanze della Segnatura (fig. 18). Rather the wash in the Loggia modelli is used merely to indicate the areas of shadow in the frescoes, which very often follow the drawings precisely.

Most nineteenth-century scholars regarded Penni, or some other member of the shop, the artist who worked up these drawings from sketches in black chalk by Raphael. According to this interpretation, the assistants made modelli on top of Raphael’s sketches that were then squared for enlargement to a cartoon used on the vault surface itself. In this scenario Raphael stood at the beginning of the design process and retained the role of the inventor of all the compositions. It also means that the entire design process for each fresco is present on one sheet of paper from first idea to finished modello.
Confirmation of this theory seemed to have been found when, sometime between 1857, when the drawing for the *Expulsion of Adam and Eve from Paradise* was first photographed (fig. 102), and 1876, when a second photograph was taken, which revealed the accidental removal of the pen and wash from the modello uncovering the black-chalk underdrawing (fig. 103).85 This faint drawing was assumed to be by Raphael. In fact it seems to be by the same hand as most of the other modelli. If Penni created most of the drawings in this group, then this underdrawing provides a look at Penni’s personal style in the early stages of creating a composition.86

I have examined thirteen of the nineteen surviving modelli myself and none show any sign of having been worked by more than one hand. These drawings can be compared with similarly highly finished modelli from the orbit of Giulio that show no signs of Giulio’s Mantuan style and yet are too late to be a product of Raphael’s Roman workshop. This group of modelli includes three scenes from ancient history now in the Albertina (fig. 104).87 But, since Penni was always under the influence of some other master and had no independent career after Raphael died, it is very difficult to pin down his personal style.

The hypothesis that Raphael’s assistants were the inventors of these scenes is borne out by the few surviving design studies. Four of these seem authentic, although

85 Windsor, Royal Library 12729. A.E. Popham and Johannes Wilde, *The Italian Drawings of the XV and XVI Centuries in the Collection of His Majesty the King at Windsor Castle* (London, 1949), 806 (Penni); O/F457 (R and Penni); KMO582 (R or Penni). See also Dacos, *Le Logge di Raffaello*, pp. 158-159, plate 14 (Penni).


some of them have been called copies. They all show a degree of freedom in the use of the medium, whether pen or chalk. This is often most evident in the contour lines of the figures, but also appears in some of the areas of hatching within the figures. This degree of freedom is never seen in known copies from this period and indicates that these drawings are true sketches from early in the design process of the paintings.

The only drawing associated with the whole project that has always been universally attributed to Raphael is a preparatory sketch in the Albertina in Vienna for David Beheading Goliath (fig. 105). The drawing is not squared and contains only the fresco’s three foreground figures in reversed positions compared to the painting; nevertheless it could have served as the *modello* for at least the figures in the fresco. It is made entirely with black chalk with no ink or white heightening. Were it not for the fact that this drawing is more heavily worked than the underdrawings of any surviving *modello*, we might assume that we are looking at the “idea” sketch by Raphael that he gave to Penni to work up into a finished *modello*. It could even be that this never occurred because it was decided to reverse the fresco (fig. 106). Reversing the direction of a drawing was a simple enough task in the Renaissance requiring only a window pane and a sunny day. The original drawing was simply placed against the glass on a bright

---

88 The authentic ones are: Metropolitan Museum of Art, Uffizi, Windsor, and Albertina, see note 79 above.

89 Vienna, Albertina 178 (SR 216). Birke and Kertész, *Die italienischen Zeichnungen*, 178 (R); O/F468 (R); KMO583 (R); J390 (R). See also Dacos, *Le Logge di Raffaello*, pp. 194-195, plate 43 (R).

day with the image facing out and a second sheet placed over it. Then the image could be traced onto the top sheet and the new drawing would be in reverse of the first version. Regardless, there must have been a *modello* for this scene other than this unsquared sheet.\(^9\) This sheet, unique among all the drawings for the Loggia, can serve as an example of Raphael’s style at this time. This drawing can be compared to Raphael’s black chalk studies for the *Expulsion of Heliodorus*, especially the two-sided sheet in the Ashmolean Museum with studies for the women in the left foreground of the fresco (figs. 43 & 44).

Many scholars have claimed that the lost *modello* for this scene can be seen reflected in two prints after it: an engraving by Marcantonio Raimondi (fig. 107) and a chiaroscuro woodcut by Ugo da Carpi (fig. 108).\(^9\) There is no question that the prints are related. They are exactly the same size down to the millimeter and contain precisely the same composition. The fact that they are in opposite directions confirms that one is based on the other. It is hard to know which came first. Both artists made prints after Raphael’s drawings. Both usually made their prints in the same direction as the drawing, but both sometimes reversed the compositions, although Ugo does this less often. Vasari mentioned a woodcut of *David and Goliath* by Ugo after a design by Raphael, but he also

---

\(^9\) There is a drawing in the Hamburg Kunsthalle, inv. no. 38654, which has been suggested as a copy of a lost first modello which was rejected in favor of a design now reflected in the fresco. This drawing has exactly the same composition as Marcantonio’s engraving discussed below and may be a copy from the same prototype used by the engraver, or it may be a copy of the engraving. See Innis H. Shoemaker and Elizabeth Broun, *The Engravings of Marcantonio Raimondi*, exh. cat., Lawrence, Spencer Museum of Art, University of Kansas and Chapel Hill, The Ackland Art Museum, University of North Carolina (Lawrence, 1981), pp. 166-168 and Oberhuber and Gnann, *Roma e lo stile classico*, pp. 168-170.

noted the engraving by Marcantonio. Vasari’s assertion that Ugo used a drawing by Raphael could be based on nothing more than the inscription at the bottom of the woodcut which Vasari, an avid collector of prints, may have owned. So, we cannot know which came first.

It is certain, however, that the first print was based on Raphael’s sketch in Vienna and not on a lost modello. Both prints differ from the fresco in every detail not contained in the drawing. A lost rejected modello is also not required, given the fact that it was regular practice for Marcantonio to supply backgrounds for compositions that came to him from Raphael with none. A very prominent example is Marcantonio’s engraving of the Massacre of the Innocents based on Raphael’s design (fig. 109). None of the six sheets that contain studies for figures in the composition contain any hint of the environment into which the scene is placed in the engraving. Since Ugo rarely invented his own background for compositions supplied to him by Raphael, this might be an argument in favor of the primacy of the engraving. So the prints, while they tell us something about the way Raphael worked with his engravers, do not provide much insight into the development of the fresco. The only thing that is certain is Raphael’s authorship of the sketch.

The pen study for the scene of The Division of the Promised Land by Lot, now in the royal collection at Windsor Castle, perfectly illustrates the problems presented by

---

93 Vasari/Milanesi, V, pp. 416, 421.

94 RAPHAEL VRBINAS / P VGO DA CARPO; see Oberhuber and Gnann, Roma e lo stile classico, p. 169.

95 The six drawings are: London, British Museum 1860-4-14-446 and 1865-9-15-624; Windsor, Royal Library 12737; Vienna, Albertina 188 (SR 220) and 189 (SR 221); and Budapest, Museum der Schönen Künste 2195.
these drawings (fig. 110). This drawing is in pen and shows every indication of being a preparatory sketch, rather than a modello. It contains no wash indicating the area of shadow, as do all the other modelli. It also prepares in detail only the figure group in the foreground, while the landscape background is indicated with very sketchy lines. It is, however, squared in black chalk and so, since it contains all of the figures included in the painting, it could have been used as a modello by the artist developing this fresco. This drawing seems to me to be by Giulio and not a copy. This is because of the tiny return strokes at the end of each hatching line inside the figures. This is typical of Giulio and occurs in his pen drawings throughout his career. There is also some awkwardness in the handling of the anatomy. This can be seen in the flattened torso of the young nude boy in the center of the composition, which makes the upper body of this figure appear to twist somewhat awkwardly in space as he reaches back and to his right. The problem is solved in the fresco by having the figure stand with his shoulders more square to the picture plane. That the sheet is not a copy is made clear by the sketchiness of the landscape elements and the fact that the figures have been worked up from relatively loose sketches to solid and stable figures.

The same controversy about attribution applies to both the drawing for Moses  

96 Windsor, Royal Library 12728. Popham and Wilde, The Italian Drawings, 807 (copy of R); O/F467 (Penni). See also Dacos, Le Logge di Raffaello, pp. 193-194, plate 41 (Perino) and Clayton, Raphael and his Circle, 34, pp. 129-131 (workshop of R, attributed to Giulio).

97 The drawing has been attributed to Raphael by John Gere (Drawings by Raphael and his Circle from British and North American Collections, exh. cat. [New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, 1987], cat. no. 47), to Penni copying Raphael by Philip Pouncey and John Gere (Italian Drawings, p. 51), to Penni acting independently of Raphael by Konrad Oberhuber (Raphaels Zeichnungen, 467), to Giulio acting independently of Raphael by Martin Clayton (Raphael and his Circle, 33], and to Perino acting independently of Raphael by Nicole Dacos (Le Logge di Raffaello, p. 193).
before the Burning Bush in the Uffizi (fig. 111)⁹⁸ and The Baptism of Christ in the British Museum (fig. 112). Like the drawing for The Division of the Promised Land by Lot, the Moses drawing in the Uffizi is in pen with no underdrawing. Similar, too, is the squaring in black chalk and their possible use as the modelli for the scenes they prepare. It appears, however, that, just as with the drawing for The Division of the Promised Land, the Moses drawing was not made as a modello. This sketch prepares only the principal figures of God emerging from the fire and Moses, about one half of the total surface of the fresco. It is possible that the sheet has been cut down, removing some of the more mundane landscape elements and making the composition tighter and more attractive to collectors.

The Baptism (fig. 112) is not squared.⁹⁹ It cannot have been intended as a modello given the important differences between the painting and the drawing, especially on the left side where the number, positions, and relationship of the figures do not match. The Moses before the Burning Bush in the Uffizi seems to be by Giulio. It shares all of the characteristics of his early pen style that are evident in the Division of the Promised Land by Lot. The Baptism looks more like Perino del Vaga, to whom Dacos attributed it. It shares many characteristics with drawings Perino made during his years in Rome for documented projects. One such sheet in the Metropolitan Museum of Art is for the decoration of the Pucci Chapel in the church of Santa Trinità del Monte in Rome,

⁹⁸ Florence, Uffizi 1222E. Petrioli Tofani, Uffizi: Inventario 1, 1222E (school of R); O/F462 (copy of R). See also Dacos, Le Logge di Raffaello, pp. 182-183, plate 32 (copy of R).

⁹⁹ London, British Museum 1861-6-8-150. Pouncey and Gere, Italian Drawings, 67 (Penni); O/F470 (Penni). See also Dacos, Le Logge di Raffaello, pp. 204-205, plate 51 (copy of Perino?).
decorated by Perino during 1521-23. The Presentation of the Virgin (fig. 113) shows the same shaky contour lines around the figures and the same curious bunches of drapery that seem to defy gravity as they cling to the figures as we find in the Baptism. Masses of hair are also treated in the same way both drawings. The hair seems to form one solid mass at the crown of the head and then separates into bundles as it moves away from the skull of the figures. This can be seen in the figure in the lower right corner of the Presentation and in the figure of Christ in the Baptism.

What conclusions can we draw from the drawings? It seems that Raphael was involved at the very beginning of the design process in at least one scene, David and Goliath, and possibly at the end of the process for another scene, Moses Receiving the Tablets. But we also know that at least two other artists participated in the beginning stages of design, Giulio Romano in the case of The Division of the Promised Land by Lot, and the author or authors of the drawings for Moses and the Burning Bush and the Baptism. Raphael’s lack of direct involvement in any stage of the creation of many of the scenes would not have been seen as a negative reflection on the master any more than Pinturicchio’s use of Raphael to design scenes in the Piccolomini library sixteen years earlier had been. It was still his reputation on the line. Castiglione’s and Michiel’s assertions that the Loggia is “by” Raphael are entirely correct. He was awarded the commission. His judgment of decorum and quality guided the project, even though he was not involved in the design process or even in the invention of all, or most, of the scenes.

Chapter 5: The Sala di Costantino (1519-24)

The history of the decoration of the last and largest of the Stanze, the Sala di Costantino, is much more difficult to work out than any of Raphael’s previous projects (fig. 114). This is because work was interrupted by Raphael’s death in April 1520, and again by the death of Leo X in December 1521. The room is located in the northeast corner of the oldest part of the Apostolic palace between the Stanza d’Eliodoro and the Loggia di Raffaello. It is more than twice the size of any of the other three Stanze decorated by Raphael and his shop. The decoration of the room is now very much as it appeared in the early sixteenth century, with the exception of the ceiling that was replaced in the early 1580s. There are three different fresco cycles, all of which start in the northeast corner of the room on the east wall and proceed clockwise around the walls. The first of these cycles consists of the main narrative scene on each wall. These depict four episodes from the life of Constantine the Great. The second cycle is comprised of a

---


2 Quednau, Die Sala di Costantino, pp. 31-32.
closely related series of scenes from the life of Constantine in the dado of each wall painted to imitate small bronze reliefs. The third cycle is a series of eight canonized popes seated in niches and accompanied by personifications of virtues, one on either side of the main scene on each wall.

The large narrative scene on the east wall shows Constantine’s vision of the cross in the sky while he addresses his troops (fig. 115). This subject is usually called the Adlocutio or the Vision of Constantine. This painting is flanked on the left by St. Peter accompanied by Ecclesia and Aeternitas, and on the right by St. Clement I with Moderatio and Comitas. The main scene on the south wall is The Battle of Constantine and Maxentius at the Milvian Bridge (fig. 116). This composition, by virtue of its large size and dramatic intensity, is the centerpiece of the program. The enthroned pope to the left of the battle is labeled Sylvester I. This misidentification was probably made in 1778 when Cristoforo Unterberger restored the bottom part of the fresco and sealed over the door leading to the Sala dei Chiaroscuri. The original label likely read Alexander I.3 Personifications of Fides and Religio are represented below the pope. To the right of the battle is St. Urban I with Iustitia and Charitas. The figures of Comitas and Iustitia are painted in oil. These figures may be early tests of the oil mural technique, an idea that will be discussed below.

The main scene on the west wall is The Baptism of Constantine by Pope Silvester I (fig. 117). This is flanked on the left by St. Damasus I with Prudentia and Pax and on the right by St. Leo I with Innocentia and Veritas. The final large scene is Constantine’s

Donation of Rome to Pope Silvester I (fig. 118). To the left is St. Sylvester I, this time labeled correctly, with Fortitudo and to the right is St. Felix I with Fulminatio. The popes on the north wall have only one personification each because they and their companions are squeezed into a relatively small space beside the windows. The small scenes on the dado of the east and south walls show various scenes from before and after the Battle of the Milvian Bridge. Those on the west and north walls are concerned with Constantine’s deeds after becoming the sole ruler of the Roman Empire. In addition, putti playing with the papal insignia and with the diamond ring that was the personal emblem of the Medici Pope Clement VII occupy the spaces above the windows on the north wall. There are also architectural fantasies in the window embrasures.

