

was inserted to make it more immediate, all suggest that it was the first scene to be painted, and technical evidence prompts us to reconsider the sequence of the frescos independently of their preparation on paper.

If Raphael's contemporaries averred that his art was not innate but born from studying other artists, they were not totally wrong, particularly in regard to his early career. Raphael seemed to need models to emulate and surpass. His syncretic method, by which he selected from all available models, painting techniques, lighting, figure motifs, poses, landscape motifs, backdrops, accoutrements and costumes may make him particularly interesting in an age of multivalent information. What Raphael can teach our age is his unique sense of quality, by which he selected what he needed to form his own style and which determined everything he made. Since Raphael's art has become a synonym for the classical ideal, it is with this message that the *notion* of 'classic' will continue to be valid.

¹ The authors refrained from giving the provenance of the works in the exhibition and relegated those of the National Gallery's paintings to Nicholas Penny's contribution.

² J. Shearman: *Raphael in early modern sources – 1483–1602*, New Haven and London 2003; see the review in this issue on pp. 696–98 below.

³ See M. Mena Marqués, ed.: exh. cat. *Rafael en España*, Madrid (Museo del Prado) 1985.

⁴ See Shearman, *op. cit.* (note 2), pp. 97–98.

⁵ A new presentation of the drawings of Perugino and Raphael in these years, outlined in the present writer's lecture 'Raphael and Perugino' at the Raphael Symposium held at the National Gallery, London, in November 2004, is forthcoming.

Raphael in Early Modern Sources (1483–1602). By John Shearman. 2 vols. xii + 1706 pp. with 37 b. & w. ills. (Yale University Press, London and New Haven, 2003, £75). ISBN 0-300-09918-5.

Reviewed by TOM HENRY

CROWE AND CAVALCASELLE's description of Raphael's pursuit of artistic perfection can reasonably be applied to John Shearman's thirty-years' pursuit of Raphael documents: 'Between Urbino and Rome [for which read Aldershot and Harvard], the poles of his existence, he wandered with but one apparent purpose in life, the purpose – diligently pursued and never abandoned – of studying everything that had been done by others before him, of assimilating the good and eliminating the bad amongst the numerous examples which had come within his ken.'¹

Some idea of Shearman's extraordinary odyssey may be gleaned from his ninety-nine page bibliography and the philological and historiographical commentaries which follow each document included in this monumental piece of scholarship, which runs to over 1,700 pages, and a measure of its importance is the impossibility of returning to Vincenzo Golzio's earlier corpus of Raphael documents and sources, first published

in 1936, in which most documents are not published in full.

In the period since Shearman's book has appeared the re-dating of the Montelucre documents to 1505, not 1503 (pp. 93–96),² and of Raphael's appointment as *Scriptor Brevium* in 1511, not 1509 (pp. 150–52),³ have made possible new interpretations of the artist's career. Sadly, however, Shearman's Corpus doesn't actually tell us very much more about Raphael than we knew already. There are new documents in this book (for instance, those connected with Albertinelli, supplied by Louis Waldman), and it is extremely useful to have them gathered together in one place (if not in one volume), but we do not have the kind of material relating to Raphael that we have, for example, for Michelangelo: two autograph letters for the former versus 1,400 to or from the latter. There are several reasons for this scarcity of biographical material. There is no evidence that Raphael kept a written archive, while it is quite clear that Michelangelo kept letters as well as financial accounts. Raphael also had a relatively small family (no living parents or siblings to write to), and in one letter he makes it clear that he did not much like writing letters anyway.⁴

Shearman, as his title makes clear, decided to publish not just documents dating from Raphael's lifetime, but also material dating from the eighty years that followed the artist's death (these documents and sources make up more than two thirds of the book). It is questionable if it was really worth reprinting Vasari's 1550 and 1568 lives here – they are readily available elsewhere and Shearman did not attempt to comment on their texts as he did for other documents and sources – but much of this posthumous material is fascinating and opens up new lines of inquiry; for example, the will of Cardinal Ferrero made in 1584 which leaves 'il quadro della Madonna di Rafaele d'Urbino che è in Roma' to his executor, Virgilio Crescenzi (pp. 1309–10). Virgilio's son, Pier Paolo (1572–1645, from 1611 a cardinal), apparently owned Raphael's *St Catherine*, now in the National Gallery, London, in the early seventeenth century (the picture has a wax seal on the reverse which could only belong to this cardinal or – less probably – to Cardinal Marcello Crescenzi; Fig. 36).⁵ If these pictures were identical it might provide some early provenance for the *St Catherine*? While the subjects do not match, Raphael's Catherine could have been mistaken for an enraptured Madonna, and the Crescenzi connection is striking. Alternatively the family may have owned two paintings by Raphael, which would be equally interesting.

