TRADITION AND INNOVATION IN THE ITALIAN RENAISSANCE WORKSHOP: FROM PERUGINO TO RAPHAEL

by

JENNIE JEE-HYUN KIM

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Art History in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York

2013

© 2013

JENNIE KIM

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the
Graduate Faculty in Art History in satisfaction of the
dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

James M. Saslow

_____ _____
Date Chair of Examining Committee

Claire Bishop

_____ _____
Date Executive Officer

Elinor Richter_____

Michael Mallory_____

Joseph Giuffre_____

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

TRADITION AND INNOVATION IN THE ITALIAN RENAISSANCE WORKSHOP: FROM PERUGINO TO RAPHAEL

by

Jennie Kim

Adviser: Professor James Saslow

Throughout Pietro Perugino's career, pupils, assistants, and collaborators associated with his shops in Perugia and Florence were critical to his highly productive enterprise. The drawings of Perugino and his Florentine and Umbrian associates are a unique source of linear genealogy documenting the role of the master, the contributions and participation of the workshop, and the artistic exchange that occurred in the process. This dissertation examines the workshop practices of Perugino and his pupils as independent artists, using evidence furnished by workshop drawings. The drawings, byproducts of the daily operations of these workshops, reveal both continuity in practice over generations and the ways in which each generation adapted to changes in the artistic climate.

The reconstructions, in addition, have the potential to shed additional light upon the intersection between tradition, theory, and practice, as well as socio-economic conditions, such as training, collaboration, and organization in the Renaissance workshop. The market for copies, variations, and replicas is considered in the context of the notion of *imitazione* and meaning and cultural value of copies unique to Perugino's time. And the different grades of workshop production are illuminated by Perugino's methods of production and design.

Using evidence furnished by workshop drawings, this dissertation also examines the formative influence of the practices of Perugino on artists trained in his workshop. Among artists

that came under his tutelage, two dominant tendencies emerge: a derivative style in Perugia among local artists under the shadow of Perugino's monopoly and an independent style, found outside of Perugia, reflecting the influence of Perugino's workshop instruction. The careers of two significant pupils, Berto di Giovanni in Perugia and Raphael in Florence and Rome demonstrate the transmission of the experience of Perugino's workshop through two very different career trajectories, and will be used as case studies. Characteristics of their practice that reflect the heritage of Perugino such as the systematic use of drawings, employment of tools and techniques of replication and the master's exemplum, and principles of organization will be evaluated to trace continuity and innovation in workshop practice.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my profound gratitude to my advisor Professor James M. Saslow. I would also like to thank the members of the committee, Professor Elinor Richter, Professor Michael Mallory and Professor Joseph Giuffre. Finally, I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my family whose patience and support sustained me through it all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Unless otherwise noted, all works of are attributed to Perugino and his workshop.

INTRODUCTION

Although the collaborative nature of Renaissance artistic production is generally acknowledged, the emphasis on the elevation of the artist from craftsman to creative genius in the Renaissance fundamentally contradicts the notion of a collaborative workshop practice. As such, since the time of Vasari, greater emphasis has been placed on the artistic personality and consequently the collaborative activities of a workshop have been largely overlooked. This emphasis on the individual artistic personality also permeates the study of Italian Renaissance drawings with an emphasis on connoisseurship, attribution and dating, and the formulation of an artist's graphic oeuvre. As a result, drawings considered to be by the hand of the master dominate scholarly attention and workshop drawings are often relegated to the status of "copies." A closer examination of the function of drawings in the workshop, however, suggests the contrary, with the significance of workshop drawings increasing along with the changing perception of the artist. With the elevation of the artist, greater emphasis was placed on the distinctions between the role of the master, invention, and the role of the workshop, execution; and artists increasingly relied on drawings to organize and manage the design and production process in the workshop. The critical function of drawing therefore cannot be separated from the creative process nor the organization of the workshop, and drawings are a unique source of visual evidence that documents the collaborative efforts of artistic production in the Renaissance.

Pietro di Cristoforo Vannucci, called Perugino (ca. 1450-1523), one of the leading painters of the late Quattrocento, stands out amongst his contemporaries for his prolific activity through his two workshops in Florence and Perugia. The drawings of Perugino and his Florentine and Umbrian pupils, assistants, and collaborators who came under his tutelage

through the workshops are a unique source documenting the role of the master, the contributions and participation of the workshop, and the artistic exchange that occurred in the process. This dissertation attempts to reconstruct the workshop practices of Perugino and his pupils as independent artists, using evidence furnished by workshop drawings. The drawings, byproducts of the daily operations of these workshops, reveal both continuity in practice over generations and the ways in which each generation adapted to changes in the artistic climate. The reconstructions, in addition, have the potential to shed additional light upon the intersection between tradition, theory, and practice, as well as socio-economic conditions, such as training, collaboration, and organization in the Renaissance workshop.

Perugino's workshops are ideal microcosms through which to consider fundamental questions about the function and organization of a Renaissance workshop and its materials and methods, for a number of reasons. Perugino's activity from the 1470s to the 1520s spans a period of fundamental change in Renaissance art, and his dual operations are highly reflective of the market conditions and demands of both cities. In addition, Perugino's practice with an emphasis on drawings provides the visual evidence necessary to reconstruct and trace developments in the workshop practice. Furthermore, major works by Perugino that have been subjected to detailed scientific analysis provide technical findings that supplement the visual analysis of the drawings. Finally, the artists who came under his instruction through the workshops are a unique source of linear genealogy documenting the profound influence of the workshop experience. The visual and technical evidence and the social and historical context ideally complement the objectives of this project.

The Changing Function of Drawings and the Creative Process

In order to recognize what distinguishes Perugino's use of drawings and to trace continuity and change in the next generation, it is important to note the standard practices of the time. By the latter part of the Quattrocento, compositions based on established iconographical types preserved in pattern- or model-books were gradually replaced by compositions conceived through exploratory sketches (*schizzo* or *primo pensiero*). From the initial ideation, detailed studies of parts of the composition (*studio*) were carried out. In the final phase of the preparatory process, the composition was fully developed in a *modello*. This highly finished compositional study was often squared for enlargement and was the basis for the production of the cartoon, a full-scale drawing used for final transfer to the surface to be painted.[1] Most Renaissance artists adhered to this sequence, but the level of differentiation and elaboration of each drawing type differed from workshop to workshop and from artist to artist, giving great range and diversity to the practice of the Renaissance.

In most large and active workshops, as the scale and scope of projects increased, the number of participants in the production process increased as well, necessitating the codification of the preparatory process. This entailed the further elaboration of the production process and is particularly apparent in the practice of artists subjected to the carefully deliberated preparatory process of masters like Perugino; Verrocchio before him, whom Perugino trained with; and Raphael. It is in the carefully differentiated drawings of a meticulous procedure of preparation that the contribution of workshop hands can be identified and organization of labor deciphered.

As the function of drawings in the workshop was being codified for practical reasons, the practice and perception of drawing were also redefined, echoing the changing perceptions of the

[1] A *modello* might be used as presentation drawing or to preserve a compositional solution.

artist. Traditionally valued for its preparatory function, drawing began to be seen in a new light beyond its technical function. Finished drawings were exhibited and exchanged by artists and recognized as autonomous works. However, even as drawing came to be newly appreciated, its practical function remained all the more significant. Practice remained rooted in the craft mode of production, and underscores a fundamental contrast in theory and practice.

Theory and Practice

With the elevation of the profession, the way in which painters were spoken of and spoke of their art became much more intellectualized and was combined with a conscious suppression of the craft elements of their practice.[2] The diminishing of the technical aspects of artistic production and the craft tradition, as Clark Hulse points out, resulted in "irreconcilable tensions" for the Renaissance painter.[3] This dichotomy is also evident in two works of fifteenth-century art-historical literature. Cennino Cennini's *Il libro dell'arte* (ca. 1437),[4] notably translated as *The "Craftsman's" Handbook,* was seen as representing the medieval tradition rooted in practice, whereas Leon Battista Alberti's *On Painting* (1435) represented the new Renaissance spirit founded on intellect. Cennini's treatise, a fundamental source on Italian painting techniques, emphasizes practical skills, and is composed of detailed instructions, a practical guide for the practicing artist. Alberti, on the other hand, very intentionally, modeled his treatise after ancient

---

[2] Clark Hulse, *The Rule of Art: Literature and Painting in the Renaissance* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1990), 16.

[3] Ibid., 81–82.

[4] Cennino Cennini, *Il libro dell'arte*, ed. Gaetano Milanesi and Carlo Milanesi (Florence: Le Monnier, 1859), iv–xii. Questions regarding this date, ca. 1437, are addressed below.

grammatical and rhetorical theory and very carefully constructed his text,[5] not for the benefit of the practicing artist but for an intellectual audience.

Although Cennini's treatise was long dated to the end of the fourteenth century (ca. 1390s) because his "medieval" approach to the art of painting better accorded with an earlier date, Latifah Troncelliti has convincingly demonstrated that it was actually completed in 1437, two years after Alberti's *On Painting*.[6] If in fact the two treatises are contemporary with one another, Cennini's practical recommendations embodying the "medieval" emphasis on practice and Alberti's representation of the new intellect of the Renaissance are a true reflection of the dichotomy between practice and theory in the Quattrocento. Cennini, writing for the practicing artist, and Alberti, writing for his intellectual audience, around the same time, documents the tensions brought on by the realities of an artist's practice and the new conception of the profession.[7]

This dichotomy also reflects the tensions that confronted Perugino and his generation of artists. Perugino's activity corresponds to a transitional period in which artists were carefully navigating this shifting relationship between workshop practice and evolving theoretical

---

[5] Robert Williams, *Art Theory: An Historical Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), 56–57.

[6] Latifah Troncelliti, "The Making of Cennino Cennini," *Explorations in Renaissance Culture: EIRC* 30, no. 2 (2004): 290–325; Martin Kemp, *Behind the Picture: Art and Evidence in the Italian Renaissance* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997), 84; Kenneth Clark, *Leon Battista Alberti on Painting*, Annual Italian Lecture of the British Academy 30 (London: British Academy, 1946), 8. Kenneth Clark also accepts that Cennini wrote the *Libro dell'arte* after Alberti's *On Painting*. Martin Kemp, writing before Troncelliti, dates the treatise to "around 1400" and writes that Cennini's treatise "makes greater claims for the intellectuality of art than is generally recognized."

[7] It is questionable whether artists had any use for treatises whether practical or theoretical in content. Theoretical treatises especially are inherently at odds with the way artists in the Renaissance actually learned and practiced their art.

constructs. The Renaissance workshop was transformed in tandem with the status of the artist and changing theoretical and aesthetic ideals, and a more nuanced understanding of individual workshops can help us better appreciate this entity that was so central to art in the Renaissance.

Historiography

There are a number of significant studies dealing with Renaissance workshops and drawings that this project draws from. Our general knowledge about workshops derives from the works of early scholars like Martin Wackernagel's *The World of the Florentine Renaissance Artist: Projects and Patrons, Workshop and Art Market* (1938)[8]. A consideration of a specific entity like Perugino's workshop would not be possible without Wackernagel's seminal work and the observations on the institutions and organization of artistic practice it provides. On the relevant drawings, Oskar Fischel's survey of Umbrian drawings of 1917, *Die Zeichnungen der Umbrer*,[9] remains the most comprehensive and still the most relevant work on the Umbrian graphic tradition.

More recently, the literature has been supplemented by more specialized studies. Anabel Thomas's publication on the Renaissance painter's practice based on the record book dating from 1453-1475 of the painter Neri di Bicci provides a rare, detailed picture of the day-to-day activities of the artist and his business.[10] It is an invaluable socio-economic context for the study

---

[8] Martin Wackernagel, *The World of the Florentine Renaissance Artist: Projects and Patrons, Workshop and Art Market*, trans. Alison Luchs (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981); Martin Wackernagel, *Der Lebensraum des Künstlers in der florentininschen Renaissance: Aufgaben und Auftraggeber, Werkstatt und Kunstmarkt* (Leipzig: Seemann, 1938).

[9] Oskar Fischel, *Die Zeichnungen der Umbrer*, 2 vols. (Berlin: Grote, 1917).

of workshops, for most of which such extensive documentation does not survive. Specialized studies with an emphasis on the production and function of drawings, for example, Carmen Bambach's study of cartoons and methods of transfer,[11] demonstrate how the materials and methods of the workshop can illuminate the complexity of Italian Renaissance workshop practice.

As for literature most relevant to this study, the exhibition catalogue by Sylvia Ferino-Pagden[12] that accompanied *Disegni umbri del Rinascimento da Perugino a Raffaello* at the Uffizi in 1983 is the most significant contribution to the study of Umbrian drawings since Fischel's 1917 publication. Building on the work of Fischel, through the Uffizi's holdings, Ferino-Pagden brings attention to key issues such as Raphael's early years in Umbria and questions of attribution concerning Perugino and Raphael. Along with her subsequent publications on the Umbrian school, Ferino-Pagden's work provides a context for many of the drawings considered in this project and questions raised about workshop practice, such as, organization, the range of workshop products, copying practices, and transmission and artistic exchange.

Two notable exhibitions, *Maestri e botteghe: Pittura a Firenze alla fine del Quattrocento*[13] organized by Mina Gregori in 1992 at the Palazzo Strozzi and *Florence in the*

---

[10] Anabel Thomas, *The Painter's Practice in Renaissance Tuscany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Neri di Bicci, *Le Ricordanze 1453-1475*, ed. Bruno Santi (Pisa: Marlin, 1976).

[11] Carmen Bambach, *Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop: Theory and Practice, 1300-1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

[12] Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, *Disegni umbri del Rinascimento da Perugino a Raffaello*, Gabinetto disegni e stampe degli Uffizi 58 (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1982).

1470s[14] by Patricia Lee Rubin and Alison Wright at the London National Gallery, have addressed key themes that concern this project such as organization, collaboration, and training in specific workshops of the late Quattrocento. *Maestri e botteghi* was an especially ambitious endeavor examining Florentine workshops from the 1450s to the 1490s and addressing a diverse range of themes such as domestic furnishings and workshop dynasties. Curiously, however, Perugino's Florentine workshop was not included in this exhibition despite his prolific activity in Florence during this time. Though both exhibitions emphasized material culture more than drawings, the examination of specific workshops, both those of minor figures like Neri di Bicci and influential masters like Verrocchio, underscores how a more comprehensive understanding of the workshop can be attained by accumulating knowledge about a single artist's practice, which this project seeks to do.

The Renaissance Workshop: Background

The Renaissance workshop was characterized by great variability and diversity. In highly productive artistic centers like Florence, operations ranged from the large all-purpose workshops, *botteghe polivalenti*, to the highly specialized workshops dedicated to very specific objects. [15] The physical space of the Renaissance artists' workshops ranged from the smaller workspace referred to as *mezza bottega, botteguzza,* and *botteghino* to large shop spaces of artists in great

---

[13] Mina Gregori, ed., *Maestri e botteghe: Pittura a Firenze alla fine del Quattrocento* (Cinisello Balsamo: Silvana Ed., 1992).

[14] Patricia Lee Rubin and Alison Wright, *Florence in the 1470s* (London: National Gallery Publications, 1999).

[15] Anna Maria Bernacchioni, "Le botteghe di pittura: Luoghi, strutture e attività," in *Maestri e botteghe: Pittura a Firenze alla fine del Quattrocento*, ed. Mina Gregori (Cinisello Balsamo: Silvana Ed., 1992), 23–34. For example, specialty workshops included those specializing in candle painting.

demand where work was not only produced but displayed, and all aspects of the business such as contract negotiations carried out.[16] Minor artists even used parts of their homes to carry out their trade. Depending on the work on hand, it was also possible for artists to work without a designated long-term workshop space. For example, when Perugino traveled extensively for commissions, it is assumed that he carried out all of the work onsite, and Raphael did not establish a workshop until his arrival in Rome.[17]

The organization of the workshop is another aspect of Renaissance practice in which inherent variability is apparent. In general, while the workshops of the Middle Ages were characterized by collaboration based on equal division of labor, the workshops of major Renaissance masters were based on a hierarchical organization, with the master responsible for the creative act of invention and pupils and assistants responsible for the more technical aspects of execution. But depending on the artist and the project at hand, the organization of labor constantly fluctuated. The circumstances surrounding two major fresco cycles by Perugino clearly illustrate the flexibility of the workshop's collaborative model. When Perugino was awarded the commission for the decoration of the Sistine Chapel (1480-1482), he planned and began the decoration independently but subsequently subcontracted a majority of the project to a group of collaborators.[18] He took on the most important parts of the cycle and served as "project coordinator" but each subcontractor retained his own pupils and assistants for his delegated

---

[16] Thomas, *The Painter's Practice in Renaissance Tuscany*, 18.

[17] Ibid., 54; Paul Joannides, *The Drawings of Raphael: With a Complete Catalogue* (Oxford: Phaidon, 1983), 16.

[18] L.D. Ettlinger, *The Sistine Chapel Before Michelangelo: Religious Imagery and Papal Primacy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965).

portion, demonstrating the degree of independence Perugino allocated to the subcontracted artists.[19] By the time he carried out the frescoes for the Collegio del Cambio in Perugia (1497-1500), Perugino was overseeing a large workshop with an internal labor force at his disposal. The project manager working alongside subcontractors model of the Sistine Chapel was consolidated into a single team formulated from within the workshop. While close scrutiny of the work at the Cambio reveals participation of different workshop hands, the workshop training ensures that consistency is maintained and the work as a whole is seen as entirely by Perugino.

In general, the participation and contribution of pupils, assistants, and collaborators in the workshop was divided between work on formally commissioned, large-scale altarpieces or narrative cycles, and smaller panel paintings that were sold in the open market. As the scale and scope of projects increased, along with the demands of the open market, the function and role of the members of the workshop assumed greater importance in both of these aspects of production. In addition to collaborating on or assisting with large-scale projects, the task of producing multiples of small devotional panels as inventory for the open market was often delegated, giving controlled autonomy to more skilled members of the workshop.[20] The study of these workshop multiples, however, is complicated by that fact that it was also fairly common for mature pupils or assistants to accept independent secondary commissions while affiliated with the master's shop. Both Vasari and recent scholarship note specific instances in which pupils and assistants accepted independent payments for works based on the master's *invenzione*.

---

[19] The circumstances of this commission are discussed in detail in chapter 1.

[20] Beverly Louise Brown, "Replication and the Art of Veronese," *Studies in the History of Art* 20 (1989): 112.

Botticelli's assistant, Biagio, produced and sold a copy of a tondo by the master[21] and Neri di Bicci's entries in his *ricordanza* record the sale of an independent work by a pupil and his concerns about how the profit from the work was to be divided.[22] Recognizing practices such as the production of shop multiples and the ways in which degrees of autonomy were granted to mature members of the workshop brings to light the full diversity in the products produced and the market demand for them. It is in the context of this type of knowledge provided by these better documented, more comprehensively understood workshops that shops that remain understudied can be brought to light.

A vast majority of the relevant documents that survive are related to bookkeeping and accounting, and in conjunction with contracts, which reveal the terms of specific commissions, they are a rich source of insight into the commercial aspects of the artist's business.[23] Records such as *quaderno di cassa*, recording payments received; *libro di uscita*, recording general payments made; and *libro di ricordanza*, recording workshop affairs presented to the guilds for examination regularly, document the practical aspects of the business.[24] Though very few *ricordanze* have survived, the mundane activities of the workshop that are recorded in them are a rare source of insight into day-to-day operations. Such complete records for the workshops examined in this dissertation unfortunately have not survived. However fragmentary, the available documentary evidence concerning Perugino and his pupils is an important supplement

---

[21] Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori ed architettori* (Florence, 1568), ed. Gaetano Milanesi (Florence: Sansoni, 1906), 3:318–320.

[22] Thomas, *The Painter's Practice in Renaissance Tuscany*, 77.

[23] Ibid., 300. However, the divergence between document and extant work often requires supplementation and reconciliation.

[24] Ibid., 297–308.

to the visual evidence that is used in this study to reconstruct independent practices in the following chapters.

Chapter Outlines

Chapter one focuses on Perugino's Florentine and Perugian operations, and how the practice of drawing was critical to his ability to oversee operations in two cities and travel widely for commissions. The reconstruction of Perugino's production process will show that despite increasing emphasis on creativity and invention, his practice remained deeply rooted in tradition. His highly systematic preparatory process based on drawings was fundamental to his ability to organize and manage the activities of the workshop. However, his systematic methods, management scheme, and extraordinary productivity also led to subsequent accusations of excessive self-quotation and repetition. The course of Perugino's reputation illustrates the tension between traditional practice and developments in artistic theory; the issue of artistic originality will be examined through his multiple treatments of the *Baptism*. This case study will attempt to clarity Perugino's notion of repetition and variation in the context of his practice.

While chapter one considers repetition and variation in Perugino's oeuvre in the context of his preparatory process, chapter two examines the active market for copies, variations and replicas that flourished despite the increasing concern for creative originality. The notion of *imitazione* and the meaning and cultural value of copies unique to Perugino's time are considered. In addition, the analysis of Perugino's methods of production and design will demonstrate that the artist did not simply re-use drawings to produce multiples in the interest of economy, but employed a highly evolved design and production process that gave rise to different grades of workshop production. The range of products produced by the workshop

reflects the market demand for copies, variations, and replicas that was driven by the same economic, social, and cultural values that drove the market for "originals." Perugino's ability to respond to all of these demands and his unprecedented productivity, it will be shown, was intricately linked to his innovative design and production process that emphasized the function of drawings.

Chapter three examines the organization and the division of labor in Perugino's workshop. Though there are no documents directly related to how Perugino organized his shop and how he divided and delegated tasks, surviving documents and available resources will be used to infer the structure of the workshop. First, documentary evidence will be used to identify significant pupils, assistants, and collaborators in the workshop in Florence and in Perugia. Then, an in-depth analysis of the workshop drawings will show how they provide evidence of Perugino's managerial scheme. Drawings documenting the contribution and participation of the workshop that were seamlessly integrated into the production process will be examined and the tools and techniques employed by members of Perugino's workshop to reproduce the master's style identified. The chapter will also consider the delegation of execution of paintings for a comprehensive view of how the full production process was managed by Perugino.

The profound influence of Perugino and the workshop experience is most apparent in the independent careers of his most significant pupils in Perugia. Among this generation of artists, two distinctive groups emerge: pupils in Perugia, where Perugino remained a prominent figure until his death in 1523, and pupils who moved beyond Perugia, seeking independence away from the shadow of the influential master. The independent careers of Berto di Giovanni in Perugia and Raphael in Florence and Rome will be examined in chapters four and five to highlight the varying degrees of continuity and innovation identifiable in their independent practices.

Berto's experience in Perugia, in many ways, echoes the experience of numerous local artists in the city. For most of his career, his activity was overshadowed by Perugino's stylistic influence as well his monopoly of the market. Berto's enduring dependence on Perugino was further exacerbated by his extended affiliation with the workshop, as an assistant early in his career and later as a collaborator. Nevertheless, in the absence of restrictions imposed by the need to produce in the manner of the master, chapter four will show how Berto demonstrated his ability to build upon the principles of practice inherited from Perugino while taking advantages of his affiliations with Perugino to develop an eclectic style of painting and establish himself as a prominent local artist.

The workshop experience also had a profound influence on Perugino's most celebrated pupil, Raphael. Chapter five begins with his early years in Umbria when the younger artist was highly dependent not only on the working methods of Perugino, but also his motifs and designs. The next part of the chapter examines his Florentine period as he emerged from the immediate influence of Perugino and demonstrates how the graphic handling and meticulous preparation of painting inherited from Perugino was rationalized with his Florentine experience. In Rome, Raphael oversaw a highly productive enterprise in which the organizational principles and collaborative production process of Perugino's workshop undeniably shaped his conception of the shop's labor structure and working methods. As the scale and scope of projects increased and the work force expanded, the production process was further codified and the careful differentiation of drawings, which characterized Perugino's practice, became ever more critical to the Roman workshop. The practices to which Raphael was exposed in Perugino's workshop were undoubtedly foundational to the practices of his Roman workshop but the innovations to Perugino's model are also notable and are highlighted through the workshop drawings. They

illustrate how Raphael, like Perugino, used drawings to enhance productivity and maintain quality control, but increasingly he also introduced innovative ways of utilizing the systematic process and labor structure to engage the workshop in all aspects of the production process while retaining full creative control. In theory, Raphael was fashioned into an ideal Renaissance master exhibiting *sprezzatura*, nonchalant effortlessness, but the systematic and laborious process he maintained shows how he remained devoted to the craft tradition.

The conclusion will address how despite fundamental changes in theory and practice, the workshop tradition was maintained over these two generations and how they are alike in significant respects. Pupils inevitably inherited the practices of the master, and this legacy is evident in the working methods of Perugino and his pupils that remained rooted in workshop tradition. This tendency extended well beyond Perugino's workshop, and practices that originated in the craft tradition of the fifteenth century, such as quotation and repetition, persisted well into the sixteenth century and beyond. Although artists of the *maniera* like Vasari emphasized creativity and invention, quotation and repetition persisted and the conclusion will consider how these very practices were rationalized, underscoring how traditional workshop practices and collaborative undertakings remained the foundation of the artistic process despite developments in theory.

The inherent diversity and variability of the Renaissance workshop encourages the study of independent practices, and the workshops of Perugino and his pupils provide a unique opportunity to consider individual practices in the context of continuity over generations. Though the following chapters do not provide an absolute picture of their workshops, the more inclusive analysis of workshop drawings, coupled with an emphasis on the conception and function of drawings, on workshop composition and organization, and on materials and methods,

will demonstrate the rich potential of the topic. An understanding of the physical process by which a work of art has been realized not only provides a more vivid picture of the workshop, but adds a further dimension to the appreciation of Renaissance works of art.

CHAPTER 1

PERUGINO AND HIS WORKSHOP

Introduction

In 1479, Pietro Perugino, at the time a local Umbrian artist, was summoned to Rome by Pope Sixtus IV. As soon as his first project for Sixtus, a *Virgin and Child with Angels* for the Cappella della Concezione of Old Saint Peter's, was completed,[1] Perugino was immediately retained for the decoration of the newly restored Sistine Chapel, one of the most prominent commissions in Italy of the late Quattrocento.[2] As the first master retained by the pope for the decoration of the Chapel, Perugino was most likely hired to plan and oversee the entire undertaking. He began the project with his own pupils and assistants and executed the most important parts of the cycle: the altar wall (which determined the scale and composition of all the other pictures), the first frescoes on both the north and south walls, and, thematically the most significant fresco, *Christ Handing the Keys to Saint Peter*. According to a contract dated October 1481, Sandro Botticelli, Domenico Ghirlandaio, and Cosimo Rosselli were brought on to paint ten additional scenes.[3] As work progressed with the collaborators under Perugino's supervision,

---

[1] The fresco was destroyed in 1602.

[2] Jeryldene Wood, "The Early Paintings of Perugino" (Ph.D. diss., University of Virginia, 1985); Pietro Scarpellini, *Perugino* (Milan: Electa, 1991), 18–28.

[3] L.D. Ettlinger, *The Sistine Chapel before Michelangelo: Religious Imagery and Papal Primacy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), 30–31; Wood, "The Early Paintings of Perugino," 130. They were to be completed by 15 March 1482. The four artists are listed without distinction. Ettlinger credits Perugino with the leading role. Wood believes it was a collaboration, with none of the artists in a position above the others.