The use of Medici imprese throughout the room provides some indication of which parts are likely to have been painted before the death of Leo X on December 1, 1521, and which parts after the coronation of Clement VII on November 19, 1523. Leo X used an impresa with a yoke and a white ribbon bearing the motto “SUAVE” that can be found in other parts of the Stanze that were decorated under Leo’s patronage such as the window embrasures in the Stanza della Segnatura. The caryatids that stand on plinths next to the papal thrones on the west, north, and south walls carry yokes and are entwined in ribbons with “SUAVE” on them. These are the walls containing the Adlocutio, Battle of the Milvian Bridge, and Donation of Rome. These figures would have seemed to carry the weight of the wood timber ceiling that was in the room when the frescoes were made. Clement’s impresa consists of a sun whose rays shine through a

---

crystal sphere and set a tree on fire with a white ribbon with the motto “CANDOR ILLESUS.” This motto is found on ribbons that twist around the caryatids on the west wall above the papal thrones that flank the Baptism of Constantine. These figures have been transformed on this wall into Apollo and Diana. In each pair the god’s head shines with the light of the sun. The rays pass through a crystal sphere Apollo holds and set ablaze a spear held by his sister Diana.

This allows us to divide the room into three phases. The first comprises the early test figures in oil, Comitas on the east wall below and to the right of St. Clement I and Iustitia on the south wall below and to the left of St. Urban I. Phase two takes in the rest of the room painted before the death of Leo X, the entire east and south walls save for the figures in oil and the upper parts of the west wall. Phase three includes the main scene on the west wall and the entire north wall. Aside from the imprese there are many documentary sources that tell us a great deal about the progress of the painting.

Paolo Giovio mentioned the room in the life of Raphael he wrote in the 1520s and published in Venice in 1546. The entire reference to the project reads, “... eius extremum opus fuit devicti Maxentii pugna in ampliore caenaculo inchoata, quam discipuli aliquanto post absolverunt.” This statement that Raphael began the decoration of the room that was finished by his followers could refer only to the creation of designs and

---

5 Ibid., pp. 66-68. “Candor illesus” means “unblemished innocence.” The rays of the sun, focused by the crystal, burn the tree while they leave the white ribbon undamaged.


7 Paola Barocchi, ed., Scritti d’arte del cinquecento (Milan, 1971), I, p. 14. “... his last work was the battle and defeat of Maxentius which he began in the larger room, completed much later by his followers.”
does not imply that Raphael, or anyone else, had actually set brush to plaster during Raphael’s life. Giovio could be describing the design process when he claims that Raphael “began” the battle and that the painting itself was carried out entirely after the master’s death.

Vasari commented at length about this room’s decoration in the Vite, in the lives of Raphael, Penni, and Giulio. In the life of Raphael, Vasari stated that Leo X commissioned Raphael to decorate the room and that the artist started the project. His mention of it in Penni’s biography in the first edition of the Lives clarified that the Sala di Costantino was one of many works commissioned from Raphael that were finished by Giulio and Penni after the master’s death: “...Giulio Romano e Gio Francesco molto tempo sterono insieme, e finirono di compagnia l’opere che di Raffaello erano rimase imperfette, ... e similmente la sala grande di palazzo; dove si venggone dipinte per loro le storie di Gostantino, e nel vero e’ fecero bonissime figure con bella practica e maniera, ancora che le invenzioni e gli schizzi della storie venissero da Raffaello.” The words “in parte” were added to the last phrase for the 1568 version of the life. Since both Giulio

---


10 “...Giulio Romano e Giovanfrancesco, stati suoi discepoli, stettono molto tempo insieme, e finirono di compagnia l’opere che di Raffaello erano rimase imperfette, ... e similmente quelle della sala grande di palazzo; dove sono di questi due dipinte le storie di Costantino con bonissime figure, e condotte con bella practica e maniera: ancor che le invenzioni e gli schizzi della storie venissero in parte da Raffaello,” Vasari/Milanesi, IV, p. 645. “...Giulio Romano and Giovan Francesco, who had been his disciples, remained together for a long time, and finished in company such of Raffaello’s works as had been left unfinished, ... and likewise those of the Great Hall of the Palace, wherein are painted
and Penni had died before 1550, it is not clear what other evidence could have been gathered between the two versions that would have caused Vasari to give some share of the design process to the workshop in the later version of the Penni’s life.

By far the longest discussion of the room is in Vasari’s life of Giulio. Here Vasari clearly stated that the room was not worked on between the deaths of Raphael and Leo. He elaborated by explaining that Giulio and Penni intended to execute some cartoons left by Raphael for this room when Adrian IV was elected in January of 1522 and put a stop to this and all papal artistic commissions. Vasari specified that Raphael had begun to work in the room and had prepared one wall for painting in oil. After the election of Giulio de’ Medici to the papacy in November 1522 as Clement VII, work began again on the room. The first order of business was to destroy the oil preparation on one wall and anything already painted on it except for two figures in oil: “...lasciando però nel suo essere due figure ch’egliano avevano prima dipinte a olio, che sono per ornamento intorno a certi papi: e ciò furono una Iustizia ed un’altra figura simile.” Despite the fact that they are on two different walls, this reference must refer to the Comitas to the right of St. Clement I on the east wall and the Iustitia to the left of St. Urban I on the south wall. These two figures are painted in oil. Vasari explicitly claimed

by the hands of those two masters the stories of Constantine, with excellent figures, executed in an able and beautiful manner, although the invention and the sketches for these stories came in part from Raffaello,” Giorgio Vasari, Lives of the Painters, Sculptors and Architects [London, 1912], trans. Gaston du C. de Vere (New York, 1996), I, p. 820.

11 Vasari/Milanesi, V, p. 527.

12 Ibid., V, pp. 527-28. “... but they left untouched two figures that they had painted previously in oils, which serve as adornments to certain Popes; and these were a Justice and another similar figure,” Vasari, Lives of the Painters, II, p. 120.
that only one wall was prepared for oil and only one wall was stripped of this preparation. Only after all this, it seems, could painting begin in earnest.

Yet he indicated that two figures were preserved and there are, in fact, two figures in oil. But they are on two different walls. This kind of small error is the type that Vasari made frequently, despite the fact that, in this case as with so many others, Vasari had the opportunity to study the works at first hand. Despite this small mistake, we should not underestimate the importance of Vasari to our understanding of any aspect of the career of a sixteenth-century painter such as Raphael. As we shall see, Vasari was able to interview people involved in these projects including Giulio Romano.13

Vasari’s account is directly contradicted by Sebastiano del Piombo’s letters written from Rome to Michelangelo in Florence. Sebastiano aimed to keep Michelangelo informed of Raphael’s shop’s activities while at the same time asking for aid in securing the commission himself. The first is a relatively short letter written on April 12, 1520. In it Sebastiano informed Michelangelo of Raphael’s death just six days earlier and then asked for a recommendation so that he might paint the room instead of Raphael’s helpers: “Hora brevemente vi aviso come el si ha a depingere la salla de’ pontifici, del che e’ garzoni de Rafaello bravano molto, et voleno depingerla a olio. Vi prego vogliate arecordarvi de me et recomandarini a monsignor reverendissimo; et se io son bono a simel imprese, vogliate metermi in opera, perché io non vi farò vergogna, come credo non vi haver facto insino al presente.”14 Sebastiano mistakenly referred to the Sala di...

13 See below at note 31.

14 Paola Barocchi and Renzo Ristori, eds., *Il Carteggio di Michelangelo* (Florence, 1965), 1, p. 227. “Now I will tell you briefly about the painting of the sala de’ pontifici, of which the garzoni of Raphael brag much, and want to paint in oil. I pray you to
Costantino as the Sala dei Pontefici, the name of the room directly below on the second level of the palace in the apartments that were being decorated for Alexander VI Borgia when he died in 1503. Perino del Vaga and Giovanni da Udine, members of Raphael’s shop, eventually redecorated the Sala dei Pontefici beginning in 1521 after Raphael’s death. The most reverend Monsignor to which Sebastiano referred is Bernardo Dovizi, Cardinal Bibbiena, a close friend of Leo X and a high official in the Chancellery. This letter implies that, while planning and design work must have been begun under Raphael’s supervision, no work had actually been carried out in the room before Raphael’s death. If there were paintings on the walls by Raphael, or after his designs and carried out under his supervision, Sebastiano could not have hoped to obtain the entire commission for himself, an event that would entail the destruction of the last of Raphael’s paintings executed during his life. Surely, given the presence in Rome of a group of artists capable of finishing the paintings according to Raphael’s designs, the part of the work carried out under his supervision would have been preserved and carried forward. The letter does confirm Vasari’s observation that the garzoni intended to paint in oil rather than fresco.

Michelangelo did as his protégé asked and dispatched a letter to Cardinal Bibbiena sometime in June pleading that Sebastiano should be given an opportunity to paint the room. On July 3, however, we learn in a letter to Michelangelo from Sebastiano that Raphael’s helpers had been given the commission and had painted a test

remember me and recommend me to the most reverend Monsignor; and if I am the right man for the job, I would like you to set me to work on it, because I will not disgrace you, as indeed I believe I have not done up to now.”

15 Ibid., I, p. 232.
figure in oil that Sebastiano, at least, found very beautiful. 16 Apparently he got the unhappy news from Cardinal Bibbiena, who also confided that the Pope did not like what Raphael’s students had done: “... [i]l Papa non li piace quello ha facto que’ garzoni de Rafaello.”17 It must be remembered that Leo X was born Giovanni de’ Medici, the second son of Lorenzo the Magnificent, and the exact contemporary of Michelangelo. Both men grew up in Lorenzo’s court in Florence during the great efflorescence of music, poetry, the visual arts, and humanist philosophy in the 1480s and 90s. It should therefore come as no great surprise that Leo’s tastes were both sophisticated and particular when it came to the decoration of this important audience hall. And he might be inclined to take Michelangelo’s suggestion seriously. But this does not seem to have affected the fate of Raphael’s followers.18

Two other letters from Sebastiano to Michelangelo on September 6 and 7, 1520, confirm that Raphael’s garzoni were working on the project. The first makes clear that Sebastiano was asked to paint part of the room but then the offer was retracted and he was instead requested to paint the entire Sala dei Pontefici on the floor below. Sebastiano refused this commission. He quoted the servant of the Pope who delivered the bad news, “... el Papa me ha hordinato che vi deba offerir la salla de’ potifici da basso.’ ...io non la farei, perché a me pare non esser inferior a li garzoni de Rafaello da Urbino, maxime

16 Ibid., I, p. 233.

17 Ibid., I, p. 233. “... the Pope does not like what has been done by the garzoni of Raphael.”

18 It has recently been suggested that Michelangelo’s letter, because it damned the Venetian with faint praise, made Sebastiano a figure of fun at the Papal court and effectively ended any chance he had of obtaining the commission. See Rona Goffen, *Renaissance Rivals: Michelangelo, Leonardo, Raphael, Titian* (New Haven, 2002), pp. 254-264.
haverdomi offerto meza la sala de sopra, de bocca del Papa, et non mi par honesto che io
depinga codamodo le cantine et loro le stancie dorate. Io li ho dicto che facino depinger
a loro.” He begged with Michelangelo to help him obtain the commission for the Sala
di Costantino, “the most honorable in the world.” At the end of the letter Sebastiano
explained that the *garzoni* had been given the full commission because they had drawings
by Raphael for the main scenes.20

As Hartt pointed out, there are many reasons to doubt this statement.21 It is
strange that this is the first report we have that Raphael left designs for the room, given
that the competition between the *garzoni* and Sebastiano had been going on for five
months. There are two obvious reasons why Sebastiano might have falsified his report
about drawings. First, Raphael’s *garzoni* might have exaggerated the number of
drawings by Raphael they held in order to gain the commission. They did not outright lie
since at least two black chalk studies for the *Battle of the Milvian Bridge*,22 drawings that
will be discussed at length below, are by Raphael’s own hand (figs. 119 and 120). But
no compositional sketches or *modelli* by Raphael survive, with the possible exception of

19 Barocchi and Ristori, *Il Carteggio di Michelangelo*, I, p. 239. “‘The Pope ordered that
I offer you the Sala dei Pontefici below.’ ...I would not do it, because I do not think I am
inferior to Raphael of Urbino’s *garzoni*, above all I had been offered half of the upper
room by the Pope, and it does not seem honest that I paint in this way the cellars and they
the gilded rooms. I told him that they could paint it.”

20 “Queste istorie me disse el Papa che le voleano, et che costoro li aveano e’ disegni de

21 Frederick Hartt, “The Chronology of the Sala di Costantino,” *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*,
ser. 6, 36 (1949): 302-3.

the *modello* for the *Battle of the Milvian Bridge*,\textsuperscript{23} and very few figure studies have been attributed to him. Second, Sebastiano may have lied in order to convince Michelangelo to help him by providing drawings for the project. There are several indications that this second hypothesis may be close to the truth. In the letter, Sebastiano provided a list of the subjects of the main scene on each wall.\textsuperscript{24} These included the *Adlocutio*, the *Battle of the Milvian Bridge*, prisoners brought before the emperor, and Constantine refusing to bathe in the blood of children to cure his leprosy.

These themes, the last two of which changed before the west and north walls were painted, were obviously provided to whet Michelangelo’s appetite for the project in the hope that the elder artist might respond with designs without further prompting. If the subjects were the carrot, the comment about the *disegni* from Raphael’s own hand may have been the stick intended to heighten Michelangelo’s sense of competitive spirit with Raphael, or at least with the dead master’s ideas. Sebastiano, therefore, had much to gain from exaggerating Raphael’s direct role in the ideation of the subjects.

Sebastiano also reported that Michelangelo’s name came up in his discussion with the servant, “‘Si Michelangelo me respondesse et che l’acetase quello li ho scripto?’ Lui me rispose: ‘Indubitatamente el Papa se contentaria, et fariano depinger coloro in altri

\textsuperscript{23} Discussed below at note 57.

