# Inventing the High Renaissance, from Winckelmann to Wikipedia: An Introductory Essay

*Jill Burke*

*I woke with this marble head in my hands;*
*it exhausts my elbows and I don't know where to put it down*

<div align="right">

George Seferis, *Mythistorema* 3[1]

</div>

The idea for this volume emerged a few years ago, when I was struggling to find a suitable title for an article for the *Oxford Art Journal*. I was writing about a robot lion made by Leonardo da Vinci for the 1509 triumphal entry of the King of France into Milan, and wanted to talk about how, during the period of the Italian wars, from 1494, interpretation of symbolic objects like the lion was rarely straightforward. The audience in Milan at this time were a heterogeneous bunch from different states in Italy and France and accounts of the entry showed that they derived different meanings from the same symbols. I wanted to suggest that interpretative slips were endemic in Italy at the turn of the sixteenth century and that this was bound up with new developments in the visual arts of the time. I had originally called the article "Meaning and Crisis in the High Renaissance", but this was queried by one of the readers: "Is it acceptable to use the term High Renaissance any more?"[2]

The *Oxford Art Journal* is explicitly dedicated to "innovative critical work" and "political analysis … from a variety of theoretical perspectives".[3] So, it is perhaps no surprise that the reader would have queried a term redolent of a grand narrative of Western achievement. Sydney Freedberg's characterization of the High Renaissance in 1971 could be seen as emblematic of an approach that critically innovative work might try to dismantle. Freedberg claimed (not quite accurately, as I discuss below) that the word "high" is used to "implicitly [recognize] the stature of [the period's] achievements … the most extraordinary intersection of genius art history has known occurred then and gave form to a style which … we call 'classic' or 'classical' – meaning its original usage 'of the highest class'".[4]

Freedberg's statement could be dismissed as a fragment of a bygone era of art historical scholarship, if this interpretative framework did not still structure the way the visual arts of this period are understood by many. Thus, in December 2010 the Wikipedia entry for "High Renaissance" suggests that this phrase "denotes the culmination of the art of the Italian Renaissance between 1450 and 1527 ... widely viewed as the greatest explosion of creative genius in history".[5] *The Oxford Dictionary of Art* suggests that "All the artistic trends of the fifteenth century culminated around 1500 in the short-lived High Renaissance ... It is generally accepted that artists of the High Renaissance developed more monumental forms and created unified and harmonious compositions that reject the decorative details of fifteenth-century art".[6] Ingrid Rowland in *The Culture of the High Renaissance* characterized the intellectual life of Rome as a quest for a "new order", arguing that "on occasion – most notably, perhaps, in the visual arts – this utopian project actually succeeded".[7] Marcia Hall (whose work, as I will discuss, has been important in rethinking early sixteenth-century art), equally writes about this period in terms of the miraculous: Pope Julius II "inaugurated a new era for the papacy, for Rome, and for art ... it is one of the miracles of art history that there were at hand artists and architects capable of fulfilling Julius's ambitions. Bramante, Michelangelo, and Raphael were each in turn inspired to expand their capabilities and their styles to match the demands of the pope's commissions."[8]

The High-Renaissance-as-miracle is equally in evidence in recent publicity materials of museums. Thus the National Gallery of Art in Washington invited the public to marvel at the "great Venetian sculptors of the High Renaissance" in their Tullio Lombardo exhibition of 2009. In 2010, Milwaukee Art Museum announced its exhibition of "Raphael's High Renaissance Masterpiece", the *Donna Velata*, a painting that "captures the ideals of the High Renaissance". The *Italian Renaissance Drawings* exhibition at the British Museum in London the same year gave the public the chance "to discover the evolution of drawing which laid the foundations of the High Renaissance style of Michelangelo and Raphael". Across London at the Victoria and Albert Museum, slightly later in the year, there was an exhibition of Raphael's Vatican cartoons and tapestries, which "are comparable with Michelangelo's Sistine Chapel Ceiling as masterpieces of High Renaissance art".[9]

Clearly there is a sense that using this type of terminology will excite the imagination of a public outside academia, but it also suggests that critically engaged art history has an ongoing task to investigate and challenge long-held assumptions about questions of periodization and stylistic characterization. A concentration on material culture and identity construction in recent years has contributed immensely to history of art as a discipline and to our knowledge of the Renaissance period, but – as contributors to a recent symposium about "Renaissance Theory" seemed to agree – it has equally meant that the central shaping of the discipline bequeathed to us by previous generations has been largely left intact.[10]

A key problem – which David Hemsoll identifies in his contribution to this volume – is that this "miracle model" takes genius as an explanatory principle in itself. It does not get to grips with the essential question of why the skills of artists, or the ambitions of patrons, took this particular form at this particular time. The central question for many art historians is how developments in the visual arts relate and contribute to social, cultural, and conceptual change – not just the particular exigencies of individual patrons, but, for example, ideas about religious reform, the Italian wars, the birth of courtesan culture or new ideas of beauty. High Renaissance style has been seen as a kind of escapism from the prevailing mood of the time – the view that Brian Curran later in this volume characterizes as "a beautiful but ultimately tragic fantasy".[11] However, there are surely more fruitful ways to consider the interaction between the events of this period and its cultural artefacts.

If, then it is still "acceptable" to use the term High Renaissance there is, as Marcia Hall observed in 2005, "much dissatisfaction abroad" about using the term and what its definition might be.[12] Over the last fifteen years or so, the idea that High Renaissance art represents the culmination of a classical ideal has become an increasingly frustrating inheritance. There are, broadly, two interlinked strands of opposition to this notion. The first unpicks the notion that there is a "classic" style that embodies the achievements of antiquity, and looks to other types of stylistic, social, and religious influences to account for new artistic idioms; the second questions the wisdom of a periodization that is pinned to a handful of artists who represent only one facet of an eclectic visual culture.

In an essay of 1995, Elizabeth Cropper argued that equating High Renaissance art with "idealized beauty" – what Gombrich called the "classical solution" – has formed a bar to its analysis as a symbolic form associated with particular conventions and ideologies. Cropper suggests that new forms of beauty associated with the High Renaissance should be analysed in terms of Petrarchan ideas that were important in contemporary poetry, particularly the unfulfilled desire of a lover for an absent beloved. Petrarch's desire for an "impossible object" feeds into the relationship between the desirous viewer of the artwork and the beautiful object itself; "the representation of absent physical beauty … was precisely what was at stake in the painting of the *terza maniera*"; the subjectivity of the individual viewer's emotional connection to the painting is stressed – compared to "fifteenth-century" painting where "every spectator … could be confident that (s)he was reading the image as others had".[13]

Cropper's attempt to unpick the "ideal" style of the High Renaissance was echoed by other scholarly works published around the same time. In Helmut Wohl's 1999 book, *The Aesthetics of Italian Renaissance Art*, for example, Wohl makes a convincing case that artists like Jacopo Ripanda (fig. I.1) or Pintorricchio, both sought-after in the early sixteenth century, represented an alternate visual idiom to that employed by the artists at the Vatican, one that

I.1   Jacopo Ripanda, *Hannibal Crossing the Alps*, 1507–1508. Musei Capitolini, Rome

Wohl usefully terms the "ornate classical style".[14] This could be characterized by an emphasis on rich decorative detail, sumptuous colours and materials, and the restaging (rather than reconstruction) of antique narrative.