It is a pity that the author is no longer with us, so that one could debate some of the more contentious points contained in these two volumes. He would have been the first to agree that this publication would be a failure if it acted as an obstacle to further research or reflection, writing, 'I have never felt that it is a mark of respect to suspend criticism' (p. 1). This is all the more important because books of this type tend to act as cornerstones (or as 'our bible' to borrow Shearman's description

of the role previously played by Golzio) for monographic study, and can thereby assume a canonical position which inhibits fresh consideration of the evidence.

In a moment of characteristic wit, Shearman describes what a biography of Raphael based entirely upon false documents would be like (p. 15). Would he have been as amused by what a student's chronology of Raphael's life based on this publication might be like? There would be much that was good and uncontroversial, but Raphael would be said to have been in Rome in 1502/03; in 1504 the only entry would read 'Signed and dated *The Spozalizio* in Città di Castello (now Milan, Brera)',⁶ while in 1508 Raphael would have 'gilded a metal garland for Michelangelo's *David* and painted a Madonna for the Audience-Chamber of the Nove in the Palazzo Vecchio'.

These three examples are at the core of the problem with a compendium of this nature: in the first case Shearman followed a disputed interpretation, in the second he excluded a much-discussed document, and in the third he included a contentious newcomer. In each case Shearman's commentary is much more nuanced, but the final conclusion, or at least the ostensible conclusion, is worthy of comment.

In 1977, Shearman proposed that Raphael visited Rome in 1502–03 and again in 1506.⁷ While this reviewer is not especially resistant to the idea, the philological proof (in which, incidentally, Shearman's position has changed over time)⁸ is difficult to accept. I cannot see how the relevant phrase in Raphael's (and Castiglione's) letter to Leo X (pp. 500–45) – 'poi ch'io sono in Roma' followed by a varying number of years depending on which manuscript one is reading – can be related to anything other than the artist's definitive transfer to Rome in 1508.⁹ Similarly, the relegation to the section of false documents of the letter from Giovanna Feltria della Rovere of 1st October 1504 in which Raphael is recommended to Soderini and said to wish to 'stare qualche tempo in Fiorenza per imparare', runs the risk of being taken as definitive (pp. 1457–62). Yet, as Shearman's four-page commentary on this document makes clear, the case against its authenticity is not proved, even if Shearman himself entertained 'no doubt that the letter is a forgery' (p. 13). In the absence of a manuscript that can be properly studied, it is very hard to assess such anomalies as speaking of Giovanni Santi (who died in August 1494) in the present tense (p. 1457), but it must be acknowledged that, if it is a fake, it brilliantly anticipates genuine documentation that was published only subsequently.¹⁰ This is not to turn a blind eye to the document's deficiencies, but keeping an open mind in the absence of a manuscript.

The case for identifying Raphael as the '*Raffaello di Giovanni dipintore*' gilding metal-work and receiving forty-two lire '*per una Nostra Donna*' in 1508 was originally published by Francesco Caglioti; Louis Waldman instead identifies this artist as the Florentine Raffaello di Giovanni Riccomani.¹¹ Shearman's commentary on these documents makes it clear that he did not believe that they refer to Raphael, and it was therefore an

reveal strong Flemish influence, the one in its motifs, the other in its sharp and enamel-like technique. Although the underdrawings of the Madrid painting made visible by infrared reflectography³ seem very similar to those in the *Madonna of the pinks*, I would be inclined to date it earlier, for the very odd and unresolved diagonal composition, which does not unfold in space. The strange date inscribed in the neckline of the Virgin, 'MD VII. IV' was explained by Tom Henry as referring to 1507, the fourth year of Pope Julius II's reign. However, it is advisable to be sceptical about the dates deciphered in the gold embroideries on hems, and often it is necessary to add or discard a 'I' or two to make the numbers coincide with our own idea of the date the work should be given on stylistic grounds.⁴ Apart from the possibility that they could have been manipulated in later years, could they not have been intended as playful allusions rather than as exact dates?