\textsuperscript{24} “Li va primamente l’istoria de Costantino imperatore, come li aparse ne l’aria una croce ne un fulguro, che in segno de quella l’averia vitoria, et amazò un certo Re. Da poi, ne la fazata mazore, una bataglia, cioè un facto d’arme, che questa dicono costoro che la vole principiare; da poi, ne l’altra facia, una representatione a l’Imperatore de’ prisoni; ne l’altra fazata, el preparamento de l’incendio del sangue de quei putti, che li intravengono done assai et putini et manegoldi per amazarli, per far el bagno de l’imperator Costantino,” Barocchi and Ristori, *Il Carteggio di Michelangelo*, I, p. 240.
The implication seems to be that it was not just Sebastiano’s opinion that Michelangelo’s help could make the difference in securing the commission, but that this interpretation of events was widely agreed on at court. The letter of September 7 is quieter in tone. It is possible that the letter of the day before crossed one by Michelangelo that does not survive. In it Sebastiano made a half-hearted attempt to secure Michelangelo’s help. Sebastiano tried again in a final letter dated October 15, 1520. In this dispatch, Sebastiano claimed that he had heard that the Pope was unhappy with what Giulio and company were doing in the room. The Pope reportedly railed against the *garzoni*, “...et se non fanno meglio di quello hanno principiato... o vero la farò depinger a damaschi.”

Sebastiano’s series of reports to Michelangelo began on July 3 and continued over four months, culminating in the October 15 letter about the Pope’s negative reactions to Raphael’s former students. The sequence suggests that Sebastiano took special pains to point out any unhappiness with the garzoni’s work, even fabricating some of it, in order to make the possibility of getting involved in the project more attractive to Michelangelo. Despite Sebastiano’s closeness to the situation in Rome during this period, we have to remember that he was an interested party. We must analyze his statements about the progress of the room and the members of Raphael’s shop working there with this in mind.

On the other hand, an independent report corroborates that the paintings made in

---

25 Barocchi and Ristori, *Il Carteggio di Michelangelo*, I, p. 240. “‘If Michelangelo would respond and accept what I have written?’ He responded, ‘Undoubtedly, the Pope would be content and make them paint elsewhere.’”


27 Barocchi and Ristori, *Il Carteggio di Michelangelo*, I, p. 247. “...and if they do no better than they did at the beginning... in truth I will make them paint damasks.”
the room were disliked, if not by the Pope, at least by many others at court. This is a letter written to Michelangelo in Florence by Leonardo Sellaio on December 15, 1520. Sellaio said that the Pope had returned from being away the day before and, “Aspertermo vadia a vedere le piture della sala, le quale sono una chosa ribalda, che farebe meg[li]o el mio ghobo.”

The last significant contemporary progress report came a full year after Sellaio’s letter to Michelangelo in a letter written on December 16, 1521, from Baldassare Castiglione in Rome to his employer Marchese Federico II Gonzaga in Mantua. In a brief discussion of Raphael’s helpers (“allevi”), some of whom Federico was trying to persuade to come to his court, Castiglione mentioned that the Sala di Costantino was more than half finished.

Hartt and most other modern critics assumed that the paintings we see today are the ones to which Castiglione referred in December 1521, and not the paintings in oil that caused the Pope and others such consternation during the late fall of 1520. Vasari, it will be remembered, claimed that the oil preparation was destroyed at the beginning of Clement’s pontificate in November 1523. Vasari may have been mistaken about the date of the destruction of the first campaign of oil murals stating that it took place in 1523 when in fact it happened in the winter or early spring of 1520/21. The only parts of these

---

28 Ibid., I, p. 266. “We are waiting for him to see the paintings in the sala, these are a vulgar thing, my hunchback could do better.”


30 Hartt, Giulio Romano, I, p. 44.
original murals to survive are the figures of *Comitas* and *Iustitia*. After all, Vasari gathered much of his information about Raphael and his school during a brief stop to visit Giulio in Mantua in the early winter of 1541 when he was on his way from Florence to Venice to work on some stage designs for Aretino. 31 Giulio’s recollections were added to interviews with others who were in the Vatican in the early 1520s and Vasari’s own memories of sketching in the papal apartments in the winter of 1532/33. 32 It is hardly surprising that he should confuse the sequence of work and destruction in one room during a short span of time twenty years before his conversations with Giulio.

Recently Fabio Fernetti separated the two figures in oil into two different periods in the development of the room’s decoration. 33 He took Vasari at his word when Vasari wrote, in his biography of Giulio that, after Raphael’s death, his helpers planned to use cartoons made by him for frescoes in this room and that they were prevented from carrying these plans forward only by Leo X’s death. Fernetti attributed the figure of *Iustitia*, on the south wall below Pope Urban I and to the right of the *Battle of the Milvian Bridge* to Raphael. This would mean that the long south wall was the wall prepared for painting in oil and that this figure is the only part of the painted decoration of the room by Raphael himself. Fernetti speculated that the second figure in oil, *Comitas* which is on the east wall below Clement I, was painted by Giulio and Penni after a cartoon by Raphael. This figure, then, is the test figure in oil painted by Raphael’s helpers that is mentioned in Sebastiano’s letter to Michelangelo of July 3, 1520. Fernetti did not provide any support


32 Ibid., pp. 357-370.

33 Fernetti, “Gli allievi di Raffaello.”
for his attributions of the two figures in oil to different artists. His chronology, however, would seem to fit the available evidence and did not alter the conclusion that Raphael began the project and did not carry it very far before his death.

The payment records for work done in the room do not begin until February 1, 1524, three and a half years after work began in the room, and extend until July 3, 1525, nine months after Giulio left Rome to take up his new post in Mantua. These payments, totaling 1350 _soldi_, were consistently made to Giulio and Giovanni Francesco together. After Giulio’s departure in early October 1524, Baldassarre Turini da Pescia collected the artist’s half of each payment. These records do not indicate who did what or what role Raphael played in the early stages of the project. Nor do they name other artists. It is possible that work was still being carried out in the room when these payments began. But, since payment schedules in the Renaissance rarely if ever coincided with periods of work, these records do not tell us when the project began or ended. A letter of September 5, 1524, from Castiglione to Federico II Gonzaga informing the Marchese that Giulio would soon be on his way to Mantua described the decoration of the Sala di Costantino in terms that suggest it was finished.

All the evidence taken together indicates that east and south walls, those with the _Adlocutio _and the _Battle of the Milvian Bridge_, were painted first. They contain the

---

34 These payments are all the records that survive for the work in this room. Together they constitute sufficient funds to be the entire payment for these works.

35 Ferrari, _Giulio Romano_, I, pp. 52, 55, 57, 61-62, 63, 70, 71, 72-73, 74, 77, 80, 82-83, 86, 88-89, 90. For the date of Giulio’s departure from Rome, see Ibid., I, p. 69. For Turini, a papal datary in the court of Leo X and a close friend of Raphael, see Rubin, _Giorgio Vasari_, p. 363.

36 “... perché lui ne ha grandissimo desiderio e non aspetta altro che esser satisfatto della sala depinta del papa, la quale è riusita molto bella,” Ferrari, _Giulio Romano_, I, p. 65.
impresa of Leo X. These two subjects match Sebastiano’s description in his letter of September 6, 1520 to Michelangelo. We can surmise that the west wall with the *Baptism of Constantine* was painted last, as it is decorated with the impresa of Clement VII.

This leaves the north wall with the *Donation of Rome*. Sebastiano listed a different subject for this space but the north wall has on it the impresa of Leo. Castiglione’s letter of December 1521 stating that the room was more than half finished is probably reliable. If so, the chronology of the room should be reconstructed as follows: first, the test figures in oil of *Comitas* and *Iustitia*; second, the east and south walls and perhaps the upper parts of the north wall containing the impresa of Leo X. All this was likely finished before the death of Leo X in December 1521 when Castiglione made his report to his employer. Then, after the accession of Clement VII in November 1523, what remained of the north wall, including the main scene of the *Donation of Rome*, was executed, and finally, the west wall was painted.

Another type of evidence, the surviving drawings for the frescoes, can be employed in an effort to understand the sequence of painters in the Sala di Costantino and their individual responsibilities. Many types of drawings for the Sala di Costantino survive. These are among the most controversial group of drawings by Raphael and his helpers. Given the rough chronology that is suggested by the documents and the walls’ iconography, I shall divide the drawings into two groups corresponding to the early and late phases of the fresco decoration.

Vasari claimed that “a Justice and another similar figure” were the only surviving parts of the first campaign. Sebastiano’s mention in his letter to Michelangelo on July 3, 1520, of a very beautiful test figure in oil painted by Raphael’s helpers provides the
earliest notice of any actual painting in the room. Since no drawings survive for the figures in oil of *Comitas* on the east wall or *Iustitia* on the south wall, the early phase is represented by drawings for the south and east walls above the level of the *basamenti* and the enthroned Popes with their attendant figures next to the windows on the north wall.

Drawings for this early phase include twelve studies for figures or figure groups, three *modelli*, four cartoons or cartoon fragments, and one auxiliary cartoon. Given what we have seen in the later stages of the previous three rooms and in the Loggia, it will be most useful to begin with the studies for individual figures or figure groups for the main frescoes of the early phase, the *Adlocutio* and the *Battle of the Milvian Bridge*. It is here, and in the only surviving auxiliary cartoon, that we might expect to find Raphael’s direct intervention in the design process as he is not likely to have taken part in the making of *modelli* or cartoons. In the earlier rooms, Raphael was most involved in the creation of figure studies, not in making compositional sketches or *modelli*. But we have seen instances where the master did reinsert himself into the last stage of the design process by correcting a head by using an auxiliary cartoon, such as the drawing in the Louvre for the head of a bishop in *The Coronation of Charlemagne* in the Stanza dell’Incendio (fig. 81).

There are four studies for these two scenes. All are black chalk nude studies that appear to be drawings from life of studio models. The study in the Uffizi of a soldier advancing to the left seems to relate to the painted version of two soldiers who move forward to a position directly in front of the Emperor Constantine as he addresses his troops (fig. 119). The positions of the head and legs of the soldier wearing the lion skin

---

37 Florence, Uffizi 542E. Annamaria Petrioli Tofani, ed., *Gabinetto disegni e stampe degli Uffizi: Inventario 1, Disegni esposti* (Florence, 1986), 542E (R); O/F484 (R); KMO599 (R); J444r (R). Hartt, *Giulio Romano*, 38a (Giulio). Konrad Oberhuber and
are the same as those of the figure in the drawing. But the drawn figure has a more upright posture than the figure in the fresco and carries a spear on his left shoulder, which the painted figure does not. That aspect of his pose is closer to the figure in the fresco just behind the soldier wearing the lion skin who carries a spear in the exact same fashion. The head of this soldier is turned to the right, unlike the head of the figure in the drawing. This painted figure is also in more of a bent posture than the drawn figure. The drawing is clearly closely related to the painting. The nudity of the figure in the drawing and all of the differences between it and either of the painted soldiers show that the drawing is preparatory to the painting.

All scholars, with the exception of Frederick Hartt, attribute this drawing to Raphael. The sheet shows the great sensitivity to the anatomy of the figure and the physical context of the fresco that one might expect from Raphael, and perhaps not from his younger and less experienced assistants. The musculature of the figure is very detailed and white heightening is used on the drawing to give an added sense of three-dimensionality. All of the parts of the figure are drawn to fit in with all the others. There is none of the awkwardness or flatness of many of Giulio’s earliest drawings. The drawing is also made to conform to a strong light source that comes from the left in front of the soldier. The windows of the room are on the north wall providing strong light on this fresco that comes from in front of this figure. On the basis of this drawing, I agree with others that Raphael was involved in the figure studies for this main scene in the Sala di Costantino. The attribution of the drawing to Raphael bears out Giulio and Penni’s

claim that they had drawings by Raphael for this project.

Another black chalk nude study for the Battle of the Milvian Bridge seems to corroborate this finding. It has been almost universally attributed to Raphael. This is a study in Oxford for the two soldiers climbing into a boat (fig. 120). The two figures in this drawing are on the extreme right of the fresco. In the painting they are in the opposite relationship to each other: the figure on the right in the drawing is on the left in the painting. In the fresco this figure’s right arm is wrapped around the waist of the other as both struggle not to drown in the Tiber. White heightening was used to achieve many of the same effects as on the drawing of the soldier in the Uffizi. The figures are strongly three-dimensional and their anatomy is well worked out. Even the twisting of the torso of the left-hand figure in the drawing so that his right arm disappears smoothly and naturally behind his own right leg is done with apparent ease. Giulio’s drawings from this early phase do not demonstrate that he was particular good at resolving these sorts of anatomical difficulties. The light in this drawing, while coming slightly from the left as it does in the painting, is more subtly modulated than in the Uffizi drawing. Raphael has taken into account the fact that, although the fictive light in the picture comes from the

---

38 Oxford, Ashmolean 569. K.T. Parker, Catalogue of the Collection of Drawings in the Ashmolean Museum, II: Italian Schools (Oxford, 1956), 569 (R); O/F487 (R); KMO592 (R); J441r (R). Oberhuber and Gnann, Roma e lo stile classico, 149 (R). The only two important scholars to take exception to this majority opinion were Oskar Fischel and Hartt. Fischel attributed to Giulio all the black chalk figure studies for the paintings in this room that were known to him when the first edition of his corpus of Raphael drawings was published in 1898. Since he died before he completed the volume of his much revised corpus, eight volumes of which were published between 1913 and 1941, it is not known if he maintained the attribution to Giulio until the end of his life. Hartt attributed all of the figure studies for the late Stanze to Giulio as a matter of course. Oskar Fischel, Raphaels Zeichnungen: Versuch einer Kritik der bisher veröffentlichten Blätter (Strasburg, 1898), 212 (Giulio). Hartt, Giulio Romano, 38 (Giulio).
left, the painting itself is on the south wall of the room and is evenly lit by two large windows in the north wall.

However, Raphael did not design these major frescoes alone. Giulio participated in the design process here just as he had in the Stanza dell’Incendio. Another black chalk nude study in the Louvre for a soldier engaged in battle on the extreme left of the fresco is a case in point (fig. 121). This drawing has a more checkered attribution history than the first two drawings. While the major catalogues raisonnés on Raphael all listed the drawing as his, the Louvre’s general catalogue added a question mark to its attribution to Raphael. Hartt and Dussler attributed the drawing to Giulio.