In the same year, Marcia Hall's *After Raphael* revisited the idea of the High Renaissance, nuancing the characterizations of Freedberg with attention to patronage, for example, and noting the importance of contemporary "Roman antiquarianism" (akin to Wohl's ornate classical style). Nevertheless, Hall saw this type of work as essentially "still Quattrocento" emphasizing their resemblance to the "Quattrocento narratives of Ghirlandaio and Pintorricchio".[15] Michelangelo and Raphael, however, "no longer studied antique remains as if they were another copybook, they studied the whole culture to assimilate it, so that they could recreate it". In a later essay, Hall briefly considered the historiography of the High Renaissance and suggested Raphael and Michelangelo were inventors of what she calls the "relief-like style", the first vocabulary of Mannerism. Thus Hall acknowledges problems with the traditional periodization, but largely accepts the idea of the "classic" solution, despite its rapid dissolution.

David Franklin, on the other hand, in 2001, vigorously argued against the idea of any homogeneous style in the early sixteenth century. He suggests we should eschew "general historical trends of an indefensibly loose and monolithic nature" in favour of acknowledging the heterogeneity of early sixteenth-century artistic production. Franklin claims that the notion that sixteenth-century artists followed Leonardo's lead has been vastly overstated;

paintings by Raphael and Fra Bartolommeo, he argues have a "dry monumentality and serial nature closer in spirit to the increasingly redundant Pietro Perugino than any model that can be isolated from Leonardo's example". Indeed "many of the qualities which have been assumed to form the High Renaissance Style are more accurately approached as a local form of entrenched conservatism".[16]

Alexander Nagel, similarly, has argued that "much of what we call 'High Renaissance' style was a conservative and even reactionary backlash, a self-conscious cultural intervention against the labile modernism of the Quattrocento".[17] Nagel's work on Michelangelo has been crucial in viewing new types of artistic expression in the early sixteenth century firmly within the ambit of religious reform. His recent book, co-written with Christopher Wood, *Anachronic Renaissance*, asks thought-provoking questions about the relationship of Renaissance art to notions of time; rather than the hallmark of Renaissance artworks being the assimilation of classical antiquity, they suggest that many of these crafted objects engage with the complex notion of historical time and the potential for these objects to exist in different times and cultures. The full implications of this book are still to emerge, yet there are clear parallels between their findings and the discussions in the second half of this volume about the High Renaissance aesthetic of conflation, discussed below. Interestingly, however, although they are resistant to replacing one model of artistic emancipation with another, Nagel and Wood still end their account with the miraculous revolutions of Raphael: The "Stanza della Segnatura was the setting for a completely new conception of painting as an art", the three most famous frescoes (the *School of Athens*, *Disputa*, and *Parnassus*) "near absolute inventions" that create the "effect of transcending their own local circumstances … by adopting a timeless formal norm".[18]

That there are problems with the term High Renaissance is clear, therefore, but to date discussions of these issues have been somewhat scattered across various volumes that deal primarily with other matters. One area where discussion of this term is conspicuous by its absence is the repeated debates about the origins and use of the term "Renaissance" which have been increasingly common from the mid-twentieth century onwards. Indeed, there are very few explicit considerations of how its sister term High Renaissance came into being, or, indeed what exactly were the implications of using it – despite the fact, as I will show – that the notion of early sixteenth-century culmination, a period characterized by a "high style", both predated and influenced the broader concept of the "Renaissance".[19] Like the marble head of George Sefiris's poem that opens this chapter, the High Renaissance is a beautiful burden that we are not entirely sure how we inherited, or, indeed, quite what to do with.

This can make for practical difficulties in research and teaching, as Brian Curran notes in the first chapter. Art historians have to make decisions about what to call courses, to title books and seminar papers; it might be that using an adjective that suggests cultural excellence and culmination – not just the

Renaissance, but the High Renaissance, the best of the best – attracts people to our work. Equally, though, we have to think about how terminology might affect our investigations materially; does using a term like High Renaissance predetermine the tenor of our research?

The contributors to this volume (and the conference that preceded it) use their research on early sixteenth-century Rome to rethink the notion of the High Renaissance. They do this in a series of case studies that focus on culture in Rome between Julius II's accession as pope in 1503 and Clement VII's death in 1534. Beyond this basic request, there was no editorial line. It was never my intention to seek or enforce consensus, but to represent and acknowledge creative tensions within the field. Readers will also see, however, that beyond the differences of opinion, there are equally important strands of common agreement. I will discuss these in detail below, but first of all it seems useful to have a dash through the centuries between 1500 and Freedberg to consider how we were bequeathed the notion of the "High Renaissance" in the first place.

## High Renaissance and Golden Age

Rome in the Renaissance, as the bygone centre of the classical empire and the centre of the Christian Church was – as many commentators have noted – as much a set of ideas, a myth, as a city. Its centrality as a point for pilgrimage, both religious and (increasingly) artistic, meant that the city had a very particular – even over-determined – cultural rhetoric. It was not unusual for Italian rulers of the later fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries to assert that they were presiding over a new Golden Age, but this assertion became almost obsessive under the early sixteenth-century popes Julius II (1503–13) and, especially, Leo X (1513–21), as the papacy attempted to bring together reformist millennial fervour with the classicizing notion of the fullness of time. This tendency was exemplified in a discourse of 1507 by the Prior General of the Augustinian order, Egidio da Viterbo, which some scholars believed influenced the iconography of the Sistine chapel ceiling. Originating as a sermon given in front of Julius II, Egidio considered previous Golden Ages and promised the fulfilment of the first Golden Age of Christ in Julius's time. Equally, the Golden Age was a major theme of Leo X's *possesso* (the inaugural procession of the pope), and in the celebrations for his nephew, Giuliano de' Medici, being made a Roman citizen in the same year.[20] Rome, moreover, as the centre of Western Christendom, was the focus for many of the apocalyptic prophecies that were circulating in the years around 1500. The 1527 Sack of Rome was, for some, as Kenneth Gouwens discusses in this volume, the fulfilment of a broader eschatological narrative.