Luca Signorelli and Bartolomeo della Gatta were also engaged to participate on the very final scenes.[4]

The collaborators, it seems, were hired primarily to ensure the timely completion of the project. But Perugino's role as planner and project manager has always been downplayed. Vasari went as far as giving Botticelli credit for supervising the project, despite the fact that he was retained later than Perugino.[5] Two sixteenth-century references confirm that Perugino not only made the main contributions but also managed the entire decoration of the Chapel. Paolo Giovio, when discussing Perugino's style, referenced his leading role in the project.[6] Raphael Maffei, however mistaken, believed that Perugino decorated the Sistine Chapel all by himself.[7] With the Sistine Chapel, his most important commission from his early period, Perugino retained independent masters as collaborators and demonstrated his exceptional ability to manage projects requiring unique labor structures. Indeed, throughout his career, Perugino employed a combination of pupils, assistants, and collaborators to meet the demands of complex enterprises. His ability to manage constantly fluctuating labor structures was due to a production process that fully realized the potential of drawing. This chapter considers Perugino, both the artist and

---

[4] Laurence B. Kanter, "Luca Signorelli, Piero della Francesca, and Pietro Perugino," *Studi di storia dell'arte* 1 (1990): 98–101.

[5] Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori ed architettori* (Florence, 1568), ed. Gaetano Milanesi (Florence: Sansoni, 1906), 3:316–317.

[6] Ettlinger, *The Sistine Chapel Before Michelangelo*, 31 n2; Paolo Giovio, *Fragmentum trium dialogarum*, ed. Girolamo Tiraboschi, vol. 7, Storia della letteratura italiana (Florence: Molini Landi, 1809), 4.

[7] Fiorenzo Canuti, *Il Perugino* (Siena: La Diana, 1931), 1:57; Raffaele Maffei, *Commentariorum rerum urbanorum liber primus* (Rome: Ioannem Besicken Alemanum, 1506), fol. CCC.

workshop supervisor, and reconstructs the production process with an emphasis on drawings that he employed to facilitate his management scheme.

Reputation and Reception

Pietro di Cristoforo Vannucci, called Il Perugino, was born in Città della Pieve, a small town in the Perugian territory. Most historians believe he was born circa 1450,[8] and, according to Vasari, he received his initial training in the workshop of an insignificant painter in Perugia.[9] Vasari says he left Perugia and "came to Florence, minded to become excellent; and well did he succeed, for the reason that in those times works in his manner were held in very great price."[10] While the success he achieved is generally acknowledged, Perugino nevertheless maintains a curious place in the history of Renaissance art. Like so many artists of his time, Perugino's reputation is still rooted in the opinions of Vasari. Vasari's construct of Perugino's career in terms of great potential, initial success, and sharp decline has unduly shaped both Perugino scholarship and the general reception of his work today.

---

[8] Vasari, *Le vite*, 3:565; Kim E. Butler, "Giovanni Santi, Raphael, and Quattrocento Sculpture," *Artibus et Historiae* 30, no. 59 (2009): 15–39. Vasari was mistaken about the year of Perugino's death, which he gave as 1524 at the age of 78, which would make his birth year 1446. When it was discovered that Perugino actually died in February of 1523, his birth year was automatically moved back to 1445. Santi in his "Cronaca" writes that Perugino was born the same year as Leonardo, 1452.

[9] Vasari, *Le vite*, 3:566.

[10] Ibid., 3:568; Giorgio Vasari, *Lives of the Painters, Sculptors and Architects*, ed. David Ekserdjian, trans. Gaston du C. de Vere (New York: Knopf, 1996), 1:585.

According to Vasari, Perugino "made the craftsmen believe that he would become excellent and marvelous" but was unable to live up to his potential.[11] In the end, "Pietro had done so much work, and he always had so many works in hand, that he would very often use the same subjects; and he had reduced the theory of his art to a manner so fixed, that he made all his figures with the same expression."[12] But it was, in fact, the general, un-particularized, and interchangeable nature of Perugino's figures that appealed to his audience.[13] The recognizable motifs in Perugino's compositions made the images accessible and encouraged the viewer to relate on a more personal level. At a time when the primary function of painting was aiding devotional practice, Perugino's works were ideally suited for his audience.[14]

Throughout the 1480s and 1490s, Perugino thrived amongst first-rate rivals in Florence and Rome. His fame reached its pinnacle around 1500, and in a letter of that year, Agostino Chigi declared him the finest master in Italy.[15] But Perugino's success, according to Vasari, was short-lived, and the unveiling of his *Assumption* altarpiece for SS. Annunziata in Florence in

---

[11] Vasari, *Le vite*, 3:569; Vasari, *Lives*, 1:585.

[12] Vasari, *Le vite*, 3:585; Vasari, *Lives*, 1:593.

[13] Michael Baxandall. *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth-Century Italy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), 46-47.

[14] Charles Dempsey, "Introduction," in *Drawing Relationships in Northern Italian Renaissance Art : Patronage and Theories of Invention*, ed. Giancarla Periti (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2004), 3. The "*maniera devota*… was eclipsed in Rome by the stupendous achievements of Michelangelo and Raphael, not to mention the superbly talented first generation of mannerist artists who followed in their tracks. Nevertheless, the affective qualities and naturalistic colorism of the art never ceased to exert a powerful influence in Emilia-Romagna and the Marches, finding continued expression in the works of artists like Garofalo, Timoteo Viti and Bagnacavallo, all of whom attempted to unite the classical design of the mature Raphael with that native colorism and pious sentiment, derived from Perugino and Francia, in which they had been trained as youths."

[15] Canuti, *Il Perugino*, 2:239. See document 384.

November of 1507 was a decisive turning point.[16] It should be noted that Vasari's account of the incident was first published in 1550, almost half a century later. According to Vasari, the painting was unveiled and the younger generation of Florentine artists sharply criticized it as outmoded and unoriginal. Vasari apparently was not alone in his criticism; various sonnets criticizing the altarpiece circulated in print for some time after the unveiling.[17]

This supposedly disastrous incident is the pivotal point of the *Life of Perugino,* and Vasari used it to mark the end of the Quattrocento and the beginning of the Cinquecento. But the unveiling of the altarpiece and subsequent response was not as detrimental to the Umbrian master's career as Vasari and later scholars have maintained.[18] Vasari claims Perugino was ridiculed by a younger generation of painters, but the work apparently satisfied the patron's expectations, for the friars never registered a complaint about the work. The altarpiece was displayed as intended, and, despite Vasari's claim that the artist was forced to retreat to Perugia, Perugino received a very important papal commission the following year in 1508. Julius II, who had as a cardinal retained the services of Perugino in 1489 for an altarpiece, commissioned him for the decoration of the ceiling of the Sala dell'Incendio del Borgo in the Vatican.[19] Such an

---

[16] Michelle O'Malley, "Quality, Demand, and the Pressures of Reputation: Rethinking Perugino," *The Art Bulletin* 89, no. 4 (2007): 674.

[17] Giovio also alluded to Perugino's shame. For Giovio, see Paola Barocchi, ed., *Scritti d'arte del Cinquecento* (Milan: Ricciardi, 1971), 1:19–20; for sonnet, see Jonathan Katz Nelson, "La disgrazia di Pietro: L' importanza della pala della Santissima Annunziata nella Vita del Perugino del Vasari," in *Pietro Vannucci, il Perugino: Atti del convegno internazionale di studio, 25 - 28 ottobre 2000*, ed. Laura Teza (Perugia: Volumnia, 2004), 70; O'Malley, "Quality, Demand, and the Pressures of Reputation," 674, 692 n5. Vasari appears to have been reporting past criticism.

[18] On Vasari, see Patricia Lee Rubin, *Giorgio Vasari: Art and History* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995).

important commission certainly raises questions about the actual impact of the *Assumption* altarpiece on Perugino's career.

In fact, Perugino's style never ceased to exert influence across Umbria in the sixteenth century, and he remained Umbria's most active painter until his death in 1523. While Perugino may not have enjoyed the same level of success during the final decades of his career, his prolific career in its entirety was one of the most successful of his generation in central Italy.

Early Formation and Training

Critical to this study of Perugino and his workshop is his relationship with an entire generation of artists who came under his influence. But before we can discuss the specifics of his practice and his relationship with his pupils, assistants, and collaborators, we should briefly consider his own formation and training, which had a profound influence on his practice and working relations with others.

According to Vasari, Perugino initially trained in the workshop of a local painter in Perugia before moving to Florence and entering the studio of Andrea del Verrocchio.[20] It has also been suggested that Perugino's early training was in Arezzo with Piero della Francesca in

---

[19] Michael Bury, "Perugino, Raphael and the Decoration of the Stanza dell'Incendio," in *Rethinking the High Renaissance: The Culture of the Visual Arts in Early Sixteenth-century Rome*, ed. Jill Burke (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2012), 223–244.

[20] Vasari, *Le vite*, 2:500, 3:568–569; Tom Henry, "La formazione di Pietro Perugino," in *Perugino: Il divin pittore*, ed. Vittoria Garibaldi (Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 2004), 73–79. Benedetto Bonfigli, Bartolomeo Caporali and Fiorenzo di Lorenzo are all possible local artists with whom Perugino could have trained, but no documentary evidence confirming Perugino's early training in Perugia has been uncovered. For further discussion of the formation of Perugino in Perugia, see Henry. In his life of Piero della Francesca, Vasari also mentions that Perugino was Piero's pupil. Based on Vasari's account, the "Piero di Castel della Pieve" recorded in the shop of Piero della Francesca was traditionally identified as Perugino. Scholars have since demonstrated that this "Piero" was not Perugino but Pietro or Piero di Galeotto.

the 1460s, followed by a brief apprenticeship in his home town of Castel della Pieve and finally with Verrocchio in Florence around 1470.[21] In either case, his early training provided enduring Umbrian foundations for his art, and, at a crucial juncture, the Verrocchio shop experience in Florence impacted the young artist profoundly.[22]

Around twenty years old, Perugino was well beyond the age of a traditional apprentice when he began his training with Verrocchio. We know he did not enter the shop as an independent collaborator, for he did not matriculate into the Florentine painters' confraternity, the Compagnia di San Luca, until June of 1472.[23] But he must have entered the Verrocchio shop on the verge of becoming an independent artist, with skills well beyond those of a typical apprentice. This would not have been unusual, as the Verrocchio shop was known for its variety of affiliations and range of subordinates and collaborators.[24]

Verrocchio's large and active shop was extremely conducive to exchange among its diverse group of artists; it was an ideal setting for a talented provincial artist like Perugino

---

[21] Michael Bury, "Review of *Perugino: L'opera completa*, by Pietro Scarpellini," *The Burlington Magazine* 128 (1986): 750.

[22] Michael W. Kwakkelstein, "Perugino in Verrocchio's Workshop: The Transmission of an Antique Striding Stance," *Paragone* 55, no. 3 (2004): 47–61.

[23] Canuti, *Il Perugino*, 2:9. It should be noted that matriculation in the guild could take place anytime in one's career.

[24] Carmen Bambach, *Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop: Theory and Practice, 1300-1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 82–83. Perugino's time in Verrocchio's shop overlaps with Leonardo's there. Exactly when Leonardo entered Verrocchio's bottega is not known. The event is usually thought to have occurred around 1466-1469, when his father, Ser Piero di Antonio da Vinci, took the young artist to live in Florence. In 1472 the Compagnia e fraternita di San Luca, the main confraternity of painters in Florence that legally depended from the Arte dei medici, speziali e merciai, recorded in its "libro rosso" the terms of payment for Leonardo's dues, beginning in the month of June of that year. This would have marked the formal beginning of Leonardo's career as a professional painter, although he stayed with Verrocchio until at least 1476, probably as a collaborator.

making his foray into the Florentine artistic environment. Verrocchio emphasized drawing, and the master regularly offered his repertory of motifs, forms, and figures to the members of the shop to copy.[25] Motifs such as the hand type seen in Verrocchio's *Tobias and the Angel* (National Gallery, London), recur not only in the later works of the workshop but also in the independent works of pupils like Ghirlandaio, Leonardo, and Perugino.[26] Such repetition and reproduction is a testament to the profound influence of the master over his shop.[27] Perugino's debt to Verrocchio is not limited to the assimilation of prototypes. Under Verrocchio's tutelage, Perugino realized that drawings profoundly facilitate the production process and lead to the widespread transmission of the master's *invenzioni*. Furthermore, he gained invaluable insights into the operations of a large and active workshop. This was a formative period and immediately preceded his debut as an independent artist in Florence; subsequently, many of Verrocchio's workshop practices became hallmarks of Perugino's operations as well.

Like Verrocchio, Perugino employed a range of workshop subordinates and made his *invenzioni* readily available for study and for use by pupils, assistants, and collaborators. He learned to adjust constantly to the needs and demands of the multiple projects at hand. And perhaps most importantly, he maintained dual operations in Florence and Perugia by employing a

---

[25] Andrew Butterfield, *The Sculptures of Andrea del Verrocchio* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997), 195. Butterfield cites Verino.

[26] Tommaso Mozzati, "Produzioni in serie, derivazioni e modelli: Perugino e la bottega di Andrea del Verrocchio," in *Perugino: Il divin pittore*, ed. Vittoria Garibaldi (Cinisello Balsamo, Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 2004), 95–103. See Perugino's *Saint Sebastian and a Franciscan Saint* in Nantes and *Saint Hieronymus*, Hannover. The motif, the left hand with curved thumb, appears in reverse. They must have all worked from a stock drawing derived from Verrocchio's original. Perugino also employed drawings he made in the Verrocchio shop for his work in the Sistine chapel.

[27] David Alan Brown, *Leonardo da Vinci: Origins of a Genius* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998), 50, 188 n9.

practice that fully realized the vast potential of drawings.[28]

Perugino's Workshops and Activity

Perugino's name appears for the first time in the *Libro rosso* of the Compagnia di San Luca in June of 1472, after about two years in Verrocchio's shop.[29] Although this made him a recognized master painter, an independent commission is not documented until 1475.[30] He probably remained associated with the Verrocchio shop, like many young artists at the start of their careers, until he was awarded his first independent commission.

His first major project was for Pope Sixtus IV in 1479, and with the successful completion of the Sistine Chapel in 1482, Perugino's reputation was concretely established. He continued to obtain prominent projects throughout the 1480s and 1490s and consolidated his position as one of the leading painters in Italy. Notable Florentine commissions of these years that attest to Perugino's reputation include two projects for Lorenzo the Magnificent: the Palazzo della Signoria (never fulfilled) and the Villa lo Spedaletto (now destroyed). He continued to travel extensively to fulfill commissions, including a 1494 sojourn in Venice where he was contracted to decorate the Sala del Gran Consiglio of the Palazzo Ducale (also never fulfilled).[31]

---

[28] Verrocchio was outstandingly successful in maintaining an independent firm, which branched out into two studios: one in Florence and one in Venice. His prosperous Florentine studio was strikingly self-sufficient, and he remained the sole proprietor of his multifaceted studio.

[29] Canuti, *Il Perugino*, 2:117. Florence, Archivio di Stato, Accademia del disegno, no. 2, Libro rosso, Debitori e creditori e ricordi, segnato A, 1472-1520.

[30] Ibid., 120. The document records payment received for works in the council chamber of the Palazzo dei Priori in Perugia, now destroyed.

[31] The Venetian commission was never fulfilled. Susanna Biadene, ed., *Titian: Prince of Painters* (New York: Prestel, 1990), 404. Over twenty years later, Titian completed the

By 1496, he had returned to Perugia to decorate the Collegio del Cambio, one of his most important projects in the city.

The number of commissions Perugino took on across Italy is indicative of the high demand for his work.[32] In addition to the level of activity, Perugino's workshops in both Perugia and Florence also distinguish his enterprise.[33] Given his long periods of absence from Perugia and Florence for other commitments, it is remarkable that Perugino could maintain operations in both cities simultaneously. The costs associated with setting up and operating a workshop, including taxes and wages, would have been significant. Operating both shops simultaneously at full capacity would have been impossible for many. But his ability to consolidate and expand his operations according to the work at hand suited his constant travels for commissions and permitted him to retain a foothold in both cities.

Perugino's management of his workshops in Florence and Perugia reflects, above all, his pragmatism. He did not take on long-term apprentices, which was a lengthy and costly commitment, but rather retained a pool of pupils, assistants, and collaborators in each city and employed them only as needed. The flexibility of retaining a local workforce according to need gave him the ability to control the scale of his operations, which was critical to his ability to maintain dual operations over so many years.[34]

---

decoration for far less than 400 ducats, the amount Perugino was contracted to be paid. Although value may affect this comparison, it speaks to the great commercial success Perugino enjoyed.

[32] Prominent commissions include projects for the Duke of Milan, Isabella d'Este, Pope Sixtus IV, Pope Innocent VIII, Pope Julius II, and Lorenzo de' Medici.

[33] Arnold Victor Coonin, "New Documents Concerning Perugino's Workshop in Florence," *The Burlington Magazine* 141 (1999): 100. Perugino kept a permanent studio in Florence from 1487 to 1511. In 1501 he began renting long-term studio space in Perugia.

Details about the physical space of the workshop have come to light in recent years, and, according to the documents from 1487 to 1511, Perugino rented his workshop space in Florence from the Ghiberti family.[35] Records of financial accounting kept by the Ghiberti and published by Arnold Victor Coonin have confirmed that Perugino entered into a contract with the Ghiberti for lease of the space at twelve gold florins per month in 1487; the agreement lasted for twenty-four years until its termination on 10 April 1511.[36] In addition to confirming the exact dates that Perugino maintained a workshop in Florence, the accounting records have brought to light previously unknown particulars about the operation. Records listing people who delivered the rent on behalf of the absent master, for example, confirm the names of specific Florentine assistants and associates.[37] The records also confirm how frequently Perugino was absent from the city but managed to coordinate the various activities of the shop through assistants and associates.

The earliest record of the workshop in Perugia, in contrast, dates from much later. A contract was signed on 1 January 1501, for rental of space in the Palazzo Nuovo dell'Ospedale della Misericordia.[38] This could not have been Perugino's first workshop in Perugia, for he was much too active throughout the 1480s and 1490s to have operated without a physical space;

---

[34] The only exception to this pattern of workforce retention would be the decoration of the Sistine Chapel, for which he was the lead painter and project coordinator. For it, he retained independent masters as collaborators and for his own portion of the project he relied upon regular assistants like Andrea d'Assisi who traveled to Rome with him, as well as local hires.

[35] Coonin, "New Documents Concerning Perugino's Workshop in Florence," 100–104.

[36] Ibid., 103, 104. Perugino wrote Buonaccorso Ghiberti from Rome requesting that the space be made available to another.

[37] Ibid., 100.

[38] Canuti, *Il Perugino*, 2:302–304. See documents 541-548.

perhaps this contract merely documents the transfer of his operations to a new location or the renewal of an existing contract.

While the date of the contract might be interpreted as evidence of Perugino's shifting his attention from Florence to Perugia at the onset of the sixteenth century, conceivably under increasing pressure from Florence's changing artistic environment, there are no actual indications that his operations in Florence were waning or that he had any intentions of winding them down. He was in fact at the height of his success and had just been declared the most sought-after artist in all of Italy.[39] He had also recently purchased a second home in Florence, indicative of his intention to maintain his presence there, which he did for another decade, until 1511.[40] The 1501 contract therefore must have been for a renewal or relocation of a workshop already in operation and the overlap between the Florentine and Perugian workshops must have extended beyond the currently documented years of 1501 to 1511.

Perugino's Practice and Drawings

The available documents provide a better picture of Perugino's two workshops, but the exact dates and locations of workshop spaces in Perugia will remain somewhat uncertain unless additional documentary evidence becomes available. For the time being, the most abundant form of documentary evidence from the workshop is the drawings. Physical evidence of the daily activities of the workshop, the drawings have the potential to shed light upon how different projects were managed and to illuminate Perugino's practice and operations.

---

[39] See reference above, n15.

[40] Canuti, *Il Perugino*, 2:166–168. See documents 199-203. Perugino purchased the property in 1498.

Perugino was one of the most prolific artists of his time, but there are just seventy or so drawings currently attributed to the master.[41] The number may be explained partly by the fact that Perugino was rooted in Quattrocento practice and rarely drew as an end in itself. For Perugino, drawing was primarily a means for carefully preparing a painting. From the sketch to the final cartoon, each drawing type was applied to a specific constructive function in the artistic production process.

Like most draftsmen of his time, Perugino followed a procedure of preparation that began with a sketch (*schizzo* or *primo pensiero*) of the first idea. That was followed by detailed studies (*studio*) of parts of the composition such as a figure or element of the background or setting. Once all of the component parts were addressed, the fully developed composition was recorded in a *modello*,[42] ready to be used for the execution of the cartoon, which marked the final phase of the preparatory process.[43]

Perugino followed this basic sequence in his preparatory process, but his practice was also characterized by a consistent re-use of designs. Many fifteenth-century Florentine painters re-used designs, but Perugino's practice is distinguished by his realization of the full potential of drawings to achieve maximum productivity. Motifs and designs were not simply re-used; they were re-proportioned and re-contextualized through the innovative use of drawings to bring

---

[41] Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, "Perugino's Use of Drawing: Convention and Invention," in *Drawings Defined*, ed. Walter Strauss and Tracie Felker (New York: Abaris Books, 1987), 77. For comparison, Ferino-Pagden points out there are over 400 sheets from Raphael's twenty-year career.

[42] The problems associated with the use of the term *modello* are discussed below.

[43] Charles de Tolnay, *History and Technique of Old Master Drawings: A Handbook* (New York: Bittner, 1943), 19–27.

endless variety and diversity to his oeuvre. This practice was not only innovative but also constantly evolving and profoundly influential.

Preparatory Process and Drawing Types

Because Perugino's shop was one in which pupils, assistants, and collaborators played an integral role, his preparatory process cannot be fully reconstructed with his extant autograph drawings alone. However, there are a large number of workshop drawings that fill in the gaps. In conjunction with the master's original drawings, these workshop drawings were a fundamental part of the production process and together they illustrate the functions of drawing types and the full preparatory process.

The production process will be reconstructed first from drawings attributed to Perugino and will serve as the framework for the examination of workshop drawings in chapter three. The drawings that will be used to reconstruct the preparatory process are from different projects representing various phases but will be presented in succession, as if forming a sequence in the preparation of a single work.

Compositional Sketch

Drawings from the initial stage of the preparatory process, sketches, make up the smallest portion of Perugino's graphic oeuvre. One of his most descriptive compositional sketches is the *Adoration of the Magi* at the British Museum for his lost fresco (described by Vasari) in the cloister of the convent of San Giusto alle Mura in Florence (fig. 1.1). It is an exceptional example of his handling of pen and ink, a technique commonly used for this type of drawing.

Certain passages possess an almost abstract quality resulting from the swift and confident handling of the medium.

Complex, richly differentiated, and characteristic of his graphic style in the 1480s,[44] the composition appears to be fully worked out, each figure and its place within the composition firmly established and fully articulated. Unlike later artists like Raphael, who began with a quick notation of the compositional idea or *embrione*, Perugino's design appears to have been fully conceived prior to the execution of the sketch.

A slightly later compositional sketch illustrates Perugino's method of graphically conceiving of a design in a much more economical manner (fig. 1.2). Connected with the *Birth of the Virgin* from the predella of his altarpiece for Santa Maria Nuova at Fano (1497), the compositional sketch was uncovered on the *verso* of a well-known sheet at the Uffizi in 1982. The abstract and conceptualized manner seen in the sketch, Ferino-Pagden has successfully argued, is a result of the experiences Perugino gained from work in Rome[45] and corresponds closely with his graphic style of the 1490s.[46]

The sketch in the British Museum presents a more concrete picture of the intended composition and possesses a level of detail suitable for fresco. Perugino's graphic language

---

[44] Francis Russell, "Towards a Reassessment of Perugino's Lost Fresco of the 'Adoration of the Magi' at San Giusto alle Mura," *Burlington Magazine* 116 (1974): 648.

[45] Günter Passavant, "Review of *Umbrian Renaissance Drawings from Perugino to Raphael* by Sylvia Ferino-Pagden," *Kunstchronik* 36, no. 5 (May 1983): 217–227. The attribution of the drawings has been the subject of great debate. Passavant notes that the earliest secure drawings by Raphael, dating to the late 1490s, show an altogether different style, whereas the Uffizi sketch is comparable to Perugino's compositional study for an *Adoration of the Magi* at the British Museum from the late 1480s, further strengthening the argument for Perugino's authorship.

[46] Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, "Pintoricchio, Perugino or the Young Raphael?: A Problem of Connoisseurship," *The Burlington Magazine* 125 (1983): 87–88.

became more abstract and minimal for the simpler composition of the small-scale predella panel. The sketches not only reflect Perugino's evolving graphic style, but also his unique concern in each case for how size and format can determine the overall quality of the sketch and graphic handling.

Studies

The next phase of the preparatory process involved the execution of detail studies. The artist used detail studies to address particular components of a composition such as a figure in an unusual pose or an architectural or landscape detail. As Renaissance artists became increasingly concerned with representation of the human form, figure studies became a means of exploring anatomical correctness and were seen as vital to a realistic narrative.[47] Ranging in variety, from a single figure to figural groups, figure studies are, in fact, the most common type of drawing in Perugino's corpus of graphic works.

While the general pose of the figure was already indicated in the sketch, figural studies were used to secure the posture and movement of the figure. In the *Study for the Cumaean Sibyl* at the Uffizi, Perugino merges a classical pose with elegant movement using powerful, controlled lines and a figural type he would return to on numerous occasions (fig. 1.3).[48] In the *Study of a Woman*, also at the Uffizi, Perugino takes inspiration from the work of Verrocchio and ancient sculpture to articulate the vigorous movement of a figure striding forward (fig. 1.4).[49]

---

[47] Francis Ames-Lewis, *Drawing in Early Renaissance Italy* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981), 91–103.

[48] Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, *Disegni umbri del rinascimento, da Perugino a Raffaello*, Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe Degli Uffizi 58 (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1982), 52–4.

Figure studies could be produced from memory or from a three-dimensional model, but studies from life became increasingly common in the later Quattrocento workshop with the development of intellectual interests and the desire to produce a more credible pictorial illusion. Studies from live models were not the quickly rendered drawings more characteristic of the sixteenth century, but highly finished prototypes of great value in the workshop.

Perugino's nude study for the *Saint Sebastian* in Cleveland (fig. 1.5), for example, is a drawing in metalpoint, a medium that requires much more controlled handling and was preferred by Perugino for life studies. It exhibits the author's careful efforts to instill three-dimensional values into the figure in this unforgiving medium. Perugino's familiarity with human anatomy is certainly on display here, but it is given form with the soft musculature and elegant movement characteristic of his figures.

The figure recalls eleven different variations of Saint Sebastian in Perugino's oeuvre and was clearly a popular prototype in the workshop.[50] The outer contours of the figure show reinforcement, evidence of tracing and copying. The evidence of transfer and the recurrence of the figure reflect the treatment of the composition as an idealized form in the workshop. The perfected form is preserved through the drawing and would have constituted the shop stock on which later use was based. Reflecting a pattern- or modelbook approach to drawings, while embracing the practice of carrying out studies from the live model, Perugino bridges the artistic developments of his time with traditional practice to maximize the productivity of his shop.