This drawing reveals an awkward articulation of the upper part of the body. The artist has failed to realize a rational relationship between the shoulders of the figure and his outstretched left arm. As a result, the musculature of the back is rendered as a series of undulations with little connection to the spine or actual muscles under the skin. Such a misunderstanding of anatomy does not occur in either of the other drawings. A comparison between this drawing and the Uffizi sheet for the Adlocutio is particularly telling. The muscles of the back of the figure in the drawing in the Uffizi appear completely rational and natural. One can immediately see the relationship between the parts on the surface of the body and the underlying muscles and bones. The light in the Louvre drawing is not as subtle as that in either of the other two drawings. A strong light

39 Paris, Louvre RF 1071. Dominique Cordellier and Bernadette Py, Inventaire général des dessins italiens V: Raphaël, son atelier, ses copistes (Paris, 1992), 928 (R?); O/F489 (R); KMO598 (R); J439 (R). Fischel, Raphaels Zeichnungen (1898), 210 (Penny).

coming from the left creates a deep black shadow across the front of the figure’s torso and right thigh. This simplistic use of lighting is somewhat inappropriate given that the painting is directly across from the windows and so would never receive strong light from the left. For these reasons, I am inclined to attribute the drawing in Paris to Giulio. The hair in particular looks very much like the lumpy masses of lines we find in Giulio’s earliest securely attributed drawings, such as the profile bust of a young man in Oxford (fig. 62).

The last of the black chalk nude studies for figures in these earlier frescoes in the Sala di Costantino is at Chatsworth and depicts the soldier in the right foreground of the Battle of the Milvian Bridge who is falling from the river bank into the Tiber (fig. 122). Few scholars have published opinions about this drawing presumably because most did not believe that it was by Raphael. Their opinions seem justified by the awkward twisting of the figure and the poor understanding of the relationship between the right shoulder and the lower back. The artist appears not to have planned the entire composition very well. He seems to have lacked space for the upward extended right leg which runs off the top of the sheet. The right ankle and foot are studied separately to the right of the leg itself. The draughtsman simply ran out of room, which may indicate that the drawing is by a relatively inexperienced artist, such as Giulio.


42 Raphael does this sort of thing occasionally, as in a drawing in the British Museum that contains studies for the drapery of the figure of Horace in the School of Athens (inv. no. Pp. 1-74) Raphael made three sketches for the hands of this figure in the space around the large drapery study in the middle of the sheet.
These four sketches indicate that Raphael and Giulio both participated in the first stages of the design process of the major frescoes in the Sala di Costantino. All of the surviving sketches are certainly preparatory to the paintings and they are by more than one hand. Raphael does not appear to have delegated the design of the scenes to his assistants, but he collaborated with at least one of those assistants, Giulio Romano, in making them. Of course, after Raphael’s death, Giulio could have continued making designs for the frescoes. Even so, this small number of figure studies gives every impression that it is a coherent group all made at about the same time using the same technique. If so, then Raphael and Giulio shared the work of designing the frescoes.

There are also a few surviving sketches for the enthroned popes accompanied by allegorical figures that flank the main scenes on these two walls. The first to be considered is a drawing that has only recently been associated with these frescoes. This is a black chalk study of an upraised right hand shown palm side out that is in the Art Institute of Chicago (fig. 123). This drawing was first attributed to Raphael by Laura Giles, who discovered it in the collection in Chicago and connected it with the outstretched right hand of St. Peter who sits enthroned on the far left of the east wall of the Sala di Costantino. The drawing bears more than a passing resemblance to the hand and arm in the fresco, although in the painting the arm appears to thrust farther away from the figure of the saint. This has the result of creating more space between the upper
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and lower portions of the crooked arm in the fresco than in the drawing. So, if the association between this drawing and the painting is maintained, there is little doubt the drawing comes from an early stage of the design process. It is not an auxiliary cartoon because it shows no signs of pounce marks.

In a review of the exhibition in Mantua and Vienna, where this drawing was attributed to Raphael, Catherine Monbeig-Goguel attributed the drawing to Giulio Romano. She compared it to the hands in an auxiliary cartoon now in Oxford for the heads and hands of two of the Apostles in the lower portion of the Transfiguration (fig. 160). She concluded that the Chicago drawing was not as good as the Oxford drawing and so could not be by Raphael, but rather must be by Giulio Romano.

The attribution of this drawing to Raphael must remain speculative. But we can say that it does share certain characteristics with the black chalk figure studies from this room, including the use of close parallel hatching on the skin that we find in the drawing in Oxford of the two figures climbing into the boat for the Battle of the Milvian Bridge (fig. 120). The light source is from the same direction in both the drawing and the painting. The drawing in Chicago displays the soft, subtle fall of light we saw in the drawing in the Uffizi of the soldier walking to the left. These two attributes alone would seem to indicate that, if it is to be associated with this project, it is probably by Raphael.

There is one more drawing for the east wall that falls into the category of
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preliminary sketch. This is a highly finished design for the caryatid to the left of Pope Clement I, over the figure of *Moderation* (fig. 124).\(^47\) This figure, despite being very tightly drawn with no corrections or *pentimenti* and worked up in layers of ink and wash on prepared paper, is preparatory to the fresco. This is clearly true as the figure in the drawing is represented as a hermaphrodite, while in the painting drapery covers the genitals making the figure appear to be female. This drawing has been attributed to Giulio or Penni, but never to Raphael. Hence it has rarely been mentioned in the Raphael literature. Indeed, while L.C.J. Frerichs’s catalogue of the Rijksmuseum attributed the sheet to Giulio, since 1972 Konrad Oberhuber has maintained an attribution to Penni.\(^48\) Only in a recent exhibition catalogue has he admitted that Giulio might be the author, but even so he attributed the drawing to “Giulio or Penni.”\(^49\)

There are four preparatory sketches for the Popes and associated figures to the sides of the *Battle of the Milvian Bridge* on the south wall. The first is a very quick sketch in pen that may relate to the figure of *Religion* who is below and to the right of the figure of Pope Alexander I (the figure group to the left of the battle scene where the Pope is incorrectly labeled Silvester I) (fig. 125).\(^50\) This is a light sketch in pen that is clearly the first idea for a female figure holding two tablets. Oberhuber and Sylvia Ferino

---


\(^{48}\) See attribution history in previous note.

\(^{49}\) Oberhuber and Gnann, *Roma e lo stile classico*, 157 (Giulio or Penni).

\(^{50}\) Florence, Uffizi 214E. Petrioli Tofani, *Inventario I, Disegni esposti*, 214E (Anonymous Florentine sixteenth Century); O/F478a (R?); KMO594 (R).
Pagden associated it with the figure of Religion but few other scholars have noticed it.\textsuperscript{51} There is little in the drawing upon which to base an attribution, as is reflected in the fact that both scholars who have studied this sheet closely have indicated a degree of uncertainty in their attribution to Raphael. This may indicate that the tentative attribution arose because of the drawing’s association with the fresco, rather than through an evaluation of the drawing itself.

The remaining three preliminary sketches for the early phase of painting in this room are all for the figure group to the right of the battle scene on the south wall. For this group there is a stronger case to be made for Raphael’s direct involvement in the design phase. This group centers on St. Urban I and includes the allegories of Justice and Charity. The figure of Justice is one of the two figures in the room painted in oil. The first drawing in this group to consider is a very finished sketch of the caryatid to the right of Urban I and above Charity (\textbf{fig. 126}).\textsuperscript{52} This drawing shows a high degree of three-dimensionality and subtle play of light that is associated with Raphael, to whom it has been attributed by almost all scholars who have studied it.

The remaining two sketches are both for the figure for Charity which is to the left of Urban I. One is a black chalk study in Oxford for the entire group (\textbf{fig. 127}).\textsuperscript{53} This

\textsuperscript{51} See the previous note and Sylvia Ferino Pagden in Luciano Berti and Marco Chiarini, eds., \textit{Raffaello a Firenze}, exh. cat., Florence, Palazzo Pitti (Milan, 1984), 39 (R?).

\textsuperscript{52} Frankfurt, Städelisches Kunstinstitut 421. O/F481 (Penni or R); KMO588 (R); J452 (R). See also Dussler, \textit{Raphael}, p. 88 (R); Dominique Cordellier and Bernadette Py, \textit{Raphaël: Autour des dessins du Louvre}, exh. cat., Rome, Villa Medici (Rome, 1992), 135 (R).

\textsuperscript{53} Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 665. Parker, \textit{Italian Schools}, 665 (copy of fresco or R); O/F479 (R); KMO589 (R); J453 (R).
soft sketch has been attributed to Raphael by all scholars who have written about it. The second is a study in the Louvre for the head for this figure (fig. 128). This drawing has also been associated with the figure of the Virgin Mary in *La Perla* in the Prado in Madrid. Joannides correctly pointed out that this drawing seems to be from the same model as the sketch in Oxford of the full figure. He also noticed that the fall of light in this drawing is correct for the fresco in the Sala di Costantino and not for the panel in Madrid.

Two more preliminary sketches can be associated with the early stages of the project. These are studies for the papal groups beside the windows on the north wall (fig. 129 and 130). This part of this wall contains the *impresa* of Leo X and so is probably part of the same campaign of work as the south and east walls. Both these drawings have been attributed to Giulio by Oberhuber and Michael Jaffé, the only two scholars to study them closely.

With the major exception of the group around Urban I, there is little evidence for Raphael’s participation in the early planning stages of the figure groups of Popes and allegorical figures at the sides of the two main scenes on the east and south walls of the Sala di Costantino, the parts of the room decorated during the early stages of work.
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54 Paris, Louvre 10958. Cordellier and Py, *Inventaire général*, 967 (R); O/F480 (R); KMO590 (R); J454 (R).


Raphael’s involvement in the early design stage is indicated by the drawings in Chicago for the hand of St. Peter and the quick sketch in the Uffizi for the figure of Religion. Raphael, faced with a much larger project in fresco than he and his shop had yet taken on, even in his projects for Agostino Chigi, seems to have pressed forward with assistance from his assistants in the design. In other words, Raphael may have been portioned out the project, giving Giulio charge of the figure group around Clement I on the east wall and the papal groups on the north wall, while he maintained control of the group around Urban I on the south wall. The two men seem to have shared responsibility for the major scenes on these two walls. There is not enough information to determine who took the lead in designing the groups around St. Peter on the east wall and Alexander I on the south wall.

The modelli for this first phase of fresco painting in the room also follow the pattern we have observed in the late Stanze and the Loggia. There are highly finished modelli for each of the two major scenes that belong to this phase of the project, The Adlocutio and The Battle of the Milvian Bridge (figs. 131 and 132). These sheets were made in exactly the same technique, pen and brown ink and brush and brown wash heightened with white over a black chalk underdrawing, and are both squared for transfer. This is the same combination of media found on the modelli for the Loggia. Both have been most often attributed to Penni. The analysis of the design and execution process in Raphael’s workshop presented in this thesis makes the attribution to
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57 Adlocutio: Chatsworth, Devonshire Collection 175. Jaffé, The Devonshire Collection, 283 (Peni); O/F483 (Peni); KMO600 (R); J445 (Peni). Battle: Paris, Louvre 3872. Cordellier and Py, Inventaire général, 130 (R?); O/F485 (Peni); KMO591 (Peni); J442 (Peni).
Penni plausible. As we have seen in each of the projects from the time of the ceiling of the Stanza d’Eliodoro, Raphael and Giulio shared the early design phase, and then turned these drawings over to Penni to be worked up into modelli of the whole compositions.\textsuperscript{58}

The surviving cartoons for this early phase of the Sala di Costantino have all been attributed to Giulio more often than to any other artist. These include a cartoon for the head of the caryatid on the east wall to the left of Clement I and above Moderation (fig. 133),\textsuperscript{59} a cartoon for the entire figure of Moderation on the same wall (fig. 134),\textsuperscript{60} a portrait of Leo X used for the head of Clement I also on the east wall (fig. 135),\textsuperscript{61} and finally, and perhaps most impressively, a large fragment of the cartoon for The Battle of the Milvian Bridge on the south wall (fig. 136).\textsuperscript{62} That so many cartoon fragments from this one phase of this room have survived is perhaps a little surprising. Although there

\textsuperscript{58} There is a copy of another modello for this room at Windsor Castle (Royal Library 0486). This drawing was called a copy of Giulio by Popham and Wilde in their catalogue of the royal collection and that attribution was maintained by Konrad Oberhuber, the only other scholar to offer an opinion. A.E. Popham and Johannes Wilde, \textit{The Italian Drawings of the XV and XVI Centuries in the Collection of His Majesty the King at Windsor Castle} (London, 1949), 358 (copy of Giulio) and Konrad Oberhuber, \textit{Raphaels Zeichnungen: Entwürfe zu Werken Raphaels und seiner Schule im Vatikan 1511/12 bis 1520}, vol. IX of Fischel, \textit{Zeichnungen}, 1913-42 (Berlin, 1972), p. 188 (copy of Giulio).

\textsuperscript{59} Florence, Fondazione Horne 5548 (on deposit at the Uffizi). O/F481c (Giulio); KMO597 (R or Giulio); J, p. 256, under Horne 5548 (Giulio). See also Ferino Pagden in \textit{Raffaello a Firenze}, 40 (Giulio).

\textsuperscript{60} Paris, Louvre 4301. Cordellier and Py, \textit{Inventaire général}, 961 (Giulio?); O/F481d (Giulio).

\textsuperscript{61} Chatsworth, Devonshire Collection 38. Jaffè, \textit{The Devonshire Collection}, 202 (Giulio); O/F482 (Giulio); KMO, p. 141 (Giulio); J455 (R). See also Hartt, \textit{Giulio Romano}, 39 (Giulio).

\textsuperscript{62} Milan, Ambrosiana. O/F489a (Giulio); J443 (Giulio). See also Hartt, \textit{Giulio Romano}, 36 (Giulio) and Dussler, \textit{Raphael}, p. 88 (Giulio).
are few cartoons from the earlier stages of the Stanze to compare with them, the cartoon for the figure of Moses in the scene of the *Burning Bush* on the vault of the Stanze d’Eliodoro (fig. 61) is relevant. This cartoon was made by Giulio and is among his earliest contributions to the design process for any of the frescoes in the Stanze. It could be that one of Giulio’s jobs in the earliest days of his association with Raphael was to make cartoons based on the *modelli* by Penni. It is possible that Giulio’s talent, which exceeded that of Penni, afforded him the opportunity to move beyond the limited role of cartoon maker and become an independent designer of compositions. Penni, it seems, remained in his role as maker of *modelli* and even acquired a nickname, il Fattore, reflecting this.

There is one more drawing associated with this early phase of fresco painting. The only surviving auxiliary cartoon for the paintings in this room is of the head of the man standing behind the Emperor Constantine on the dais in *The Adlocutio* (fig. 137).⁶³ Raphael make auxiliary cartoons in the earlier Stanze presumably to apply final corrections to a design which may have been begun by Raphael or Giulio, but which was carried forward by Giulio and Penni. This is the case with the auxiliary carton for the head of the bishop for the *Coronation of Charlemagne* in the Stanza dell’Incendio (fig. 81), a drawing universally attributed to Giulio by the scholars who have studied it. What are we to make of this? This is the first time we have encountered an auxiliary cartoon for any of the Vatican projects by someone other than Raphael. It is possible that this
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sheet was made after the death of Raphael and Giulio’s assumption of the leadership of the shop. It is equally likely that Raphael allowed Giulio to take on more of the role of the master for those areas of the project for which he was responsible, including making the final corrections of a head by use of an auxiliary cartoon.