The revived interest in antiquity that was by the early sixteenth century commonplace throughout Italy took a particular tenor in Rome where

humanists lived cheek by jowl with the remnants of the classical past – remnants that were being both culturally rediscovered, and often literally uncovered, as Brian Curran discusses here. There was an attempt to relive the classical Rome of the humanist imagination in festive gatherings, feasts, and poetry competitions.[21] Latin was the *lingua franca* for Rome's large population of educated foreigners (that is non-Romans as well as non-Italians) who, increasingly from the later fifteenth century, came to look for preferment at the papal court.[22]

One of the humanists who was later to be key in the creative idealization of 1500s Rome was Paolo Giovio, who had arrived in the city in 1512, at the age of twenty-six. In his *Life of Leo X* he explained how the Rome of his youth provided the seedbed of genius: "In addition to its uncommonly salubrious air and clement sky … Rome then flourished with outstanding talents and an abundance of everything, which explains why it was that Leo X – a pope of preeminent virtue and amplitude – was said to have founded after many centuries an age of gold".[23] As well as remembering pre-Sack Rome with gold-tinted spectacles, Giovio is here quite self-consciously re-iterating Medicean Golden Age propaganda that had been used extensively by Leo himself, and would be readily recognized by the dedicatee of Giovio's book, Cosimo de' Medici, then Duke of Florence.[24]

As Michael Bury discusses in his chapter later in the volume, Paolo Giovio was also important in being possibly the first commentator to articulate a major change in artistic style happening in this period. In a text dated to just after the Sack of Rome, when like some of his contemporaries, Giovio was steeped in nostalgia for what seemed to be a lost world, he discussed the waxing fame of Pietro Perugino, claiming that Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo, and Raphael, the "stars of a perfect art", "rose from the shadows of that age".[25] Although, as Bury points out, the idea of a distinct artistic change at the turn of the sixteenth century was far from the only opinion current at the time, it was to become an especially influential one. Twenty or so years later, Giorgio Vasari, in the 1550 edition of his *Lives of the Artists*, also picked out these artists as being pioneers of the *maniera moderna*, the third age "which I will call the modern, notable for boldness of design, the subtlest imitation of Nature in trifling details, good rule, better order, correct proportion, perfect design and divine grace."[26]

Vasari's chronological scheme for the start of his third age – starting with Leonardo in Milan, spreading to Florence with Michelangelo and Raphael, then to Rome – is still echoed in narratives of the spread of High Renaissance style (here, for example, in Christoph Frommel's essay); it is certainly true that the idea of a shift around 1500 is one that was marked by some contemporaries, or near contemporaries.[27] There is an important difference between Vasari's third age and the High Renaissance, however. For Vasari the revival of art was ongoing, and he did not (at least explicitly) anticipate a decline, certainly not one that started as early as 1520. Sixteenth-century commentators tended to see continuity rather than change in these years.

Probably the first text to suggest that the cultural high point in the early sixteenth century was followed immediately by a sharp decline was Giovanni Pietro Bellori's *Lives of the Modern Painters, Sculptors and Architects* of 1672. Bellori suggests that after "ultimate perfection" of Raphael that art of painting "was soon set to decline … in a short time every one of its forms vanished; and artists abandoning the study of nature, corrupted art with the *maniera*, by which we mean the fantastic idea, based on artistic practice and not on imitation", a situation that was for Bellori only remedied by Annibale Carracci (1560–1609).[28] The age of greatness represented by Raphael, however, did not extend beyond painting. Sculpture, Bellori complained, was never raised to the level of painting "boasting only some few statues such as those of Michelangelo, which are inferior to ancient works".[29] The concept of the "High Renaissance" as a period that represented an integrated artistic and cultural highpoint is, therefore, not really to be found in Bellori; it would be another hundred years or so, in the mid-eighteenth century, before this idea was developed fully.

**The High Style**

In 1756 the painter Anton Raphael Mengs, then president of the Academy of Art in Rome, declared "We have enough *vite* of painters. To my mind it would be better to replace them by a history of art".[30] He was influenced in this goal by his celebrated collaborator, Johann Joachim Winckelmann, whose *History of the Art of Antiquity* of 1764 is often seen as a landmark of art historical scholarship. In this book Winckelmann provided a model for the organization of Greek art into four distinct period styles – the archaic, the high, the beautiful, and the imitative – that was to provide a critical vocabulary and a way of looking that was to be hugely influential on the way the history of art was shaped as an academic discipline.[31] At the end of the fourth chapter of his fourth book, he explains that modern art (i.e. art after the fall of Rome) and ancient art follow the same trajectory:

The fate of art in newer times is basically the same, in regard to periods, as that of antiquity … only with this difference: that art did not, as with the Greeks, sink [gradually] down from its height, but scarcely had it achieved its highest possible degree in two great men, it suddenly plunged down again … Style was dry and stiff up to Michelangelo and Raphael; the height of art in its recovery rested upon these two men. After an intervening period, which was governed by evil taste, came the style of the imitators; this was the time of the Carracci and their school with its followers; and this period goes up to Carlo Maratta [1625–1713]. Moreover, discussing sculpture in particular, the history is similarly very short. It bloomed and ended with Michelangelo and [Jacopo] Sansovino [1486–1570].[32]

Winckelmann anchors Raphael and Michelangelo's work within an antique visual language, the "high" style (*der hohe Stil*), which he contrasts in his discussion of Greek art with the equally valid but very different "beautiful

style".[33] As Mengs later explained, in the high style: "elevated or sublime subjects are embodied and made available to our visual experience and intelligible to our minds", eschewing the more earthly sensuous attractions of the beautiful style.[34] Early sixteenth-century paintings were important as models for artists as so little Greek painting existed, and even if the work of Michelangelo and Raphael did not fully attain the high style, they were as near to it as had been reached in modern times, Mengs points out. The "high" in High Renaissance did not, therefore, originate in an amorphous idea of excellence, of being the "highest class", as Freedberg and others have supposed, but rather in a specific kind of representation largely concerned with achieving a perfected universalized form. As Alex Potts has put it, "theoretically speaking, [the high style] is the most elevated yet impossible mode of visual signification, in which the material signifier effaces itself to the point where it becomes transparent to an immaterial signified. The high style is both essence and absence".[35] The audience looks through, rather than at, the high style to perceive a perfect beauty that is, in essence, impossible to attain in the material world – a trace of a Platonic form or idea.

Winckelmann's claim that the high style of post-antique art could be found in Raphael and Michelangelo was to have a fundamental effect on the characterization of early sixteenth-century art, as I will discuss below. Also of key importance, however, was his suggestion that modern art went into a period of unavoidable and irreversible decline after Raphael. Winckelmann's ideas were to lead to new narrative histories of "modern" art which took an interest in how art improved up to the time of Raphael, and which overwhelmingly saw the early sixteenth century as an apex of achievement that was to be followed by a fall, an intellectual position, according to Potts, linked with anti-democratic political conservatism.[36]

Highly influenced by Winckelmann, Jean-Baptiste Seroux d'Agincourt probably completed his illustrated six volume work *Histoire de l'art par les monumens depuis sa décadence au IV siècle jusqu'à sa renouvellement au XVI* in 1780, though it was only published posthumously in 1823.[37] Agincourt has been credited with one of the earliest uses of the word "renaissance" as a period term, which he sees as starting at the time of Giotto up to the late fifteenth century. He echoes Winckelmann's historical schema, but sees the point of climax – which he terms the period of "renewal" – dating from the painting of the Sistine Chapel walls in the 1470s up to the early sixteenth century. Raphael and Michelangelo, he argued "brought the fundamental elements of painting to the highest degree".[38]