Raphael's most ambitious altarpiece of the period, the *Entombment of Christ*, commissioned by Atalanta Baglione for S. Francesco in Perugia, is at present in restoration and was represented by the Cavalier d'Arpino's copy (no.65). The two predella scenes, today in the Vatican Museum (nos.66 and 67), with their figures in grisaille set against subtle shades of green marble, foreshadow Raphael's later obsession with antique coloured stones. Six of the nearly twenty sheets connected with this work charted the progress of the composition from a static lamentation to a dramatic transportation in full movement, achieved by incorporating motifs from Perugino, Signorelli, Michelangelo, the Antique and other sources (nos.68–73).

Raphael invented by drawing, and continually found inspiration in the inventions of others but also created his own solutions, as the drawings made in preparation for the *Disputa* show (nos.78–86); they leave no doubt that he was one of the draughtsmen geniuses of all time. Raphael's self-propagation of his inventive powers through the medium of the print was also illustrated; hardly any other subject demands the visualisation of such extreme passions and emotions as the *Massacre of the innocents*, and before handing over the final composition to Marcantonio Raimondi for the print, Raphael repeatedly revised the composition (nos.87–90) to turn a cruel event into a powerful 'icon of passion', as David Rosand aptly put it.

Raphael's paintings of Madonnas and portraits from his early years in Rome were represented by the Alba Madonna, from the National Gallery of Art in Washington (no.93). Specifically restored for this show, it wonderfully complemented the Garvagh Madonna from the National Gallery, London (no.91), in its pastel colour scheme, emotional tenderness and in Raphael's new accomplishment of harmoniously blend of apparent naturalness with abstract form into a wholly new aesthetic. This was the aesthetic of the portrait of Julius II. The bright blue and gold underpaint with *imprese* of the pope's portrait (no.99), which further confirm the autograph

status of the painting, may always have served only to give texture to the green wall cloth above it. The *Donna velata* (no.101) gave a glimpse into Raphael's future and his most fertile period as painter, architect and sculptor.

What impression of Raphael emerges from the catalogue? Three points are worth examining in detail. The first regards Raphael's artistic training. In its reconstruction, the authors follow a theory launched by Rudolf Wittkower and John Shearman which has convinced many scholars, including the present writer: after his father's death the eleven-year-old boy was not trained in Perugino's shop, as Vasari claimed, but remained in Urbino and was educated in his father's workshop by Evangelista di Pian di Meleto.

While Vasari's account of Raphael starting his apprenticeship with Perugino as a child was widely accepted in the nineteenth century, in the early twentieth century, documents were discovered for the commission of the altarpiece of the *Coronation of St Nicholas* in Città di Castello, in which Raphael appeared as 'magister' and signed the contract jointly with Evangelista di Pian di Meleto. This suggested the possibility that he received his first artistic training in Urbino, an idea corroborated by the very obviously un-Peruginesque qualities apparent in the fragments of the St Nicholas altarpiece and in the closely related Gonfalone of the Holy Trinity. That Raphael, the son of a court painter with literary and humanistic aspirations, was trained in Urbino corresponded much more to the twentieth-century discipline of art history when the relationship of Renaissance literature and the visual arts came to the fore.

Yet if we are to believe that Raphael was trained in Urbino, and that his earliest artistic creations should demonstrate how he studied the art available in Urbino at the time – Piero della Francesca, Melozzo da Forlì, Joos van Ghent, Francesco Laurana, Francesco di Giorgio and others – then we have to admit that not a single work has come to light. Only the serious evaluation of the drawings in the so-called Venetian sketchbook (Gallerie dell'Accademia, Venice), which correspond in their variety of motifs to those works which Raphael might have studied as an autodidact, could sustain the theory that Raphael was trained in Urbino; yet this assemblage of copy-drawings was not taken into consideration at all.

As a kind of concession to admitting that there is a problem, the curators did, however, include the processional cross from the Museo Poldi Pezzoli (no.14), dated it 1498–1502 and linked it to a drawing by Raphael for such a cross, but of a later date (no.13). Although of very high quality, the matrix is so totally Peruginesque that its attribution to Raphael would actually put the curators' argument of Raphael's training in Urbino into question. Should it be dated before or after the first commission in Città di Castello? If after, why should an independent and already highly individual artist try so hard to hide his own personality, after he had successfully procured commissions for himself?