---

[49] See Arnold Victor Coonin, "The Interaction of Painting and Sculpture in the Art of Perugino," *Artibus et Historiae* 24, no. 47 (2003): 103–120 and Michael W. Kwakkelstein, "Perugino in Verrocchio's Workshop: The Transmission of an Antique Striding Stance," *Paragone* 55, no. 3 (2004): 47–61.

[50] Joseph Antenucci Becherer, *Pietro Perugino: Master of the Italian Renaissance* (New York: Rizzoli, 1997), 149.

Perugino even ventured outside the workshop to produce drawings from life and nature. A landscape study from the Metropolitan Museum of Art provides a rare glimpse into his use of studies from nature for his highly admired landscape backgrounds (fig. 1.6).[51] Perugino started with a rough sketch in pen and ink on the *verso* and then developed the forms and atmospheric qualities in brush and wash on the *recto*.

Perugino habitually developed his inventions in a systematic manner, and he applied this approach to landscape as well. For figure studies executed in the studio, he would start with a study sketched in contemporary clothing and then develop the figure with the appropriate attributes. This systematic approach is applied to the study of nature as well, with the details of the landscape fully worked up back in the studio on the *recto*. Landscape backgrounds recalling the New York drawing can be seen in multiple works by Perugino, suggesting that a single study would have been readapted for the production of multiple works, much like the figure study of Saint Sebastian discussed above.[52]

Worksheets

In addition to sheets addressing a singular concern, Perugino also addressed multiple components of a composition in a worksheet format as well. A range of motives, figures and parts of figures are freely assembled across a sheet in the Kunstmuseum in Düsseldorf (fig. 1.7). Executed with delicate precision in metalpoint on prepared paper, they have the appearance of a random scattering of exploratory ideas. But each motif can be found in the British Museum's

---

[51] George Goldner, "New Drawings by Perugino and Pontormo," *The Burlington Magazine* 136 (1994): 365–366. Goldner has identified this study as the landscape in the *Vision of Saint Bernard* for the Nasi Chapel at the Cestello in Florence, now at the Alte Pinakothek in Munich.

[52] Becherer, *Pietro Perugino*, 194.

compositional sketch of the *Adoration of the Magi* and can be identified with a specific destination in the painting (fig. 1.1). Each motif addresses a specific concern, such as a downturned or foreshortened head. The worksheet is a testament to the extensive preparatory process that even a well-established composition like the *Adoration of the Magi* required.

Studies of Heads

A major concern of Perugino's in the preparatory process was the head, the expressive focus of each figure. Depending on the context and type of painting, Perugino executed studies of heads in a variety of mediums, ranging from metalpoint on prepared paper to broad renderings in charcoal or chalk.[53] In this step of the preparatory process, Perugino addressed the individuality and expressive qualities of his figures, some fraught with emotion (fig. 1.8), others conveying a sense of *angelica* and *dolce*, characteristics his figures were most identified with (fig. 1.9).[54] Perugino's renderings are in line with Alberti's emphasis on the function of emotional expression in narrative, which he describes as "movements of the mind."[55]

Studies of heads began with portrait studies drawn from the live model but were subsequently transformed into ideal types to be cast in various contexts. It is important to distinguish portrait studies after a model executed for functional purposes from drawings that are

---

[53] Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, "Perugino's Use of Drawing: Convention and Invention," in *Drawings Defined*, ed. Walter Strauss and Tracie Felker (New York: Abaris Books, 1987), 95.

[54] Michael Baxandall, *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth-Century Italy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 26.

[55] Leon Battista Alberti, *On Painting and On Sculpture: The Latin Texts of "De pictura" and "De statua,"* trans. Cecil Grayson (London: Phaidon, 1972), 83.

independent portraits.[56] A portrait study executed for functional purposes was a way of capturing a sense of individuality and expression from a model to be used as a vehicle of expression in the painting. Perugino began with a portrait study and the drawing was then systematically developed; the physical and emotional attributes of the model were perfected into Perugino's ideal types.

The *Head of a Man Wearing a Knotted Headscarf* at the British Museum (fig. 1.10), a drawing in black chalk for the head of Nicodemus in the lower right foreground of the Pitti *Lamentation* (fig. 1.11),[57] illustrates this methodical approach toward the ideal. The fluid and free rendering of the head in chalk is drawn over a stylus underdrawing visible to the naked eye, evidence that an earlier study of the head was transferred to the current sheet by means of stylus indentation. The stylus underdrawing does not correspond precisely to the chalk drawing on top,[58] indicating that Perugino was still incorporating changes to the stylus underdrawing as he was executing the later chalk drawing on top. The final form achieved through this systematic development would be used in the final cartoon.

---

[56] Francis Ames-Lewis and Joanne Wright, *Drawings in the Italian Renaissance Workshop* (London: Victoria & Albert Museum, 1983), 286. Until the early-sixteenth century in central Italy, portrait studies were functional.

[57] Oskar Fischel, *Die Zeichnungen der Umbrer* (Berlin: G. Grote, 1917), 119. The painting is dated 1495.

[58] Carmen Bambach, "A Substitute Cartoon for Raphael's 'Disputa'," *Master Drawings* 30, no. 1 (Spring 1992): 19; Catherine Monbeig-Goguel, "Le tracé invisible des dessins de Raphaël: Pour une problématique des techniques graphiques à la Renaissance," in *Studi su Raffaello: Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Studi*, ed. Micaela Sambucco Hamoud (Urbino: QuattroVenti, 1987), 377–389. The stylus markings are most visible along the neck on the right side of the sheet, in which the contour of the neck is moved several millimeters to the right of the stylus outline.

The cartoon, the final phase of the preparatory process, is discussed in greater detail below, but a cartoon fragment also connected to the Pitti *Lamentation* (fig. 1.11), the *Head of Joseph of Arimathea* at Christ Church Library, Oxford (fig. 1.12), illustrates the development of a cartoon from a head study and will be mentioned here briefly. The handling of the chalk medium and the treatment of the eyes are very similar to those of the London *Head of a Man Wearing a Knotted Headscarf* (fig. 1.10). Since the two drawings are preparatory for the same work, they can be seen as representing two different phases of a single preparatory process. The sequential connection between these two drawing types makes for a revealing comparison. The squaring beneath the chalk rendering of the head in the Oxford cartoon is indicative of its having been scaled up from a smaller drawing. The ideal form realized in a study like the London drawing was re-proportioned and integrated with the figure into the larger composition of the full-scale cartoon.[59]

Studies of heads like the London sheet (fig. 1.10) were integral to the production of cartoons (fig. 1.12). They were also integral to the production of more highly finished head studies produced to preserve the artist's *invenzione* for the execution phase and later use. The *Head of a Young Woman Wearing a Cap* at the British Museum (fig. 1.9) is a typical example rendered in metalpoint on prepared paper. Once the ideal was realized in a flexible medium like chalk (fig. 1.10), Perugino would have executed the "final draft" in metalpoint (fig. 1.9). In addition to preserving an ideal type, the subtle details of the highly finished drawing would have been an essential guide for the internal modeling of forms during the execution of the painting. Similar in quality and function to the highly finished metalpoint figural studies such as the study

---

[59] Ames-Lewis and Wright, *Drawings in the Italian Renaissance Workshop*, 298–300.

for *Saint Sebastian* (fig. 1.5), they reflect the "modelbook" mentality underlying aspects of Perugino's practice.

The function of this type of drawing of the head is reiterated by an additional example at the British Museum, the *Head of an Old Man with Long Beard* (fig. 1.13).[60] The leadpoint contours around head and neck are strong curves that define the limits of the head, and the delicate shading carefully applied in silverpoint defines the facial features. The modeling of the facial features is extremely sensitive, with subtle white shading heightening and articulating reflections across the eyebrows, nose and around the eyes. This refined drawing by Perugino not only captures the physiognomy of the face but also conveys a serene and contemplative mood similar to the *Head of a Young Woman Wearing a Cap* (fig. 1.9).[61] The drawing is connected to the figure of Saint James to the left of the Virgin in Perugino's altarpiece for the church of Sant'Agostino, Cremona, signed and dated 1494 (fig. 1.14). The Cremona altarpiece is derived from a similar composition at the Uffizi with the Madonna between John the Baptist and Saint Sebastian painted a year earlier (fig. 1.15). Compared to the version in Cremona, the Florence version is higher in quality, both in composition and in execution, clearly making it the prototype.[62]

That would make the *Head of an Old Man with Long Beard* a drawing by the master for a

---

[60] Leadpoint and silverpoint, some gum-based (?) glazes in shading, heightened with white, on ocher prepared paper. The drawing is on the remains of an old Vasari mount from his celebrated *Libro de' disegni*, and the artist-collector's hand is recognizable in the pen and wash figure of the reclining old man and in the pediment at the top.

[61] Ames-Lewis and Wright, *Drawings in the Italian Renaissance Workshop*, 314–317.

[62] There is a continuous landscape in the background with clear articulation of architectural forms and the two saints display the artist's virtuosity in handling figures. In the Cremona painting, the heavy drapery of the saints obscures the architectural setting and the grand open loggia is replaced with a nondescript backdrop.

derivative painting. We tend to associate more mechanical workshop drawings with derivative productions, but the London sheet is a finely executed drawing by the master. Such fine execution and deliberate modeling reflect the function of the drawings. Like *Head of a Young Woman Wearing a Cap* (fig. 1.9), these studies of heads in metalpoint on prepared paper served as guides in the execution of the painting. The subtle tonal gradations and highlights on the surface of the forms of the sheet would have been critical in the workshop, where Perugino often delegated portions of the production process when overburdened with orders. The original drawing ensured that his trademark qualities would be retained in all the range of products of his enterprise. It also attests to the fact that derivatives produced in the workshop were not slavish copies, but carefully reworked compositions developed according to a systematic production process in which the master was fully involved.

Modello

The next step in the preparatory process was the production of a relatively finished compositional drawing in which all of the individual studies corresponding to the component parts of the composition would be integrated into a composite whole. This final compositional drawing, often referred to as a *modello*, would be the basis for the subsequent production of the final full-scale cartoon.[63]

The current graphic oeuvre of Perugino does not include a compositional drawing with the degree of finish that can be categorized as a *modello.* This lacuna may be a simple fact of

---

[63] Carmen Bambach, "Review of *Michelangelo and His Drawings* by Michael Hirst," *The Art Bulletin* 72, no. 3 (1990): 493–498; Michael Hirst and Carmen Bambach, "A Note on the Word Modello," *The Art Bulletin* 74, no. 1 (1992): 172–173. The term is also used for demonstration or contract drawings, drawings produced for the purpose of delegating labor in the execution of a project, and a plastic model.

survival, or it may be a sequence of the production process that he frequently circumvented. This hypothesis is supported by the nature of his initial compositional sketches, which tend to be very thorough. For example, the compositional sketch for the *Adoration of the Magi* at the British Museum (fig. 1.1) is abbreviated, but each component of the composition is fully articulated and firmly fixed. Along with individual studies, the sketch might have been a sufficient guide for the purposes of cartoon production, in which case a *modello* would not have been necessary. A *modello* would have been carried out only if a patron required a demonstration or contract drawing, which Perugino is known to have provided on very few occasions.[64]

In addition, the nature of many of his works could also have allowed Perugino to bypass the production of a *modello*. For a simple symmetrical design like *St. Augustine with Members of the Confraternity of Perugia* at the Carnegie Museum of Art in Pittsburgh (fig. 1.18), in which the figures are mostly static and elaborate interweaving of figures was not involved, figural cartoons could be worked up from individual figure studies and arranged directly onto the panel without a *modello*.

The production of *modelli* appears have been a sequence of the preparatory process that, if possible, was omitted and it was this ability to implement a systematic production process with flexibility that made Perugino's workshops so highly productive. The drawing type appears to have made up a smaller portion of Perugino's graphic production, but certainly a composition like the Pitti *Lamentation* (fig. 1.11) for which a full-scale cartoon was executed (fig. 1.12),

---

[64] O'Malley, "Quality, Demand, and the Pressures of Reputation," 682; Michelle O'Malley, "The Business of Art: Contracts and Payment Documents for Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-Century Italian Altarpieces and Frescoes" (Ph.D. diss., Warburg Institute, University of London, 1994), 197.

would have required a *modello,* and the general character of a hypothetical *modello* can be gathered from Perugino's compositional drawings very close to the *modello* phase.

A study in Venice for Perugino's *Apollo and Marsyas* (fig. 1.17) for the finished work at the Louvre (fig. 1.16) is an example of a full-scale compositional drawing suggestive of a *modello*.[65] Portions of the drawing have contours that are incised and pricked, and the figures in the drawing correspond in size and position to the figures in the painting. The visual evidence therefore confirms that the Venice drawing was developed in subsequent sheets, each increasingly closer in character to a *modello*.[66] It tells us that the integration of component parts into a final compositional drawing did not take place on a single sheet that can be designated as the *modello* but in some cases through a series of compositional drawings. The final design transfer for the Louvre panel, we know, was carried out with a cartoon, since infrared reflectography shows extensive *spolvero* marks in the underdrawing of the painting. [67] For the production of such a small panel, there may not have been a clear distinction between the *modello* and the cartoon. This ambiguity again underscores the flexibility of Perugino's production process.

The Cartoon

Cartoons are usually associated with the production of fresco, for it is generally assumed that panel gave greater freedom to the painter and did not require a full cartoon. Perugino's

---

[65] It is not a true *modello,* for changes to the background and the elimination of the tree in the center of the composition have yet to be incorporated into the drawing.

[66] Bambach, *Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop*, 297.

[67] Ibid.

procedure, however, was one of meticulous planning and limited improvisation, and the use of the cartoon ensured the thorough transfer of the final design for both panel and fresco. The cartoon fragment in Oxford (fig. 1.12) for the Pitti *Lamentation* (fig. 1.11), briefly mentioned above, and a figural cartoon in Berlin (fig. 1.19) for a panel in Pittsburgh (fig. 1.18), are the only know cartoons by Perugino. The transfer process to panel is less rigorous than transfer to a wet plaster surface for fresco; therefore, cartoons used for panel production are bound to be less damaged and more likely to be preserved, which appears to be the case here. [68]

For the squared and pricked cartoon fragment in Oxford (fig. 1.12) for the figure of Joseph of Arimathea on the lower left of the Pitti *Lamentation* (fig. 1.11), Perugino employed his preferred medium for cartoons, charcoal and chalk. Rendered in a vigorous handling of the medium, it is a fragment of a full-scale cartoon on two sheets of paper joined together. Drapery belonging to the figure above and left of Joseph of Arimathea in the painting is visible on the left edge of the cartoon, indicating that it comes from a cartoon for the whole of the figure group of the painting.[69] For the *Lamentation,* in which the seamless integration of the figures is integral to the success of the painting, a full-scale figural cartoon was employed.

Simpler compositional arrangements like *Saint Augustine with Members of the Confraternity of Perugia* in Pittsburgh (fig. 1.18), on the other hand, could have been developed from individual figural cartoons like the cartoon for Saint Augustine in Berlin (fig. 1.19).[70] Drawn in pen and brush and brown wash over pencil, the drawing is graphically simplified and

---

[68] In general, very few Quattrocento cartoons survived the rigors of use.

[69] Ames-Lewis and Wright, *Drawings in the Italian Renaissance Workshop*, 298–300.

[70] Fischel, *Die Zeichnungen der Umbrer*, 122, 124; Bambach, *Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop*, 405 n49.

dry in appearance, making it difficult to attribute to the master with certainty, but it is generally given to Perugino for its close correspondence to the figure in the finished painting.[71]

In addition to the figural cartoon of St. Augustine, there are two figure studies in metalpoint, at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York (fig. 1.20) and at the Clark Art Institute in Massachusetts (fig. 1.21), that are also related to the painting and illuminate the compositional formulation out of figural cartoons. The kneeling figures representing members of the Confraternity mirror each other and flank the central figure of St. Augustine in the finished work.

The cartoon (fig. 1.19) and figure studies (figs. 1.20 and 1.21) represent two distinct phases of the production process related to the development of a figure. In the sheets in New York and Massachusetts, the poses of the figures are addressed through life studies, and he uses the margins of the sheet to further deliberate the heads of the figures. Although the Berlin cartoon is comparatively simplified and dry in appearance, it too must be derived from sensitive life studies in metalpoint similar to the New York and Massachusetts sheets. Similarly, from the two metalpoint studies, a full-scale figural cartoon for each of the figures must have been produced. All of the figural cartoons could then be arranged directly on the panel without the need for a full-scale cartoon of the entire scene. The painting and related drawings reflect Perugino's design process based on figural motifs, with an emphasis on integrating component parts into a singular whole formulaically. This ideally suited his concern for efficiency and productivity, as the motifs could be re-used in an endless array of combinations in later productions.

---

[71] Scarpellini, *Perugino*, 104.

They are also instructive with regard to the function of cartoons and repetition in the oeuvre of Perugino. The kneeling figures also appear in the *Madonna of the Confraternity of the Consolazione* (fig. 1.22) and such repetition has encouraged the assumption that Perugino re-used cartoons. But before assuming cartoon re-use based on recurring motifs, the preparatory process as indicated by the drawings should be taken into consideration.

According to the preparatory drawings related to the Pittsburgh panel (fig. 1.18), each component of the painting was considered separately in individual studies. The kneeling figures on the right and left (figs. 1.20 and 1.21), essentially mirror images of one another, were in fact addressed in separate sheets and would suggest the production of two separate cartoons. Perugino thus treated the kneeling figures as two independent components of a composition and did not use the same cartoon in reverse. The motif also appears in a new context in the *Madonna of the Confraternity of the Consolazione* but there is no indication of cartoon re-use. For simpler, formulaic compositions, Perugino addressed each component individually and employed separate figural cartoons to devise the composition. We can further conclude that for more complex designs, like the Pitti *Lamentation*, he worked up a full-scale cartoon for a seamless integration of figures to be transferred with accuracy onto the surface to be painted.

The reconstruction of Perugino's preparatory process from sketch to cartoon outlined above reflects a systematic use of drawings for a diverse range of projects, and the sequence of the above reconstruction reveals a codified yet flexible production process. Though Perugino's conception of design, like that of his Quattrocento contemporaries, was rooted in tradition, his rather formulaic modelbook approach was complemented by the innovative use of drawings that enhanced his productivity and ability to control the design process and ensure that the workshops' productions were consistent. Furthermore, Perugino's codified production process

was also a means of managing workshop operations, which will be considered in greater depth in chapters two and three.

Case Study: The Baptism of Christ

The innovation and efficiency of Perugino's design and production process come to full light in his treatment of the same subject matter at different points in his career. The following examines the Baptism of Christ, a subject matter Perugino addressed on eight different occasions. The various versions in fresco and panel, ranging in size from small predella panels to monumental frescoes, will be examined with regard to the general sequence of drawings that made up Perugino's production process as outlined above. This process constituted the specific methods and techniques employed by Perugino to make the most numbers of uses out of designs that had already proved successful and thus to achieve the highest level of productivity possible. Tracing a singular subject will show how Perugino used drawings to achieve his objectives while adhering to both traditional workshop practice and the evolving artistic standards of his time.

Perugino first addressed the Baptism of Christ in his celebrated fresco for the Sistine Chapel (1481-1482) (fig. 1.23). The composition, the most complex of Perugino's numerous treatments of the subject matter, is symmetrically organized around Christ, John the Baptist, and the Jordan River. It includes crowds in the foreground with contemporary portraits, scenes of Christ and John the Baptist preaching in the middleground, and a landscape with a view of Rome in the distant background.

Consistent with what we would expect from the previous demonstration of his ability to capitalize on a successful design, the Sistine *Baptism* became the prototype for versions in panel and fresco in various phases of his activity. For example, Perugino painted two versions of the

Baptism in the 1490s clearly inspired by the Sistine *Baptism*; the panels in Rouen (1495-1500) and Vienna (1498-1500) are, however, notably smaller in scale (figs. 1.24 and 1.25). Perugino then returned to a larger scale and the fresco medium in 1506-1507 for the version in the Oratorio della Nunziatella in Foligno (fig. 1.26). Two later derivatives include the panels in Città della Pieve (1510) and for Sant'Agostino (1512-1513), which are similar in format and scale to the fresco in Foligno (figs. 1.27 and 1.28). Perugino also painted two additional predella panels during the first decade of the sixteenth century, now in Chicago (1500-1505) and Perugia (1507) (figs. 1.29 and 1.30). The existence of eight related versions certainly raises questions about Perugino and originality, but repetition was actually a common practice in the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century workshop. Perugino's Baptisms, however, are not workshop copies, which were a distinct category of painting of their own. (Copying practices in the workshop are discussed in the next chapter.) The following analysis in the context of the production process offers insights into the relationship between the prototype and the derivative and into Perugino's approach to the process of design.

Since, as we have seen, Perugino's practice was often motivated by the desire for efficiency and productivity, he frequently readapted established compositions for less prominent paintings such as the predella panels of larger altarpieces. Of the three Baptisms for predella panels, the finest is for his San Pietro altarpiece (now Musée des Beaux Arts, Rouen), commissioned in 1495 (fig. 1.24). Working from the Sistine prototype in fresco (fig. 1.23), he scaled down and reworked the composition for the smaller predella.[72] The middleground is eliminated, the landscape is replaced with a more open, atmospheric version, and an even

---

[72] The altarpiece was dismantled in 1608 and the predella panels are now in the Musée des Beaux Arts, Rouen. Helen Howard and Scott Nethersole, "Two Copies of Perugino's 'Baptism of Christ'," *National Gallery Technical Bulletin* 31 (2010): 84.

distribution of ideal figural types replaces the wall of portraits in the foreground of the Sistine fresco. The Rouen composition is much less crowded, creating a sense of refined simplicity for the small predella format.

The years that separate the two works and their disparate medium, scale and handling are apparent in the finished paintings, but the connection between them is evident in the motives from the Sistine version that reappear in the Rouen panel. Most notably, the main episode, the figures of Christ and John the Baptist with John standing on the rock formation, is repeated almost exactly.[73] In the other six versions, Perugino eliminates the rock formation and the two figures stand on even ground directly in the river. The repetition of the main figural group strongly supports the link between the two versions but it is important to note that the motif of the figural group is re-used with the introduction of nuanced variations. While clearly working from the prototype, Perugino renders Saint John the Baptist leaning in ever so slightly, enhancing the sense of interaction between the two figures. Because subtle changes to the composition and figural groups are introduced here, the Rouen *Baptism* is not a simple reproduction of an earlier prototype but a more developed, reworked variation. The independent development of the Rouen composition is confirmed by infrared photography, which has revealed a precise underdrawing for the folds of the drapery, faces, hands and details of the landscape.[74] In other words, the revised composition was carefully worked out in great detail prior to execution, indicative of production based on a sequence of preparatory drawings separate from the prototype.[75]

---

[73] Scarpellini, *Perugino*, 93–91. Eusebio da San Giorgio and Giovanni di Franceso Ciambella are named as witnesses in the contract and are often suggested as the primary assistants on the project.

[74] Howard and Nethersole, "Two Copies of Perugino's 'Baptism of Christ'," 94 n35.

This preparatory process and the independent treatment of each version are indicated by a number of extant drawings related to the Baptisms that represent various phases of the preparatory sequence. While fragmentary, the drawings in proper context can be extremely illuminating in regard to the relationship between the seemingly repetitive versions of the Baptism.

A drawing from the earliest phase of the preparatory process of a Baptism is a compositional sketch at the National Gallery of Art in Washington (fig. 1.31). The sketch in pen and brown ink sets forth the fundamental components of the composition, the landscape setting and the surrounding figural groups, and is dominated by the central episode of the Baptism. While the figures of Christ and John the Baptist might be linked to a number of versions of the Baptism, the drawing has been traditionally seen as connected to the Rouen panel because of the surrounding figures. The standing observers and kneeling angels do make the sheet compositionally similar to the Rouen version, but it is difficult to overlook the more vertical orientation of the drawing compared to the painting. For more convincing evidence of the connection between the sheet and painting, we might look to the drawing and its place in the preparatory process.

The sheet exhibits quick handling of pen, brisk cross-hatching and sketchiness, which seem to indicate the preliminary nature of the sketch. Indeed, compared to a compositional sketch like the *Adoration of the Magi* at the British Museum (fig. 1.1), in which each component is fully integrated into the setting, the Washington sheet seems far less compositionally certain, as if still in development. All of the component parts drawn are present, but the author has yet to

---

[75] Ibid.

arrive at a full compositional resolution. A telling detail of the work in progress is the lack of proportional consistency between Christ and John the Baptist.

This preliminary sketch may be the link in the conversion process from fresco to a much smaller panel. From the prototype, the Sistine *Baptism*, a selection of component parts is brought together for integration and development into a new composition. The reinforced outlines found throughout the sheet and the sketch and pricking on the *verso* confirm that the sheet was exploratory and subsequently developed for preparatory purposes. The final design would have been transferred onto the panel and the underdrawing worked up prior to painting, as the infrared photo of the Rouen panel confirms.[76]

Despite the similarities and connection between the Sistine and Rouen versions, the production process for the later version was independent of the preparatory drawings for the prototype. By developing the Rouen panel independently, Perugino introduced changes and variations to the new design. Each time Perugino returned to the Baptism iconography, he achieved his characteristic monotonous perfection by employing idealized and recognizable motifs, but he re-presented them with subtle changes and variations, never resorting to the production of an exact replica.

Figural studies carried out subsequent to the compositional sketch reveal the development of motives, which Perugino consistently reutilized. Two extant figure studies for Christ and the Baptist in London and Oxford, both workshop figural studies, provide general insight into this phase of the preparatory process and the development of the figural group of the main episode that links the different versions. The *Study for a St John the Baptist* at the Ashmolean, Oxford (fig. 1.32) is drawn in chalk over preliminary stylus indentations on off-white paper and the

---

[76] Ibid.

Standing Man in an Attitude of Prayer corresponding to the Christ figure at the British Museum (fig. 1.33) is drawn in pen and brown ink, over black chalk.

Although the figures represented on both sheets are clearly related to Perugino's Baptisms, the attribution of both drawings has fluctuated between Perugino and Raphael.[77] There is certainly a Raphaelesque quality about the penwork over the chalk underdrawing of the London sheet, which has been long noted.[78] *Garzone* studies, assiduously carried out in the Perugino shop, became a lifelong practice of Raphael's, and his early ones are so similar in technique and handling to Perugino's that they are almost indistinguishable. Combined with the prevalence of Perugino's motifs in his early works, questions are raised about what Perugino drawings Raphael had at his disposal. In this case, the features of the two figure studies, their presumable place in the preparatory process, and their connections to Perugino's Baptisms strongly support an attribution to Perugino.

Both studies are a lively reflection of the preparatory activity in the workshop. It was quite common for a shop hand to serve as a model for a study, and in the Ashmolean sheet Perugino considers the pose and gesture of the figure as the model mimics the act of baptism. Rendered in black chalk, a medium preferred by Perugino for figural studies in his late period,

---

[77] Fischel, *Die Zeichnungen der Umbrer*, 155, cat. no. 92, fig. 158; Karl T. Parker, *Catalogue of the Collection of Drawings in the Ashmolean Museum: The Italian Schools* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1956), 2:19, cat. no. 28; Philip Pouncey and John Arthur Gere, *Italian Drawings in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum: Raphael and His Circle* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1962), cat. no. 53. The drawing was traditionally given to Raphael but Fischel identified it as a Perugino drawing from the first decade of the sixteenth century and Parker maintained Fischel's attribution and dating. At present, the Ashmolean Museum attributes the drawing to Perugino.