This narrative scheme was widely adopted throughout Europe. In 1795–96 Luigi Lanzi published his *History of Italian Painting* (*Storia pittorica della Italia*). Divided into regional schools, Lanzi disagrees with Vasari in placing the date of the initial resurgence (*risorgimento*) of art before Giotto, but he follows the, by then traditional, path of seeing its climax in the early sixteenth century. The Roman school under the aegis of Raphael is "the most brilliant period, not only of the Roman School, but of modern painting itself

… art in but a few years thus reached a height to which it had never before attained, and which has never been rivaled".[39] Moreover, he is clear that this art declined because of the tragedies of the 1527 Sack. Curious about why several geniuses should appear at the same time, he adds that he is sure that this is because the age was influenced by "certain principles" but decides he is not competent to say exactly what these were.[40] Later, Carl von Rumohr, in his *Italian Studies* (*Italianische Forschungen*) of 1827–31, similarly ends with "Raphael and his near contemporaries" as the culmination of the revival of art after the fall of antiquity.[41]

Thus, by the early nineteenth century, the periodization of the High Renaissance as a culmination of the development of art that was to be followed by a sharp decline was well established in art historical narratives. This historical schema was to have far-reaching consequences, not least because of its effect on acquisition and display practices in public museums.

In 1798 Raphael's *Transfiguration* (fig. 12.3) had its a triumphal entry into Paris, where it joined many of the Renaissance and classical works of art seized from Italy by Napoleon's artistic advisors to display in the Louvre, recently made into a public museum. Ten years later Paris saw an exhibition of "The State of Painting in Italy During the Four Centuries Preceding that of Raphael"; giving concrete form to the narrative of development and climax laid out by Winckelmann and later writers.[42] As public museums opened around Europe, they also strove to show this story in their permanent collections from the turn of the nineteenth century onwards. In Florence, for example, the Uffizi – as Paula Findlen has shown – was culled of its broad range of objects to concentrate on the acquisition of fifteenth-century paintings in order to represent the narrative of "modern history".[43] The National Gallery in London, opening in 1824, concentrated from 1836 on the acquisition of work by Raphael and his predecessors, a decision later explained by the need to display a historical narrative of increasing excellence: "a just appreciation of Italian painting can as little be obtained from an exclusive study of the works of Raphael, Titian or Correggio, as a critical knowledge of English poetry from the perusal of a few of its masterpieces. What Chaucer and Spenser are to Shakespeare and Milton, Giotto and Masaccio are to the great masters of the Florentine School."[44]

These patterns of acquisition in the nineteenth century fundamentally shaped many of the major art museums in Europe and the US, which in their layout often still suggest a distinctive break between the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Some museums place their "sixteenth-century" paintings in a separate wing – the criteria for separating them being rather less clear cut than the dating might suggest. In the National Gallery in London, for example, Michelangelo's *Entombment* of 1499 is placed in the main wing, whilst early sixteenth century paintings such as Mantegna's *Introduction of the Cult of Cybele to Rome* or Piero di Cosimo's *Lapiths and Centaurs* are both found in the "Early Renaissance" collection in the Sainsbury Wing, despite their later dating. The Uffizi equally leads you through pre-

High Renaissance art in its east wing before going across the corridor to the climax of Michelangelo, Raphael, and Titian in the west. Other major museums in Europe and the US broadly follow this chronological narrative. As Findlen has shown, the historical imagination of Renaissance scholars has been fundamentally shaped by the acquisition and display practices of museums.[45] No wonder – as Nagel and Wood remarked recently – "the most powerful discursive compulsion of all in modern art history … [is] to end the account with Raphael".[46] Raphael's work as a key hinge point in the history of art has been consistently drummed home in museum displays and art historical survey books for more than two hundred years.

**The "Classic" High Renaissance**

The first academic chair of art history was at the University of Göttingen in 1813, and universities around Europe and then the US followed suit over the next eighty years.[47] From this point, the development of the High Renaissance is closely tied to three generations of German-speaking scholars. Franz Kugler, who was made the first Professor of Art History in Berlin in 1833, wrote his *Handbook of Art History* in 1841, a work that has been credited with being the first "modern" survey text.[48] Kugler echoed earlier surveys in seeing the early sixteenth century period as the "crest of development" of Italian art.[49] The 1855 English two-volume version of the *Handbook*, containing only the Italian schools, considers the "period of the Highest Development and Decline" at the beginning of volume 2:

All the elements which … in the aggregate fulfilled the conditions of a consummate practice of Art, were united about the beginning of the sixteenth century. This union constituted a most rare and exalted state of human culture – an era when the divine energies of human nature were manifested in all their purity … It was only for a short period that Art maintained the high degree of perfection – scarcely more than one quarter of a century! But the great works then produced are eternal, imperishable.[50]

This edition of Kugler's *Handbook* was co-edited by his student, Jacob Burckhardt, and its effusive celebration of early sixteenth-century art may well be down to the younger man – who, in his *Cicerone* of the same year, coined the term "Hochrenaissance". The following discussion of "painting in the sixteenth century" is from the English translation of the *Cicerone* of 1873:

art at the close of the fifteenth century attained the highest level to which it was predestined to ascend, and rose newborn out of the study of life and character which had been the special aim and purpose of the new age …Then and there it springs forth, suddenly, like a flash of lightening, not simply the fruit of persevering endeavor, but like the gift of heaven. The time had come … this perfect ideal was created, once for all, for the solace and admiration of all time, will live for ever, and bear the stamp of immortality.[51]

Burckhardt's indebtedness to Winckelmann for periodization and the almost impossible "ideal" of this art (that, like a flash of lightening vanishes as soon as it appears), the "purity" of the high style are clear. Burckhardt later averred that "the history of style … begins with Winckelmann … It was only after him that art history became a branch of cultural history".[52]

By the later nineteenth century, the English translation, "High Renaissance", was in common usage, though there were still some questions as to exactly what it referred to. George Browning, in his Royal Historical Society lecture of 1874, declared the High Renaissance to last "from 1450 to the death of Raphael", whereas John Charles van Dyke's *Text-Book of the History of Painting* of 1894 and Deristhe Hoyt's 1898 *The World's Painters* considered the entire century between 1500 and 1600 as "High Renaissance", with "the decadence" to follow.[53]

It was Burckhardt's former student, Heinrich Wölfflin, in his *Classic Art* (*Die Klassische Kunst*, 1899, first translated into English in 1903 as *The Art of the Italian Renaissance*), who definitively put High Renaissance brackets around the period c.1500–30.[54] *Classic Art* painstakingly demonstrates the stylistic evolution of the work of five artists – Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo, Raphael, Fra Bartolommeo, and Andrea del Sarto – from their "antecedents" in the fifteenth century. Wölfflin's declared aim was to rescue this later "classic" art from the public scorn that had been lavished upon it in the nineteenth century, because of the by then prevalent fashion for Quattrocento painting, which had been pioneered by artists' movements such as the Nazarenes and the Pre-Raphaelites. Wölfflin's memorable metaphor about going from the painting of the fifteenth century to that of the sixteenth remains evocative: "reluctantly and grudgingly … we step out of this bright gay world into the high, still halls of classic art".[55] Here, Wölfflin – implicitly criticizing Burckhardt – makes the claim that the "chilly" nature that might be associated with the art of the early sixteenth century is due to a misapplication of this type of art outside of its Italian context: "a purely national feature has been taken for a general thing, and an attempt has been made to imitate, under quite different conditions, forms which have life and significance only in a specific soil and under a specific sky".[56]