The last phase of painting in the Sala di Costantino takes in everything on the west wall where the major scene is the *Baptism of Constantine*, and the major scene on the north wall, the *Constantine’s Donation of Rome*. There are only five preliminary sketches and one *modello* for these parts of the room’s decoration. The preparatory drawings include two large compositional sketches for *Constantine’s Donation*. The first is divided between the Louvre and the National Museum in Stockholm (fig. 138). This large pen and ink sketch has been universally attributed to Giulio. Its flat, frieze-like quality is characteristic of Giulio’s compositional sketches from his early years in Mantua, such as the sketch now in Chatsworth for the fresco on the ceiling of the Sala di Cesare in the Palazzo del Tè depicting Caesar ordering the burning of the books of Pompey (fig. 139). The other is a sheet in Oxford for the right half of the composition (fig. 140). This sheet is also attributed to Giulio by all scholars who have studied it.

The only *modello* for the last phase of work in this room was worked up from these drawings, especially the sheet now divided between Paris and Stockholm, and represents an early idea for *Constantine’s Donation*. This sheet is now in the
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64 Paris, Louvre 3874 and Stockholm, Nationalmuseum 329-330. Cordellier and Py, *Inventaire général*, 937 (Giulio); O/F, p. 28 (Giulio); J448 (Giulio).

65 Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 248. Parker, *Italian Schools*, 248 (Giulio?); O/F, p. 28 (Giulio); J, p. 29 (Giulio and Penni).
Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam (fig. 141). There are so many one-to-one correspondences between these two drawings that there can be little doubt that the *modello* was based directly on the sketch. The figure in the foreground just to the left of center is particularly telling. He wears a long tunic and looks out of the composition at the viewer. This figure provides the best link between these drawings and the last drawing for this scene to be considered. This is one of the most problematic in the Raphael corpus. It is a study in black, yellow, red, and white chalk in the Gardner Museum in Boston for the figure of Pope Sylvester I being borne on a *sedia gestatoria* (fig. 142). This color drawing is unique among the drawings associated with Raphael and his circle and most scholars have been reluctant to provide a firm attribution to anyone. But the sheet is related to the larger and more complete sketch and *modello* for this fresco. This is made clear by the presence on the Boston drawing of the figure in the foreground wearing the long tunic.

There are two more sketches for this last phase of decoration in this room. These are drawings for the putti above the windows on the north wall. The first is a double-sided sheet in Berlin with a putto playing with a diamond ring, a Medici *impresa*, on one side and a putto riding a swan on the other (figs. 143 and 144). After not attracting
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66 Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum 1948:368. L.C.J. Frerichs, *Italiaanse Tekeningen II: de 15de en 16de Eeuw*, exh. cat., Rijksmuseum (Amsterdam, 1981), pp. 40-42, cat. no. 77 (Giulio); O/F, p. 28 and under cat. no. 490 (Giulio); KMO, p. 141 (Penni), J449 (Giulio perhaps with the participation of Penni).


68 Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Preussicher Kulturbesitz, Kupferstichkabinett KdZ 4548. O/F, p. 189, n. 8, fig. 211 (Giulio).
much attention for many years, these drawings have in recent years been attributed to both Raphael and Giulio. The other drawing of a putto is in the Albertina in Vienna (fig. 145). That these sheets are attributed to Giulio by most scholars is not at all surprising for two reasons. This last phase of work was carried out three years after the death of Raphael and after the themes of the major frescoes on the last two walls had been changed, as we know from Sebastiano del Piombo’s letter to Michelangelo of September 6, 1520. Sebastiano indicated in it that these walls were originally intended to contain scenes of prisoners brought before Constantine and the emperor refusing to bathe in the blood of children.

We can draw the following conclusions from the drawings for this last major project undertaken by the Raphael shop. The execution of the Sala di Costantino began in much in the same manner that had characterized the later stages of the Stanza dell’Incendio and the Loggia. Raphael and Giulio seem to have shared responsibility for the early phases of the design process, dividing the large amount of work between them. Penni then worked up individual figure studies into modelli of complete compositions. Giulio next made the cartoons upon which the frescoes were based. The last phase was begun only after Clement VII became Pope on November 19, 1523. There is no solid evidence that Raphael’s designs were used in this last phase. By at least 1521, Giulio had attributed both sides of the sheet to Raphael, at least provisionally. Linda Wolk-Simon and Carmen C. Bambach, “Toward a Framework and Chronology for Giulio Romano’s Early Pen Drawings,” Master Drawings 37 (1999): 171-174 attributed them to Giulio without reservation.
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emerged as the head of the shop and he was acting like a master, using all the available resources to create the best possible results for his patron in the shortest amount of time. These resources included drawings by Raphael for the frescoes in the Sala di Costantino. So, Raphael was indeed one of the designers of the paintings in this room. But his activity was cut short by his death. The shop, however, carried on as it had under Raphael’s leadership, making use of all available resources.

Giulio succeeding Raphael as head of the shop had enormous repercussions for later Roman painting. But the results for Giulio’s own later career were perhaps even more spectacular. Under the pressures of the workshop headed by Raphael, but most especially under the even greater pressure on him and his colleagues after Raphael’s death, Giulio learned how to deploy assistants in many different ways to produce high quality fresco cycles in great quantity and in relatively short time frames. The frescoes he produced in Mantua and its environs for his Gonzaga patrons during the last twenty years of his life are testament to this way of working.
Chapter 6: The *Transfiguration* (1518-20)

It is perhaps not surprising that Raphael’s assistants played a major role in the creation of the fresco decorations for the papal apartments in the Vatican Palace. Frescoes are large complex works of art that require at least some collaboration. What is surprising is the degree to which Raphael allowed key members of his workshop to be involved with the design process for these paintings, a phase of work normally reserved to the master commissioned to carry out the project in the first place. We have seen that Raphael used his assistants to his best advantage in all phases of the Vatican frescoes, including all phases of the design process. When they were made, the rooms containing these paintings were semi-public audience and reception rooms whose specific functions changed over time. So their frescoed decoration had to be of the highest quality both stylistically and artistically. Raphael, it seems, had devised a way to achieve these goals while using his assistants early in the design process. As we have seen, this involved a varying degree of involvement by Raphael himself in the individual projects. He also made use of devices, such as the auxiliary cartoon, that allowed him to correct the most important details of other artists’ designs before they were committed to plaster.

We might well imagine that the situation with Raphael’s panel paintings from this same period would be completely different. Panel paintings, whether they are portraits, devotional pictures, or large altarpieces, were often commissioned by individuals. Contracts sometimes stated how much of the artist’s own hand must be present in the final painting.¹ But this does not seem to be the case with the *Transfiguration* altarpiece.

¹ For recent general discussions of the stipulations of artists’ contracts in the Renaissance,
This painting was, according to Vasari, the last picture that Raphael touched before he died on April 6, 1520. As will become clear, the circumstances of this commission were such that we would well imagine that Raphael would have done all of the preparatory work and all the painting himself. Yet this does not appear to be the case. Even here we find that the assistants, especially Giulio Romano, played an important role in the design phase of the panel.

No documents referring to the commissioning of the *Transfiguration* have survived. But other literary evidence tells us that the panel was commissioned by Cardinal Giulio de’ Medici, the cousin of Pope Leo X and the future Pope Clement VII. The Cardinal had also commissioned an altarpiece from Sebastiano del Piombo of the *Raising of Lazarus* (fig. 147). Both pictures, which are exactly the same size, were apparently intended for the Cathedral of Narbonne, the Cardinal’s titular church. And since the light comes from the opposite direction in each panel, it seems reasonable to assume that they were both supposed to be installed in the Cathedral on opposite sides of a light source. But the lack of a formal competition does not mean that the artists
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involved were unconcerned about the dual commission and its implications. The earliest notice we have of the project comes in a letter written on January 19, 1517 to Michelangelo by Leonardo Sellaio, his friend and main informant about Roman affairs beginning in 1516. In this letter we learn that Sebastiano had begun a painting that Raphael was trying to prevent his completing because Raphael feared that the two altarpieces would be compared. Sellaio wrote, “Per quello chararese 3 gornni [sic] sono vi schrissi chome Bastiano aveva tolto a fare quella tavola e avuti danari per fare e’ legname. Ora mi pare che Rafaello metta sotosopra el mondo perché lui non lla faca [sic], per non venire a paraghoni. Bastian one sta chon sospetto...”5 The phrase “to avoid comparisons” implies that Raphael knew that Michelangelo had supplied drawings to Sebastiano to help him with this commission.6 Michelangelo had done this for Sebastiano in the past, as in the prominent case of the frescoed altarpiece of the Flagellation in the Borgherini Chapel in San Pietro in Montorio, and this was well-known in Rome.7 Raphael was, according to Sellaio, trying to avoid a direct comparison with Michelangelo.

Sebastiano, according to the letters between Sellaio and Michelangelo, seems to have worked on his painting at a fairly good pace.8 Nevertheless, as the picture approached completion, he tried to go as slowly as possible in order to avoid allowing


7 Ibid., pp. 47-65.

8 Goffen, Renaissance Rivals, pp. 251-252.
Raphael to see the finished panel before his own painting was finished. Sebastiano himself reported this delaying tactic to Michelangelo in a letter of July 2, 1518. In this letter Sebastiano reported that he was almost finished with his painting while Raphael had yet to begin, “Ancora Rafaelo non [ha] principiata la sua.” On May 1, 1519, Sellaio was able to report to Michelangelo that the *Raising of Lazarus* was finished.

Alfonso Paolucci, the agent of Alfonso d’Este, reported to his master on May 4 of the same year that Raphael was at work on the *Transfiguration* and could not be diverted from this to paint a picture for the Duke’s *camerino*. This is our earliest indication that Raphael’s altarpiece was underway. Around the end of January 1520 Paolucci reported to the Duke that Raphael’s painting was nearing completion and that the Duke’s picture was the next to be undertaken. On March 21 Paolucci wrote that Raphael was still at work on the altarpiece but that he was eager to serve the Duke just as soon as he finished it. Raphael died during the night of April 6/7. On the April 12, Sebastiano wrote to Michelangelo in Florence that both the *Raising of Lazarus* and the *Transfiguration* were being brought to the Vatican to be displayed side by side. This is the same letter in which Sebastiano first asked Michelangelo to help him secure the commission for the Sala di Costantino (see Chapter 5). This document is pregnant with a sense of urgency: now that Raphael has died, Sebastiano must act quickly to consolidate a position as the
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10 Ibid., doc. 1519/29.

11 Ibid., doc. 1520/2.

12 Ibid., doc. 1520/9.

13 Ibid., doc. 1520/26.
leading painter in Rome. Sebastiano was clearly trying to heighten Michelangelo’s sense of competition with Raphael by reminding him that by the time the letter reached him in Florence, the painting that he designed was already being compared to Raphael’s last great panel.

There is a last series of documents which record the payments for the *Transfiguration*. These total 1,079 ducats. Like the payments for the Sala di Costantino, these moneys were paid to Giulio and Penni or Giulio’s agent in Rome Baldassarre Turini. But none of these documents indicate what role Raphael or his assistant played in the design or the execution of the panel. While it is true that during the late winter and spring of 1520 Alfonso Paolucci often wrote to Alfonso d’Este that Raphael himself was hard at work on the panel, we must keep in mind that Paolucci’s task was to get Raphael to accept and fulfill a commission for the Duke. So his protestations that Raphael was personally engaged with Giulio de’ Medici’s panel could be seen as an excuse for not securing Raphael’s labor for the Duke. The payments also mean nothing. Giulio and Penni were Raphael’s heirs and as such had a right to collect any unpaid debt owed him at his death. All we can say for certain is that the painting was underway by the spring of 1519 and was largely completed by the time of Raphael’s death in April 1520.

In his life of Raphael, Vasari wrote not once but three times that the entire painting was by Raphael’s own hand. In his main discussion of this painting Vasari described, “la quale egli di sua mano continuamente lavorando” and “il quale pare che tanto si restrignesse insieme con le virtù sua per mostrare lo sforzo ed il valor dell’arte

---

14 Ibid., docs. 1522/3, 1522-23/1, 1526/1, 1526/2, 1526/5, 1526/6.
nel volto di Cristo, che finitolo, come ultima cosa che a fare avesse, non toccò più
pennelli, sopraggiugnendogli la morte.” And later, immediately after his claim that the
frescoes of the Loggia di Psiche and the Fire in the Borgo suffered at the hands of other
painters, Vasari says, “dal quale errore ravvedutosi, come giudizioso, volle poi lavorare
da se solo e senza aiuto d’altri la tavola di San Pietro a Montorio, della Trasfigurazione di
Cristo; nella quale sono quelle parti, che già s’è detto che ricerca e debbe avere una
buona pittura.”

Conservation work on the panel over the past thirty-five years indicates
that the vast majority of the painted surface is by Raphael and that only minor
interventions were made by other painters, perhaps to finish the last areas left unfinished
at Raphael’s death.

So for now, the best literary and technical evidence would seem to indicate that
the Transfiguration, Raphael’s great final masterpiece, was commissioned sometime in
the fall or winter of 1516, begun in the spring of 1519, and largely finished by the time
Raphael died on April 6, 1520. Those around Raphael, and so probably also the painter
himself, saw it as directly competing with Michelangelo because he provided drawings
for Sebastiano’s Raising of Lazarus. Given these facts, it is perhaps not surprising that
Raphael seems to have done almost all of the actual painting of the panel himself. We
would expect that any surviving drawings would also be universally accepted as by
Raphael himself. This is, however, far from the case.


16 Fabrizio Mancinelli, ed., Primo Piano di un Capolavoro: La Trasfigurazione di
Raffaello (Vatican City, n.d. [ca. 1977]) and Fabrizio Mancinelli, “La Trasfigurazione e
la Pala di Monteluce: Considerazioni sulla loro tecnica escutiva alla luce dei recenti
restauri,” in John Shearman and Marcia B. Hall, eds., The Princeton Raphael
There are seventeen drawings related to the *Transfiguration*: two *modelli* for the entire composition at both an early and late stage of development, one copy of a *modello* for the whole picture at an early stage; one sketch for the entire upper portion of the composition; five red chalk studies for figures or figure groups in the lower portion of the picture, two black chalk studies of details of figures in the lower zone, and six auxiliary cartoons for head and hands of the apostles in the lower left quarter of the panel.