[78] For example, A. E. Popham, *Catalogue of Drawings in the Collection Formed by Sir Thomas Phillipps, Bart., F.R.S., Now in the Possession of His Grandson T. Fitzroy Phillipps Fenwick of Thirlestaine House, Cheltenham* (London: Privately printed, 1935), 91, no. 1.

the model is initially rendered in his contemporary work clothes. Perugino often added the attributes as final touches; here red chalk is used to superimpose the Baptist's garments on those of the model.[79]

At first glance, the British Museum sheet also appears to be a study from a live model, but whether a study is from a live or sculptural model[80] is not always clear. Moreover, the pen additions on the sheet make it difficult to interpret the drawing with certainty. Careful examination, however, reveals the faint indication of a plinth upon which the figure stands, suggesting a study based on a sculptural model. The drawing is typical of Perugino's carefully rendered nude studies, with carefully defined contours carried out after the more hastily rendered version in the compositional sketch (in reverse in the Washington sheet, fig. 1.31).

The London and Oxford drawings illustrate Perugino's use of figural studies from both live and sculptural models for the development of a figural type. Even as studies from life became increasingly common in both workshop practice and education, they never fully replaced the use of the sculptural or static model and remained indispensable tools in the workshop of Perugino and his contemporaries. Sculptures and sculptural models offered distinct advantages over the live model such as stillness in complex pose and multiple views.[81] Alberti makes

---

[79] The pose of the figure differs slightly from Perugino's Sistine John the Baptist and has been identified as the Baptist from a lost painting by Perugino a copy of which is at the Louvre (fig. 1. 34). This lost painting appears to be yet another derivative; similar life studies would have been executed for the Sistine prototype as well. See Dominique Thiébaut and Marie-Alice Debout, *Le Pérugin et l'école ombrienne* (Paris: Réunion des Musées Nationaux, 1979), 1–16.

[80] Sculptural or static models took the form of ancient and modern sculptures—works of art in their own right—and sculptural models—devices produced specifically for study (e.g., casts of sculptures, écorché models, and wooden jointed models called lay figures). Laurie Fusco, "The Use of Sculptural Models by Painters in Fifteenth-Century Italy," *The Art Bulletin* 64, no. 2 (June 1982): 175.

reference to the challenges of drawing living things and advocates sculptural models that remained fixed and stable and also allowed for the consideration of light, unlike live models.[82] Vasari likewise describes a life-size wooden model with movable joints that could be dressed in natural clothes with which the artist was "able to obtain excellent results, by keeping the figure in any position he desired, until he had completed his work," confirming the prevalence and utility of such apparatuses in the workshop.[83]

A combination of studies from live and sculptural models allowed Perugino to address the various challenges of a figural invention initially indicated in the sketch. In this phase of the preparatory process, studies such as that of the studio assistant mimicking the act of baptism (fig. 1.32) and the figure with hands drawn in a gesture of prayer (fig. 1.33) are developed into a figural motive. These studies, unlike preliminary compositional sketches such as fig. 1.31, which exhibit physical evidence of subsequent use for other drawings, are more finished and were preserved in the studio for later use, much like motifs in a modelbook. Though Vasari singled out Perugino for his re-use of his own inventions, it is precisely the idealized consistency that these motives gave to Perugino's paintings that was largely responsible for much of his productivity and commercial success; they characterize his reiterations of subjects throughout his career.

---

[81] Ibid., 176.

[82] Alberti, *On Painting and On Sculpture,* 58.

[83] Vasari, *Lives*, 1:679; Vasari, *Le vite*, 4:195–196. "Fra Bartolommeo always liked to have living objects before him when he was working; and in order to be able to draw draperies, armor and other suchlike things, he caused a life-size figure of wood to be made, which moved at the joints; and this he clothed with real draperies, from which he painted most beautiful things, being able to keep them in position as long as he pleased, until he had brought his work to perfection. This figure, worm-eaten and ruined as it is, is in our possession, treasured in memory of him."

Perugino produced yet another variation of the Baptism for the Oratory of Nunziatella, Foligno in 1507 (fig. 1.26). The horizontal format of the Sistine prototype maintained in the Rouen predella is here transformed into a vertical arrangement. For the more compressed space of this format, Perugino eliminates the standing figures and kneeling angels in the middleground of the Rouen predella and replaces them with standing angels in the foreground. Returning to the larger scale of the fresco medium, he adapts a simpler composition recalling the Rouen rather than the Sistine version. Thus, while the Foligno panel derives from the two earlier versions, it has been re-proportioned and reworked with changes appropriate to the project at hand, and is clearly not a product of straightforward cartoon re-use. Accordingly, the re-proportioned and revised version would have required an independent series of preparatory drawings including a new cartoon.

Another source for reconstructing the preparatory process is the physical evidence found on the surface of finished works. Physical examination of the fresco at Foligno additionally supports Perugino's independent preparatory process and his role in the execution of this established iconography, ruling out the common assumption that the workshop rather than the master himself was responsible for the execution of variations.

The most apparent evidence of mechanical transfer on painted surfaces is *spolvero* from pricking and pouncing, the most common method of cartoon transfer in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Another mode of design transfer was *calco*, from the verb *calcare*, meaning to trace or incise with a stylus, according to the use of the term in early treatises.[84] Although stylus tracings can be difficult to decipher on a fresco surface, the increasing availability of

---

[84] Carmen Bambach, "The Tradition of Pouncing Drawings in the Italian Renaissance Workshop: Innovation and Derivation" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1988), 30–40.

scientific analysis has drawn attention to this common but understudied practice.[85] While pricking and pouncing provided precision and exactitude, *calco* was quicker and better suited for setting out broader guidelines such as larger contours.[86] *Spolvero* and *calco* appear on mural surfaces together beginning about the mid-century, attesting to the combined use of these techniques throughout workshops across central Italy.[87] In a prolific workshop like Perugino's, the use of these time-saving methods became standard practice as speed of execution and productivity became increasingly critical to commercial success.

At Foligno, stylus incisions are visible in areas like the left leg and left arm of John the Baptist and also the lower part of the mantle of the angel on the far right.[88] The presence of *calco* is evidence of the master's participation in this re-presentation of the Baptism. Unlike the mechanical act of pricking and pouncing, in which there is little room for error and which can be easily delegated, *calco* required familiarity with the design and a greater level of skill. With

---

[85] Bambach, *Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop*, 333. "Photography in raking light, if an indispensable tool for documenting the actual presence of stylus incisions, considerably distorts – certainly flattens, at times even inverts the depth of – the physical evidence on the plaster surface."

[86] Ibid., 92. Bambach notes that Allori, for example, who relied almost exclusively on the *calco* technique, used *spolvero* in response to the demand from his patrons for an exact replica.

[87] Ugo Procacci, "The Technique of Mural Paintings and Their Detachment," in *The Great Age of Fresco: Giotto to Pontormo*, exh. cat. (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1968), 29; Bambach, *Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop*, 334. Bambach writes, "In the *spolvero* technique, little holes were pricked along the outlines of figures, and their silhouettes were then transferred to the wall by placing the cartoon against the wall and dusting it with a small bag of charcoal. By mid-century this technique had been replaced by that of tracing the outlines onto the wet plaster through the cartoon by means of a stylus."

[88] Carlo Giantomassi and Donatella Zari, "Il restauro del Battesimo di Pietro Perugino alla Nunziatella," in *Pietro Perugino e il Santuario della Nunziatella a Foligno*, ed. Giordana Benazzi (Foligno: Numeister, 2005), 149–151. Besides Foligno, *incisioni indiretti* by *calco* are visible in the lower part of the fresco of *Strength and Temperance with Six Classical Heroes* in the Cambio, Perugia.

calco, the incisions had to be executed quickly and precisely, as contours requiring correction in paint would be visible in the *intonaco*; this difficult process was therefore less likely to be delegated and more often executed by the master himself.[89] At Foligno, Perugino not only re-proportioned and re-contextualized the Baptism in an independent preparatory process based on established motifs, but he also engaged in the execution of the work as well.

While the drawings and paintings examined thus far indicate an independent sequence of preparatory drawings for each version of the Baptism, the limited number of original drawings by the master that remain extant requires the reconstruction of the preparatory process from a fragmentary group. But there are a number of drawings that supplement the sequence, in which specific parts of Perugino's Baptism iconography are recorded by pupils, assistants and collaborators. For instance, a sheet in Venice and another in New York depict two angels, one kneeling and the other standing upright, flanking the Baptism, modeled after the angels of the fresco at Foligno (figs. 1.37 and 1.38).[90] These drawings make up a category of workshop drawings after established compositions and will be considered in chapter 3 in the context of workshop drawings. In the following discussion, the drawings will be used to reconstruct the part of the preparatory sequence for which original drawings by Perugino do not survive.

The sheets in Venice and New York correspond closely to one another as well as to the Foligno fresco, with identical spacing of the angels and even correspondence between individual folds of drapery. But the graphic handling exhibited on each of the sheets clearly reveals two different hands working from a single prototype. Neither sheet exhibits any signs of having been

---

[89] Bambach, "The Tradition of Pouncing Drawings in the Italian Renaissance Workshop," 362–363.

[90] A third drawing is in Madrid. See Alfonso E. Pérez Sánchez, *Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando* (Madrid: Rivadeneyra, 1967), plate 7.

executed freehand, further supporting the conclusion that they were produced from an original drawing by the master with the assistance of a mechanical means of transfer rather than visually from the finished work.

While it is impossible to determine the exact drawing type from which the Venice and New York sheets derive, a cartoon of the figural group seems likely, since the fresco at Foligno exhibits evidence of cartoon transfer by *spolvero* and *calco*. And based on the similar qualities of the Venice and New York sheets, Perugino's original cartoon must have been similar in character as well. The final cartoon would have brought together all of the resolutions achieved in the preparatory process, and the meticulous handling seen in the sheets in Venice and New York reflects the fully worked-up drawing from which they derive. Though the original drawing does not survive, the workshop drawings preserve the figural groups, and the master's fully resolved ideal was made available for later use by the master himself and his workshop, as well as by followers and imitators.

Youth with Hands Folded in Prayer at the National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa (fig. 1.39)[91] similarly references an original drawing related to the same figural group by Perugino. Drawn in metalpoint on prepared paper, the sheet has been cut down on all four sides to the contours of the figure and the break in the drapery at the knees confirms that the figure was kneeling before it was cut down. As Ferino-Pagden has noted, the figure is related to the kneeling angel of the Venice and New York sheets and the Foligno fresco. In fact, ultra-violet photography has revealed an underdrawing of the figure in brush and ink underneath the cream-

---

[91] Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, "A Re-Examination of the 'Raphael' Drawing in the National Gallery of Canada," *Annual Bulletin (National Gallery of Canada)* 3 (1980): 57–66. Traditionally attributed to Raphael, it is here considered a drawing of Perugino's *invenzione* by a workshop hand.

colored preparation (fig. 1.40). The pose, outlines and drapery are identical to the drawing on top, but the figure in the underdrawing is winged, recalling the angel of the Venice and New York sheets. The drawing exhibits subtle use of the silverpoint and free handling characteristic of preparatory drawings rather than a copy after the painting. Thus it is evident that the kneeling angel motive was covered up and traced over in metalpoint for re-use in a new context. In other works, Perugino re-used the same basic model, transforming male saints into female ones and vice versa by altering the relevant attributes; similarly, in the Ottawa drawing, a figural motive is stripped of its attributes for further re-use. As the layered drawing illustrates, drawings preserving figural motives by the master and by the workshop were used not only for variations on the original design but also for re-presentation in new contexts.

The eight versions of the Baptism and related drawings by the master and the workshop demonstrate Perugino's independent treatment of each variation. Motivated by the goals of productivity and economy, Perugino's creative and production process capitalized on reproductive drawings. However, in the case of the Baptism, cartoons were never re-used. Rather, Perugino's process evolved with an emphasis on the notion of an ideal. Once an ideal was achieved, the figures and compositions became highly prized motives from which variants were produced. Each version that was re-scaled and re-contextualized was subjected to the workshop's systematic production process, resulting in an endless combination of variations anchored by a highly regarded and recognizable motive.

Perugino was in many ways an artist rooted in Quattrocento tradition; the formative experience of the Verrocchio shop also remained a large influence on his work and methods. At the same time, he was at the forefront of the innovative use of drawings, making maximum use of drawings in the workshop to achieve unprecedented productivity. The reconstruction of the

preparatory process and the emphasis on the function of drawings outlined above provides more subtle and differentiated understanding of Perugino's drawings and the systematic process that was fundamental to his workshop's operations. This chapter primarily focused on Perugino's practice and preparatory process and the Baptism case study highlighted Perugino's notion of repetition and variation. Rather than seeing the finished multiples of the Baptism as copies, the drawings confirm that Perugino treated each version as a re-presentation of an ideal. Inevitably, for the modern viewer, the multiple versions seen together lend a superficial validity to Vasari's criticism of the repetitive nature of Perugino's oeuvre. A certain repetition cannot be denied, but one should not impose Vasari's late-sixteenth-century standards and criticisms of such repetition as a lack of originality. The next chapter considers the significance of copying practices and the cultural value of copies unique to Perugino's time.

CHAPTER 2

COPYING PRACTICES AND MODES OF PRODUCTION

Copies, Variations, Replicas

The analysis in the preceding chapter of Perugino's treatments of the *Baptism* theme throughout his career focused on his practice and preparatory process, and the multiple versions seen together lend some validity to Vasari's criticism of the repetitive nature of Perugino's oeuvre. Repetition cannot be denied; but rather than imposing Vasari's late-sixteenth-century standards that associated repetition with a lack of originality, or dismissing repetition by attributing it to the participation of the workshop, this chapter considers the significance of copying practices and the cultural value of copies unique to Perugino's time.

Recognizing that copying practices were prevalent not only in Perugino's shop but across workshops of his time, this chapter will examine the function of such practices and how they affected Perugino's particular method of design and workshop organization. The production of copies, derivatives, and variations in Perugino's workshop was governed by a "system of grades" determined by economic, social, and cultural values. In addition, the physical production process in the workshop and its output were intricately linked to market demand. The first part of this chapter will consider the theoretical changes in the notion of imitation and the revision of artistic standards in the sixteenth century to which Perugino was subjected. In the second part, copies, variations, and replicas in Perugino's workshop and his modes of production will be examined alongside these changing ideas in order to illustrate how Perugino's practice bridged tradition and innovation in response to market demand.

Copying is more central to the artist's profession than we tend to recognize. It is therefore important to briefly survey the function and meaning of the word "copy" in the workshop and in the conception of works of art. Patricia Mainardi, in her examination of copying practices in the nineteenth-century studio, reflects upon how modernist attitudes have flattened "the many diverse meanings of *copy* in the artist's studio into the simple concept of *replica*."[1] Perugino's employment of a range of copying practices in his workshop falls victim to such reductionism. Vasari's objective of using Perugino as a transitional figure from the *seconda maniera* to the superior *terza maniera* was accomplished by his emphasis on Perugino's *imitazione*.[2] Furthermore, art historiography's general emphasis on originality has contributed to Perugino's currently lowered reputation.

An artist's training in the Renaissance revolved around the imitation of the style, color, and manner of a master, and thus copying was foundational in the workshop education. In the process of assuming the manner of the master, pupils assisted and participated in the different levels of activity in the workshop while developing the necessary skill set for art production. As operations expanded and the number of participants increased in larger workshops like Perugino's, aspects of the production process were increasingly assigned to able subordinates. Renaissance masters rarely executed replicas themselves; the task was usually delegated. As the production process became increasingly codified, the master became associated with *disegno* and *invenzione* while the workshop apprentices and associates were associated with execution; this division of labor among various artists resulted in different grades of production from the same

[1] Patricia Mainardi, "Copies, Variations, Replicas: Nineteenth-Century Studio Practice," *Visual Resources* 15, no. 2 (1999): 135.

[2] See below.

shop. The presumed amount of direct participation by the master himself became intimately associated with the measure of originality in modern connoisseurship

Unlike the emphasis on originality in the visual arts, Mainardi points to the fact that in performance, opening night is not assumed to be qualitatively better than later performances.[3] In fact, subsequent performances often improve through greater experience and familiarity with the material. If this model is applied to Renaissance painting, repetitions that make reference to an earlier version of the same theme, but containing variation or change, become distinct from the original. Because the artist is at liberty to introduce such variation in a repetition—unlike in a replica—the repetition is equivalent to an acceptable "performance" and must be judged on its own merits. While the workshop *replica* lacks what Walter Benjamin refers to as the "aura" of a work of art, the creative freedom with which the master carries out a *repetition* elevates it in terms of uniqueness.[4]

According to Mainardi's performance model, Perugino's repetitions were opportunities for the master to return to the previous design and further pursue an ideal; as such, each "performance" should be seen as independent of the predecessor. But this is not the criterion by which the repetition in Perugino's oeuvre is judged today.[5] Benjamin noted that the phenomenon of mechanical reproduction introduces a standard of exactitude and acts to

---

[3] Mainardi, "Copies, Variations, Replicas," 135.

[4] Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," in *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt, trans. Harry Zohn (New York: Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group, 1968), 219–253.

[5] Perugino scholars generally assume repetitions are based on cartoon re-use despite the lack of physical evidence. See below, *Repetition and the Question of Cartoon Re-use.*

democratize visual culture.[6] In the fifteenth century, such mechanical reproduction occurred with the realization of drawing's full potential and other mechanical means of production, such as pricking and pouncing.[7] Across cultures and across time periods, the rise of mechanical reproduction leads to a shift from the performance model to the industrial production model, where priority is given to the "original."[8] Such democratization might increase accessibility, but first manifestations become associated with innovation and increased value. Despite Perugino's own expectation that repetitions in his oeuvre would be evaluated independently and not in the context of an "original," his repetitions are rarely seen in this light today.

The Market for Copies

The production of copies, derivatives, and variations was widespread throughout Italian workshops of the Quattrocento, and the grades of workshop production are a reflection of the range in market demand.[9] The open market for replicas was particularly active in Perugino's time and this particular segment of the market and Renaissance standards regarding copies will

---

[6] Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," 219–253.

[7] Tools and techniques of reproduction in Perugino's workshop are addressed in chapter three. See also, Megan Holmes, "Copying Practices and Marketing Strategies in a Fifteenth-Century Florentine Painter's Workshop," in *Artistic Exchange and Cultural Translation in the Italian Renaissance City*, ed. Stephen J. Campbell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 39. The workshop of The Lippi and Pesellino Imitator produced over 160 "copies" after Fra Filippo Lippi and Francesco Pesellino. The increase in demand for replicas and repetitions corresponds also to the development of the Renaissance print; the reproductive print in Raphael's workshop is discussed in chapter 5.

[8] See for example, Lothar Ledderose, *Ten Thousand Things: Module and Mass Production in Chinese Art* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000); Mainardi, "Copies, Variations, Replicas."

[9] Holmes, "Copying Practices and Marketing Strategies," 38–74.

be mentioned here briefly. The market for copies was substantial enough that the transformation of devotional paintings into a readily available commodity was supplemented by the enterprise of secondary workshops.[10] Copies made by secondary workshops from cartoons supplied by primary workshops met the increasing demand for copies that primary workshops left unmet. Megan Holmes has identified 160 paintings by the secondary workshop of the so-called "Lippi and Pesellino Imitators" dating between the 1450s and the mid-1490s, all based on 64 cartoon-generated motives from the paintings of Lippi and Pesellino.[11] Though the labor structure employed in specific secondary workshops remains unclear, they appear to have been entirely dependent on a privileged and exclusive relationship with primary workshops. Their activity attests to the cultural value associated even with copies and replicas somewhat removed from the original master's immediate realm.

An example of how Renaissance standards regarding copies differed from our modern notions is contained in the story that Vasari tells of how Federico II Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua, while passing through Florence on his way to visit Pope Clement VII in Rome, saw Raphael's portrait of Pope Leo X.[12] When he arrived in Rome, and requested it from Clement as a gift. Clement ordered the painting be sent to Mantua, but its owner, Ottaviano de' Medici, was

---

[10] Jeryldene Wood, "The Early Paintings of Perugino" (Ph.D. diss., University of Virginia, 1985), 179.

[11] These include close copies of notable paintings by Lippi and mass-produced Madonna panels based on compositions by Lippi and Pesellino. Holmes in her study illustrates several examples of original paintings by Lippi along with reproductions by the Lippi and Pesellino Imitator and based on juxtapositions of tracings she has been able to obtain of several of the pairs, concludes that the cartoons derived from the figures in Lippi's original paintings were used for the reproduction.

[12] *Portrait of Pope Leo X with Cardinals Giulio de' Medici and Luigi de' Rossi,* Galleria Palatina, Palazzo Pitti, Florence.

unwilling to part with it. He had Andrea del Sarto paint an exact copy,[13] which he passed off to the Duke as the original. The copy was so faithful that even Giulio Romano, who collaborated on the original, was completely fooled. When Vasari, years later, convinced him that it was copy by del Sarto, Giulio is said to have replied, "I value it no less than if it were by the hand of Raffaello—nay, even more, for it is something out of the course of nature that a man of excellence should imitate the manner of another so well, and should make a copy so like."[14] If the standards of originality and individualism to which modernity has subjected the art of Perugino were applied here, del Sarto's "amazing feat" would be dismissed as a mere reproduction. Vasari's account underscores again the need to reconsider copies, derivatives, and variants of the Renaissance in their proper context.

The Theory of "Imitazione"

The Renaissance understanding of imitation has its roots in the discussions of the literary arts in ancient Greece that informed much sixteenth-century writing on art.[15] Vincenzo Danti's sixteenth-century treatise, *Il primo libro del trattato delle perfette proporzioni* (1567), describes two distinct forms of imitation.[16] *Ritrarre* is defined as a mode of imitating which results in

---

[13] *Portrait of Pope Leo X with Cardinals Giulio de' Medici and Luigi de' Rossi*, after Raphael, by Andrea del Sarto, Museo e Gallerie Nazionali di Capodimonte, Naples.

[14] Giorgio Vasari, *Lives of the Painters, Sculptors and Architects*, ed. David Ekserdjian, trans. Gaston du C. de Vere (New York: Knopf, 1996), 1:843–845; Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori ed architettori* (Florence, 1568), ed. Gaetano Milanesi (Florence: Sansoni, 1906), 5:42–43.

[15] For example, Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, trans. Harold Edgeworth Butler (London: Heinemann, 1920).

making "something exactly as another thing is seen to be," in other words, to produce a copy.[17] The second and more advanced mode of imitation is *imitare*. Danti defines *imitare* as representing things as they are meant to be, without flaws or imperfections. *Ritrarre*, the copying of nature and works of art by ancients and modern masters, was fundamental to the education of the Renaissance artist and is recommended by earlier theorists like Cennini and Alberti. *Imitare* is a more refined form of representation, "nature perfected by art," and a Renaissance "master of the arts of design" must be able to give form to this ideal.

There is a vast array of modern writings on the theory and practice of imitation in Renaissance literature. Rensselaer Lee, for example, has discussed the practice of literal and ideal imitation in Renaissance literature and art in terms implicitly recalling Danti's *ritrarre* and *imitare*.[18] The literary scholar G. W. Pigman III classifies imitation in Renaissance literature in three forms: *following*, *imitation,* and *emulation*.[19] *Following* is a non-transformative form of imitation that parallels Danti's *ritrarre* and Lee's literal imitation. Pigman's *imitation* is replication with the intent to equal the model but is distinguished from *following* by the presence of differences as well as resemblances. *Emulation* is a critical reflection on the model and an attempt to surpass the source, recalling Danti's *imitare* and Lee's ideal imitation.

---

[16] On Danti, see Paola Barocchi, ed., *Trattati d'arte del Cinquecento fra Manierismo e Controriforma* (Bari: Laterza, 1960), 206–269.

[17] David Summers, *Michelangelo and the Language of Art* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981), 279.

[18] Rensselaer Wright Lee, *Ut Pictura Poesis: The Humanistic Theory of Painting* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1967), 9–16.

[19] G. W. Pigman, III, "Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance," *Renaissance Quarterly* 33, no. 1 (April 1980): 32.

The theory of *imitazione* even resonates with the standards of Renaissance courtly behavior. In *Il libro del cortegiano* (1528), Baldassare Castiglione recommends self-fashioning with *ritrarre* in order to develop a unique courtly *maniera*. First, an individual should follow one source, making every effort to resemble and transform himself into his model; only after the individual has equaled his model can he creatively fashion his own ideal self-image.[20]

Vasari also recognized the importance of copying practices, writing, "Draughtsmanship (*disegno)* was the imitation (*imitazione*) of the most beautiful parts of nature in all figures, whether in sculpture or in painting; and for this it was necessary to have a hand and a brain able to reproduce with absolute accuracy and precision, on a level surface… everything that the eye sees."[21] The practice of exact replication Vasari describes, the depiction of nature as is (*ritrarre*), he associates with the *seconda maniera*. In his preface to the second part of his *Lives*, he characterizes the advancements of the *seconda maniera* as seeking "to imitate that which they saw in nature and no more."[22] What the *seconda maniera* lacked would be realized in the *terza maniera* with the highest form of *imitazione* and a greater consciousness of the ideal.

Vasari's distinction is linked to his general premise that the *terza maniera* was superior to the *seconda maniera.* He underscored his position in his description of Raphael's early years. He writes, "Raffaello, studying the manner of Pietro, imitated it in every respect so closely, that

---

[20] Baldassare Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier*, ed. Daniel Javitch, trans. Charles Southward Singleton (New York: Norton, 2002), 42–43. Castiglione writes, "When he feels that he has made some progress, it is very profitable to observe different men of that profession; and, conducting himself with that good judgment which must always be his guide, go about choosing now this thing from one and that from another. And even as in green meadows that bee flits about among the grasses robbing the flowers, so our courtier must steal this grace from those who seem to have it, taking from each the part that seems most worthy of praise."

[21] Vasari, *Lives*, 1:617; Vasari, *Le vite*, 4:7–8.

[22] Vasari, *Lives*, 1:254; Vasari, *Le vite*, 2:106.

his copies could not be distinguished from his master's originals, and it was not possible to see any clear difference between his works and Pietro's."[23] Raphael mastered the practice of *ritrarre* and assumed the manner of his master so completely that "if his name were not written upon it, no one would believe it to be a work by Raffaello, but rather by Pietro."[24] The precocious Raphael then fashioned his own *maniera* rooted in *imitare,* or correcting or perfecting the source: "One may recognize the excellence of Raffaello increasing and growing in refinement, and surpassing the manner of Pietro."[25]

According to these sixteenth-century notions about *imitazione,* copying practices were fundamental to the training of the Renaissance artist and provided artists with the ability to move beyond *ritrarre* into the creative act of *imitare*. The ability to copy (*ritrarre*) accurately from nature and works of art by ancient and modern masters in order to perfect them was essential to the creative process. Raphael's ability to recognize beauty and select aspects with which to formulate a composite ideal allowed him to surpass the model and achieve a level of perfection not found in reality or in the original.