This art was not based on mere copying of classical antiquity, but its sense of beauty was founded partly on the fact that the "inner life" of the Cinquecento "had become more akin to that of antiquity" and, for a short time, art "reached a level where … it saw the antique face to face, on equal terms."[57] Its fundamental qualities were a concentration on the human body, a feeling for the "solemn and noble", a "spirit of increased dignity", and idealization as opposed to realism.[58]

The scope of Wölfflin's influence – and particularly his comparative method, fostered by his pioneering use of two slide projectors – has been enormous, and still felt today.[59] It has been argued that Wölfflin's overall approach was governed by a Hegelian notion of thesis/antithesis, depending

on one style emerging from, and reacting against, another. Indeed, perhaps it is not going too far to see that this duality – rather than his emphasis on formalism – was to be the most important of Wölfflin's legacies for the way High Renaissance art was understood for much of the twentieth century.

As Christopher Wood has shown, a generation of émigré scholars who fled persecution in Nazi-dominated mainland Europe were instrumental in the development of academic art history in the US from the mid-twentieth century onwards. These scholars, who were often finding refuge from instability and terror in continental Europe and working under the shadow of the early Cold War, perhaps had understandable reasons for "constructing an unambiguously affirmative story about Western art", with the High Renaissance as a rational, socially cohesive, and heroic point of origin.[60] The situation was similar in the UK. In an essay originally published in the wake of the student uprisings in Paris of 1968, Perry Anderson considered the "reactionary" character of British academia. Art history's conservatism, he claimed, was due to the fact that the discipline was "an enclave in British culture much more completely colonized than any other by expatriates". Not all of these immigrants were methodologically conservative, but Anderson argues that the most prominent of them, Ernst Gombrich, refused to engage with a broader sociology in his work. Gombrich's emphasis on the psychology of viewing and on technical progress alone as an engine for stylistic change seemed to Anderson as to be "abstracted from the social conditions of artistic production".[61]

In his celebrated essay entitled "Norm and Form", Gombrich contrasted the classicizing rationality of early sixteenth-century art with the visual styles that came before and afterwards, suggesting that artistic development perpetually veered between the classical and the anti-classical, an opinion that was reified in the post-war debates about Mannerism.[62] Erwin Panofsky equally compared the "factuality" of the Renaissance with its sense of a "fixed distance" from the classical past to the false "renascences" of the medieval period.[63] For both Gombrich and Panofsky, Raphael represented a synthesis or culmination – for Panofsky of "classical form with classical content", for Gombrich the "age of the High Renaissance" saw "the realization of a human ideal of Beauty".[64] As Brian Curran outlines in the next chapter, the classical "solution" could be seen as a profoundly moral response to the degradation of other approaches; significantly, in many twentieth-century art historical texts classicism and republicanism are implicitly aligned; Mannerism and the International Gothic are associated with courtly tyranny and aristocratic foppishness.[65] Curran shows that the Second World War also profoundly affected US scholars who were not themselves émigrés, such as Frederick Hartt and Sydney Freedberg, and how in the wake of war the perceived rationality of the High Renaissance could elicit a strong emotional attachment. It is this generation which laid its mark so firmly upon current characterization of the High Renaissance.[66]

**Vantage Points**

The chapters in this volume, then, seek to firmly move on the discipline beyond the High Renaissance bequeathed to us by our predecessors. The first section of this book, "Vantage Points", is largely concerned with contemporaries' opinions about cultural life in early sixteenth-century Rome, and how these experiences were later ordered into historical narratives. In the second section of the first chapter, Brian Curran tackles a key notion closely associated with this period – "classical revival", and considers how this concept may have been articulated in the period itself, considering contemporary responses to two antiquities rediscovered in the early sixteenth century, the *Laocoön*, and a sculpture now identified as a *Sleeping Ariadne*, but known in the Renaissance as *Cleopatra*. Rather than seeing the High Renaissance as somehow a culmination of classical ideals, Curran here emphasizes how fluid the notion of antiquity was in the early sixteenth century – an idea that is becoming increasingly accepted in Renaissance art history. He shows that these antique works were often used as starting points for imaginative artistic and literary responses that were "antiquely modern and modernly antique", to borrow a phrase of Pietro Aretino's.

Suzanne Butters's chapter presents new evidence about life in Julius II's Rome – a city "half dismantled" in 1508, according to Bonsignore Bonsignori, a Florentine visitor. Using previously unpublished archival documentation, Butters shows how Julius' intentions about the building of St Peter's developed from initial plans to repair the basilica, as shown in a letter of March 1504 (transcribed at the end of Butters's chapter). She points out that Julius' grand building projects, and the work of his favourite architect, Bramante "the wrecker", were responsible for a great deal of destruction that could be extremely difficult to live alongside. Rome in the early sixteenth century, she argues, was characterized by the "figments and fragments" of buildings, ancient and new, knocked down, half-rebuilt and left unfinished as part of Julius' grandiose and often unrealized plans; the Belvedere Courtyard, the Via Giulia, the Palazzo dei Tribunali, and, not least, St Peter's, are all famous examples. "Rome was conspicuous for the gap displayed between the idea of the Urbs and its reality", the social body "lacerated" and operating in physical surroundings full of the fragments of failed architectural aspirations. The tension between the lofty ideal of the High Renaissance and its actuality is made abundantly clear.

In the next chapter Kenneth Gouwens re-examines the idea of the early sixteenth century being the "swan song" for the Italian Renaissance. Gouwens, whose previous work has been fundamental in delineating the dangers of taking humanists' "creative idealization" of pre-1527 Rome at face value, nevertheless suggests in his chapter the possibilities of a "more conscious variant of the established periodization of the High Renaissance".[67] Focusing on prophetic literature, especially works by Joannes Staphyleus, Pietro

Galatino, and Egidio da Viterbo, Gouwens here examines contemporaries' notions about the time and prophecy. The emphasis of much prophetic writing in the early 1500s was on the culmination of antique and Christian knowledge, or the dawning of a new age led by an Angelic Pastor. Gouwens shows how the Sack, rather than being a terminating point for this type of speculation, was incorporated into these prophetic writings which continued well into the sixteenth century. For some, however, there was a sense of a major historical shift in the aftermath of the Sack – and this perception needs to be acknowledged by historians even if it may not have reflected broader realities. Overall, we need to treat chronological boundaries with circumspection, and recognize their "perpetual inadequacies".