The first *modello* to consider is a drawing in the Albertina that represents an early stage of the composition when the entire pictorial field was going to be filled with the scene of the transfiguration of Jesus (fig. 148). In this drawing Jesus stands on the ground flanked by Moses and Elijah who float in the air. In front of him kneel the apostles Peter, James, and John. To the right of the scene are two saints dressed as deacons. These are probably Pastor and Justus, to whom the Narbonne Cathedral was dedicated. The scene on Mount Tabor looks complete in the drawing. The scene of
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17 Vienna, Albertina 193 (SR 228). Veronike Birke and Janine Kertész, *Die italienischen Zeichnungen der Albertina*, 4 vols. (Vienna, 1992-97), 193 (Penni); J423 (Penni or copy of Penni). See also Konrad Oberhuber, “Vorzeichnungen zu Raffaels ‘Transfiguration’,” *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen* 4 (1962): 116-149 (Penni) and Konrad Oberhuber and Achim Gnann, *Roma e lo stile classico di Raffaello 1515-1527*, exh. cat., Mantua, Palazzo Te and Vienna, Graphische Sammlung Albertina (Milan, 1999), 171 (Giulio?). In the earlier article, Oberhuber examined the *modelli* in an effort to understand the development of the composition. He attributed to Giulio the sketches of three apostles, now in Vienna (see note 27 below) and another of the boy and his father, now in Milan (see note 29 below). He stated that Giulio was following Raphael’s ideas in these drawings. He reserved all creative work to Raphael himself.

Jesus curing a possessed boy, which follows this story in all three synoptic Gospels and which takes up the lower half of the finished altarpiece, is not in the drawing at all.\(^{19}\)

It has been suggested that Raphael changed his idea from a simple transfiguration scene with the six required figures (plus the two local saints from Narbonne) to the much more elaborate two-tiered composition of the altarpiece in response to Sebastiano’s more complex composition in the *Raising of Lazarus*.\(^{20}\) This is a distinct possibility since Raphael’s painting represents the first time that these two scenes were combined in a single composition. Indeed Matthew and Luke depict the episodes as happening consecutively. Luke even recorded the healing event as taking place the day after the transfiguration. Only Mark leaves open the possibility that the events happened simultaneously.

The *modello* in the Albertina is a highly finished drawing in ink and wash on grey prepared paper. It has been attributed to either Giulio or Penni by almost all scholars who have studied it. By itself, however, it does not tell us much about the design process. No other drawings can be connected with this earliest stage of the process. The drawing could be the end result of a long process in which many drawings, none of which survive, were made to study individual details and figures, or it could be a highly finished studio record of the earlier transfiguration scene worked up by Raphael or Giulio in one sheet. We have seen that Penni, to whom this drawing is most often attributed, made these types of *modelli* for the scenes in the Loggia di Raffaello (see Chapter 4).


A drawing in the Louvre represents a middle stage in the development of the composition (fig. 149). This sheet has often been attributed to Penni or alternatively called a copy after Raphael or Penni. It shows the both the transfiguration and the scene of the possessed boy. Jesus is still standing on Mount Tabor rather than floating above it as he does in the painting, and the figures in the lower level adopt different poses than they do in the finished work. But the apostles on the mountain with Jesus have begun to take the attitudes they have in the painting and the two deacons have shifted from the right to the left, their final position. That Penni’s name has often been mentioned in relation with this drawing is not surprising. It is very clean with very few corrections or pentimenti. The figures are rigid and unyielding and the sheet looks almost like it records the appearance of a relief sculpture. This sort of uninspired and mechanical drawing is exactly what we would expect from a modello by Penni, especially given his drawings for the Loggia, which was completed the year before Raphael set to work on the Transfiguration.

The last modello in the series of three is a large elaborate sheet in the Albertina (fig. 150). This drawing, which shows all the figures in the nude, was probably done as
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22 Vienna, Albertina 17544 (SR 293). Birke and Kertész, Die italienischen Zeichnungen, 17544 (school of R); F-T under 172 (workshop of R); J430 (Penny or copy after him).
an intermediate stage between the nude studies of individual figures and figure groups
and a series of drapery studies, only one of which survives. This sheet is clean and a
rather uninspired in its execution. It has almost never been attributed to Raphael. Penni
is generally given credit for it. Given the character of the drawing, that is exactly what
we would expect.

This drawing, whether it is by Penni or a copy after his modello, is clearly based
on a series of nude studies and compositional sketches. In this case, unlike the more
haphazard circumstances we saw in the late Stanze, sheets of both types survive. Two of
these show the same figure at two different stages of the design process. This allows us
an insight into the working practice of Raphael’s shop that will clarify my argument
about how the Vatican frescoes were designed. The first sketch of this figure is a fairly
loose study in red chalk for the apostle holding the book in the left foreground of the
painting (fig. 151).23 This small sheet is drawn with a very light touch, and while it is not
a quick and highly experimental sketch of the type Raphael sometimes made, it does have
very much the character of a working drawing. The figure in the drawing appears to be a
young man with a full head of hair and beard. This drawing has been universally
attributed to Raphael by all scholars who have written about it.

This same figure appears again in a larger more highly finished red chalk study,
now at Chatsworth (fig. 152).24 This drawing, which is most often attributed to Raphael,
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23 Vienna, Albertina 237 (SR 287). Birke and Kertész, Die italienischen Zeichnungen,
237 (R); F-T172 (R); KMO604 (R); J425 (R). See also Oberhuber, “Vorzeichnungen zu
Raffaels ‘Transfiguration’,” 116-149 (R?).

24 Chatsworth, Devonshire Collection 51. Michael Jaffé, The Devonshire Collection of
shows the apostle with the book and the figure just behind him and to the left in the painting. Fischel attributed it to Penni.\textsuperscript{25} The drawing is very sure and confident in execution. Despite the elaborate poses of the two figures and their complex relationship to each other, all their anatomical parts work well and the figures’ positions are not awkward. They appear perfectly natural as they strike these very unnatural poses. This argues strongly for Raphael’s authorship of the sheet because Giulio sometimes had difficulty with complex anatomical passages (\textbf{figs. 58 and 93}), a problem that persisted throughout his career.

The sheet could, however, represent Giulio at his best under the close supervision of Raphael. The hair of the figures is conceived as masses that seem to emerge from the crowns of the heads, which is Giulio’s normal manner of rendering hair (\textbf{fig. 62}). The large shadow behind the left leg of the foreground figure and the rock on which he sits is more typical of Giulio’s manner than Raphael’s. This handling of shadow outside the figure can be clearly seen in Giulio’s study now in the Royal Library at Windsor of a figure holding a large stone for the \textit{Stoning of St. Stephen} altarpiece (\textbf{fig. 87}). On the other hand, the shadow in the sketch does correspond more or less to the position of a large shadow on the ground in the painting, which suggests that Raphael could have been using this drawing to study the lighting effects he knew the panel would encounter in Narbonne with the light coming strongly from the left.

\textit{Italian Drawings}, 4 vols. (London, 1994), 319 (R); F-T under 172 (workshop of R); KMO605 (R); J426 (R).

The situation with the remaining three remaining red chalk nude studies is quite different. The drawing of two figures, the apostle in the center of the group who wears pink and points at Jesus, and the figure to his right of him who wears yellow and green, has been attributed to both Raphael and Giulio (fig. 153). This drawing seems more tentative than the study in Chatsworth. There are slight changes in the positions of the figures’ bodies as compared to their poses in the painting. There are also shadows on the ground which do not correspond to the painting. While the anatomy does not display Giulio’s telltale awkwardness, the figures are in fairly simple poses. Their arms are pulled in close to their chests, a position which presents fewer challenges to a draughtsman like Giulio.

The next sheet to consider is a study in Vienna for the group of three apostles who huddle together directly below Jesus in the middle of the lower zone of the painting (fig. 154). There is an even greater difference between the poses of the figures and their relationships to each other in the drawing and painting than in the last example. The figures hold their outstretched arms in slightly different positions than in the painting. In the painting the figures in this group are much closer together. This drawing has been


27 Vienna, Albertina 4880 (SR 222). Birke and Kertész, *Die italienischen Zeichnungen*, 4880 (R); F-T under 172 (workshop of R); KMO609 (Giulio); J429 (Giulio). See also Hartt, *Giulio Romano*, 29 (Giulio) and Oberhuber, “Vorzeichnungen zu Raffaels ‘Transfiguration’,” 116-149 (Giulio). Following their usual practice, neither Hartt nor Oberhuber integrate this drawing into the design process. In contrast to my approach in this dissertation, they never considered drawings as evidence for the process by which paintings were designed in Raphael’s workshop. Hartt considered Giulio the leader on certain projects (but not this one) whereas Oberhuber contended that the ideation of all of Raphael’s commissions, including this one, should be reserved to Raphael.
attributed to Giulio more often than to any other artist, including Raphael. The figures
display some of Giulio’s characteristic awkwardness, especially in the position of the
lower body and raised right leg of the figure on the right.

These three red chalk nude studies in Chatsworth, Paris, and Vienna for groups of
apostles in the lower zone of the Transfiguration make an interesting study. These three
sheets prepare seven of the nine apostles present in this part of the painting. The only
figures not represented in a study of this type are the two apostles in the upper left corner
of the lower zone. These figures are hidden behind others and very little of them can be
seen, save for their heads. So these sheets may well represent all the drawings made to
study these groups of figures. The Chatsworth sheet is more often given to Raphael
while that in Vienna is almost universally given to Giulio. Opinion seems divided on the
drawing in Paris. The picture that emerges is one in which two artists, a more mature and
confident Raphael and a younger, less certain Giulio, were engaged in the making of
these studies at the same time. When the quick sketch for the apostle holding the book is
brought into the picture, it becomes even more certain that we are dealing with two
different artists.

The last red chalk nude study prepares the figures of the possessed boy and his
father who are on the right of the lower zone of the painting (fig. 155). This drawing


(Notre Dame, IN, 1984), 46 (R or Giulio); F-T under 172 (workshop of R); KMO607 (R);
J429 (Giulio). See also Hartt, Giulio Romano, 31 (Giulio); Oberhuber, “Vorzeichnungen
zu Raffaels ‘Transfiguration’,” 116-149 (Giulio); and John Shearman, “Die Loggia der
Psyche in der Villa Farnesina und die Probleme der Letzen Phase von Raffaels
graphischen Stil,” Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien 24 (1964): 59-
has more often been attributed to Giulio than to Raphael. There is a slight awkwardness in the anatomy of the boy’s upper body as he throws his right arm and twists his head violently toward the viewer. This study also differs a great deal from the final composition especially in the positions of the feet and relationship between the boy’s up-stretched arm and the father’s head.

Raphael and Giulio may have worked on these nude studies together. They may all have been based on single figure sketches by Raphael of the type now in Vienna for the apostle in the foreground (fig. 151). If so, then the next step in the process would have been to work these nude sketches together into a single compositional sketch.

There is a compositional sketch in Chatsworth for the upper half of the painting (fig. 156). No such sketch survives for the lower half of the composition. Except of Forlani-Tempesti, who thought it was a product of the shop and Fischel who attributed it to Penni, the drawing has been attributed to Raphael almost universally. It shows a great deal of thought on the page as contours of figures were reworked and some figures were more elaborately worked up than others. The purpose of such a drawing was to work out the scale and spatial relationships of the figures. It is the kind of sheet we expect to see preparing the way toward a *modello* like the one in Vienna (fig. 150).

The next step in the design process after the nude *modello* would have been a series of studies for the drapery elements and other details such as heads, hands, and feet. Only two of these drawings have come to light. The first is a drapery study in black
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chalk for the apostle in pink who points at Jesus (fig. 157). 31 This sheet has been most often attributed to Raphael; its strength and confidence would seem to confirm that he is the author. There are almost no lines on the page as the artist blocks out the areas of light a dark against a background of tan prepared paper. The forms seem to emerge from the sheet almost organically like a rock formation. Yet this drawing retains a sense of lightness and fluidity that seems beyond Giulio or any of Raphael’s other assistants.

The other black chalk detail study is a close examination of the head of the kneeling woman in the foreground of the painting (fig. 158). 32 This sheet has also been attributed to Raphael by most scholars. This powerful drawing approaches the level of finish found in an auxiliary cartoon. And while the scale and lack of pouncing marks indicate that it was not made after the cartoon, it could have served something of the same function as an auxiliary cartoon and allowed Raphael an opportunity to work out this figure’s elaborate hairstyle before the cartoon was produced. Despite the fact that this sheet must have had as one of its main purposes the study of the hairstyle, the braids which twist over this figure’s head in the painting are much more complex. The drawing may be an elaboration of a first idea sketch for this figure and the hairstyle may have grown more complex at the cartoon stage. Or there may have been a separate auxiliary cartoon for this head which does not survive.

31 Paris, Louvre 4118. Cordellier and Py, Inventaire général, 909 (R); F-T under 172 (workshop of R); KMO608 (R); J431 (R).

32 Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum 1971:51. L.C.J. Frerichs, Italiaanse Tekeningen II: de 15de en 16th Eeuw, exh. cat., Rijksmuseum (Amsterdam, 1981), 130 (R); F-T under 172 (workshop of R); KMO611 (R); J432 (R). See also Hartt, Giulio Romano, 30 (Giulio).
There is a series of auxiliary cartoons for the head of the apostles in the lower half of the altarpiece. These prepare all the heads of apostles that face the viewer, except for the figure second from the left in the middle distance. All these drawings have been universally attributed to Raphael, except by Fischel, who instead divided them into two groups, giving some to Raphael and some to Penni.

These sheets reveal some interesting facets of Raphael’s working procedures in the last stage of the design process before painting actually began. The drawing for the head of the apostle holding the book in the foreground has pounce marks that indicate that in the cartoon this figure had a head of curly hair much as he does in the Chatsworth red chalk sketch (fig. 159).33 The change from a relatively youthful figure to an older man was something that Raphael decided at the very end of the design process. The figure in the painting has more hair than in the drawing, but less than in the cartoon, to judge by the pounce marks on the drawing. The sequence of drawings indicates that Raphael was marking changes at every stage of work on the altarpiece, perhaps because he knew that Michelangelo had supplied drawings to Sebastiano and that his painting was going to be judged side by side with the Raising of Lazarus.

An auxiliary cartoon in Oxford for the lower two of the four heads in the center of the composition directly below Jesus reveals a similar situation (fig. 160).34 The older

---


figure has usually been identified as St. Peter and the younger as St. John. Here we also find that Raphael has altered the design of the cartoon. Pounce marks are plainly visible defining a different position for St. Peter that in the drawing. The contour of St. John’s hair as it falls against the back of his neck has also been changed between the cartoon and the drawing. Both of these changes were rejected in the final painting. Raphael chose to follow the original design in the cartoon rather than the reworked design in this drawing.