These notions about *imitazione* also closely parallel Vasari's narrative construct emphasizing Perugino's place in the *seconda maniera* and Raphael's in the *terza maniera*. Raphael's practice, characterized by *imitare,* is used by Vasari to criticize Perugino's repetition based on *ritrarre,* and the once-prized ability of equaling nature is overshadowed by the ability to give form to an ideal above and beyond nature.

---

[23] Vasari, *Lives*, 1:711; Vasari, *Le vite*, 4:317.

[24] Vasari, *Lives*, 1:712; Vasari, *Le vite*, 4:318.

[25] Vasari, *Lives*, 1:712; Vasari, *Le vite*, 4:318–319.

Keeping in mind this changing notion of *imitazione* that subsequently relegated Perugino to the *seconda maniera*, the remainder of this chapter considers the repetition in his work by examining the copying practices and other modes of production in his workshop and addressing the value uniquely associated with repetitions.

Repetition and the Question of Cartoon Re-use

Perugino accepted well over two hundred commissions during his career, and such productivity has often been misconstrued as an uninventive mass-production of art. The vast workshop output was a result of Perugino's transformation of the traditional workshop model into a highly organized artistic enterprise, and the range of products produced by the workshop was governed by a complex system of values (social, economic, and cultural). The output of repetitions in particular was a carefully controlled process managed by the master himself, and Perugino exercised great control and discernment.

Contrary to Vasari's characterization of Perugino as driven by greed and monetary gain, Perugino rarely engaged in the production of exact replicas. According to Vasari, Francesco del Pugliese was so impressed with Perugino's *Lamentation* for S. Chiara (fig. 1.11) that he offered three times the cost for the original and agreed to buy the church a copy from the master's own hand. Perugino refused the offer, stating that he did not think he could equal the original, which is understandable since the production of a copy is in fact more restrictive, and a copy is bound to lack the freedom and spirit of an original.[26] Pugliese's offer and Perugino's refusal illuminate several things about the market for copies. First, Pugliese did not commission a copy for himself but pursued the original, which indicates that there was a greater value associated with the

---

[26] Vasari, *Le vite*, 3:569–570.

original and clear monetary values were assigned to both the original and the copy. It is not that the Renaissance consumer was unconscious of the notion of the original, but rather that copies were also acceptable on their own terms. Second, Perugino's excuse for refusing the offer makes reference to a measure of quality, which would not have been a concern if producing a copy were, for example, a matter of simply reusing an existing cartoon. In other words, the production of copies and repetitions was far from an assembly-line mass production of art and was governed by a complex market system.

Nevertheless, repetition in the oeuvre of Perugino has been emphasized since the time of Vasari and to explain the recurrence of motifs and designs, a variety of theories have been advanced, including the use of a pattern- or modelbook in the workshop and the re-use of cartoons.[27] Physical evidence to support either theory, however, remains elusive. While the employment of preparatory drawings in Perugino's practice reflects a modelbook mentality, there is no record of or reference to a book of drawings in the workshop. As for the re-use of cartoons, there are just two drawings in Perugino's graphic oeuvre that can be classified as a cartoon and neither exhibits evidence of re-use. Though cartoon re-use is generally assumed with Perugino, concrete physical evidence, in the form of an extant cartoon and more than one finished work exhibiting transfer from that single cartoon, does not exist.

The repetitive nature of many of Perugino's works has nevertheless encouraged the notion that Perugino routinely re-used cartoons. In the absence of physical evidence, this theory of re-use has been advanced by suggesting alternative methods of reproduction. Rudolf Hiller von Gaertringen, for instance, has meticulously traced the outlines of recurring motifs in finished

---

[27] Alessandro Nova, "Salviati, Vasari, and the Reuse of Drawings in Their Working Practice," *Master Drawings* 30, no. 1 (1992): 95–98; Pietro Scarpellini, *Perugino* (Milan: Electa, 1991), 38.

paintings, thereby "reconstructing" the cartoon and interpreting correspondence between tracings as proof of production based on the re-use of a single cartoon.[28] Reconstructing cartoons based on tracings, in theory, gives physical form to the lost drawings, offering fresh insight into the employment of this method of production, but this methodology is based fundamentally on observation of repetition rather than physical evidence of a cartoon as the source of repetition.

In instances in which the physical evidence, the cartoon, has not survived and cartoon re-use is suspected, the underdrawings of the finished works often reveal critical data regarding the question of re-use. The underdrawing represents a unique phase in the production process; it is the culmination of a design process based on a series of preparatory drawings and marks the transition from the design to the execution phase. We generally assume that this transition occurred with the transfer of the final design by means of the cartoon. However, very few cartoons from the period have survived,[29] and in light of the scarcity of Quattrocento cartoons, the ability to reconstruct lost cartoons would have invaluable effects for the study of Renaissance practice. But tracings alone cannot be seen as true reconstructions of lost cartoons unless they are supplemented by physical evidence. For example, if in fact an underdrawing had been developed from a cartoon, in theory it should exhibit marks of transfer, such as *spolvero* or stylus indentations.

Images of underdrawings are obtained using infrared reflectography (IRR), and IRR images are the primary source for deciphering cartoon use.[30] Unfortunately, only a limited

---

[28] Rudolf Hiller von Gaertringen, *Raffaels Lernerfahrung in der Werkstatt Peruginos: Kartonverwendung und Motivübernahme im Wandel* (Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1999).

[29] Carmen Bambach, *Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop: Theory and Practice, 1300-1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 245.

portion of Perugino's oeuvre has undergone scientific analysis and any conclusions about cartoon use must be based on the available sample data. Though statistically limited, the emerging data in conjunction with extant preparatory drawings are illuminating new aspects of Perugino's practice that may clarify long-established assumptions about the master's practice and repetition, including the re-use of cartoons.

Before examining the scientific data, it is important to note that cartoon re-use was a common practice in the Renaissance workshop and most likely had a role in Perugino's practice. However, Vasari's characterization of Perugino and subsequent scholarship have unfairly exaggerated his dependence on the technique. Cartoons were one type of preparatory drawing within a full range of drawing types, devices, and methods employed in different combinations according to the demands of the particular project at hand. Perugino employed a highly systematic but variable preparatory process that did not always terminate with the transfer of the final design via the cartoon, so other modes of production besides cartoon re-use must be taken into consideration to account for recurring motives and repetitive designs.[31]

A panel painting by Perugino for which cartoon re-use has been long assumed is the *Deposition* for the SS. Annunziata in Florence (fig. 2.1), the very painting, according to Vasari, that transformed Perugino's standing in Florence. At the unveiling of the altarpiece, a younger generation of artists harshly criticized Perugino precisely for his re-use of figures. Based on visual observation alone, it seems reasonable to assume that the familiar figures of the

---

[30] For overview of underdrawings see David Bomford, ed., *Art in the Making: Underdrawings in Renaissance Paintings* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002).

[31] Similarly, reflectograms of underdrawings alone cannot absolutely identify or rule out cartoon use and must be interpreted with caution. Rudolf Hiller von Gaertringen, "The Practice of Erasing 'Spolvero' Dots in Italian Renaissance Panel Paintings: A Hypothesis," in *Le dessin sous-jacent et la technologie dans la peinture*, ed. Roger van Schoute and Hélène Verougstraete (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 196–206.

Deposition must result from cartoon re-use.[32] But while it serves as Vasari's primary example of Perugino's indolence, technical analysis has shown that Perugino's design process and method of production were not based on the recycling of cartoons. IRR images of the painting have revealed no traces of cartoon transfer. Further casting doubt on the use of a cartoon is the freely executed underdrawing exhibiting extensive *pentimenti* rather than the rigid lines of an underdrawing derived from a cartoon.[33] If stock cartoons were hastily re-used and the objective was to complete the work as quickly as possible, such an extensive underdrawing would not have been developed freehand, directly on the panel surface.

Perugino's cartoon re-use was actually very limited, even for the components of his design ideally suited for the re-employment of existing cartoons. For example, the facility of reversing cartoons was ideal for symmetrical motifs and bilaterally symmetrical compositions.[34] In the interest of economy the artist could fill in the details of one side of a symmetrical motif, leaving to the assistant the reversal of the design for completion. In seemingly unfinished drawings, we see artists from Leonardo to Giulio Romano executing half of a symmetrical design and using mechanical means for the other half or delegating the execution of the other half to assistants.[35] In addition to being a time-saving shorthand, simply reversing a cartoon to

---

[32] Hiller von Gaertringen, *Raffaels Lernerfahrung in der Werkstatt Peruginos*, 170–172.

[33] Roberto Bellucci and Cecilia Frosinini, "The Myth of Cartoon Re-use in Perugino's Underdrawing: Technical Investigations," in *The Painting Technique of Pietro Vannucci Called Il Perugino: Proceedings of the LabS TECH*, Kermesquaderni (Florence: Nardini, 2004), 72. See figure 2, detail of infrared image.

[34] David Summers, "Figure come fratelli: A Transformation of Symmetry in Renaissance Painting," *Art Quarterly* 1 (1977): 59–60.

[35] This practice made particular sense for intricate symmetrical designs such as Leonardo's anatomical drawings or Giulio's small-scale decorative objects in metals and other materials.

the other side of a central axis was also a way in which variety could be achieved in a symmetrical composition. By turning over a cartoon, the figure is turned one-hundred-eighty degrees and the outlines in reverse can be re-used within the same work.[36] Perugino's symmetrically arranged angels are a recurring example in his oeuvre, but, according to the technical examination of these symmetrically arranged motifs, he appears to have rarely resorted to this technique. The angels of the upper half of the Monteripido Altarpiece (fig. 2.2), for instance, are mirror images of each other, so using the same figural cartoon in reverse would have been an understandable and common time-saving device to employ. However, infrared images of the angels could not be superimposed, even when the angulations were changed, ruling out Perugino's use of a single cartoon and suggesting independent treatment of each angel directly on the panel surface.[37]

In contrast, the underdrawings for a similar pair of angels in the *Adoration of Christ*, Perugia (fig. 2.3) exhibits faint *spolvero*, confirming execution based on cartoon transfer.[38] However, Roberto Bellucci and Cecilia Frosinini found that the infrared images, like those of the Monteripido angels, could not be superimposed. Cartoon use is confirmed by the *spolvero*, but areas of difference between the outlines of the angels again corroborate the separate treatment of

---

[36] Laurie Fusco, "The Use of Sculptural Models by Painters in Fifteenth-Century Italy," *The Art Bulletin* 64, no. 2 (1982): 177–178. This technique was used in ancient times, the Middle Ages and throughout the Quattrocento. See fig. 11, Villard de Honnecourt, *Sketchbook* (detail), ca. 1235, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.

[37] Bellucci and Frosinini, "The Myth of Cartoon Re-use," 72–73. See figure 7, superimposition of the tracings of the infrared images after mirroring. See also chapter three on *patrono*, another method used for transferring an image onto the final support, which can easily be mistaken for cartoon use.

[38] Ibid., 73.

the similar motifs.[39] Careful pouncing marks visible in passages of the underdrawing that distinguish one figure from the other (namely the gesture of prayer of the angel on the left and the crossed arms of the angel on the right) confirm the use of two separate cartoons.[40] Furthermore, the two angels could not have been developed from the same cartoon with changes introduced in the underdrawing, since the areas of difference are clearly based on two separate cartoon transfers. As this example shows, Perugino lavished great care on the development of independent cartoons, even for minor elements of paintings for which cartoon re-use would have been acceptable, if not expected.[41]

Vasari's biggest contention with Perugino was not the repetition of minor elements, but the recasting of figures throughout Perugino's oeuvre. His Archangel Michael, first seen in his Certosa di Pavia Altarpiece (fig. 2.4), appears again in his Vallombrosa Altarpiece (fig. 2.6), not reinvented but simply as Archangel Michael once again. In the context of technical findings, however, the method with which the later version was produced actually proves to be more independent of the earlier version than generally assumed.

A related preparatory drawing at Windsor (fig. 2.5) for the Archangel Michael from the Certosa Altarpiece suggests the employment of a traditional sequence of preparatory drawings for the preparation of the figural *invenzione*, presumably terminating with the production of a figural cartoon. However, no indication of a figural cartoon of Saint Michael having existed is

---

[39] Ibid., 76.

[40] Ibid.

[41] For additional example, see also Hiller von Gaertringen, *Raffaels Lernerfahrung in der Werkstatt Peruginos*, 144 figs. 85 a-c. Additional examples with traces of *spolvero* include *Battle between Chastity and Love* (Louvre inv. 722) and *Apollo and Marsyas* (Louvre inv. No. R.F. 370).

available; no detectable marks of transfer, or even an underdrawing, were found on the panel under IRR.[42] The *invenzione* must have been considered valuable in the workshop and recorded for later use, for the figure is seen shortly thereafter in the Vallombrosa Altarpiece (fig. 2.6).[43]

IRR of the Vallombrosa panel, in contrast, has revealed an underdrawing of faint and thin lines for Saint Michael drawn freehand with extensive *pentimenti* and no traces of transfer.[44] Thus it seems, though the later Vallombrosa Saint Michael clearly derives from the Certosa Saint Michael, that stock drawings, not a prototype cartoon, were the source of the Vallombrosa version. The visual similarities between the two figures that lack any physical evidence of cartoon use strongly support a modelbook approach to using stock drawings to showcase an ideal rather than the more economical re-use of cartoons.

The figure makes a third appearance consistent in scale with the Vallombrosa Saint Michael, now in the guise of the Roman Lucius Sicinus, in the frescoes of the Collegio del Cambio, Perugia (fig. 2.7). Unlike the two previous versions of Saint Michael on panel, here the armored figure type is reinvented for a new context. Not only was the prototype reworked, but a full-scale figural cartoon was produced and the design was transferred onto the fresco surface by means of a cartoon, as traces of *spolvero* are visible on the fresco surface.[45]

---

[42] The authors note that this may imply either that there is no underdrawing present or that the paint layers on top were not being sufficiently penetrated.

[43] Figural *invenzioni* could be recorded in a number of ways including *ricordo* drawings and tracings after the finished work.

[44] Hiller von Gaertringen, “The Practice of Erasing ‘Spolvero’ Dots," 202; idem, *Raffaels Lernerfahrung in der Werkstatt Peruginos*, 203–207. See fig. 149 b.

[45] Hiller von Gaertringen, *Raffaels Lernerfahrung in der Werkstatt Peruginos*, 203–207. See fig. 78.

The following conclusions can be drawn from the sequence of armored figures and the corresponding technical data. Based on the life study of a model in armor at Windsor (fig. 2.5) and what we know of Perugino's preparatory process, we can assume that a sequence of preparatory drawings was carried out. Rather than using a cartoon, Perugino worked up the figure directly on panel for the Certosa version. For the larger Vallombrosa version, also on panel, he again eschewed production of a final cartoon, and drawings recording the *invenzione,* and a technique such as squaring, must have been used to enlarge the figure freehand.[46] For the final version at the Cambio, even though the figure is consistent in scale with the Vallombrosa version, Perugino is unable to circumvent the production of a cartoon in the fresco medium. Cartoons were almost always required for fresco but when the step could be circumvented for panel, he often combined it with the use of freehand underdrawings. The paintings along with the technical data confirm Perugino's selective and efficient use of cartoons.

With the increasing availability of paper, cartoons transformed the preparatory process of Renaissance artists and there is no question about Perugino's use of cartoons. During periods of great demand, when Perugino was overseeing workshops in both Florence and Perugia, cartoons must have facilitated the organization of the workshop and division of labor significantly. As the above examples show, however, the question of re-use remains inconclusive. Even when finished works suggest cartoon re-use, assumptions about Perugino's practice should be made with caution and should be corroborated by physical evidence and scientific analysis.

The questions surrounding cartoon use and re-use are further complicated by the fact that traces of transfer marks on panel are rarely found. It is therefore important to consider whether Quattrocento artists simply bypassed this step for panel or the absence of transfer marks is a

---

[46] Bomford, *Art in the Making*, 68.

consequence of some other aspect of standard practice.[47] It is generally assumed that because panel did not require speed of execution, painters rarely invested the resources to produce a carefully pricked cartoon. Fresco, however, must be produced quickly and cartoon use was common practice. The inherent characteristics of panel and fresco may also explain the absence of markings. *Spolvero* marks can easily be detected on fresco because surface moisture tends to retain pigments and markings,[48] but because fresco is usually seen from a distance, the marks rarely interfere with the image. *Spolvero* is similarly visible on panel but more noticeable because the dots are usually closer to the viewer. In order to keep the paint layers on panel clean, *spolvero* could be erased or cancelled.[49] Although we have written sources that make reference to the practice of deliberately erasing *spolvero*, it is impossible to determine whether traces of *spolvero* have been eliminated or whether they ever existed at all.[50]

With Perugino, because there are a number of extant panel paintings where *spolvero* suspended in the paint layers is readily visible, we know that cancelling *spolvero* was not standard practice for him. Therefore cancellation of *spolvero* cannot be assumed just because they are not present; rather, they may have never existed. The argument for using tracings as

---

[47] Bambach, *Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop*, 24, posits that Quattrocento painters did without cartoons for panel. As demonstrated in chapter one, this was a step of the production process Perugino often bypassed.

[48] Hiller von Gaertringen, "The Practice of Erasing 'Spolvero' Dots in Italian Renaissance Panel Paintings"; Bambach, *Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop*, 79–80. Canvas similarly exhibits *spolvero* because of the medium's surface irregularity but the open and loose canvas surface is more forgiving to irregularities like *spolvero*.

[49] Hiller von Gaertringen, "The Practice of Erasing 'Spolvero' Dots in Italian Renaissance Panel Paintings," 196–206; Bambach, *Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop*, 79–80.

[50] Technical treatises are not always an accurate reflection of actual practice in the workshop.

reproductions of lost cartoons despite the absence of physical evidence, *spolvero*, depends on the assumption that it was erased or cancelled. But as Perugino's extant works demonstrate, he did not always erase *spolvero*; therefore, tracings cannot be seen as reconstructions of cartoons.

It is also certainly possible for marks of transfer to be lost, or covered up, in the process of reinforcing contours and working up the underdrawing. Until more advanced methods become available to help decipher whether marks of transfer have been erased or covered, we can also rely on the available visual evidence of the underdrawings. The process of working up an underdrawing from *spolvero*, comparable to connecting the dots, results in an underdrawing characterized by rigidity of line.[51] But Perugino's underdrawings, as seen in the examples discussed above, are freely executed and also exhibit extensive *pentimenti*. While it could be argued that the freely executed underdrawings are based on extensively worked up *spolvero*, the extensiveness of the underdrawing and the changes indicated by the *pentimenti* directly on the panel surface would have defeated the purpose of, and resources invested in, producing the cartoon. Such inefficiency seems highly uncharacteristic of Perugino's practice, underscoring how limited the re-use of cartoons in Perugino's practice actually was.[52]

The available scientific data considered so far pertains to larger works and notable commissions, but Perugino's preparatory process was bound to vary according to the demands of

---

[51] Bambach, *Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop*, 26 figs. 14 and 15; see also Joyce Plesters, "Technical Aspects of Some Paintings by Raphael in the National Gallery, London," in *The Princeton Raphael Symposium*, ed. John K. G. Shearman (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990), 15–37. Bambach describes the underdrawing as being comprised of short dashes.

[52] Ink wash was used to reinforce contours of the angels in the *Adoration of the Shepherds*, Galleria Nazionale dell'Umbria, Perugia. The *spolvero* marks remain faintly visible and the underdrawing is not as freely executed. See Bellucci and Frosinini, "The Myth of Cartoon Re-use," 73–76.

the work at hand, and a painting type seemingly more susceptible to cartoon re-use is the small devotional painting commonly produced in multiples by Renaissance workshops. The following considers whether the method of production was indeed variable and whether cartoon re-use played a more significant role with this type of workshop product.

There are approximately twenty smaller devotional works depicting the Madonna and Child in Perugino's oeuvre variously attributed to the master and the workshop.[53] The market for small devotional works can be considered more tolerant of copies and variations since they were not formally commissioned works. These small devotional paintings are undoubtedly related to his well-known altarpieces depicting the Virgin enthroned and surrounded by saints that made him one of the most sought-after artists of his time (fig. 2.8). Not only did the altarpieces supply fully resolved figural *invenzioni* that could be scaled down for the design of the devotional paintings, but the figures were also recognizable types associated with important altarpieces, which would have been appreciated by buyers. Components from highly regarded altarpieces could be extracted and recombined to formulate new compositions for the production of smaller devotional panels; this mode of production was an efficient and ideal time-saving device for the highly productive workshop of Perugino.

Some of the devotional paintings are compositionally so similar, for example the *Madonna and Child* pictures at the Louvre and Vienna (figs. 2.9 and 2.10), that the case for

---

[53] Attributions are usually based on the quality of execution seen as reflecting Perugino's participation and the number is based on Vittoria Garibaldi, *Perugino: Catalogo completo* (Florence: Octavo, 1999); Scarpellini, *Perugino*. The number does not include distant copies and pastiches produced by followers outside Perugino's immediate circle. For example, there are an extensive number of copies in the tondo format, a format that Perugino and his workshop were never engaged with.

cartoon re-use is very compelling.[54] But for this painting type also, despite the strong visual evidence, physical evidence that might confirm cartoon re-use is insufficient.

Though the two are undeniably related, the most notable difference between the *Madonna and Child with John the Baptist and Saint Catherine* at the Louvre (fig. 2.9) and *Madonna and Child with Saints Catherine and Rose* in Vienna (fig. 2.10) is the quality of execution. The Louvre panel is most sensitively rendered in a dark palette with light entering from the right, and exhibits the luminous paint layers characteristic of Perugino's best works. In the Vienna panel, overall lighter in palette, the figures are set against a brighter blue background and light is distributed more evenly across the entire composition. Overall, the Louvre painting is higher in quality, displaying greater sensitivity to light and concern for surface details, and is thus clearly the prototype from which the Vienna panel derives. The differences in quality of the two panels may be a reflection of the varying level of the master's participation in the execution, representing different grades of workshop production.

Another difference is Saint Rose, who replaces the Louvre panel's Saint John the Baptist on the left. A female head is substituted for Saint John's, but they are essentially the same figure in pose and gesture. Apart from the variations introduced in the Vienna panel and the difference in quality of execution, the Vienna panel is compositionally a literal imitation of the Louvre panel.[55] Hiller von Gaertringen, using tracings of both original paintings and proportional projections of slides superimposed, has persuasively argued for cartoon re-use.[56] But before

---

[54] Rudolf Hiller von Gaertringen, "Eine Madonna mit Kind und Johannesknaben im Städel," *Staedel Jahrbuch* 16 (1997): 227–238.

[55] Lee, *Ut Pictura Poesis*, 9–16.

[56] Hiller von Gaertringen, *Raffaels Lernerfahrung in der Werkstatt Peruginos*, 167–168.

accepting cartoon re-use as the explanation for their relationship, it may be informative to note additional visual observations and apply some of the scientific findings discussed above.

One of the most unexpected findings from the technical investigations on Perugino's panels carried out by Bellucci and Frosinini that might be applicable here is the underdrawing for the angels of the *Adoration* in Perugia (fig. 2.3).[57] The pair appears to be based on the same cartoon in reverse, but the underdrawing has revealed careful pouncing in areas of difference, namely the hands, confirming the use of two separate cartoons for these minor components. Likewise, if we argue that the Vienna Christ Child is based on the same cartoon used in the Louvre panel, there is no explanation for the changed position of the foot. Whereas the Christ Child's foot in the Louvre panel is sharply foreshortened, it is turned down and flattened in the Vienna panel. Cartoons were re-used as a time-saving device and to facilitate the execution of elements of design the artists had labored to resolve. There is no reason to introduce such changes when the original cartoon was presumably available, particularly since hands and feet were considered very challenging to depict. Based on the inexplicable change that is introduced, the lower quality of execution and lack of physical evidence that indicates cartoon use, the derivative was not based on the same cartoon but rather a related preparatory drawing. If the Vienna panel is seen as a freehand copy of a lower grade, we can then understand how the difficult angle of the foot seen in the Louvre panel was replaced with the downward-turned foot in the absence of an original cartoon.

Related preparatory drawings and what we know about Perugino's preparatory process can suggest other plausible explanations for the correspondence between the two panels.[58] A

---

[57] Bellucci and Frosinini, "The Myth of Cartoon Re-use," 75 fig. 10.

study of a head of a woman at the Louvre (fig. 2.11) is related to the female saint on the right of both panels in reverse. The head study is typical of Perugino's graphic oeuvre, highly finished with white heightening to facilitate the execution of paintings. Additionally, the sheet has been carefully pricked for transfer. Most of Perugino's extant pricked drawings represent either single isolated figures or heads, indicative of his extensive use of pricking and pouncing in his preparatory process.[59] Contrary to the extensive pricking seen on drawings, *spolvero* marks on panel are rare and most of Perugino's underdrawings are executed freehand. Therefore, I would argue, component parts preserved in stock drawings like the Louvre head study are the more likely source of repetition than cartoon re-use. Rather than reusing a compositional cartoon and erasing the traces of transfer, a stock motif, such as the Louvre *Head of a Woman*, would have been integrated into a compositional whole using methods such as pricking and pouncing, and the composition could then be enlarged or reduced freehand onto panel using methods such as squaring.

In another painting of the Madonna and Child at the Städel (fig. 2.12), the Virgin and Child figural group recalls that of the Louvre panel in reverse, and an argument for the re-use of the Louvre cartoon in reverse has also been made.[60] Perugino changes the symmetrical composition of the Louvre panel, in which saints flank the Virgin and Child, by placing the infant Saint John on the left and shifting the Madonna and Child slightly to the right. However,

---

[58] The Louvre painting is 5.5 cm longer but the shadowed edge does not interfere with the exact correspondence of the key elements of the composition.

[59] Carmen Bambach, "The Tradition of Pouncing Drawings in the Italian Renaissance Workshop: Innovation and Derivation" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1988), 325–334.

[60] Rudolf Hiller von Gaertringen, "A Madonna and Child with the Infant St. John in the Städel: Between Perugino's Formulas and Raphael's Interest in Narrative," in *Le dessin sous-jacent et la technologie dans la peinture*, ed. Hélène Verougstraete and Roger van Schoute (Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 189–203. See fig. 3 in particular.

the areas of difference in the Frankfurt panel, namely the revised arms and hands of the two figures, and the technical findings need to be addressed. Extensive technical analysis of the Frankfurt panel, by radiography and infrared reflectography, has found no physical evidence associated with cartoon transfer.[61] The quality of the underdrawing similarly casts doubt on cartoon re-use. The underdrawing of the arms and hands of the two figures in particular is sketchily rendered as if drawn freehand.[62] Hiller von Gaertringen argues for a selective re-use of the Louvre cartoon in combination with freehand underdrawing. However, this graphic handling is not limited to these areas of difference. Even the parts that are presumably derived from the lost cartoon are handled in a similar graphic manner. If the prototype cartoon was re-used, the graphic handling based on the cartoon and the freely drawn areas in which variations are introduced should exhibit some graphic disparity. However, the handling is consistent throughout, casting additional doubt on cartoon re-use. If the two versions of the Christ Child do not derive from the same cartoon, they certainly must derive from the same *invenzione* in the workshop; rather than cartoon re-use, extant drawings that record and document successful motifs might explain repetition.