Gwendolyn Trottein focuses on Benvenuto Cellini's representation of Rome in his autobiography, where he looks back at his youth in the city, which he first escaped to at the age of nineteen, spending much of the next twenty years there. Trottein suggests that the High Renaissance should be seen as "an aesthetic, rather than an historical artifact". She argues that Rome, for Cellini as with other Renaissance artists, acted as a "symbolic stage", where his exploits mirror the fortunes of the city. Key to this memorialization of Rome was an emphasis on conviviality and humour, what Cellini remembered as "that brilliant society" – something that is repeatedly mentioned in accounts of élite Roman life in the early 1500s, as Ingrid Rowland, amongst others, has shown.[68] Trottein shows how Cellini uses Rome as a type of "mythic creation", a suitable backdrop to his stories of the idealized days of his youth, his heroism during the Sack, and his later imprisonment by Pope Paul III. Trottein finds echoes in Federico Fellini's concept of Rome: "a horizontal city, stretched out, the ideal platform for fantastic vertical flights."

David Cast considers how a key element of Vasari's third age is the coming together of the three arts of painting, sculpture, and architecture as exemplified in the person of Michelangelo. The idea that the three "arts of design" shared the same historical trajectory is fundamental to creating a unified history of art. Yet positing a connection between these three occupations was not straightforward, especially in the case of architecture. Cast explores the tensions and contradictions that arose in Vasari's account of the unity of the arts, especially in the light of the creation of the Accademia del Disegno in Grand-ducal Florence, and the benefits of presenting a wholesale cultural revival under beneficent Medici leadership (be it Paolo Giovio's account of Rome under Leo X, or Vasari's of Florence under Duke Cosimo I).[69]

**Making the High Renaissance: Classicism, Conflation, and Culmination**

Storytelling, or the making of coherent narratives from fragments is, therefore a thread that runs through the first section of this book. The second half of the volume turns its attention from verbal accounts to visual

rhetoric, as contributors seek to untangle the notion of High Renaissance art by considering influences and models used by High Renaissance artists and architects, to articulate the artistic strategy that these artists may have shared, but also to locate them within a specific cultural milieu. Christoph Frommel starts this section with an essay that argues that we should retain the term High Renaissance because of its roots in the self-perception of the period, particularly in Vasari's third age. The historiographical problem is rather with the false separation between the "classical" and "anti-classical", and thus implicitly between "High Renaissance" and "Mannerism". Through focusing on Bramante's career, integrating a discussion of his early Lombard works with the later architecture in Rome, Frommel demonstrates Bramante's creative assimilation of models from the past – including, but not limited to, models that we now know to be antique. He shows the almost dizzying number of precedents Bramante called upon in order to create his architectural designs, and in particular the importance of early Christian models and as well as Gothic prototypes. Indeed, the notion of what David Hemsoll calls "a deliberate strategy of artistic conflation" is a leitmotif of many of the essays of this second section. Frommel argues that the years between 1505 and 1513 represent the climax of the High Renaissance movement, as Julius II was the crucial force for bringing together Michelangelo, Raphael, and Bramante – though "an outer circle" of this type of artistic production can be seen from the date of Leonardo's *Last Supper* to Raphael's death in 1520.

Angeliki Pollali in the next essay also questions the notion that the High Renaissance should be seen as a climax of a sort of simplified notion of classical revival. She shows how problematic the relationship with classical antiquity could be through a case study of the Italian translation of Vitruvius's *De Architectura* by Fabio Calvo, made for Raphael 1514–16. Through a close analysis of Calvo's misunderstandings of the original Latin text, particularly in relationship to architectural orders – generally thought the key indicator of antique models of architecture – Pollali argues that the imitation of antique orders was less important than invention, echoing Curran's emphasis on a "useable antiquity".

Sabine Frommel's discussion of Giuliano da Sangallo's career is equally telling when considering the relationship of High Renaissance style to classicism: Giuliano had, arguably, an unrivalled understanding of classical architecture; what he lacked, she argues, was the synthetic mind and flexibility of design of Bramante who was able to bring a great range of influences together. It is, perhaps, the wish and ability to look beyond classical influences, or to comment upon them through locating them within a much broader range of visual source material, that is a key indicator of the "High Renaissance" style.

Sabine Frommel's essay reminds us that new cultural movements co-exist and interact with existing currents, and Michael Bury's chapter confirms the difficulty of ascribing a clean periodization to this type of cultural change

as he considers the fortunes of Perugino in the early sixteenth century. Bury points out that Perugino and other artists such as Pintorricchio were still much sought-after in the first decade of the Cinquecento. Perugino perhaps was associated with producing a particularly devout type of image, which might explain, why Perugino's ceiling frescoes were retained in the Stanza di Eliodoro. It was only in 1511 when "opinion changed decisively" in Rome away from artists such as Perugino and towards the new aesthetic represented by Raphael and Michelangelo's work in the Vatican. Taking Vasari's view as representing contemporary opinion is, therefore, problematic. Not only was Vasari writing thirty years or so after the fact, in a rather different set of cultural circumstances hugely affected by the increased pace and effectiveness of Catholic Reform, but his views were not accepted by all his contemporaries, some of whom did not see a decisive break in the production of art at the turn of the sixteenth century.

Chronological complexities are equally emphasized in Meredith Gill's essay, which also looks at some of Raphael's frescoes in the Vatican *stanze*, but this time in the light of writings by the Early Renaissance humanist Lorenzo Valla (1405–57), in particular his famous commentary on the *Donation of Constantine*, written in 1440, but only published in 1517. Gill considers the angelic intervention in the *stanze* in the light of Valla's investigations of the properties of angels. In Gill's view, many of Valla's concerns about papal legitimacy and the hierarchy of heaven and earth came to fruition in Raphael's frescoes.

This crisscrossing of influences across time is also evident in Michelangelo's Sistine Ceiling. In his contribution to the volume, David Hemsoll shows how Michelangelo's design of the ceiling referenced antique painting and the arch of Constantine, but also a range of predecessors and contemporaries such as Pintoricchio, Melozzo da Forlì, Perugino, and Bramante – persuasively arguing that this "notion of artistic conflation" constituted a "genuine artistic strategy". This is not, however, to suggest that these borrowings from the past were always ideologically neutral, that there were not problems in using, for example, an antique statue of Venus as a model for a virgin saint.[70] This seems, at least by the 1520s, to have become a particularly tense issue in Rome. If other essays in this collection show that the "eclectic style" long associated with Clement VII has roots in the art commissioned by his papal predecessors, Sheryl Reiss shows here how what we now term early medieval art may have been particularly suited to expressing notions of religious decorum – just as Michael Bury suggested Perugino's paintings may have been considered especially decorous. Bringing the discussion well into the 1520s, Reiss's work reminds us that considering the High Renaissance style from the point of view of eclecticism rather than classical rebirth, harmony or unity, makes the development of "Mannerist" style a logical continuation of artistic practice rather than an abrupt break.