And if before, then we would have to associate him very closely with Perugino before he reverted his father's stylistic idiom, which so strongly pervades his own first commission.

It is possible that Raphael's capacity to draw – for which he was soon exploited by his colleagues and superiors; Pintoricchio and Domenico Alfani are the most famous to do so – may have first been recognised by Perugino. If the designs for the Fano predella, a work commissioned from Perugino in 1497, are attributed without reservation to Raphael by renowned scholars, one may have to try out a more complex 'prehistory' for Raphael, one in which he was already involved with Perugino's artistic practices before 1499/1500.⁵ This would not mean that we have to return to Vasari's story that Raphael was apprenticed to Perugino for many years and that he had to comply with the guild regulations while in Perugino's shop. But if he wanted to learn by practice, why should he not have tried to meet Perugino and learn from him as much as possible, either in Fano or Perugia or in both places? We only have to imagine that Raphael was as quick and versatile before 1500 as he was afterwards.

The authors take a brave stance on the question of Raphael's move to Florence. Admitting that Raphael would have had knowledge of Florentine works, particularly by Leonardo, at an earlier point in his career, nonetheless they question, in my view rightly, Shearman's inclusion among the forged letters of the famous letter of recommendation written on 1st October 1504 by Giovanna Feltria della Rovere to the Gonfaloniere Soderini in Florence. That Raphael went to Florence some time between late 1504 and early 1505 with the intention of staying has hardly ever been questioned, and the reasons that this document has been doubted seem unjustified in the light of possible errors in its transcription. The arguments given by the authors in their introductory essay weigh heavily in favour of the document being genuine.

Another debate is generated by Arnold Nesselrath's stimulating essay on 'Raphael and Pope Julius II'. Following the restoration of the frescos of the Stanza della Segnatura, Nesselrath has argued that Vasari was right in proposing that the *School of Athens* was the trial piece that Raphael carried out for the pope, and not, as Bellori claimed, the *Disputa*. This might seem at first incompatible with our notion that the hemispheric arrangement of the divine vision in the *Disputa* seems to follow on directly from Florentine models, such as Fra Bartolomeo's *Last Judgment*, not to mention the elaborate sequence of drawings unique to the *Disputa* (nos.78–86). Following Bellori, it has been generally accepted that the airy architectural setting of the *School of Athens* was the result of Raphael's encounter with Rome's past, in architecture, sculpture and learning. Yet, the adherence to a strict perspectival setting into which the figures are added, including Raphael's self-portrait among the philosophers and scientists, and the fact that, after its completion, an extra figure

idiosyncratic – even misleading – decision to include them among the accepted documents. It is extremely difficult to believe that Raphael's Urbinate origins would not be referred to when he appeared as a newcomer in Florentine communal payments.¹²

In effect the above criticisms are about the criteria for inclusion or exclusion in the sequence of accepted documents and about the separation of documentary fact from scholarly interpretation. Shearman may have come to believe in his interpretations, but that has not transformed them into facts. Similarly there are other instances where knowledge of the author's other publications highlights patterns in the interpretation of documents. He attempted to redate a series of pre-Roman works a year or more later than other scholars but, as Caroline Elam pointed out to me, this creates a log-jam in 1508.¹³ This is duly reflected in Shearman's interpretation of Raphael's letter to his uncle of April 1508 in which he proposed that the Small Cowper Madonna in Washington might have been painted c.1507–08 for Giovanna Feltria, instead of the preferable date of c.1505, and might therefore be 'la Nostra Donna dela profetessa' mentioned in that letter (pp.112–18). The other great debating point in this letter is the identification of 'una certa stanza da lavorare, la quale [to] ha a sua S. de alocare' (pp.112–18). It has occasionally been suggested that this was the Sala del Gran Consiglio in Florence and that Raphael was lining up to take over where Leonardo and Michelangelo had left off, or to obtain some other commission in the Palazzo Vecchio.¹⁴ However, as Shearman argues, the room that Raphael alludes to in the letter was probably not the great hall (which would never have been referred to as a 'stanza'), but one of the Vatican Stanze.¹⁵