Much too readily, we have embraced the Vasarian construct that attributes Perugino's repetition to his re-use of cartoons and labeled it the main source of his professional decline in the new century.[63] But we must recognize Vasari's misunderstanding of Perugino and his

---

[61] Ibid., 198; Hiller von Gaertringen, "The Practice of Erasing 'Spolvero' Dots in Italian Renaissance Panel Paintings," 201–202.

[62] Hiller von Gaertringen, *Raffaels Lernerfahrung in der Werkstatt Peruginos*.

[63] Marcia B. Hall, ed., "Introduction," in *The Cambridge Companion to Raphael* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 8–9. For example, Hall writes, "The new century would no

unwarranted accusation of indolence, and more objectively evaluate the prevalence of cartoon re-use. Using tracings to reconstruct presumably lost cartoons is an innovative and intriguing approach to demonstrating Perugino's cartoon re-use, but definitive conclusions cannot be made until scientific and technical findings can be fully reconciled with any hypothesis. Until more advanced scientific findings become available, a more comprehensive understanding of Perugino's design and production process will be the key to understanding his aesthetic and practical concerns and clarifying unresolved questions about aspects of his practice like cartoon re-use. The next section is an examination of Perugino's approach to design and production that offers other plausible explanations for repetition and other conventions of Perugino's art.

Copying Practices

Perugino's unprecedented use of a full range of devices and methods for mechanical transfer certainly allowed him to achieve new levels of productivity. His productivity did not come without consequences, however, for the compositional and component similarities shared by many of his works have been the source of much criticism. But as the previous section noted, repetition cannot be attributed to cartoon use alone. This section focuses on Perugino's modes of design and production to further illuminate the repetition in his oeuvre and the mechanical aspects of his practice. It also considers how he reconciled his copying practices with the practical realities and theoretical concerns of the time. Perugino's production process, it will be shown, is intricately linked to his approach to design and is a testament to his innovation and business acumen. Since a major subject of this section is copying practices, the meaning of "authorship" and "the original" in the Renaissance will be briefly considered first.

---

longer tolerate Perugino's system of recycling cartoons that had been made for previous commissions."

The collaborative nature of Renaissance workshop practice makes for a fundamental ambiguity about the meaning of authorship.[64] Particularly in an active and prolific workshop like Perugino's, where subordinates and collaborators were frequently engaged in the production process, questions about authorship are bound to arise, [65] but we must keep in mind how the notion of authorship differed in the Renaissance. As demands upon the artist increased along with the scope and scale of projects, it was inevitable that aspects of the production process had to be delegated. Although we often attribute works to the workshop based on the identification of different hands, workshop participation did not equate to a compromise of authorship in the Renaissance. This principle is further underscored in the *sua mano* clauses of Renaissance contracts, which prohibited the master from subcontracting the work but did not prohibit the participation of members of the workshop.[66] Collaboration was inherent to workshop practice, and contributions to a work, when made under the master's auspices, were accepted as if they were from his own hand.[67] By Renaissance standards, the master was the author of everything produced by his workshop.

---

[64] For general overview see Wendy Stedman Sheard and John T. Paoletti, eds., *Collaboration in Italian Renaissance Art* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1978).

[65] On the meaning of authorship in the Renaissance workshop see Jonathan Katz Nelson, "'Botticelli' or 'Filippino'?: How to Define Authorship in a Renaissance Workshop," in *Sandro Botticelli and Herbert Horne*, ed. Rab Hatfield, The Villa Rossa Series 5 (Florence: Syracuse University in Florence, 2009), 137–167.

[66] Michelle O'Malley, "Quality, Demand, and the Pressures of Reputation: Rethinking Perugino," *The Art Bulletin* 89, no. 4 (2007): 674–693.

[67] Richard E. Spear, "Notes on Renaissance and Baroque Originals and Originality," *Studies in the History of Art* 20 (1989): 97–99; see also idem, "What Is an Original?," *Melbourne Art Journal* 7 (2004): 15–32.

Like the meaning of authorship, the significance of "the original" is somewhat paradoxical and had a tendency to shift with context as well. For instance, around the turn of the sixteenth century, increasing theoretical awareness of the changing artistic criterion of originality was ironically accompanied by an active market for copies and derivatives.[68] The demands and motivations that drove this active market reflect an expanding consumer class and the shifting significance of the original work. There was already a traditional market for straightforward copies of small devotional paintings, the most common being of Marian imagery. Art continued to serve a traditional religious purpose, and as a form of devotional aid for domestic use, the distinction between original and copy was not critical. It was effectively exempt from the developing standards of originality. Stemming from this market for devotional objects, new strategies for copying works of art transformed the enterprise of the copyist and the market for copies and derivatives.

As Megan Holmes has noted, copies and derivatives became far more than reproductions of originals; they became a new object type shaped by the demands and aspirations of audiences and patrons.[69] For example, commissioning a copy of well-known painting associated with a prominent patron was often motivated by social aspirations. Particularly during the final quarter of the Quattrocento and into the following century,[70] obtaining a copy of an original painting with an illustrious patronage established a connection to the status of the prototype's patron. An association with the Medici was particularly desirable, and a triptych by Fra Filippo Lippi

---

[68] Spear, "Notes on Renaissance and Baroque Originals and Originality," 99.

[69] Holmes, "Copying Practices and Marketing Strategies."

[70] See Lisa Venturini, "'Copie' da dipinti illustri," in *Maestri e botteghe: Pittura a Firenze alla fine del Quattrocento*, ed. Mina Gregori (Cinisello Balsamo: Silvana Ed., 1992), 165–167.

commissioned by the Medici and presented to King Alfonso of Naples in 1458, for example, was the prototype for a copy commissioned by a Neapolitan nobleman. The copy guaranteed this patron not only the *invenzione* of Lippi but also references the prominent patron and the owners of the original, the Medici and the King of Naples.[71] Driven by such diverse demands and motivations, from devotional practice to social ambition, the meaning of the copy shifts with the value of the original, giving rise to a market for copies that flourished and coexisted with a market for originals.

Another source of insight into the Renaissance market for copies is surviving contracts. The information gleaned from the contracts attests to the complexity of the market for copies and presents yet another function of the original. Michelle O'Malley's analysis of contract language and comparison of painting-prototype pairs has found that Italians never commissioned copies of works of art for large public commissions for which formal contracts were drawn.[72] Models were used as references for individual elements and to facilitate communication of visual information, and contracts called for paintings to be made in the manner of other works, but formally commissioned works were characterized by *similitudine*, "bearing a resemblance to" or "similar to" a prototype.[73] They represent a different grade of production distinct from the exact copy,

---

[71] Holmes, "Copying Practices and Marketing Strategies," 50–52. This episode is documented in a letter that Giovanni de' Medici sent to his agent in Naples making reference to a drawing related to the triptych in the possession of the Medici to be used to produce a copy from within Lippi's own workshop. Holmes refers to this copy as a "cartoon generated replica," but there is no indication that this drawing was a cartoon.

[72] Michelle O'Malley, "Memorizing the New: Using Recent Works as Models in Italian Renaissance Commissions," in *Memory & Oblivion*, ed. Wessel Reinink (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1999), 803–810.

[73] Michelle O'Malley, *The Business of Art: Contracts and the Commissioning Process in Renaissance Italy* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005), 222. When contracts called

such as multiples of Marian imagery or a copy of a work with an illustrious patronage.[74]

In other words, different standards were at work for different types of "copies," and this was reflected in the language. Formally commissioned public works, for which contracts were drawn, made material and visual references to a model[75] and stipulated that the new work be made in *modo et forma* or *secondo* the designated prototype.[76] In contrast, the term *retrahere,* meaning "to draw again" or "to draw anew," used for instance in a 1508 document with reference to the production of a second version of Leonardo da Vinci's *Madonna of the Rocks,*[77] refers to the precise copying of a composition in its entirety, like the small-scale devotional paintings produced in series and the copies of well-known works of notable patronage. The terminology reflects a range of copying practices at work, giving rise to different grades of production for different arenas of consumption. There was a market for exact, faithful copies as well as a market for formally commissioned works destined for public sites that called for similarity rather than precise replication. For the consumer of a Marian imagery, the devotional function of the copy negated the value of the original. For the consumer seeking a connection

---

for paintings to be made in the manner of other works, more often, they referred to material components such as the framing and the use of specific material that had implications for cost rather than to the pictorial content of the paintings.

[74] Ibid., 222.

[75] O'Malley, "Memory & Oblivion." The author notes that occasionally contracts refer to prototypes for iconography, and more rarely, for compositional arrangement or level of quality.

[76] O'Malley, *The Business of Art*, 222. The author defines the following contract terms: *modo*, "in the manner of"; *modo et forma*, "in the manner and form of" or "like"; *secondo,* "according to"*; ad instar,* "to the likeness [of]"*; prout*, "according to" or "just as."

[77] Michelle O'Malley, "The Business of Art: Contracts and Payment Documents for Fourteenth and Fifteenth-century Italian Altarpieces and Frescoes" (Ph.D. diss., Warburg Institute, University of London, 1994), 151. Cennini also uses *retrahere* in a section devoted to copying in his *Libro dell'arte* as he instructs artists on the use of tracing paper (*carta lucida*) for making exact copies. See chapter 3.

with the Medici, the original and the owner of the original were the source of the copy's value. For formally commissioned public works, a model or a prototype merely facilitated the commissioning process. Perugino's activity corresponds to this period in which the significance of the original and copy were undergoing a transformation that was highly nuanced and diverse. The recognition of the complexity of this market is vital if we are to appreciate his modes of design and production, examined in the next section.

Component Pictures

Perugino's preparatory process, outlined in chapter one, and the systematic approach that was highlighted there were linked on many levels to the demands of the market. Perugino's systematic studio practice, so critical to his success, was also closely tied to his approach to design, and this section examines this connection between the design and production processes. The preparatory process that Perugino developed was ideally suited for his particular method of design, and through this relationship, we can establish a context within which Perugino's repetition and the derivative nature of some of his works can be properly understood and the value of his copying practices within the Renaissance workshop milieu can be fully appreciated.

Perugino was faced with unprecedented demand at the height of his career and his documented works suggest the pressures under which he operated. In the year 1499 alone, Perugino's operations in Perugia and Florence were engaged in the execution of six major altarpieces, the frescoes of the Collegio del Cambio, and multiple smaller workshop pieces.[78] The only way he was able to manage all of this activity was to prioritize projects that required a greater degree of his participation and then delegate aspects of the preparatory and execution

---

[78] O'Malley, "Quality, Demand, and the Pressures of Reputation," 676–677.

process that could be carried out by the workshop. The level of productivity would not have been possible without his innovative use of drawings and exceptional managerial skills, and this system ensured the production of a consistent and seamless product.

Another critical aspect of Perugino's successful practice was the economy and efficiency with which he formulated his designs. In line with his systematic preparatory process, he approached composition in a very methodical manner. Martin Kemp has written about Leonardo's "component pictures," in which motifs from original paintings and drawings were pieced together by workshop hands to formulate a new composition, which was often produced in multiples on a collaborative basis.[79] Perugino's workshop similarly built up his compositions, especially when returning to a previously treated subject matter, attesting to workshop practices concerned with the maximization of an *invenzione*. Although Perugino and Leonardo are perceived very differently today and are rarely treated together in the art-historical literature, the two masters were contemporaries, well acquainted with one another from Verrocchio's workshop. That both Perugino and Leonardo formulated compositions, large and small, out of component parts is not surprising in light of the formative influence of Verrocchio's working methods, which always emphasized the function of drawings.

The notion of component pictures, as a method of design, is consistent with Alberti's theory of *composition*.[80] According to this theory, composition is formulated from "surfaces,"

---

[79] Martin Kemp, "The 'Madonna of the Yarnwinder' in the Buccleuch Collection Reconsidered in the Context of Leonardo's Studio Practice," in *I leonardeschi a Milano: Fortuna e collezionismo*, ed. Maria Teresa Fiorio (Milan: Electa, 1991), 40.

[80] Leon Battista Alberti, *On Painting and On Sculpture: The Latin Texts of "De pictura" and "De statua,"* trans. Cecil Grayson (London: Phaidon, 1972), 73: "Composition is the procedure in painting whereby the parts are composed together in the picture. The great work of the painter is not a colossus but a *historia*, for there is far more merit in a *historia* than in a colossus. Parts

"members," "bodies," and "*historia*," and each element of this hierarchical framework had a role in the total effect of the picture.[81] Building planes into members, members into bodies, and finally bodies into a complete design is a creative process in which parts are composed into a whole work of art, and this approach is apparent in the studio practices of both Leonardo and Perugino.

In Perugino's shop, each component of a painting was carefully perfected through a meticulous preparatory process, and a successful *invenzione* was seen as having acquired the status of an ideal. Repetition of an ideal, in the form of a stock component, was consistent with Perugino's notion of design, and the implementation of this method was facilitated by the shop's codified preparatory process.[82] Perugino's views, firmly rooted in the Quattrocento and echoed by Alberti, are apparent in his response to the criticism of his SS. Annunziata altarpiece: "I have used the figures that you have at other times praised, and which have given you infinite pleasure; if now they do not please you, and you do not praise them, what can I do?"[83] Perugino's practice clearly dissatisfied Vasari and his contemporaries, but as Baxandall has pointed out, for Perugino

---

of the *historia* are the bodies, part of the body is the member, and part of the member is the surface. The principal parts of the work are the surfaces, because from these come the members, from the members the bodies, from the bodies the *historia*, and finally the finished work of the painter. From the composition of surfaces arises that elegant harmony and grace in bodies, which they call beauty… So in the composition of surfaces grace and beauty must above all be sought. In order to achieve this there seems to me no surer way than to look at Nature and observe long and carefully how she, the wonderful maker of things has composed the surfaces in beautiful members. We should apply ourselves with all our thought and attention to imitating her, and take delight in using the veil I spoke of."

[81] Michael Baxandall, *Giotto and the Orators: Humanist Observers of Painting in Italy and the Discovery of Pictorial Composition, 1350-1450* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 129–130.

[82] Kemp, "I leonardeschi a Milano," 37.

[83] Vasari, *Lives*, 1:594; Vasari, *Le vite*, 3:586–587.

and his contemporaries, component design gave rise to compositions exhibiting a new and innovative concept of total interdependence of forms.[84] Perugino's ability to seamlessly interweave component parts into a unified whole was unmatched and furthermore, he was also able to codify it into a system of production in the workshop.

The process of bringing together component parts to form a larger whole is applicable to the larger composition as well as to the individual components themselves. For example, a figure can be seen as a component part of the larger composition but the figure itself is also a sum or composite of yet smaller components. The following discussion examines specific examples of component figures and component compositions in Perugino's oeuvre and considers how they relate to both copying practices and to the market for copies.

Kemp, in his study of Leonardo's studio practice, has traced specific component parts, such as a certain foreshortened hand favored by Leonardo. It first appears in the *Virgin of the Rocks* and subsequently in the *Last Supper* (St. James), *Madonna of the Yarnwinder*, *Madonna with the Holy Children at Play*, the second version of the *Virgin of the Rocks*, and in paintings by his various pupils and followers.[85] This pattern illustrates how perfected ideals were repeated and how parts of a figure, or components, were seen as interchangeable.[86] Perugino was much more prolific and his operations were much larger than Leonardo's. He codified this basic idea into a system that allowed for a figure's appearance or even identity to be changed by substituting parts of the figure like the head, arms, or hand, much like a manikin, while the rest of the figure

---

[84] Baxandall, *Giotto and the Orators*, 129–130.

[85] Kemp, "I leonardeschi a Milano," 37–39.

[86] Ibid., 37; Jean K. Cadogan, "Verrocchio's Drawings Reconsidered," *Zeitschrift Für Kunstgeschichte* 46, no. 4 (January 1983): 367–400.

remained unchanged. The effect could be subtle (see above discussion about the angels with different hand gestures) or a figure could be reintroduced in a new guise. Saint John in the Louvre's *Madonna and Child* (fig 2.9) is replaced by a female saint of the same posture and gesture in the version in Vienna (fig. 2.10). Though the related preparatory drawings do not survive, our knowledge of Perugino's preparatory process allows us to assume that the figure originated in a figure study, most likely from life, and that the attributes necessary for painting the subject were layered onto the figure study (see fig. 1.32 as an example). Thus, using a single figure study, the attributes of Saint John were easily replaced by the attributes of the female saint. The head of Saint John was replaced with the head of a female saint while the hands in prayer, a gesture particularly favored by Perugino, were repeated more directly.[87]

Although one gains variety and efficiency with this method, it does have its limitations and drawbacks. If parts are varied or rearranged but the core of the figure remains static, movement is treated as a pattern rather than a play of internal dynamics, and Perugino's figures are often criticized for lacking dynamic movement. But in the context of devotional imagery, the serene figures void of dynamic expression or movement were ideally suited for their intended purpose. Perugino was perfectly capable of creating dynamic figures. In narrative contexts, Perugino repeatedly demonstrated his ability to create complex figures of lively movement (see above fig. 1.4), demonstrating that he was conscious of the context in which the image would function and selected the method of production accordingly.

By building a case study of Perugino's variants of one subject, the Nativity, it will become clear that his use of composite forms did not limit his creative freedom. It should be noted that,

---

[87] The same cartoon could not have been used. Note differences such as the separation of the figures.

unlike "copies after," which are independent works by a copyist outside the master's immediate circle, the versions included in the following discussion are "autograph variants," produced internally in the workshop with varying degrees of Perugino's participation.[88] Since the Nativity is a traditional iconography and remains fairly consistent throughout its variations, it is an ideal series with which to consider the practice of component design in the workshop and the socio-economic contexts in which variants were produced.

The *Nativity* of the Collegio de Cambio fresco cycle (fig. 2.13) is the earliest known version of the subject by the master that includes the adoration of the shepherds in a circular arrangement. The origins of this *invenzione* can be found in a related compositional sketch at the Ashmolean (fig. 2.14). Perugino's process of devising this composition, which would become the most commonly repeated prototype for the iconography in his shop, is illustrated in this sheet. Although the preliminary sketch is roughly executed in a quick handling of pen and ink, all of the components that appear in the finished painting are already present, as is their disposition in a semicircular arrangement.[89]

Additionally, the figures of Joseph, the Christ Child, and the Virgin Mary are component figures previously seen in the Albani Torlonia Polyptych, painted five years earlier (fig. 2.15). A design process based on such established component parts explains the certainty with which the figures are conceived in the sketch at such an early stage of the preparatory process. Perugino uses the compositional sketch to bring together component parts and resolve their arrangement.

---

[88] Beverly Louise Brown, "Replication and the Art of Veronese," *Studies in the History of Art* 20 (1989): 111–124. Brown uses the phrase "autograph replicas."

[89] On the verso of the sheet (fig. 2.14), Perugino briefly explores a slightly different arrangement with angels in the foreground and here once again, rather than exploring the interaction of figures in space, it is a formulaic bringing together of components in a symmetrical arrangement.

The existence of this type of drawing and its obvious function in the design process is also illuminating with regard to the myth of cartoon re-use. Cartoons were not created and rearranged like cut-out dolls;[90] rather, as the compositional sketch shows, each component functions like an established exemplum and is reworked in the new context starting at the very beginning of the preparatory process, the preliminary sketch.

Workshop drawings that carefully recorded favored motifs were essential to the re-use of component parts long after finished paintings left the shop. The reclining Christ Child motif seen in both paintings is carefully recorded in a sheet by a workshop hand at the Uffizi (fig. 2.16). The meticulous handling used to record the modeling of form would have made the sheet suitable for later use in the workshop and by later pupils outside the workshop. Another drawing of a component part at the Uffizi depicts a shepherd bearing a lamb on his shoulder (fig. 2.17). Clearly inspired by antique sculptures of the Good Shepherd, it is an *invenzione* that goes back to his fresco at San Giusto alle Mura in Florence (now destroyed).[91] Consistent with the drawing type used in the shop as an exemplum, the drawing of the shepherd is highly finished and exhibits a delicate and refined handling, as seen in the tufts of wool fleece and contours of the body. Fine pricking along the contours further confirms the production of additional drawings and paintings from the exemplum. Perugino considered the use of this component figure for the Cambio *Nativity,* as it is indicated in the Ashmolean sketch (fig. 2.14), where it can be seen above and to the left of the kneeling Virgin. The figure was left out in the final painted version,

---

[90] Bambach, *Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop*, 87–88. "Perugino may have shifted cartoons for some of the individual figures, much like a child's cut-out paper dolls, along precisely established points, to work out their alignments."

[91] Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, *Disegni umbri del Rinascimento da Perugino a Raffaello*, Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe Degli Uffizi 58 (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1982), 37.

however, which underscores how Perugino was formulating his composition out of component parts but was also working towards a new *invenzione,* making changes and introducing variations throughout the preparatory process. Though component parts are re-employed in the formulation of the Cambio *Nativity*, as the compositional sketch confirms, it was far from a straightforward, mechanical process, void of any creative freedom.

Lothar Ledderose, in his study of modular composition in Chinese art, describes a system of assembling objects from standardized parts similar to Perugino's component pictures.[92] He refers to it as a "phenomenon of component composition in the visual arts" and notes that it occurred particularly during times of increased production. While his work traces this phenomenon through the history of Chinese art, he points to the fact that it occurs in the production of art across a range of cultures and time periods. In the Renaissance, artists of Perugino's generation had to deal with the increasing scale and scope of projects and as heads of workshops, responsible for obtaining, planning, designing and executing as well as overseeing a labor force. Ledderose describes the use of "modules" (a repertoire of motifs and figures) as parts assembled into "units" (compositions) as a natural phenomenon akin to reproduction in nature, therefore a natural phenomenon to be expected in highly productive workshops. As Perugino's operations expanded in scale and the number of participants increased, work was codified into a systematic process; he used drawings to manage a prolific level of production based on modular production, which put him at the forefront of innovative methods of production and design in response to demand.[93]

In addition to streamlining the physical process of production in the workshop, the module

---

[92] Ledderose, *Ten Thousand Things*, 2–3, 175.

[93] Ibid., 4–5.

system also increased the range of workshop products.[94] Perugino's autograph variants of the *Nativity* (figs. 2.3, 2.18-2.22, 2.24, 2.25) are clearly related products of the modular production system, but each is also distinguished by modular variation. Versions in fresco at Monteripido (fig. 2.18) and Montefalco (fig. 2.19) follow the Cambio prototype almost exactly, but variation is introduced in the background and architectural details. The Monteripdo and Montefalco frescoes illustrate the use of proportional variation in which the primary modules remain consistent but are scaled down for the new compositional space. In later versions carried out between 1504 and 1513 (figs. 2.20-2.22, 2.24), using the same basic component parts, the modules are not only scaled down for panel, but some modules are omitted entirely to fit the smaller compositional space. A compositional study most closely corresponding to the panel in Perugia (fig. 2.23) attests to the careful consideration each of the modules carried through and omitted from the composition. From fresco to panel, the scaling down requires the subtraction of modules, while moving from a smaller panel to fresco requires the introduction of new modules for the larger scale.

The workshop's autograph variants also inspired lower-grade workshop products that contributed to the widespread transmission of Perugino's *invenzioni* and style. The *Adoration of Christ* at the Yale University Art Gallery (fig. 2.26) was most likely produced in the workshop by one of Perugino's abler assistants. There is a related drawing at the British Museum that corresponds exactly in composition (fig. 2.27). The drawing and finished painting recall Perugino's fresco in the Cambio at Perugia (fig. 2.13), but one notices immediately that a wooden barn has replaced the stone colonnade and that the singing angels were removed to accommodate the smaller scale. Other differences include the posture of the shepherd kneeling

---

[94] Ibid., 5.

to the left of the Virgin, details in the treatment of the infant Christ, and altered background figures (one of which, in the center of the composition, has been omitted entirely). But nearly all these variations occur in one or another of the other compositions and demonstrate how the module system facilitated the production of different grades of workshop production.

Component paintings not only increased productivity. Grades of distinction in the formal features, differences in size, figure number or pose, and background treatment were all easily manipulated in the module system, and thus broadened the range of the workshop's production. While the patronage and cost of each of the variants is beyond the scope of this analysis, each variant is linked to the social status and cultural values of the consumer, which varied widely. Thus Perugino's workshop, using the module system to increase the range of products, was able to attract a larger pool of buyers and expand the circle of participants in the market.

Perugino's activity was governed by a notion of *imitazione* unique to his time and shared by the patrons and consumers of his art. Far from simply reusing cartoons in the interest of economy, he developed a method of production and design based on a module system, utilizing the full potential of drawings to meet the unprecedented demand for his work. Repetition seen in this context highlights the different grades of production that Perugino's innovations in the workshop facilitated. Such grades of production were well suited to exploit multiple markets, all of which reflected the economic, social, and cultural values found in a stratified society and drove the expanding market for copies, variations, and replicas.

CHAPTER 3

PUPILS AND THE WORKSHOP

Throughout Perugino's career, pupils, assistants, and collaborators associated with his shops in Perugia and Florence and those who came under his tutelage more temporarily as he traveled widely for commissions were critical to his highly productive enterprise, which brought him both commercial success and great renown. Chapter 1 considered these workshops in more general terms, and practical matters such as the location of the physical space and dates of operation were noted. Chapter 2 examined Perugino's design and production process, with emphasis on his managerial skills, systematic processes, and the grades of workshop production. This chapter will focus specifically on the workshop's labor force. Affiliations, relationships to the master, and issues of documentation will be examined. The first part of the chapter will outline the documentary evidence regarding the painters connected to Perugino's workshop. While these affiliations can be confirmed, there are no documentary records of how Perugino organized his shop and divided the labor, and the organization of the shop will be deduced from extant drawings and art works. The second part of the chapter will examine tools and techniques of replication and drawings and finished works that reflect the usage of these techniques and illuminate the organization and labor structure of the workshop. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the evidence of the role of delegation in the workshop.

Pupils, Assistants and Collaborators

According to Vasari, Perugino "made many masters in his own manner" and in his Life of Perugino, Vasari lists Perugino's *discepoli* from Rome, Florence, and Perugia beginning with his most famous pupil, the "miraculous" Raphael.[1] The following will highlight the recent documentary evidence that connects many artists on Vasari's list to Perugino and his workshop, including those affiliated with his earliest major project in Rome, as well as key pupils in Florence and Perugia.

Perugino's first major commission was to plan and manage the decoration of the Sistine Chapel decoration. Perugino retained independent masters as collaborators, and under his supervision, each master and his team were delegated a portion of the decorative cycle (discussed in chapter 1). A testament to Perugino's ability to organize collaborators and his managerial capabilities is the successful and timely completion of this prominent project. He was responsible for a team composed of established masters along with pupils and assistants. Bartolomeo della Gatta and Andrea d'Assisi, called L'Ingegno, were both established masters when they came to work for Perugino in Rome. L'Ingegno was active in Assisi and della Gatta had been practicing as an independent master in Arezzo for a decade before participation in the Chapel's decoration.[2] By composing a team of both experienced artists and pupils and assistants, Perugino was able to maximize his role, so that he could both oversee the entire project and carry out his portion of the decoration.