### What is the High Renaissance?

A major theme in the chapters here is the multiplicity of influences and precedents used by High Renaissance artists and architects – notably Bramante, Raphael, and Michelangelo. I would suggest that not only was this – as David Hemsoll suggests – a deliberate methodological strategy, but it is one that is key to understanding the *maniera moderna*, or High Renaissance style, as a whole. As Hemsoll notes, Michelangelo's technique may have been formed in the light of his early association with Poliziano, who repeatedly stressed the merits of using eclectic models in writing Latin.[71] Certainly, in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, imitation as a literary strategy was a constantly revisited – and contested – theme for several humanists including Poliziano and others, like Pietro Bembo and Castiglione, who were close to Raphael.[72]

In a passage of his *On Invention*, Cicero urges students of rhetoric to use many excellent models, a passage that has been of interest to art historians such as Michael Baxandall and Frederika Jacobs.[73] Cicero illustrates his suggestions with the story of how the celebrated painter Zeuxis, when wishing to portray Helen of Troy, asks the people of Croton for their most beautiful virgins as "he did not think that he could find all the component parts of perfect beauty in one person, because nature has made nothing of any class absolutely perfect in every part".[74] The painter or sculptor's role is not to mimic nature but to bring together the best from nature – or from previous crafted objects – and from this collation of examples to use his imagination, his *fantasia*, to create the most beautiful and fitting image.

Significantly, Condivi cites this example when he talks about Michelangelo's methods: "That ancient master when he wanted to paint a Venus was not content just to see one virgin but wished to contemplate many; and then he took from each one the most beautiful and perfect features to use for his Venus. And truly anyone who thinks he can reach some degree of excellence without following this path (which leads to the correct theory of beauty) deceives himself very badly".[75] Raphael (or someone very close to him) equally engaged with, and critiqued, this technique in the letter to Castiglione that discussed the design of the *Galatea*: "in order to paint a beautiful woman, it is necessary to see many beauties … But there being a scarcity of good judges and of beautiful women, I make do with a certain Idea which comes into my head".[76] The notion of the Idea, in Anna DellaNeva's words "synthesized from a multiplicity of real objects but distinct from any single instantiation of it", had been familiar in literary theory at least since Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola's *De imaginatione* of 1501, and was a hot topic in Italian literary culture.[77]

We could perhaps usefully see the work of Bramante, Michelangelo, Raphael, and others who emulated them, as paralleling this literary technique. In other words, rather than seeing a High Renaissance period, or even a particular unified style, there was a common methodological approach that

sought to depict an idealized beauty through the conflation of a number of prized models. Through acknowledging conflation, as opposed to idealized classicism, as the model for this group of artists, it is possible to see how High Renaissance and Mannerism are fundamentally facets of the same approach to visual citation and appropriation that, arguably, became increasingly self-referential as time went on.

It is easy to see why this approach to the use of eclectic models might have become prized in the early 1500s. The necessary movement of artists and sections of the Italian élite from one state to another during the Italian wars exposed them to a large range of different regional models as well as different regional tastes, allowing artists to experience a greater range of visual influences as well as privileging the idea of a "styleless style" (as Nagel has described it), a beauty that, rhetorically at least, is beyond regional or local preferences.[78] In practice, the attempt to blend different models could lead to a plethora of misunderstandings on the part of the viewer; ambiguity, I suggested in the lion article, was one of the hallmarks of this visual mode.[79]

Rome, perhaps, was a natural home for this approach, not only because of the sheer number of potential models provided by its classical/Christian past, but also because of its cosmopolitan present, a "city of foreigners" which was equally a common *patria*; the destination for pilgrimages, embassies, and, increasingly, tourists.[80] Equally, tracing the influences of this cultural movement could not only extend chronologically well beyond 1520, but also globally. The artistic idiom associated with Leonardo and particularly Raphael became appropriated elsewhere in Europe and, increasingly, around the world, where new syntheses were made that incorporated local visual traditions.[81] Indeed, it is easy to see the advantages of a style that embodied a rhetoric of synthesizing idealized beauty, without geographical or temporal limits, to an ambitious and self-aggrandizing papacy that was increasingly under threat from foreign attack and religious heterodoxy. Once we disassociate High Renaissance imagery from a narrative of inevitable culmination pinned to artistic genius, we are better able to consider the ideology underpinning these changes in the visual arts. If true beauty was in the service of the Catholic Church, it is no wonder this style was so closely linked with European missionary and colonial ventures in the early modern period.[82]

To return to the original question; can we use the term High Renaissance any more? I think it is an acceptable – even useful – term for a cultural movement, but has to be used with caution. We should not echo unthinkingly the qualitative judgments of the past, where "high" equates to a culturally transcendent "highest class"; neither should we think of High Renaissance style as a shorthand for a "classical solution" to be undone by "anti-classical" Mannerism. Rather, it is possible to see how a cluster of ideas and methodologies relating to the conflation of excellent and fitting exemplars was shared by many visual artists, architects, and humanists; this quest

for perfect form perhaps accorded with the Golden Age propaganda and millennial fervour that was a key feature of this period, and which became increasingly steeped with nostalgia after the 1527 Sack of Rome. Our narrative of culmination in the early sixteenth century, then, has roots in the way some contemporaries made sense of the events they lived through. This narrative, however – and the artistic approach associated with it – was only one facet of a complex and fragmented cultural world.

## Notes

1    With thanks to Angeliki Pollali for this poem. Thanks also to David Rosenthal, Carol Richardson, and Stephen Bowd who have read drafts, suggested ideas and suffered me talking about the subject of this essay for far too long.

2    J. Burke (2006a) – eventually called "Meaning and Crisis in the Early Sixteenth Century: Interpreting Leonardo's Lion".

3    See the website: http://oaj.oxfordjournals.org/ (accessed November 2010).

4    S.J. Freedberg (1971), 14. Freedberg's High Renaissance is discussed in more detail by Brian Curran in Chapter 1.

5    See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/High_Renaissance (accessed December 2010); I and others have now rewritten this page. Wikipedia is repeatedly amongst the top ten websites consulted globally, particularly among college students (http://www.alexa.com/siteinfo/wikipedia.org#, accessed December 2010).

6    Wundram (2008).

7    Rowland (1998), 2.

8    M. Hall (2005a), 19.

9    For these exhibitions, see: http://www.nga.gov/exhibitions/lombardoinfo.shtm; http://www.mam.org/info/pressroom/2009/07/museum-announces-exhibition-of-raphael%E2%80%99s-high-renaissance-masterpiece/; http://www.britishmuseum.org/whats_on/all_current_exhibitions/italian_renaissance_drawings/exhibition_overview.aspx; and http://www.vam.ac.uk/collections/paintings/features/raphael/sistine-tapestries/index.html (accessed December 2010).

10    See particularly Zorach (2008) and other essays in Elkins and Williams (2008); there are of course exceptions to this rule, which I discuss below.

11    Previtali (1994), 53–54, discussed in J. Burke (2006a), 14.

12    Hall (2005b), 224.

13    Cropper (1995), quotation at 205.

14    Wohl (1999), especially 115–52.

15    M. Hall (1999), 14; an idea reprised in M. Hall (2005a), 125.

16    Franklin (2001), especially Introduction, 1–3; in Franklin's 2009 exhibition on the art of papal Rome he avoided period terms by using the change of popes as chronological divides: Franklin (2009).

17    Nagel (2005), 399.

18   Nagel and Wood (2010), compare 16 with 354 and 358, where they seem to be heading towards a similar suggestion of a historical caesura represented by Raphael's works in Belting (1994), esp. 458–90.