In this publication inscriptions in paintings are rightly omitted. Annotations on drawings are included, whether the drawing is datable or not, and apparently regardless of the significance of the annotation, but there is a problem of inconsistency. Perhaps the inscriptions on undisputed drawings in Oxford (Ashmolean, PII 501v) and Paris (Louvre, inv.no.3856r) have been omitted because they are fairly insignificant (although this is debatable; the former supports the sometimes questioned attribution to Raphael of the Gonfalone in Città di Castello, while the latter points to the correct identification of the subject),¹⁶ but leaving them out poses unresolvable questions such as whether or not Shearman had doubts about the drawing or its inscription. Signatures are included if a date appears, but not if they are undated (thereby omitting the signature on the Mond Crucifixion, although this does appear in the commentary to the dated inscription on the picture's original frame). One also finds strange situations such as the acceptance of the date of 1508 on a variant of the *Madonna of the pinks* that Shearman rejects as a later painting (p.122)¹⁷ and the unnecessarily restrictive reading of the date on the Madrid *Holy Family with the lamb* (p.110).¹⁸

The other problem in such a publication is how one deals with 'indirect' documents.



36. Wax seal on the reverse of *St Catherine*, by Raphael (National Gallery, London).

Paola Barocchi and her colleagues resolved this for Michelangelo by having separate volumes for the *Carteggio Indiretto*, but quickly encountered problems of where to draw the line and, as a result, that carteggio is as much *incompleto* as *indiretto*. In the case of Raphael's portrait of Pope Julius II, it is surely relevant that the Pope presented his portrait – by an unnamed artist – to the church of S. Marcello in Rome in December 1511.¹⁹ This aspect of the book is most unlike Shearman's great studies of the Raphael Tapestry Cartoons or of the Vatican Stanze,²⁰ which are so rich in contextualising material. His stated aim in this compendium of documents was 'the restitution of context' (p.7), but a monographic focus only highlights how much context lies with patrons, contemporaries and events.

It is also worth pointing out the limits of a strictly chronological approach. This ordering of the material suits anyone who wants to study the life as a whole. If, however, one wishes to see, for example, the documentation for Raphael's dispute with Sebastiano del Piombo and Michelangelo, then one needs a different kind of ordering (one that was occasionally adopted by Golzio) in grouping references to one project together. In the future, such documentation will be published on CD-ROMs or websites, which allow one to order the material in different ways.

It was said, probably apocryphally, that Shearman would ask his doctoral students to discover at least one new Raphael document in the course of their researches. He was sure that there were more to be found. At least one published reference was missed in this trawl. David Franklin published some entries from the 1538 posthumous inventory of Fra Jacopo di Battista de' Rossi, a Servite in Florence from 1499, prior of SS. Annunziata in 1503 and again in 1515–17, and a notable patron. One entry reads: 'Una Nostra Dona con San Giovanni di mano di Raffaello'.²¹ Although it is prudent to be cautious regarding attributions in inventories, a number of pointers suggest that this reference should probably be taken at face value. By 1538 one can reasonably assume that 'Raffaello' is Raphael and not some other artist with the same name (it is rare for early inventories to name an artist so only the most

famous are likely to be mentioned). Fra Jacopo, who died in 1537, was a contemporary of Raphael and the inventory probably preserves his attributions. He was an active and apparently rather sophisticated collector of paintings, whose taste and patronage ran to young and innovative artists.²² This reference (which could result in the identification of another of Raphael's Florentine Madonnas) is akin to the inventory of Silvia Piccolomini's possessions of 1542 where, *pace* Shearman, I still believe that the 'tondo bello di casa, con la Madonna, il Signore piccolo che dorme e Santo Giovanni, opera di Raffaello di Urbino' should be identified as the *Madonna del Silenzio* (pp.926–27).²³

Given that this book appeared four months after Shearman's death, the standards of consistency are impressively high. Nevertheless, the indexing is not faultless. The reference to Raphael staying in Taddeo Taddei's house in Florence (added by Raffaello Borghini in 1584) is not picked up in the index (p.1323), and the Small Cowper Madonna and Nicolini–Cowper Madonna have also been amalgamated into a single work in the index. None of the preceding comments is intended to belittle Shearman's extraordinary scholarly monument which will provide the backbone for Raphael studies for many years to come. The investment of time, thought and energy is exemplary, and it deserves to be emulated by future generations of archival scholars. Shearman's *Raphael* will not go uncorrected, but it may well be unsurpassed for centuries to come.