The remaining auxiliary cartoons are for the heads of the apostles across the top row in the lower zone of the painting (figs. 161-164). The designs of all four of these drawings correspond very closely to the finished painting. These four drawings are the ones that Fischel attributed to Penni or to an unnamed member of the workshop.

What do these seventeen drawings tell us about Raphael’s working procedures at the end of his life? The existence of at least two modelli with compositional alternatives means that the Transfiguration, as we now see it, is based on at least the third design that Raphael worked up for the altarpiece. How the earlier designs were conceived and elaborated is not known: all that remains to record the first ideas are modelli of the entire compositions. Scholars agree that these drawings were most likely made by Penni. They

may be studio records of ideas that did not get beyond the stage of compositional sketches.

When Raphael settled on the final design, he must have made some rough compositional sketches that do not survive, and followed them with a series of individual figure studies. The only one of these figure studies to survive is the drawing now in Vienna (fig. 151). The next stage was a series of nude studies of figures or groups of figures made by Raphael and Giulio together. According to the consensus of scholars’ opinions there are four of these, some by Raphael and some by Giulio. Experts also concur that Raphael then took these and turned them into more finished compositional studies, like the sheet in Chatsworth for the upper portion of the painting (fig. 156), that Penni then worked up into a nude modello. The next stage was a series of studies of drapery and important details such as heads. Expert opinion is divided over the role of Giulio in the production of these two drawing, but most scholars favor an attribution to Raphael of both black chalk detail studies.

The cartoon was produced from this modello and these studies. The final stage was a series of auxiliary cartoons of the heads in the foreground of the composition. All stages, save the earliest idea sketches and the full cartoon, are attested to in the surviving drawings. Raphael clearly retained a great deal of control over this project, as we would expect given his important patron and the competition with Sebastiano backed by Michelangelo. But nevertheless Raphael employed Giulio to make studies of individual figure groups at a very early stage in the process. This may be because Raphael had used Giulio in this way so often in the past that he was completely comfortable allowing the younger artist to have input in the earliest stages of the design process. In the execution
of the *Transfiguration* we can trace more clearly than in any single composition for the frescoes of the Stanze, how Raphael developed and negotiated a working procedure that allowed him to admit others into the design process without any loss of quality. Giulio was employed by Raphael in much the same way as Raphael was employed by Pinturicchio to make designs for the Piccolomini Library sixteen or seventeen years earlier. It is true that Giulio was not an independent master in 1519, as Raphael was in 1503. Nevertheless, Raphael seems to have trained Giulio, and Penni to some lesser extent, to exercise his own judgment in making a contribution to a collaborative venture, as the *Transfiguration* surely was. By the last years of Raphael’s life, this seems to have been how the workshop functioned. All projects were under the ultimate control of the master. But Raphael did allow certain assistants to be involved in all stages of the design process. The evidence of the drawings indicates that Giulio worked out the final poses of some of the figures in the lower zone of the composition.
Chapter 7: Conclusion

During the last five years of his life Raphael developed a new way of deploying the talented artists in his shop. He employed specialists to perform specific tasks called for by certain commissions. An example is Giovanni da Udine who created the grotesques, garlands, and stucco reliefs for the Loggia di Raffaello. Raphael also trained assistants to perform specific tasks related to the design of major paintings. By the end of Raphael’s life, Giulio Romano had emerged as a major artistic force. Once the drawings for the Vatican frescoes are examined in the context of all the available documentary evidence, it becomes clear that Giulio designed important parts of the Vatican fresco cycles, sometimes with no apparent intervention by the master and that Giovanni Francesco Penni created modelli of complex compositions that had been worked up by the master or by Giulio. I draw a different conclusion from all previous scholars, including most recently Bette Talvacchia, who always reserved the ideation of the works of art to Raphael’s creative genius alone.¹ Unlike Talvacchia and earlier scholars I see the mind, not just the hand, of Giulio Romano and Giovanni Francesco Penni engaged in the design process.

This dissertation begins the reinvestigation of this problem by examining the frescoes of the Vatican Stanze, a coherent group of large and important works which, in addition to sharing a series of spaces in the papal palace, were commissioned under similar circumstances. The Transfiguration altarpiece is included as a case study to prove that this phenomenon of creative collaboration extended to works outside the

¹ See above, chapter 1 and note 55.
Stanze. This kind of analysis has not been attempted before for such a large number of commissions spread out across the years from the completion of the Stanza della Segnatura to Raphael’s death. I have tried to explain the changing role of Raphael and his principal assistants by using their drawings to explore the design process in the workshop. An editorial published in July 1984 in *The Burlington Magazine* as a summation of the accomplishments of the “Raphael Year,” which was then drawing to a close, stated, “What we seriously need now is a systematic study of the functioning of drawings in the late Roman workshop.”\(^2\) This lacuna has not been filled in the past twenty-three years. This dissertation, while not completing this task, attempts to make a crucial step in this direction by examining how and by whom the frescoes in the Vatican Stanze were designed. It aims to examine this material and come to certain conclusions about the way Raphael’s workshop functioned during a period of stress as the demands on Raphael’s time were increasing enormously. The evidence suggests that Raphael chose to relinquish control over aspects of the design process and to allow Giulio and Penni to come to the fore as major forces within the organization. This was accomplished without a diminution of quality and without the works becoming mired in the mediocrity of easy solutions and repeated motifs taken from past successes. As a result we can now see the distinct creative minds of more than one artist being brought to bear on projects that at any earlier moment in Raphael’s career would have occupied him alone. Instead we find that Raphael was expansive in his view of how work could be

---

accomplished and so created collaborators where other masters had only students or assistants.

The slide into mediocrity is a fate that befell the artist of the earlier generation who is most associated with Raphael. Perugino employed a large very productive shop. The master was in complete control of the design process and was not above reusing figures, or even cartoons, from one composition to another in order to save labor. As we have seen, Raphael was probably associated with the Perugino shop in some way, although not as an assistant. It is more than probable that Raphael understood that the ossification of Perugino’s stylistic development was due at least in part to the older artist’s inability to let go of any aspect of the design process. Raphael was able to take this lesson and turn a logistical necessity, the use of assistants in the design process, into an artistic advantage. Raphael, to judge by the drawings that survive, was more than willing to allow Giulio to work out solutions to certain compositional problems. And even though we see many cases of Raphael intervening in the final stages of the design, such as the series of auxiliary cartoons for the figures of the apostles in the lower zone of the Transfiguration, it is clear that Raphael trusted Giulio enough that he sometimes allowed the younger artist’s designs to stand, as with most of the biblical scenes in the Loggia di Raffaello.

This trust in a young assistant is something that Raphael may have learned from an artist of the previous generation with whom he was associated in the years before he arrived in Rome. Raphael had been employed by Pinturicchio to make designs for the

---

3 See above, chapter 2, beginning at note 25.
Piccolomini Library. ⁴ And even though these designs were altered by the older artist, the
drawings give us every reason to believe that the overall solutions to the challenges
presented by the first few scenes in the Library were Raphael’s. From this experience
Raphael would have learned that a master can remain in overall control of a shop and its
commissions even while the ideation of major works of art are undertaken by assistants.
That Raphael seems to have incorporated this idea into his usual practice in the Stanze
speaks to a willingness to try new working procedures that involved new levels of trust in
his assistants.

Raphael was successful, and not in a limited way. All of the commissions after
about 1514 that have been examined in this dissertation show some degree of
involvement by shop assistants in the design phase. In his reorganizing of the design
process in his workshop Raphael was truly inventing a new way of making art. He must
also have created a different attitude toward the working procedures of the shop. We
have seen in the documents and letters that discussed the production of Raphael and his
assistants during these years, as well as in the writings of Vasari, that to the sixteenth-
century eye, all the commissions were considered the works of Raphael. ⁵ This
dissertation is limited to the frescoes in the Vatican and the Transfiguration altarpiece in
order to be manageable in length. A close examination of the drawings for the Sistine
tapestry cartoons, the Loggia di Psiche in the Villa Farnesina, and many of the panel
paintings produced after 1514 would show the same result: a master who was ready and

---

⁴ See above, chapter 2, beginning at note 32.

⁵ Of the many examples cited in this dissertation, one of the most prominent is the letter
of Michiel which describes the Loggia di Raffaello as “by Raphael.” See above chapter
4, at note 62.
willing to give up some control in the design phase of the projects to a cadre of shop assistants more than capable of innovative designs on the highest level of quality.

Since my main evidence for this shift in procedure by Raphael is the drawings that represent the creative act in its most immediate form, a word should be said about the media of the drawings presented here. Raphael, as will be seen in the surviving drawing for the Stanza della Segnatura, was an incredibly facile draughtsman who could use almost any medium. He often chose, or mixed, media to create specific effects that allowed him to study certain problems. This can be seen in his drapery studies for the Disputa. Some are made in ink and ink wash with white heightening like the study for the figure of Christ (fig. 27). While others are made in black chalk with white heightening as is the sketch for St. Stephen (fig. 28). Both of these drawings are meant to study the play of light across the complex folds of drapery that wrap around the figures. The ink study has very clearly defined areas of light and shadow which create a solid, almost sculptural, effect. In the drawing of St. Stephen the black chalk blends with the white to create a softer more subtle play of light across the figure. This is but one small example of many possible examples. As time went on and the members of the shop took on more and more design responsibilities, there seems to have developed a somewhat standard way of creating the drawings necessary to the complex process of creating a work of art. The media used in many drawings during the last period of Raphael’s life seem to be related to the drawing’s function and bear no explicit relationship to the attribution of the drawing to a particular draughtsman. Quick sketches, like the one for
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the figure of *Religion* in the Sala di Costantino (Fig. 125), were usually made in pen, while nude studies of figures were often made in either red or black chalk. There is a series of red chalk studies of nudes for the *Fire in the Borgo* (figs. 82-85) and a series of black chalk studies for the frescoes on the east and south walls of the Sala di Costantino (figs. 119-123). *Modelli* were very often made in pen and brush and wash with white heightening. This technique is fairly consistent throughout the work in the Vatican and can be seen most clearly in the series of *modelli* created for the Loggia di Raffaello (figs. 97-103). This is another sign perhaps of the levels of collaboration within the shop. If the nude studies by more than one hand for a particular project share a particular medium, this makes it more likely that the artists were working together on these drawings, rather than separately.

There could be a more subtle conclusion to be drawn here. Even though we cannot assign a particular drawing to a particular artist based on the medium alone, we can see from the surviving sheets that Penni, for example, was more comfortable with brush and wash than chalk. A comparison of his study in red chalk for a figure in the *Coronation of Charlemagne* (fig. 76) with any of his *modelli* clearly shows this. Giulio, on the other hand, was more than capable of using pen or chalk to create designs for single figures or figure groups. He was particularly facile with a pen and so Raphael might have chosen him, at least partially on this basis, to make first idea sketches and design drawings for figures and figures groups.⁷ We can see this in his pen drawings for complex grouping such as the *Division of the Promised Land by Lot* for the Loggia (fig.

By about 1516 when the Loggia was painted, Raphael appears to have settled into a routine with his assistants where he assigned different types of drawings, and so different steps in the design process, to his assistants based on their proven abilities. It is possible that some of the drawings attributed to assistants such as Giulio by earlier scholars and in this dissertation are the remains of Raphael’s effort to train the members of his workshop to emulate his style. We cannot be certain that Raphael’s aim was not a pedagogical one when he asked an assistant to make a drawing. But there is not a single case where we have a drawing by the master and a copy by an assistant where the purpose is unambiguously to teach. This may be merely an accident of survival of the drawings. But it is much more likely that Raphael was assigning creative design work to other artists in the shop. In the rare cases where two drawings for a single figure do exist, such as the red chalk studies in the Albertina and Chatsworth for the apostle with the book in the Transfiguration (figs. 151 and 152), the drawings are from different stages in the design process and have distinct functions. The drawing in Vienna is clearly an idea sketch meant to block out the masses of the figure and experiment with the lighting to a small degree. The drawing in Chatsworth is a detailed study of anatomy and hair as well as a much more complete study of light and the pose of the figure. If the drawing in Chatsworth was made by Giulio, was the purpose to train him? Possibly, but the immediate and more important intention was to bring this figure to a much higher degree of finish. Raphael was a teacher, as all employers are to a degree. His teaching methods, however, are not at all clear to us. After examining the evidence presented here, what is clear is that his main purpose in giving so much responsibility to the
members of his shop was to accomplish his artistic goals as efficiently and as well as possible.

The aftermath of Raphael’s way of organizing work during his last years is in many ways an interesting story in itself. The obvious first place to look for the influence of Raphael’s entrepreneurial methods is in the Roman workshop of his principal assistant Giulio Romano. Vasari provided a great deal of information about Giulio’s work and stature in the artistic community in Rome between 1520 and his departure for Mantua in 1524 to take up the post of court artist to Marquis Federico II Gonzaga.8 Much of Vasari’s detailed account of Giulio’s activities in Rome, even though it is new to the second revised edition of the Lives, must have come to Vasari directly from Giulio during a trip Vasari made to Mantua in 1541.9 Vasari named Giulio and Penni the artistic heirs of Raphael who inherited his commissions as well as the workshop. He told a story in the life of Andrea del Sarto that indicates that Raphael and Giulio collaborated on paintings. According to Vasari, Giulio mistook a copy of the portrait Pope Leo X with Cardinals Giulio de’ Medici and Luigi Rossi, which was painted by Sarto, for the original.10 Giulio claimed to have seen his own brushstrokes in the copy until Vasari, visiting Mantua in 1541, proved that the panel was a copy.11 This shows how well Giulio was able to mimic

---


9 Patricia Lee Rubin, Giorgio Vasari: Art and History (New Haven, 1995), pp. 229-230..


11 Vasari/Milanesi, V, pp. 41-43.
the master’s hand. But it also demonstrates that pictures that had been partly painted by other men were considered to be by Raphael. Vasari also related that Raphael imparted to Giulio “le più difficili cose dell’arte.”¹² This seems to include the organization of an efficient workshop which Vasari described in great detail as he laid out the particulars of several large and complex commissions including the decoration of the Sala di Costantino, the painting of the Fugger and Monteluca altarpieces, as well as the construction of the Villa Madama and the Villa Lante. Vasari even mentioned the names of several artists employed by Giulio in much the same manner as Raphael employed Giulio and Penni and other artists in the completion of his many commissions. These artists included Giovanni da Lione and Raffaello dal Colle who were particularly useful in the execution of the frescoes in the Sala di Costantino.¹³ Vasari claimed that these artists learned to paint in Giulio’s style and executed designs that Giulio had made for this room. Vasari went on to discuss Giulio’s production in Mantua after 1524. According to his account, Giulio made use of specialist assistants such as the painters Benedetto Pagni and Rinaldo Mantovano who were employed to do the actual painting of the Sala dei Cavalli in the Palazzo Te.¹⁴

It is not at all surprising that Giulio should have organized his work much in the same way as his master had. But there is a crucial difference between the two that should not be overlooked. Raphael had surrounded himself with several strong artistic
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¹² “The most difficult artistic things.” Vasari/Milanesi, V, p. 525.