19   There has been a vast amount of consideration about the use of the term "Renaissance" over the last fifteen years, and particularly the construction of the period in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. See particularly Findlen and Gouwens (1998); Molho (1998); Grieco et al. (2002), J. Martin (2003); Celenza (2004a); Lasansky (2004), A. Brown (2004), Law and Østermark-Johansen (2005); Mack (2005); Bowd (2010). For art history in particular, see Nagel and Wood (2005), and responses in the same volume by Cole, Dempsey, and Farago; essays in Elkins and Williams (2008); Loh and Rubin (2009); Nagel and Wood (2010); Farago (1995) was something of a precursor. There is a brief discussion of the roots of the term High Renaissance in Winckelmann in M. Hall (2005b).

20   These themes are discussed, with bibliography, in Gouwens in this volume. See also O'Malley (1969); Gill (2005), 197–98; Stinger (1985), 297–98.

21   See particularly Rowland (1998) for a discussion of this culture. For the rediscovery of classical antiquities, see Barkan (1999) and Christian (2010).

22   See Burke and Bury (2008) for an introduction to the particular facets of Roman civic life that distinguished it from other Italian cities; Fosi (2008) for foreigners in Rome.

23   Quoted and discussed in Zimmerman (1995), 23.

24   For the Medici family and Golden Age imagery, see Cox Rearick (1984).

25   Also discussed recently in Franklin (2001), 5, and Sohm (2007), 29. For the original text, see now Shearman (2003), 832.

26   Vasari (1963), vol. 2, 153.

27   For the suggestion that Renaissance culture of the fifteenth and early sixteenth century was, in many ways, discontinuous with Vasari's milieu of 1550, see S. Campbell (2008).

28   Bellori (2005), 49 and 71.

29   Ibid., 89.

30   Quoted in Barasch (2000), 91.

31   For Winckelmann, see Potts (1994), and for an alternative view, Kaufmann (2001).

32   My translation of Winckelmann (1764), 247–48.

33   I am indebted to Alex Potts' discussion (1994), 67–72.

34   See Barasch (2000), 89–93.

35   Potts (1994), 70.

36   Potts (1978).

37   Seroux d'Agincourt (1823). For a discussion of the use of the word "renaissance" in France in the early nineteenth century, see Bullen (1994), 27–34.

38   Seroux d'Agincourt (1823), vol. 3, 162.

39   From the English translation: Lanzi (1847), vol. 2, 48–51.

40   Ibid., 124.

41   Rumohr (1827), vol. 3; for a discussion of this in the context of the emergence of the art historical survey text, Schwarzer (1995).

42   For Raphael's *Transfiguration*, see Rosenberg (1985–86) and Findlen (2002), 97–98. For the 1808 exhibition, Bullen (1994), 34.

43   Findlen (2002), 106–7.

44   This quotation, from the select committee of 1853, is cited and discussed in Levi (2005), 34.

45   Findlen (2002).

46   Nagel and Wood (2010), 358.

47   Berlin in 1844; Vienna in 1851, Zurich in 1855, the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris in 1863. The first chair of art history in the UK was inaugurated in Edinburgh in 1880, and in the US at Harvard in the 1870s. Information derived from search results in http://www.dictionaryofarthistorians.org/historiography.html.

48   Schwarzer (1995), 24–25.

49   Kugler (1842), 688.

50   Kugler (1855), vol. 2, 273.

51   Burckhardt (1873), 111–12. Burckhardt's role as initiator of the High Renaissance idea is also discussed by Christoph Frommel later in this volume.

52   Quoted in Potts (1994), 70.

53   Browning (1874), 409; Van Dyke (1894); Hoyt (1898).

54   For the impact of *Die Klassische Kunst* in the English-speaking art world see the anonymous editorial in the *Burlington Magazine* on the occasion of Wölfflin's eightieth birthday (June 1944); Roger Fry's comments in the *Athenaeum* of 1903; and the Introduction by Peter Murray to the English edition of *Classic Art* (1952). See also Brian Curran's comments in Chapter 1.

55   Wölfflin (1952), xv. See also Holly (1996), 1–28.

56   Wölfflin (1952), xvi.

57   Ibid., 231, and 244–50.

58   Ibid., 208, 219, 223–25. See also his discussion of Renaissance as opposed to Baroque art in the *Principles of Art History* (1915).

59   For discussions of Wölfflin's influence, see Holly (1984), 46–48; M. Brown (1997), 88–115; Podro (1982), 98–116, Gombrich (1966).

60   Wood (2002); quotation from 78.

61   Anderson (1992), 84–87; I am indebted to the discussion by Hemingway (2009). My thanks to Andrew Hemingway for sharing this essay with me before publication. See also now for the impact and Cold War context of Gombrich's *Story of Art*, Azatyan (2010).

62   Gombrich (1966a).

63   Panofsky (1960). See the discussion of this text in Nagel and Wood (2005), 409–10.

64   Panofsky (1960); Gombrich (1986), 124.

65 Shearman, for example (1967, 141–51), memorably links Mannerism's interest in variety to the "exceptional opportunities for boredom" in a courtier's life.

66 See also M. Hall (1999) for a useful discussion of Freedberg's conception of the High Renaissance.

67 See, particularly Gouwens (1998a and 1998b).

68 For the topos of conviviality in early sixteenth-century Rome, see, for example, Levin (1982) and Rowland (1998), *passim*, but especially 242–44 for Agostino Chigi's parties.

69 See Barzman (2000) for the Accademia del Disegno and Medicean politics.

70 For a recent discussion of the tensions between Christian and antique, pagan source material in the later fifteenth century and beyond, see S.J. Campbell (2006), 15–21. See also Nagel (2005), 399–403 and J. Burke (2006b).

71 The debate between Poliziano and Cortesi about the use of literary models is reproduced and translated in DellaNeva (2007), 2–15.

72 See ibid., Introduction, vii–xxxix, for an overview of the literary debate about imitation; 16–125 for the exchange between Bembo and Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola. For Raphael's painting in the context of literary theories of imitation, see Partridge and Starn (1980), 19–24; Raphael's architecture and imitation, see Hemsoll (2009), and other contributions to the same volume: Erikson and Malmanger (2009); for Michelangelo's architecture and imitation, Hemsoll (2001).

73 Jacobs (2000); Baxandall (1986), 34–44; Ackerman (2000) for a general discussion of imitation.

74 Cicero (2008), 2.1.

75 Condivi (1999), 69.

76 Shearman (2003), 735 – Shearman believes this letter was written by Castiglione, shortly after Raphael's death. For a discussion of this letter see Hemsoll (2009), especially 213–16.

77 DellaNeva (2007), xx–xxii; quotation from xx.

78 Nagel (2005), 399.

79 Burke (2006a).

80 Fosi (2008).

81 See, for example, for this rapidly expanding field of research, Farago (1995) and Bailey (2001).

82 For a discussion of the issues that a later English audience felt over their taste for "popish" art, see Haynes (2006). Thanks to Claire Haynes for discussing this with me.