¹ J.A. Crowe and G.B. Cavalcaselle: *Raphael: His Life and Works*, London 1882, I, pp.4–5.

² See J. Shearman: 'On Raphael's Chronology 1503–1508', in ed. V. von Fleming: *Ars naturam adiuvans. Festschrift für Matthias Winner*, Mainz 1996, pp.201–07.

³ This reviewer independently published the correct date; see T. Henry: 'Reflections on Il Marcillat's work in the Vatican Palace', *Apollo* 152 (January 2001), pp.18–27, esp. p.25, note 23.

⁴ See the apparent self-criticism of his letter to his uncle Simone Ciarla of 1st July 1514 (pp.180–84); see also the analysis of this letter by C. Elam in her review of the book under review here in *Römische Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana* 35 (2003–04), pp.27–31.

⁵ C. Plazzotta, in H. Chapman, T. Henry and C. Plazzotta: exh. cat. *Raphael: from Urbino to Rome*, London (National Gallery), 2004, pp.222–24.; for the biographies of these two cardinals, see I. Polverini Fosi: 'Crescenzi, Pier Paolo', *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, Rome, XXX, 1984, pp.641–45 and *idem*: 'Crescenzi, Virgilio', *ibid.*, pp.648–49.

⁶ The good student would have also read the Addenda on p.1642 and noted that Raphael was resident in Perugia on 12th January 1504; see also D. Cooper: 'New Documents for Raphael and his patrons in Perugia', *THE BURLINGTON MAGAZINE* 146 (2004), pp.742–44.

⁷ J. Shearman: 'Raphael, Rome and the Codex Escorialensis', *Master Drawings* 15 (1977), pp.107–46.

⁸ Shearman (pp.539–43) dates MS. I to c.1516 and argues that its fourteen years refers to a visit in 1502. He dates MS. II to the period May–November 1519 (here accepting that the eleven years relate to Raphael settling in the city in 1508). Di Teodoro observed that '110' was Castiglione's autograph correction of his earlier '140'; see F.P. Di Teodoro: *Raffaello, Baldassare Castiglione e la lettera a Leone X*, Bologna 1994, p.44; therefore the date of 1502 probably can be dismissed.

⁹ This has been the objection of, *inter alia*, C. Thoenes:

'La 'lettera' a Leone X', in C.L. Frommel and M. Winner, eds.: *Raffaello a Roma*, Rome 1986, pp.373–81, and Di Teodoro, *op. cit.* (note 8), pp.44–56.

¹⁰ See T. Henry and C. Plazzotta: 'Raphael: from Urbino to Rome' in Chapman, Henry and Plazzotta, *op. cit.* (note 5), p.63, note 129. An argument in favour of the letter's authenticity is Raphael's letter to his uncle Simone Ciarla, first published in 1779, over twenty years after Bottari published Giovanna Feltria's letter. In this, Raphael himself sought another letter of recommendation from Giovanna's son Francesco Maria. For this request in the autograph letter of 21st April 1508, see pp.112–18.

¹¹ F. Caglioti: *Donatello e i Medici*, Florence 2000, I, pp.336–38; L. Waldman: 'A Raphael riddle resolved', *THE BURLINGTON MAGAZINE* 146 (2004), pp.753–56.

¹² See T. Henry: 'New perspectives on Raphael before Rome', *Atti del Convegno internazionale su Raffaello – pluralità e unità*, *Bibliotheca Hertziana*, 2–4.5.2002, Rome, (forthcoming; see <http://colosseum.biblherz.it/event/Raffael/texte/Henry/henry.htm>, note 12), and Chapman, Henry and Plazzotta, *op. cit.*, p.63, note 131.

¹³ Shearman, *op. cit.* (note 2), pp.201–07; Caroline Elam (verbal communication).

¹⁴ Caglioti, *op. cit.* (note 11), p.337.