---

[1] Giorgio Vasari, *Lives of the Painters, Sculptors and Architects*, ed. David Ekserdjian, trans. Gaston du C. de Vere (New York: Knopf, 1996), 1:595–597; Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori ed architettori* (Florence, 1568), ed. Gaetano Milanesi (Florence: Sansoni, 1906), 3:590–597.

[2] Vasari, *Lives*, 1:591, 596–597; Vasari, *Le vite*, 3:578–579, 595–596. Vasari describes della Gatta working alongside Perugino on the *Giving of the Keys to Saint Peter*.

It is likely that Perugino's experience in the Verrocchio shop influenced his ability to recognize the advantages of having a full range of subordinates in the workshop. Perugino's permanent workshop in Florence, established shortly after his sojourn in Rome, was run much like Verrocchio's shop, expanding and contracting as necessitated by the changing workload.[3] Among Vasari's list of Perugino's pupils in the Florentine shop, the presence of Rocco Zoppo (Giovan Maria di Bartolomeo Bacci di Belforte) and Bartolomeo (Baccio) di Ubertino Verde in the workshop has been confirmed by documentary evidence and the two seem to have been significant assistants. Rocco Zoppo delivered several payments on behalf of Perugino between 1498 and1501[4] and was given rights to pick up Monte credits for Perugino in 1498 and 1501.[5] Baccio,[6] whom Vasari praises as an exceptional colorist and draughtsman, delivered rent payments for Perugino in 1510 and 1512 and is referred to as Perugino's *garzone* in the documents.[7] These financial transactions, undertaken on behalf of Perugino during his frequent absence from the city as he traveled for commissions, may indicate that these pupils were his most trusted disciples.

Local pupils and assistants hired on a temporary basis are less well documented. But with notable pupils who are documented, their long-term connections with the workshop indicate

---

[3] Arnold Victor Coonin, "New Documents Concerning Perugino's Workshop in Florence," *The Burlington Magazine* 141 (1999): 100–104.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Fiorenzo Canuti, *Il Perugino* (Siena: La Diana, 1931), 2:149. See documents 174-175.

[6] Coonin, "New Documents Concerning Perugino's Workshop in Florence," 102. Baccio was born in Florence in 1484 and matriculated in the painter's guild in 1525. He is otherwise undocumented.

[7] Vasari, *Le vite*, 3:592, 6:454.

that Perugino cultivated fruitful relationships. After working for Perugino in Rome (1480-1482), L'Ingegno joined him again for work at the Cappella della Porziuncola, Assisi (1486) and Collegio del Cambio, Perugia (1498-1500). Overall, L'Ingengo worked alongside Perugino on major projects for a span of more than twenty years. He was Perugino's contemporary in age and was an established artist in Assisi, but Vasari refers to him as the most promising of Perugino's pupils.[8] Nothing in these documents is indicative of L'Ignegno's role in the shop but the responsibilities delegated to him are tentatively suggested by a selection of surviving works (see below).

The Florentine pupil Rocco Zoppo, according to Vasari, worked particularly on paintings of the Madonna in the workshop, and appears to have been one of Perugino's most trusted assistants during the years in which he is recorded delivering a number of payments on behalf of the master;[9] and, like L'Ingegno, he similarly enjoyed a lengthy association with the shop. If Vasari is correct and Zoppo assisted Perugino with his work in the Sistine Chapel prior to joining the Florentine shop, then Zoppo was under Perugino's tutelage from at least 1480-1500.[10] Zoppo probably participated in the execution of the *Last Supper* for the Cenacolo di Foligno (1493-1496), a major project of his years in the Florentine shop and a work that shows considerable workshop contribution,[11] but unlike L'Ingegno, his contributions to Florentine commissions remain elusive.

---

[8] Filippo Todini, "Il Perugino, le sue botteghe e i suoi seguaci," in *Perugino a Firenze: Qualità e fortuna d'uno stile*, ed. Rosanna Caterina Proto Pisani (Florence: Pagliai Polistampa, 2005), 58–59; Vasari, *Le vite*, 3:595–596.

[9] Vasari, *Le vite*, 3:591.

[10] Ibid.

Though Perugino was primarily based in Florence from the 1480s until the last decade of his life,[12] his shop also had a monopoly of the Perugian market, which had a profound effect upon local artists. Perugino's prominence attracted local pupils to the shop, as well as pupils from across Umbria, including the precocious Raphael from Urbino.[13] These experiences influenced pupils and followers, who perpetuated the master's style for an entire generation. The dates for this influential Umbrian workshop, however, remain a subject of debate.[14] There is documentation of a physical space beginning in 1501, but it is generally assumed that a shop was already in place prior to this date, based on the considerable level of Perugino's activity throughout the 1480s and 1490s (see chapter 1).

Despite the debate about the dates and location of the workshop space, we can safely assume that Perugino's presence in Perugia increased significantly and the work force expanded in 1495, when contracts were signed for two major projects, the *Pala dei Decemviri* for the chapel of the Palazzo dei Priori[15] and the high altarpiece of the church of San Pietro;[16] the following year, the frescoes of the Sala dell'Udienza Collegio del Cambio were commissioned.

---

[11] Serena Padovani, "Il Cenacolo del Perugino," in *Perugino a Firenze: Qualità e fortuna d'uno stile*, ed. Rosanna Caterina Proto Pisani (Florence: Pagliai Polistampa, 2005), 17–22.

[12] Caroline Elam, "Lorenzo de' Medici and the Urban Development of Renaissance Florence," *Art History* 1 (1978): 65.

[13] For an overview of the literature on Raphael's association with Perugino and the role of his father in his training, see Kim E. Butler, "Giovanni Santi, Raphael, and Quattrocento Sculpture," *Artibus et Historiae* 30, no. 59 (2009): 15–17.

[14] For the latest publication on the workshop in Perugia, see Todini, "Il Perugino."

[15] Canuti, *Il Perugino*, 2:188. See document 220.

[16] Pietro Scarpellini, *Perugino* (Milan: Electa, 1991), 93–95.

Like his Florentine pupils, the list of Perugino's Umbrian pupils derives from Vasari. In addition to Raphael, Lo Spagna, and Roberto da Montevarchi, from Urbino, Spain, and Montevarchi respectively, Vasari separately lists natives of Perugia in the shop. This list includes Pintoricchio, Eusebio da San Giorgio, Domenico di Paris and his brother Orazio, Giannicola di Paolo, and Benedetto Caporali. Not all of Perugino's Umbrian pupils included in Vasari's list can be otherwise documented in the workshop, and a precise configuration of the Umbrian shop also remains uncertain. However, it is possible to connect specific names with certain projects, and draw some preliminary conclusions about collaboration and organization within the workshop.

Eusebio da San Giorgio is listed as a witness in the 1495 contract for Perugino's San Pietro altarpiece and is believed to have acted as one of the principal assistants for the project.[17] Eusebio's later independent works reveal the formative influence of Perugino, but there is no clear documentation of the exact nature of his association with Perugino prior to 1495. Born ca. 1465, he was already an established master when he assisted Perugino at San Pietro,[18] but this type of arrangement was not all that uncommon. Because the most prominent commissions in the city were awarded to Perugino, artists already established in Perugia often worked on a temporary basis for specific commissions.[19]

---

[17] Canuti, *Il Perugino*, 2:176–177. See document 224.

[18] Umberto Gnoli, *Pittori e miniatori dell'Umbria* (Spoleto: Argentieri, 1923), 103. In 1493 Eusebio is recorded as having received payment from the monastery of San Pietro in Perugia for a panel depicting St Benedict; he served as the Treasurer of the Perugian painters' guild in 1494.

[19] Scipione Borghesi and Luciano Banchi, *Documenti per la storia dell'arte senese* (Siena: Presso Onorato Porri, 1898), 390–391; Michelle O'Malley, *The Business of Art: Contracts and the Commissioning Process in Renaissance Italy* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005), 90–91. His first recorded independent work dates from 1493, but he assisted Perugino and other

Vasari does not mention Francesco Ciambella, called Il Fantasia, but it is recorded that he, along with Eusebio, was a witness of the 1495 San Pietro contract.[20] Subsequently in May 1499, Il Fantasia is mentioned in connection to a payment for canvas for a *gonfalone* for the confraternity of San Francesco, one of Perugino's commissions,[21] and in 1502, he is described as one of Perugino's *garzoni* who received payments on his behalf from the Collegio,[22] placing him as a *garzone* in the shop during the years of these two major projects, San Pietro and the Cambio.[23]

Three additional significant pupils were associated with the Umbrian workshop: Berto di Giovanni, Lo Spagna, and Raphael. Chapter 4 will examine them in the context of their independent careers, but here the generally accepted terms of their association with the workshop will be discussed in brief. Berto di Giovanni, a native of Perugia, is not mentioned by Vasari; however, he can be placed in the shop around 1495 when there is a record of him delivering a payment on Perugino's behalf to Bartolomeo Caporali for a painting to be placed above Perugino's *Decemviri Altarpiece.* This activity strongly suggests his presence in the workshop during the years of 1495 and 1500, a period of increased productivity. Furthermore, his dependence on the master's formal language throughout his career makes for a strong case for

---

masters throughout his career including Pinturicchio. Borghesi and Banchi note that in "1506 Pinturicchio commissioned the Perugian painter Eusebio da San Giorgio to paint most of the altarpiece he was contracted to produce for the church of Sant'Andrea in Spello. In this case, Pinturicchio provided the *disegno* and painted the heads."

[20] Canuti, *Il Perugino*, 2:176–177. See document 224.

[21] Ibid., 188. See document 252.

[22] Ibid., 191–192. See documents 206-261. Roberto da Montevarchi, described as one of Perugino's *garzoni*, also received payments on behalf of the master from the Collegio in 1502, 1503, and 1504.

[23] Ibid., 191. See document 260.

his training with Perugino.[24] It is not clear what circumstances brought the Spanish-born Giovanni di Pietro, known as Lo Spagna, to Italy, but there is documentation of his participation in Perugino's Florentine workshop in 1492, and he was a key pupil of the Perugian workshop until the master's death in 1523.[25] The connection of Raphael, Perugino's most famous pupil, and most excellent according to Vasari, is undocumented, and thus, his affiliation with Perugino's shop continues to be a topic of debate. But as chapter 4 will demonstrate, his debt to Perugino and the Umbrian shop experience is observable well beyond his early years, in his works and in his practice.[26]

Though the exact makeup and configuration of the shops has not been determined, the preceding review of documents attests to the diverse group of key pupils, assistants, and collaborators that emerged from Perugino's workshops. The documentation also suggests several things about Perugino's methods of organization. First, records of assistants making and collecting payments on the master's behalf indicate his frequent absences from both Perugia and Florence and that the business of the workshops was carried out by trusted assistants. Second, Perugino maintained a number of long-term relationships with artists to facilitate work during his constant travels. L'Ingegno, an accomplished artist, was retained for major projects in Rome,

---

[24] Borghesi and Banchi, *Documenti per la storia dell'arte senese*, 390–391; O'Malley, *The Business of Art*, 90–91. See document 219.

[25] Coonin, "New Documents Concerning Perugino's Workshop in Florence," 101; Fausta Gualdi Sabatini, *Giovanni di Pietro detto Lo Spagna* (Spoleto: Accademia Spoletina, 1984), 366. See document 2 dated 1504. Lo Spagna settled and worked in Spoleto following Perugino's death.

[26] Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, "Raphael's Activity in Perugia as Reflected in a Drawing in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford," *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 25, no. 2 (1981): 231–252; Oskar Fischel, "Raffaels Lehrer," *Jahrbuch der Preußischen Kunstsammlungen* 34 (1913): 89–96; Richard Offner, "A Portrait of Perugino by Raphael," *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 64/65 (1934): 245–257; Francis Russell, "Perugino and the Early Experience of Raphael," *Studies in the History of Art* 17 (1986): 189–207.

Assisi, and Perugia over a twenty-year period. Rocco Zoppo, a Florentine, first worked for Perugino in Rome and subsequently joined the Florentine shop on a permanent basis. Lo Spagna started out in the Florentine workshop and moved on to become a key member of the Perugian workshop. In addition, Perugino relied on a pool of local artists he could retain as demand required. This was especially the case in Perugia, where he retained local artists, often established masters, on a temporary basis,[27] and as the number of commissions expanded, as it did in 1495, Perugino expanded the team, taking on additional pupils and assistants on a more permanent basis.

Tools and Techniques of Replication

The types of working relationships maintained by Perugino give some insight into how the workshop was organized. An additional source from which further insight might be gained is the output of the workshop, the paintings and particularly the drawings that reflect the various phases of the production process. The following is an analysis of the tools and techniques of replication employed in the workshop, as well as evidence of the use of the techniques as seen in the workshop drawings. This section considers how tools and techniques facilitated the seamless integration of the workshop's contributions into the production process, and how workshop drawings can reflect the functions and responsibilities of a workshop hand and further illuminate workshop organization and the division and delegation of labor.

Perugino employed pupils, assistants and collaborators with a range of experiences, which allowed him to integrate the workshop in all aspects of the production process according

---

[27] Berto was independently active by at least 1488 and Eusebio by 1493. Ciambella is referred to as Perugino's *garzone* is 1491 but was already independently active by that year, according to Umberto Gnoli, *Pittori e miniatori dell'Umbria*, 154.

to each individual's ability. Furthermore, Perugino maintained a modular system of production, which used a large workforce and broke down the production process into delegable steps. Thus, collaborators could be utilized for the aspects of production that required greater competency, and the straightforward mechanical tasks could be assigned to the more junior members of the workshop.

In addition to taking advantage of the diversity of the workforce, copying played a particularly important role in Perugino's workshop. Copying was the primary method of education and training in the workshop, and the careful execution of copies of the master's preparatory drawings and paintings trained the student to mimic the hand of the master, a skill critical to success in the workshop. Because training emphasized copying, pupils assumed the master's formal vocabulary, and eventually incorporated the master's inventions into their own repertoires. Copies also served the important function of preserving the master's inventions for later use by the workshop. Workshop drawings mechanically derived from original drawings and paintings formed the stock of patterns and motifs for future productions by the workshop, and were also essential to the production of lower-grade productions.

The number of workshop copies suggests that copying was a practice imposed by Perugino on the members of this workshop for reasons of both pedagogy and productivity. While the workshop experience emphasized copying, copies were not the only type of drawing produced there. A number of drawings suggest, for example, that Perugino encouraged his pupils and assistants to perform studies from life. As discussed in chapter 1, he often had a workshop member pose for studies from life and a number of studies of this type survive. In the *Two Studies of a Standing Youth in Quattrocento Clothing* (fig. 3.1), the pupil or assistant follows Perugino's practice of studying the model in contemporary costume, and subsequently

works out the details of gesture and clothing on the same sheet. In *Studies of a Head and a Hand*, a sheet at the Ashmolean, the assemblage of studies resembles the worksheets used by Perugino to address multiple elements of a single composition on one sheet (fig. 3.2). The New York and Oxford studies are exceptions, however; the number of such drawings is very small in relation to the vast majority of workshop drawings that are copies after the master's *invenzione*.[28]

Despite the visual evidence, Renaissance treatises seldom address the practical aspects of copying. Alberti's *De pictura* is an exception: he addresses the practice of copying in his discussion of circumscription. Alberti defines circumscription as the "recording of the outlines or the process of tracing the outlines in the painting." Alberti recommends the use of a veil, described as a loosely woven fabric that is squared and fixed upon the subject to be traced, and indicates that he was the first to discover its utility. Alberti describes the advantages of using a veil for circumscription and emphasizes capturing the outlines of an original with a fine line.[29] His emphasis on the reproduction of contours is reiterated in an exchange between Pollaiuolo and Dürer in which the Italian painter provided an outline of a figure and Dürer filled in the outline with "plastic volume and functional energy,"[30] demonstrating the practice of realizing figural forms from contours.[31] Both Alberti and the exchange between Pollaiuolo and Dürer

---

[28] This observation is based on the assumption that the drawings that survive are proportional to the drawings that were actually executed. There is a measure of uncertainty since the proportion could be an accident of survivorship.

[29] Leon Battista Alberti, *On Painting and On Sculpture: The Latin Texts of "De pictura" and "De statua,"* trans. Cecil Grayson (London: Phaidon, 1972), 31:66–69.

[30] Erwin Panofsky, *Meaning in the Visual Arts* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1955), 244–247.

[31] David Summers, "Figure come fratelli: A Transformation of Symmetry in Renaissance Painting," *Art Quarterly* 1 (1977): 65–66.

attest to the prevalence of copying in the Renaissance, but it remains an aspect of practice that is frequently overlooked.

Echoing Alberti's emphasis on reproducing contours, a number of other tools and techniques facilitated the workshop's ability to reproduce the master's forms on the basis of contours. The visual evidence found in drawings can be attributed to specific tools and techniques, like Alberti's veil, in Perugino's workshop and these tools and techniques can be seen as indicative of Renaissance practice in general. For example, a *patrono* was a rigid piece of paper that was cut in a shape, most often of a head, and laid onto the painting surface as a guide for the articulation of contours. *Patroni* are distinct from stencils: the latter were used more for repetition in decorative patterns. *Patroni*, in contrast, could be arranged at different angles, which could be varied and individualized while maintaining consistency of scale. Besides Bruno Zanari's 1996 study of the use of the *patrono* in the St. Francis fresco cycle in Assisi, there has been very little investigation of the use of *patroni* by Renaissance artists.[32] Ample evidence suggests that *patroni* were a fairly common tool in the Renaissance workshop[33] and may have been used in mediums other than fresco; however, the full application of the technique has yet to be addressed adequately. Further study is required, but the visual evidence exhibited in Perugino's workshop drawings suggests that *patroni* were used in the production of workshop drawings.

---

[32] Bruno Zanardi, *Il cantiere di Giotto: Le storie di San Francesco ad Assisi* (Milan: Skira, 1996), 32–35. Zanardi surveys the use of *patroni,* drawings or templates for facial types, used to achieve a uniformity of proportions and figural typology.

[33] Carl Brandon Strehlke and Cecilia Frosinini, *The Panel Paintings of Masolino and Masaccio: The Role of Technique* (Milan: 5 Continents, 2002), 22.

Take, for instance, a study in metalpoint related to Saint Lawrence in Perugino's *Decemviri Altarpiece* (fig. 3.3). The drawing lacks the confident and quick handling of the medium that characterizes Perugino's own metalpoint drawings (figs. 1.20 and 1.21), but the unknown assistant nevertheless exhibits his able handling of the unforgiving medium by utilizing delicate lines to create a sensitive reproduction of the master's example. Typical of a drawing after an existing work, the lack of *pentimenti* and the crisply delineated features create an overall feeling of stiffness in the study. In order to produce such a precise copy, especially by mechanical means, the artist must have had access to a fairly finished drawing by Perugino. Although the most common form of transferring a motif from one sheet to another was pricking and pouncing, *spolvero* marks are absent from this sheet. Moreover, connecting *spolvero* dots would not result in a seamless contour, as seen in the curve of the head. Considering the challenges of depicting a head at this angle, the smooth, unbroken curve of the head rendered without hesitation makes it likely that the contours were drawn against the firm edges of a *patrono*.

The same technique appears to have been widely used not only for graphic renderings of heads, as the above example demonstrates, but also for figures. *A Seated Woman Holding a Child and a Standing Male Figure* at the British Museum appears also to have been crafted with the use of *patroni* (fig. 3.4). Though the image has been worked up extensively, the *patroni* contours are clearly identifiable, especially in the clearly defined, unbroken outlines of the heads.[34] Contours traced from a *patrono* are clearly distinguishable from the more familiar

---

[34] The correspondence with portions of the Sistine frescoes is so exact that it is unlikely to be anything but a copy by a follower. The woman and child correspond with part of the fresco of the *Circumcision of the Sons of Moses* in the Sistine Chapel and the standing figure corresponds with the Christ in the *Giving of the Keys to Peter* in the same chapel.

mechanical method of transfer, pouncing. In the *Head of an Angel* in London, for example, underneath the similarly smooth and unbroken contours formed by connecting the *spolvero* dots, the dots themselves remain clearly visible (fig. 3.5).[35] *Patroni* contours are also distinct from contours transferred by stylus indentation (*calco)*. In the detail of *Sketch of a Battle* at the Uffizi, transfer by *calco* results in the rigidity characteristic of all forms of mechanical transfer, but also the lines are irregular and broken (fig. 3.6). As seen in the detail of the Uffizi sheet, the resulting forms from the *calco* technique are sketchier: broken lines overlap slightly and reinforce the contour, and are markedly different from the crisp lines derived from *patroni*.

The irregular and overlapping broken lines of the *Head of a Youth* in Bayonne related to the Pazzi Crucifixion are the result of transfer by *calco* (figs. 3.7 and 3.8). In addition to the *calco* contours, however, the sheet exhibits additional evidence of mechanical means of production. The markings visible in the pupils of the upward-gazing head and the lines along the eyebrows were clearly used to align and fix the unusual position of the head (fig. 3.7). In the finished painting, the eyeball markings become rather unsuccessful depictions of eyelashes (fig. 3.8). Although the exact technique used cannot be identified, it was used elsewhere by pupils and the master himself, for example, in the head and eyes of the angel of the *Madonna del Sacco* (fig. 3.9).[36] Unlike the *Head of Saint Lawrence*, probably executed for pedagogical purposes or perhaps to preserve an ideal motif, the Bayonne sheet is a working drawing, confirming the engagement of the workshop in the production of mechanical preparatory drawings.

---

[35] Carmen Bambach, *Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop: Theory and Practice, 1300-1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 324, fig. 272.

[36] Raphael's use of this technique will be discussed in chapter 4.

Just as a workshop hand used a combination of available tools and techniques to reproduce the master's signature upward-gazing head, a combination of mechanical techniques was used by a workshop hand to produce a compositional preparatory drawing at the Ashmolean for the *Christ and the Woman of Samaria* panel (figs. 3.10 and 3.11). Drawn over *spolvero*, the composition has been worked up in black chalk from the *spolvero* dots.[37] Light incision marks on the *recto* and evidence that the *verso* had been rubbed with black chalk[38] attest to the subsequent transfer of this sheet onto another by *calco,* presumably the cartoon since the sheet corresponds to the final painting almost exactly. This drawing represents the kind of intermediary work that could be mechanically rendered and delegated to a pupil or assistant.

The final technique commonly used in the workshop for copying purposes that will be considered is direct tracing (*lucidare)*. We are more familiar with Cennino Cennini's reference to the "adverse situation" of drawing and copying in chapels, clearly a reference to the common practice of copying a master's finished work and the challenges of doing it freehand.[39] Artists or members of a workshop produced copies more easily by making tracings of drawings and paintings available in the workshop;[40] Joseph Meder was one of the earliest modern scholars to

---

[37] *Spolvero* is most visible on the upper part of Christ and parts of the well. The majority of the well, however, is based on stylus rulings.

[38] Karl T. Parker, *Catalogue of the Collection of Drawings in the Ashmolean Museum: The Italian Schools* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1956), 31. Parker noted the black chalk rubbing before the sheet was mounted down.

[39] Cennino Cennini, *The Craftsman's Handbook*, trans. D.V. Thompson Jr. (New York: Dover, 1960), 6.

[40] Mary Philadelphia Merrifield, *Original Treatises on the Arts of Painting* (New York: Dover, 1967), 2:734–739, 750–752.

note this Renaissance practice.[41] Raffaele Borghini in *Il riposo* (1584) makes reference to the use of transparent paper, *carta lucida*, and discusses the different types of paper available and recipes for making paper transparent (parchment, oil-soaked papers, solidifying thin films of fish-glue and oil).[42] The most common method involved oiled or transparent paper made by drying fish glue in thin sheets on porphyry or marble. The transparent paper was placed against the surface of a picture and the underlying contours outlined.[43] Alternatively, a sheet of glass or thin piece of black silk stretched on a frame (*velo*) could be placed before the painting and the image could be traced onto it.[44] The materials and processes used to trace paintings were, by and large, the same as those used to trace drawings.[45] The *carta lucida* captured the outlines of the prototype and could be transferred onto other mediums using more conventional means of transfer such as pricking and pouncing or stylus transfer.[46] This technique was also useful when the original cartoon did not survive the transfer process, which was quite common with damp fresco surfaces. The *carta lucida* created a means by which to produce a substitute cartoon, even in the absence

---

[41] Ibid.; Linda Freeman Bauer, "A Letter by Barocci and the Tracing of Finished Paintings," *The Burlington Magazine* 128 (1986): 356; Joseph Meder, *Die Handzeichnung: Ihre Technik und Entwicklung* (Vienna: Schroll, 1919), 534–538, 540–543; Joseph Meder, *The Mastery of Drawing*, trans. Winslow Ames (New York: Abaris Books, 1978), 397–399, 401–402.

[42] Raffaello Borghini, *Il riposo* (Florence: Giorgio Marescotti, 1584), 144–145; Lloyd Harris Ellis, "Raffaello Borghini's *Il riposo*: A Critical Study and Annotated Translation" (Ph.D. diss., Case Western Reserve University, 2002), 350–352.

[43] For bibliography on tracing, see Bauer, "A Letter by Barocci and the Tracing of Finished Paintings," 356 n11.

[44] Ibid., 356.

[45] Joseph Meder, *Die Handzeichnung: Ihre Technik und Entwicklung* (Vienna: Schroll, 1919), 534–538, 540, 543.

[46] Leonardo da Vinci, *Trattato della pittura: Condotto sul Codice Vaticano Urbinate 1270*, ed. Silvia Bordini (Rome: Grandi Tascabili Economici Newton, 1996), 47.

of the original, by tracing from the finished painting, a time- and labor-saving device, critical for an active workshop under the pressures of great market demand. Entire compositions, stock figures or a singular detail could be traced from drawn and painted prototypes using these techniques. Compared to freehand copying, the *carta lucida* allowed the artist to replicate models and motifs more quickly and with greater accuracy. Thus, the technique was indispensable for the tasks delegated to the workshop.

Though Borghini's technical discussion of *lucidare* dates to the latter part of the century, visual evidence confirms that the practice was prevalent during Perugino's time and was not limited to the tracing of paintings. Lorenza Melli identified two drawings by Antonio Pollaiuolo, one at the Louvre and the other at the British Museum, and has convincingly demonstrated that the London drawing, which exhibits an oily substance across the surface, is a copy of the drawing in Paris, made using tracing paper.[47] This pair from the Pollaiuolo workshop is a rare example where both the original and the copy on tracing paper survive. Though related pairs of drawings are not to be found in the graphic oeuvre of Perugino's workshop, there still is ample evidence that supports the use of this method.