¹³ Ibid., V, pp. 533-534.

¹⁴ Ibid., V, p. 539.
personalities such as Giulio Romano, but also including Perino del Vaga and Giovanni da Udine. Giulio does not seem to have had the luxury of assistants with the ability to take control of the design process for important commissions. As a result, as Vasari wrote about the painting of the Sala di Costantino, Giulio had to be content with assistants who could imitate his style and produce high quality work in that style.\footnote{Ibid., V, p. 539.} This is not exactly how Raphael’s workshop functioned. Giulio’s way of doing things was in fact closer to what was normal artistic practice in the Renaissance. A standard part of the training of the young artist was to learn to mimic his master’s style closely enough that in the last stages of the learning process the assistant could stand on the scaffold beside the master and produce work that was virtually indistinguishable from the master’s.\footnote{On this phenomenon see Martin Wackernagel, \textit{The World of the Florentine Renaissance Artist: Projects and Patrons, Workshop and Art Market} [Leipzig, 1938], trans. Alison Luchs (Princeton, 1981), pp. 328-337; Anna Padoa Rizzo, “La bottega come luogo di formazione,” in Mina Gregori, Antonio Paolucci, and Cristina Acidini Luchinat, eds., \textit{Maestri e botteghe: Pittura a Firenze alla fine del Quattrocento}, exh. cat. (Florence, Palazzo Strozzi, 1992), pp. 53-59; and Francis Ames-Lewis, \textit{The Intellectual Life of the Early Renaissance Artist} (New Haven, 2000), pp. 35-46. It should be pointed out that our understanding of the way workshops functioned in the Renaissance is based on very few documents. The literature on the subject, therefore, tends to be somewhat self-referential.} It is possible that Raphael’s own way of using his assistants grew out of a pedagogical process such as this. But it is clear from what we have seen of the Vatican projects produced by Raphael and his shop that Raphael was not toward the end of his life interested in producing a “shop style” based on his own personal style.

Raphael’s ideas about the organization of artistic production came to full fruition in the workshops of the early Baroque in both Italy and the north. The most prominent
example is perhaps the Roman workshop of Annibale Carracci for two reasons. First, Annibale was a great admirer of Raphael.  

He was born in 1560 and came to Rome in 1595 to decorate the palace of Cardinal Odoardo Farnese. Annibale must have carefully looked at the frescoes and altarpieces of Raphael. We know that the Carracci had read Vasari closely because there exists in the Biblioteca Communale dell’Archiginnasio in Bologna a copy of the second edition of Vasari’s book with many marginal annotations that have been identified as by the hands of Annibale, Agostino, and Ludovico Carracci.  

From Vasari’s comments in his life of Giulio, an intelligent artist such as Annibale could easily have surmised that Raphael ran his shop in a much more open and collaborative manner than other artists of the era. The second reason Annibale may have been more prepared than most to make use of a large shop which included strong artistic personalities is his experience running an academy for artists with his brother Agostino and his cousin Ludovico in their native Bologna.

In 1602 Annibale was well established in Rome and began to receive many commissions. Because of the increased demands on his time, he gathered a group of young artists around him. Annibale’s health, both physical and mental, was in decline

---


during this period.\textsuperscript{21} In 1605, he was so ill that he felt compelled to turn over primary responsibility for the \textit{Aldobrandini Lunettes} to Albani. According to a letter from Cardinal Farnese, who was in Rome, to the Duke of Modena, Annibale was suffering an “infermità mortale” and so could not carry on the commission.\textsuperscript{22} Both circumstances probably account for his increased reliance on his assistants to execute his ideas. These men included his nephew Antonio, the son of his elder brother Agostino who died in February of that year, and Francesco Albani and Domenichino who came from Bologna to work with Annibale. The group also included Giovanni Lanfranco and Sisto Badalocchio, as well as other painters. Annibale employed these painters in a flexible way. Some of them, like Albani, an alumnus of the Carracci Academy in Bologna, were semi-independent masters who worked for Annibale but also for other artists and patrons in Rome.\textsuperscript{23} Others were totally dependent on the work they received from Annibale such as Domenichino who was only twenty-one years old in 1602.

Annibale employed his shop assistants for a variety of purposes. Members executed easel paintings after the master’s designs. An example is the canvas \textit{Night Bearing Sleep and Death} in the Musée Condé in Chantilly. This painting, which has been attributed to Domenichino, is based on a drawing by Annibale that is in the Kupferstichkabinett in Dresden.\textsuperscript{24} Shop assistants were also used to complete the Farnese

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., pp. 142-143.

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., p. 143.


\textsuperscript{24} Posner, \textit{Annibale Carracci}, plates 137a. and b.
Gallery. For example, Sisto Badalocchio painted the fresco of *Hercules and the Dragon* after a drawing by Annibale now in the Louvre. The assistants also often worked as a team under the direction of Annibale, much as Raphael’s shop operated as a unit on complex projects such as the Loggia di Raffaello. The *Aldobrandini Lunettes* in the Galleria Doria Pamphilj in Rome are a good example of this type of collaboration. Albani, Lanfranco, Badalocchio, and, of course, Annibale himself, all worked on these canvases. Albani was responsible for all or important parts of the *Landscape with the Assumption of the Virgin*, *Landscape with the Visitation*, and *Landscape with the Adoration of the Magi*. Badalocchio painted the *Landscape with the Adoration of the Shepherds* on his own. Lanfranco collaborated in the execution of *Landscape with the Adoration of the Magi*, while the master seems to have reserved *Landscape with the Entombment* for himself. All of these were painted following Annibale’s designs. So, while Annibale did not surrender any of the design work to his assistants, he did employ them as semiautonomous subcontractors to carry out his designs. This is very much in the spirit of the large shop organized by Raphael in Rome and run by Giulio after Raphael’s death.

Annibale’s workshop may have been the guiding influence on Peter Paul Rubens as he set up his large studio in Antwerp starting in 1608. Rubens had been in Italy between 1600 and 1608 and had been strongly influenced by the Roman work of

25 Ibid., plates 140j and k.

26 Puglisi, *Francesco Albani*, pp. 5-6, 17-18, 104-106.


Annibale. Upon his return to Antwerp, he began working toward the goal of creating a uniform “shop style” but using unique means. His studio seems to have operated as a loose confederation of painters, some of whom were independent masters in their own right who did not try to hide their personal hands by copying Rubens’s manner. Yet the shop’s production had a remarkable uniformity of style. Rubens was apparently able to achieve this by the judicious use of collaborators, for example, Frans Snyders, for the painting of animals. The two artists collaborated on the large canvas of Prometheus, now in the Philadelphia Museum of Art; Rubens painted the figure of Prometheus and Snyders the eagle. But it is a product of the “Rubens shop” and displays the style of that shop because Rubens kept control over the entire production from start to finish. This was so much so that, in a famous letter of 1618 in which Rubens describes some of the pictures he has in “stock,” he describes this painting as, “original by my hand with the eagle by Frans Snyders.”

One might say that Snyders is among the many tools employed by Rubens to achieve his artistic goals. This is much like the workshop created by Annibale in Rome, which in turn may owe its inspiration to Raphael’s Roman workshop.

Raphael created a new way of working during his years in Rome between 1508 and 1520. He began these years as a traditional master in charge of a productive shop in which he designed all the paintings and painted most of them himself. By the end of his life Raphael was the principal artist and guiding master of a large group of painters and stucco artists in which the responsibility for execution and design were shared by

---


Raphael and his most important assistants. Raphael did not reserve the design process to himself. In fact, in most cases he seems to have allowed assistants to design and carry through major paintings. He and his shop managed to create innovative and sophisticated works of art while at the same time inviting new ways of working that challenged traditional notions of artistic genius and creativity.
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Fig. 128. *Head of Charity* for the Sala di Costantino, black chalk, white heightening, Paris, Louvre 10958, 230 x 160 mm.
Fig. 129. *Sylvester I and Fortitude* for the Sala di Costantino, pen, brush and wash, Chatsworth, Devonshire Collection 139, 310 x 235 mm.
Fig. 130. *Gregory I* for the Sala di Costantino, pen, brush and wash, London, Victoria and Albert Museum 2269, 299 x 244 mm.
Fig. 131. *Modello* for *The Adlocutio*, pen, brush and wash, over black chalk, white heightening, Chatsworth, Devonshire Collection 175, 232 x 415 mm.
Fig. 132. *Modello* for *The Battle of the Milvian Bridge*, pen, brush and wash, over black chalk, white heightening, Paris, Louvre 3872, 376 x 851 mm.
Fig. 133. Cartoon for the head of a caryatid on the east wall of the Sala di Costantino, charcoal, Florence, Fondazione Horne 5548 (on deposit at the Uffizi), 248 x 200 mm.
Fig. 134. Cartoon for *Moderation* in the Sala di Costantino, charcoal, Paris, Louvre 4301, 1842 x 1190 mm.
Fig. 135. Portrait of Leo X, cartoon fragment for Leo I in the Sala di Costantino, black chalk, white heightening, Chatsworth, Devonshire Collection 38, 480 x 299 mm.
Fig. 136. Cartoon fragment for *The Battle of the Milvian Bridge*, black chalk, white heightening, Milan, Ambrosiana, 805 x 2494 mm.
Fig. 137. Auxiliary cartoon for a head in *The Adlocutio*, black chalk over pounce marks, London, British Museum 1949-2-12-3, 393 x 241 mm.
Fig. 138. Left half of Constantine’s Donation of Rome, pen, Paris, Louvre 3874, 418 x 287 mm.
Fig. 138a. *Constantine’s Donation of Rome*, pen, Left: Paris, Louvre 3874, 418 x 287 mm; Right: Stockholm, Nationalmuseum 329, 415 x 285 mm.
Fig. 139. Giulio Romano, *Caesar Ordering the Burning of the Books of Pompey*, fresco, Sala di Cesare in the Palazzo Te, Mantua.
Fig. 140. Right half of *Constantine’s Donation of Rome*, pen, white heightening, over black chalk, Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 248, 273 x 247 mm.
Fig. 141. Early *modello* for Constantine’s *Donation of Rome*, pen, brush and wash, white heightening, some stylus, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum 1948:368, 395 x 549 mm.
Fig. 142. *Pope Sylvester I Being Borne on a Sedia Gestatoria for Constantine’s Donation of Rome*, black, red, yellow, and white chalk, brush and wash, Boston, Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum 2.4093, 398 x 404 mm.
Fig. 143. Putto playing with a diamond ring, a Medici *impresa*, for the north wall of the Sala di Costantino, pen, brush and wash, Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Kupferstichkabinett KdZ 4548r, 210 x 155 mm.
Fig. 144. Putto riding a swan, for the north wall of the Sala di Costantino, pen, brush and wash, Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Kupferstichkabinett KdZ 4548v, 210 x 155 mm.
Fig. 145. Putto for the north wall of the Sala di Costantino, pen, Vienna, Albertina 213 (SR 254), 120 x 96 mm.
Fig. 146. *Transfiguration*, panel, Rome, Pinacoteca Vaticana, inv. no. 333, 4050 x 2780 mm.
Fig. 147. Sebastiano del Piombo, *The Raising of Lazarus*, panel, London, National Gallery, inv. no. 1, 3810 x 2900 mm.
Fig. 148. Early *modello* for the *Transfiguration*, brush and wash, white heightening, Vienna, Albertina, 192 (SR 228), 398 x 268 mm.
Fig. 149. Early *modello* (or a copy) for the *Transfiguration*, pen, brush and wash, white heightening, over traces of black chalk, Paris, Louvre 3954, 414 x 274 mm.
Fig. 150. Nude *modello* for the *Transfiguration*, pen over stylus and, in the upper section, black chalk, Vienna, Albertina 17544 (SR 293), 534 x 376 mm.
Fig. 151. Study for an Apostle in the *Transfiguration*, red chalk over traces of black chalk, Vienna, Albertina Vienna, Albertina 237 (SR 287), 126 x 144 mm.
Fig. 152. Study for two Apostles for the *Transfiguration*, red chalk over stylus, Chatsworth, Devonshire Collection 51, 328 x 232 mm.
Fig. 153. Study for two Apostles for the *Transfiguration*, red chalk over stylus, traces of black chalk, Paris, Louvre 3864, 341 x 223 mm.
Fig. 154. Study for three Apostles for the *Transfiguration*, red chalk over stylus, Vienna, Albertina 4880 (SR 222), 320 x 271 mm.
Fig. 155. Study for the Possessed Boy and His Father for the *Transfiguration*, red chalk over stylus, Milan, Ambrosiana F273 INF 36, 282 x 193 mm.
Fig. 156. Nude sketch for the top half of the *Transfiguration*, red chalk over stylus, Chatsworth, Devonshire Collection 904, 246 x 350 mm.
Fig. 157. Drapery study for the *Transfiguration*, black chalk, white heightening, Paris, Louvre 4118, 264 x 198 mm.
Fig. 158. Head of the kneeling woman for the Transfiguration, black and white chalk, indecipherable pouncing, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum 1971:51, 330 x 242 mm.
Fig. 159. Auxiliary cartoon for the head of an apostle for the *Transfiguration*, black chalk and charcoal over pouncing, London, British Museum 1860-6-16-96, 399 x 350 mm.
Fig. 160. Auxiliary cartoon for two heads and hands of apostles for the *Transfiguration*, black chalk, white heightening, over pouncing, Oxford, Ashmolean 568, 499 x 364 mm.
Fig. 161. Auxiliary cartoon for the head of an apostle for the *Transfiguration*, black and white chalk over pouncing, Chatsworth, Devonshire Collection 67, 375 x 278 mm.
Fig. 162. Auxiliary cartoon for the head and hand of an apostle for the *Transfiguration*, black chalk over pouncing, Princeton, NJ, Piasecka-Johnson Collection (formerly Chatsworth, Devonshire Collection 66), 363 x 346 mm.
Fig. 163. Auxiliary cartoon for the head of an apostle for the *Transfiguration*, black chalk over pouncing, London, British Museum 1895-9-15-634, 265 x 198 mm.
Fig. 164. Auxiliary cartoon for the head of an apostle for the Transfiguration, black and white chalk over pouncing, Vienna, Albertina 242 (SR 294), 240 x 182 mm.
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