¹⁵ G. Vasari: *Le Vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori e architettori: nelle relazioni del 1550 e 1568*, ed. P. Barocchi and G.G. Bertelà, Florence 1997, IV, p.165, also referred to 'certe stanze' when describing Raphael's call to Rome. Raphael's allusion in the letter to the patron of the project as 'sua S.' has sometimes been taken to refer to Soderini himself (standing for *sua Signoria*, or his Lordship), but it is far more likely to be shorthand for *sua Santità* (His Holiness), the pope. Soderini was the most powerful person in Florence for Raphael to turn to when seeking a recommendation for employment at the papal court, and he had involved himself in Julius's relations with other artists at the Vatican. Soderini's relationship with the pope was important for his foreign policy in these years: see M. Hirst: 'Michelangelo in Florence: "David" in 1503 and "Hercules" in 1506', *THE BURLINGTON MAGAZINE* 142 (2000), pp.487–92.

¹⁶ The inscriptions on the former read 'Carissimo', 'Carissimo quanto fratello'; see Chapman, Henry and Plazzotta, *op. cit.* (note 5), pp.106–07. The inscription on the latter reads 'PERVSIA AVGVST'; see T. Henry: 'Raphael's "Siege of Perugia"', *THE BURLINGTON MAGAZINE* 146 (2004), pp.745–48. For the attribution of the banner, see A. Marabottini in F.F. Mancini, eds.: *Pinacoteca Comunale di Città di Castello: Dipinti*, Perugia 1989, pp.170–72.

¹⁷ See P. Joannides: 'Raphael: a sorority of Madonnas', *THE BURLINGTON MAGAZINE* 146 (2004), pp.749–52.

¹⁸ For an alternative reading of the date, see Chapman, Henry and Plazzotta, *op. cit.* (note 5), pp.194–95, and T. Henry's review of J. Meyer zur Capellen's *Raphael. The Paintings, I. The Beginning in Umbria and Florence ca.1500–1508*, *THE BURLINGTON MAGAZINE* 143 (2001), pp.575–76. Another example of a papal indiction appearing in the date on a picture is Fra Angelico's *Lamentation* for S. Maria della Croce al Tempio (S. Marco, Florence), which is dated 1441 in the hem of the Virgin's mantle and preceded by the indiction ('IND. IV'); see G. Bonsanti: *Beato Angelico: catalogo completo*, Florence 1998, pp.141–42, no.62, and the detail on p.70.

¹⁹ M. Sanuto: *I Diarii*, ed. R. Fulin *et al.*, Venice 1879–1903, XIII, fol.192, col.350; see B. Kempers: 'The Pope's two bodies. Julius II, Raphael and Saint Luke's Virgin of Santa Maria del Popolo', in E. Thunø and G. Wolf, eds.: *The Miraculous Image in the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance*, Rome 2004, pp.189–213.

²⁰ J. Shearman: *Raphael's Cartoons in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen and the Tapestries for the Sistine Chapel*, London 1972; and *idem*: 'The Vatican Stanze: Functions and Decorations', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 57 (1971), pp.369–424.

²¹ D. Franklin: *Rosso in Italy*, New Haven and London 1994, p.272, note 59. Archivio di Stato di Firenze,

Corp. Relig. Soppr. dal governo francese, 119.52, Ricordanze B, 1510–1559, fols.135v–36v (10th February 1538). This Servite has sometimes been brought into discussion of Rosso's origins; see L. Waldman: 'The origins and family of Rosso Fiorentino', *THE BURLINGTON MAGAZINE* 142 (2000), pp.607–12.

²² Franklin, *op. cit.* (note 21), pp.14–15.

²³ For a different interpretation of this inventory reference, see T. Henry: 'Raphael and Siena', *Apollo* 155 (October 2004), pp.50–57.

boilers and replicas ('not inspiring work but profitable – however I have forsworn all such again & again, but find myself at it now and then still'; letter 71.117; see also 64.123). The letters also begin to sound a new note, often to be repeated: in September 1867 Rossetti complained about his difficulty in sleeping and made the first of many appointments with oculists. In the letters that follow we read of nervous depression, insomnia, eyestrain, spec-

Th

Re

Ed

pp

pl.

+

20

(I)

Re

Nat

RC

in

ad

El

let

de

th

ec

Co

br

Sv

de

Jai

M

or

m

se

be

te

pe

'd

no

pr

te

w

lis

fo

m

R

ez

de

st

th

ir

w

st

p

o

th

C

e

p

tl

le

d

d