For example, the figure of Saint James of the Marches in a drawing at the Uffizi corresponds exactly to the *gonfalone* painted by Perugino for the Confraternity of Saint Jerome of Perugia (figs. 3.12 and 3.13). In addition to the figure's pose and gesture, the horizontal lines of the wall behind the saint correspond exactly, which strengthens the connection between the drawing and painting. The drawing is rather dry and stiff, exhibiting all of the signs of mechanical production, and the crisp and consistent contours are characteristic of tracing rather

---

[47] Lorenza Melli, "Sull'uso della carta lucida nel Quattrocento e un esempio per il Pollaiolo," *Paragone Arte* 52, no. 3 (2001): 3–9.

than *spolvero* or *calco*. The sheet appears badly damaged, but upon close inspection, it appears less opaque, and though there is no oily substance on the surface, it certainly seems possible the sheet was treated to make it transparent.[48]

Because of the close correspondence to the finished painting, scholars have interpreted the sheet as a fairly advanced preparatory drawing, perhaps a part of the sequence immediately preceding the production of the cartoon for the *gonfalone*.[49] But the fact that it is a tracing of the fully resolved final form of the saint makes it more likely that it was carried out by a workshop hand to preserve the motif for later use in the workshop. The pose of the figure and general compositional format of this work are reiterated in several later paintings. A banner, *Saint Anthony of Padua and a Patron* (Pinacoteca Comunale, Bettona) and a panel, *Saint Anthony of Padua* (Church of Santa Croce, Florence) are both clearly variations on the *Blessed James gonfalone* (figs. 3.14 and 3.15).[50] It is logical, then, to consider the Uffizi tracing of the prototype as an example of stock workshop drawings used for the production of variations.

As demonstrated by the Uffizi sheet, drawings that are easily overlooked for their damaged state or mechanical quality have the potential to further enhance our understanding of the production process and the function of pupils and assistants. The above discussion draws connections between the mechanical workshop drawings of Perugino's shop and the specific

---

[48] Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, *Disegni umbri del Rinascimento da Perugino a Raffaello*, Gabinetto disegni e stampe degli Uffizi 58 (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1982), 63–64. Ferino-Pagden describes it as giving an impression of having been immersed in water.

[49] Joseph Antenucci Becherer, *Pietro Perugino: Master of the Italian Renaissance* (New York: Rizzoli, 1997), 164.

[50] Vittoria Garibaldi, *Perugino: Catalogo completo* (Florence: Octavo, 1999), 143–144. The banner is signed by Perugino and an inscription records that it was commissioned by Bartolomeo di Maraglia.

tools and techniques for replication that the workshop had at its disposal. The tools and techniques were critical to Perugino's ability to codify his production process and delegate mechanical tasks. Having established how the workshop was able to carry out the more mechanical tasks, the discussion will now examine drawings produced by the workshop by type to further illuminate the function and role of pupils, assistant and collaborators therein.

Carefully executed workshop *ricordi,* made after original drawings by the master, make up the largest portion of workshop drawings. The production of *ricordi* represents the final step in the systematic production process and was consistently delegated to pupils and assistants, forming a rich collection of stock drawings that was critical to future productions in the workshop. The most common subject of a *ricordo* drawing is a single figure, which can usually be linked to an original figural *invenzione* by the master; this relationship is illustrated in a pair of drawings at the Uffizi. Perugino frequently carried out figure studies from life in metalpoint on prepared paper (fig. 3.16). Typical of his life studies in this medium, he places the rendering of a *garzone* in the garb of a friar in the center of the sheet. In the upper margins, he clarifies the positioning and details of the hands, as he frequently does with particularly difficult passages, and uses white heightening throughout to articulate the modeling of form. The clarity of presentation at this preliminary stage reflects Perugino's consciousness that the subsequent development of the figure would be rooted in this study as a part of a systematic production process.

A *ricordo* by a workshop hand (fig. 3.17) is clearly connected to this life study by the master; its formal elements are typical of workshop *ricordi*. In the hands of the pupil, the modeling effortlessly articulated by the white heightening is given form using a tight network of cross-hatching. The meticulous drawing in pen is an explicit and pronounced translation of the

master's intentions, characterized by a system of precise contours and a complex pattern of tight cross-hatching. The plastic three-dimensionality that characterizes this group of drawings must have been developed by the master and imposed upon the pupils in light of their purpose. The effect is close to the prints associated with Raphael's shop in Rome, which can be seen as rooted in Perugino's *ricordi* and similarly contributed to the transmission of Perugino's *invenzione* (see chapter 4).

The difference between a *ricordo* and a copy executed for study is illustrated by drawings at the British Museum and Uffizi (figs. 3.18 and 3.19) after Perugino's *Famous Men of Antiquity* fresco in the Cambio (fig. 3.20). First, the figures are recorded on a smaller sheet compared to the larger format of the *ricordo* (fig. 3.17). In the *ricordo*, the figural invention is also centrally placed. In the studies, the author, who is not restricted by the requirement to produce a faithful copy, leaves out attributes, for example Fabius' crested helmet and scepter (figs. 3.18 and 3.20). In the Uffizi sheet (fig. 3.19), the author identifies each of the figures by name along the top of the sheet, which is unusual for *ricordi,* since the drawings preserved the figural invention, but not necessarily the original context.

Among the rich collection of studio *ricordi,* distinct workshop hands are clearly discernible. This indicates that the role was assigned to different members of the workshop depending on the team at hand. For example, the *ricordo* of Perugino's Moses, also at the Uffizi (fig. 3.21), is a similar drawing type; it is consistent in scale and handling to the *ricordo* of a friar (fig. 3.17), but is clearly by a different hand. The pen work is lighter and more fluid, and is distinguished by a network of parallel strokes, which draws attention to the subtle movements of the body.

Though not all of the producers of *ricordi* can be identified, certain members of the shop can be more securely linked to this responsibility. As discussed above, Berto di Giovanni was a significant Umbrian pupil and was long affiliated with the shop, both early in his career and as a mature master. Berto's graphic hand can be identified on the basis of a small oeuvre of independent drawings, and a significant number of workshop *ricordi* can in fact be attributed to Berto, two of which are illustrated here (figs. 3.22 and 3.23).[51] These *ricordi* exhibit the same meticulous cross-hatching in pen, but there is a level of plasticity achieved by the tight pen work that separates Berto's hand from the others in the workshop. It is this high level of finish, the clarity, and his ability to reproduce each detail of the master's original with precision (figs. 3.20 and 3.24), as exemplified by Socrates' hand at an angle against a plain background, that distinguish Berto's *ricordi*.

Though it cannot be confirmed, it is intriguing to explore Berto's role in Perugino's shop. In light of the number of workshop *ricordi* that have been attributed to Berto and his graphic language, which seems particularly well suited for the function of this drawing type, it seems possible that he was in charge of this final step of the production process whenever he was retained by Perugino. Berto benefited immensely from being a *ricordi* specialist: his assimilation of the master's formal language had a profound influence upon his independent career, which will be examined in greater depth in the next chapter.

In addition to preserving motifs for later use in the workshop, copies are invaluable records of works that are no longer extant. *Group of Warriors Standing* (fig. 3.25) from the

---

[51] For additional references to drawings attributed to Berto after Perugino's designs, see Ferino-Pagden, *Disegni umbri del Rinascimento da Perugino a Raffaello*, 51–52. Berto's independent drawings will be discussed in Chapter 4.

Metropolitan Museum of Art does not correspond to an extant work by Perugino, but Sylvia Ferino-Pagden has successfully attributed the figural group to Perugino, citing a number of works by the master and linking the work to the "uomini illustri" commission for the Palazzo Vecchio in Florence.[52] Indeed, the pose seen in the *Two Studies of a Standing Youth in Quattrocento Clothing* from the workshop (fig. 3.1) recalls the pose of the warrior in the foreground, and similar armor is seen in a study by Perugino at Windsor (fig. 2.5). Copies of the same group of warriors, all by different hands, exist in Paris (fig. 3.26), Florence, and Venice,[53] and the lack of consistency among the copies suggests that they may have been produced outside of the shop with varying degrees of access to the original. It seems that Perugino's original was highly regarded and widely circulated and that the copies in their varying degrees of quality and faithfulness preserve an *invenzione* that is no longer extant.[54]

Copying was a primary function of pupils and assistants in the workshop. Beyond the training and production process in the workshop, as the above example demonstrates, copies of highly regarded *invenzioni,* by both members of the workshop and followers outside of Perugino's immediate circle, are intricately linked to the enormous influence Perugino exerted in Umbria. These drawings circulated widely among Umbrian studios, forming the repertoires of an entire generation of local artists who were largely responsible for the widespread transmission

---

[52] Sylvia Ferino Pagden, *Disegni umbri: Gallerie dell'Accademia di Venezia* (Milan: Electa, 1984), no. 55.

[53] Anna Forlani Tempesti, *Italian Fifteenth- to Seventeenth-Century Drawings in the Robert Lehman Collection* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1991), 214, fig. 73.1.

[54] An additional example of copies preserving a lost original by Perugino is the pair of angels pulling ropes. Fischel was the first to attribute the motive to Perugino. See Oskar Fischel, *Die Zeichnungen der Umbrer* (Berlin: Grote, 1917), 232. Copies at the Albertina, Uffizi, and Louvre (figs. 3.27-3.29), all by different hands, cannot be attributed to Perugino. The author of the Albertina copy (fig. 3.27) apparently had access to the preparatory study whereas the Uffizi and Louvre copies (figs. 3.28 and 3.29) are after a finished drawing or the finished painting.

of Perugino's *invenzione* and style. The chapter has been primarily concerned with the artists who are documented in the workshop and how their drawings can help us glimpse the organization of the workshop; however, the fact that Perugino engaged the workshop in all aspects of the production process, not just preparatory work, warrants a brief consideration of aspects of execution that were delegated in the workshop.

Delegation of Execution

If we turn once again to Perugia in the years between 1495 and 1500 when Perugino was most likely to have been overburdened by the number of projects at hand, the Tezi Altarpiece stands out as a comparatively less prominent commission, the execution of which might have been delegated (fig. 3.30 and 3.31). It was commissioned from Perugino by Bernardino di ser Angelo Tezi for his chapel of Santa Lucia Vecchia in the Perugian church of Sant'Agostino. The use of colors in the Tezi Altarpiece is not typical of Perugino, and based on coloring and manner of painting, it has long been assumed that it was executed by the workshop and that Perugino's participation was very limited. Eusebio and Berto, among the pupils associated with the shop around this time, are considered largely responsible for the execution of the panel and predella respectively.[55]

Although these attributions are generally accepted, the master's role in the design process is not as clear. The Madonna and Child figural group clearly derives from his *Madonna della Consolazione*, completed in 1499 (fig. 1.22),[56] and the surrounding saints are also familiar

---

[55] Francesco Santi, *Galleria nazionale dell'Umbria: Dipinti, sculture e oggetti dei secoli XV-XVI* (Rome: Istituto poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, 1985), 103–104.

figural types. The two Madonna and Child figural groups are identical but with different dimensions and the technical findings have confirmed the relationship.[57] When the reflectographic images of the two were superimposed with electronic procedures, they were found to have a scale relationship of 12 percent, reflecting the use of proportional scaling.[58] The reflectographic images also revealed a hard rigid line in the underdrawing of the Tezi Altarpiece, characteristic of an underdrawing derived from a cartoon, compared to a freer handling in the underdrawing of the prototype. In other words, the exemplum of the prototype was proportionally scaled down and transferred to the panel of the Tezi Altarpiece by means of a newly generated cartoon.[59] This confirms that the altarpiece was generated from a cartoon, and the design and production process were more mechanical than that of the original. But it remains unclear whether Perugino was responsible for the derivative design and cartoon and entrusted

---

[56] Canuti, *Il Perugino*, 2:184. See document 242. The altarpiece was commissioned in 1496 by the Confraternità dei Disciplinati for their chapel in S.M. Novella.

[57] Roberto Bellucci and Cecilia Frosinini, "The Myth of Cartoon Re-use in Perugino's Underdrawing: Technical Investigations," in *The Painting Technique of Pietro Vannucci Called Il Perugino: Proceedings of the LabS TECH* (Florence: Nardini, 2004), 77–80.

[58] This method of using proportional scaling is seen in the drawings of Piero della Francesca and the technique was also widely adopted by his circle of followers, including Signorelli. Piero's use is more rigorous and theoretically oriented while Perugino uses the more empirical application of squaring. On Piero and Signorelli, see Roberto Bellucci and Cecilia Frosinini, "Ipotesi sul metodo della restituzione pittorica di Piero della Francesca: Il caso dei ritratti di Federico da Montefeltro," in *La Pala di San Bernardino di Piero della Francesca: Nuovi studi oltre il restauro*, ed. Emanuela Daffra (Florence: Centro Di, 1997), 167–187; Carmen Bambach, "On 'La Testa proportionalmente degradata': Luca Signorelli, Leonardo, and Piero della Francesca's *De prospectiva pingendi*," in *Florentine Drawing at the Time of Lorenzo the Magnificent*, ed. Elizabeth Cropper, Villa Spelman Colloquia 4 (Bologna: Nuova Alfa, 1992), 17–43.

[59] Garibaldi, *Perugino*, 132. Garibaldi assumes cartoon re-use.

just the execution to the workshop, or he provided an exemplum and delegated the generation of a new cartoon as well as the execution of the painting.[60]

As demonstrated in the previous chapter, production of a very large number of products in a short time period is characterized by a large workforce with a division of labor that leads to a system of grades discernible in the range of workshop products. Delegating aspects of the production process was integral to this production system and critical to Perugino's ability to meet demand, and the Tezi Altarpiece is a prime example of a low-grade workshop product executed by a pupil. Michelle O'Malley has demonstrated that the budget of a project and a professional or social connection between the parties involved can also be linked to the quality of the finished work and the degree of the master's participation.[61] For example, she notes that the execution of the least expensive of Perugino's documented paintings, the *Madonna di Loreto* (National Gallery, London),[62] appears to have been delegated to a workshop member, suggesting a relationship between cost and production practice.[63]

The exact terms of the Tezi commission are unknown but the delegation of its execution to reliable assistants is consistent with the knowledge we have of Perugino's division of labor in the shop. Furthermore, the production practice and the finished product can be seen as a

---

[60] Vasari, *Le vite*, 5:568; Konrad Oberhuber, "Raphael and Pintoricchio," *Studies in the History of Art* 17 (1986): 155–172; S. J. Freedberg, *Painting of the High Renaissance in Rome and Florence* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961), 374–376. It was actually quite common for artists to supply contemporaries with drawings. Michelangelo supplied preparatory designs for compositions to Sebastiano del Piombo, see Vasari and Freedberg, and Pinturicchio received drawings from Raphael, see Oberhuber.

[61] Carol Plazzotta et al., "'The Madonna di Loreto': An Altarpiece by Perugino for Santa Maria dei Servi, Perugia," *National Gallery Technical Bulletin* 27 (2006): 72–95.

[62] Ibid., 77–78.

[63] Ibid., 87.

reflection of the terms and the expectations of the patron. Despite having been executed by the workshop, presumably for a lower price, the painting exhibits recognizable figures and Perugino's signature style, characteristic elements the patron would have associated with the celebrated master and appreciated.

The attribution of the altarpiece to Eusebio and Berto among the pupils in the shop at the time of the commission is based on stylistic grounds, but is further substantiated by their relations with Perugino and the workshop. By 1500, Berto and Eusebio were not pupils or assistants but already independent masters.[64] However, Perugino consistently retained them throughout the 1490s as subordinates, and they took part in the most prominent commissions. But like the majority of the local artists, they also worked as independent masters, maintaining small permanent workshops and even collaborating with each other on commissions.[65] They were long familiar with Perugino's practice and more than capable of managing the execution of a workshop product. This may explain the level of autonomy given when the execution was delegated to them.

Delegation of significant aspects of execution was reserved for the most trusted of assistants. In addition to Berto and Eusebio, there were two other documented assistants who produced identifiable paintings in the shop based on Perugino's designs, with varying degrees of his participation. The *Madonna and Child with Saints Peter and Paul* (Chantilly, Musée Condé)

---

[64] Berto was active by 1488 and Eusebio by 1493. See above, note 27.

[65] Francesco Federico Mancini, "Un episodio di normale 'routine': L'affresco cinquecentesco dell'Oratorio di Sant'Agostino a Perugia," *Commentari d'arte* 1, no. 1 (1995): 29–48. Berto and Eusebio were members of a collaborative workshop established in 1496 by five local artists to undertake commissions together. See also, Chapter 4.

can be attributed to Rocco Zoppo (fig. 3.32),[66] another significant pupil. But Perugino's hand is seen in the heads of the saints, which are reminiscent of the master's drawings, like the sheet at the British Museum of an old man (fig. 1.13), similar to the panel's St. Jerome on the left. In contrast, the *Virgin and Child Enthroned with Angels and Saints* is attributed to an assistant discussed earlier, Andrea d'Assisi (L'Ingegno), but the great control he exercises in the execution of the master's design makes his hand almost indistinguishable from Perugino's (fig. 3.33). Increasingly, however, Perugino granted his students greater liberty. Berto carried out the *Madonna and Child with Saints James and Francis* for San Francesco del Monte (Galleria Nazionale dell'Umbria) when he returned to the Perugino shop during the final years of Perugino's life (fig. 3.34). Though the design is wholly Perugino, the treatment of the faces and reddish complexion are undeniably Berto's execution.[67]

Significant pupils who enjoyed autonomy in the workshop emerge from these examples of works designed by the master and executed by pupils. Perugino's methods of organization, including the formation of teams composed of artists of varying levels of skill, provided a number of advantages. An examination of their drawings as well as their tools and techniques underscores the central role of copying practices in this workshop structure. The codification of the production process allowed for the isolation of mechanical procedures that could be delegated to pupils, assistants, and collaborators. The combination of documentary and visual evidence, though fragmentary, provides a better understanding of Perugino's workshop, its associated artists, and the configuration and division of labor therein.

---

[66] Todini, "Il Perugino," 61–62.

[67] Laura Teza, "Un dipinto in società: Perugino, Berto di Giovanni e la bottega del 1496," in *Pietro Vannucci e i pittori perugini del primo Cinquecento*, ed. Paola Mercurelli Salari (Perugia: Quattroemme, 2005), 47–61. Perugino received the commission from Friar Pietro da Castello and the execution by Berto became the object of a dispute between the friar and Perugino.

CHAPTER 4

BERTO DI GIOVANNI

The education and training of young artists was one of the most important functions of the Renaissance workshop. As discussed in the previous chapter, education in the workshop revolved around learning to produce in the manner of the master. This instruction, in combination with a codified production process, ensured consistency of the workshop's outputs. Throughout Italy, workshops provided an essential foundation and practical experiences for young artists that often resonated throughout their careers. Well-regarded masters with large shops inevitably attracted the most competent pupils, and, without a doubt, Perugino was the most sought-after master in Umbria. Giovanni Santi went out of his way to place his precocious son Raphael in the Perugino shop, which reflects Perugino's high standing in Umbria.[1] Although today Perugino is better known for being surpassed by the budding genius of Raphael, his shop fostered the skills and careers of Raphael as well as many other Umbrian artists.

While the last chapter dealt with the activities of pupils, assistants, and collaborators within Perugino's workshop, the remaining chapters will examine their careers independent of the workshop. The influence of the Perugino workshop can be traced through the activities and innovations of this next generation of Umbrian artists and the varying levels of continuity and innovation can be evaluated. Pupils can be divided between those who remained in Perugia as independent artists and those who established themselves outside of Perugia. Within these two groups, two dominant tendencies emerge: a derivative style in Perugia among local artists under

---

[1] Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori ed architettori* (Florence, 1568), ed. Gaetano Milanesi (Florence: Sansoni, 1906), 4:317.

the shadow of Perugino's dominance and an independent style, found outside of Perugia, reflecting the influence of Perugino's workshop instruction. The careers of two significant pupils, Berto di Giovanni in Perugia and Raphael in Florence and Rome, demonstrate the transmission of the experience of Perugino's workshop through two very different career trajectories, and thus, will be used as case studies to represent the two groups. Berto's activity will be examined in this chapter and Raphael's in chapter 5.

In Perugia, Perugino's monopoly of the local art market was one of the most influential factors in the development of the independent careers of young artists. Although the great demand for Perugino's work across Italy meant that the artist was often physically absent and more often engaged in the activities of his Florentine workshop, as the most celebrated son of Perugia, he regularly returned to his native city for major commissions. Throughout the 1490s, though primarily based in Florence, Perugino was awarded virtually all of the significant commissions in Perugia.[2] Because the city's most important commissions were tied to his workshop, Perugino was able to retain assistants and collaborators, as needed, from the pool of local artists. Many local artists submitted to this market dynamic, which often limited their advancement as independent artists. For many in this generation of Umbrian artists, beginning with their training in the shop of Perugino, and throughout their careers, it was impossible to escape Perugino's shadow.

While Perugino's dominance often dictated the career trajectory of local artists, exceptional pupils like Raphael and Giovanni di Pietro, called Lo Spagna, flourished outside of his domain. The story of the precocious Raphael, Perugino's greatest pupil, is well known. Lo

---

[2] Michelle O'Malley, "Quality, Demand, and the Pressures of Reputation: Rethinking Perugino," *The Art Bulletin* 89, no. 4 (2007): 674–693, especially 676-677. See also chapter 3.

Spagna, a key pupil in the Umbrian workshop, like Raphael, found success outside of Perugia, in Spoleto.[3] Both Lo Spagna and Raphael closely followed the technique and style of their master early in their careers, and subsequently developed unique and personal styles, and flourished outside of Perugia. These two artists illustrate how formative a master-pupil relationship can be and how imitation can lead to innovation.

Within Umbria, Perugino's less prominent pupils provide a different, and generally overlooked, perspective on the master-pupil relationship. These pupils, rather than developing unique and independent styles, depended upon Perugino into their maturity. Berto, a successful local artist, remained intermittently associated with the Perugino workshop throughout his entire career. Although he was far less innovative than a pupil like Raphael, the career of Berto illustrates a more direct transmission of the style and technique of Perugino's workshop and contributes to a more comprehensive view of the profound influence of Perugino's workshop on an entire generation of Umbrian artists.

Società del 1496

In Perugia, because of Perugino's prominence, it was often difficult for his pupils, assistants, and collaborators to gain a foothold in the market as independent masters. In addition, the conservative patronage, with a preference for Peruginesque works, did not encourage local artists to move beyond their training to produce original works or develop an independent style.

---

[3] Vasari, *Le vite*, 3:592–595. Although Vasari suggests that Lo Spagna was driven out by jealous contemporaries, it seems Lo Spagna simply sought to establish himself as an independent artist by moving outside the sphere of Perugino and taking advantage of some of his political connections. On Lo Spagna, see Giovanna Sapori, ed., *Giovanni di Pietro: Un pittore spagnolo tra Perugino e Raffaello* (Milan: Electa, 2004).

In this environment, it was common for artists to remain affiliated with Perugino's shop and collaborate on joint commissions. For example, in 1496, five local artists—Berto di Giovanni, Eusebio da San Giorgio, Sinibaldo Ibi, Ludovico d'Angelo and Lattanzio di Giovanni—rented a communal workshop space near the Porta Eburnea and formed a cooperative, often referred to as the "Società del 1496."[4] The formation of this cooperative, with close ties to Perugino, is a telling indicator of the environment in which many artists associated with Perugino's shop navigated their professional activity.

In the most recent publications on the Società, it has been largely portrayed as a collective act of rebellion against Perugino's monopoly of the Perugian market.[5] The notion of pupils banding together in rebellion is intriguing; however, the actual circumstances of the Società's formation require careful consideration. It is important to keep in mind the practicalities of establishing a workshop that might have also motivated a collaborative practice. In theory, the completion of an apprenticeship qualified a young artist to work as an independent master. But in reality, unless the artist inherited a family practice, the resources required to set up an independent workshop were quite demanding; young artists more commonly remained affiliated with the master's shop or worked as a collaborator on various projects.[6] This was especially the case in the 1490s in Perugia where joint commissions for public works were

---

[4] Walter Bombe, "Eusebio da San Giorgio," *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* 39 (1916): 30–51; Fiorenzo Canuti, *Il Perugino* (Siena: La Diana, 1931), 1:284; Laura Teza, "Un dipinto in società: Perugino, Berto di Giovanni e la bottega del 1496," in *Pietro Vannucci e i pittori perugini del primo Cinquecento*, ed. Paola Mercurelli Salari (Perugia: Quattroemme, 2005), 48.

[5] Teza, "Un dipinto in società," 47–61.

[6] Antonio Natali, "Nel giro del Verrocchio," in *Perugino: Il divin pittore*, ed. Vittoria Garibaldi (Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 2004), 81–87; Canuti, *Il Perugino*, 1:40, 2:116–118; Vasari, *Le vite*, 3:371, 568. Both Perugino and Leonardo were affiliated with the Verrocchio shop for several years after they joined the Florentine guild.

unusually common.[7] We know that at least three members of the Società, Eusebio, Berto, and Ludovico, remained affiliated with the Perugino shop well beyond their training. Perhaps the Società was a way for members to pool their resources for joint commissions at times when they were not engaged by Perugino. An act of rebellion further suggests strained relations between Perugino and the members of the Società; however, there is no evidence of conflict, rather, there is evidence of continued relations. Even after the Società was established, Perugino continued to retain individual members as assistants and collaborators for major Perugian commissions.[8]

Despite the close ties to Perugino, the Società was organized in a way that was fundamentally different from the organization of Perugino's workshop. As in most traditional Renaissance workshops, his labor structure was hierarchical with the master at the helm. The Società, in contrast, was organized horizontally, with each member equal in rank. Each member functioned as an independent artist, retaining and carrying out independent commissions, and when working on joint commissions, collaborating on equal terms.[9] The collaboration appears to have been mainly concerned with the operational and administrative aspects of the workshop.[10]

---

[7] Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, "The Early Raphael and His Umbrian Contemporaries," *Studies in the History of Art* 17 (1986): 94–95. Ferino-Pagden advances the possibility of Raphael setting up a *bottega* jointly with Umbrian contemporaries.

[8] See chapter 3 on Berto and Eusebio's extended association with Perugino. Ludovico di Angelo was a witness for the final payment to Perugino for the San Pietro Altarpiece in 1500.

[9] Francesco Santi, *Galleria Nazionale dell'Umbria: Dipinti, sculture e oggetti dei secoli XV-XVI* (Rome: Istituto poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, 1985), cat. no. 140. The *Madonna and Child Enthroned* attributed to Berto and Sinibaldo Ibi is one of several examples in which two members of the Società collaborated on equal terms.

[10] The economic arrangement amongst the members is unknown.

It is not clear how long the organization lasted, but the formation of the Società appears to have been a pragmatic response to market conditions determined by Perugino's looming local presence. Sharing the obligations of operating a workshop and the cooperative model made it possible for the members to maintain a physical space and take on independent commissions while remaining available to work with Perugino on more prominent commissions. The perpetuation of Perugino's style throughout the early decades of the sixteenth century in Umbria can be attributed to this unique situation in Perugia, and the long-term affiliations of many mature collaborators with the Perugino workshop. This influence is most evident in the independent career of one of the most active members of the Società, Berto.

Berto di Giovanni

Though Berto was not an exceptionally gifted artist, he was responsible for several notable Perugian commissions, and for over forty years was a prominent presence in Perugia.[11] Between 1497 and 1507, Berto is listed in the Matricola dei Pittori per Porta Sole. He was appointed treasurer (*camerlengo*) of the painter's guild (*Arte dei Pittori*) in 1499 and served again in 1504, 1514, and 1522.[12] Despite his established status in Perugia, Berto's work is consistent, in ideation, form, and technique, in its dependence on and faithfulness to Perugino. Berto's extant body of work confirms that even in his mature years he never developed the capacity to move beyond Perugino's sphere of influence. Nevertheless, throughout his career, Berto demonstrated subtle responses to the influence of Perugino, as well as to his Umbrian

[11] Fausta Gualdi, "Contributi a Berto di Giovanni pittore perugino," *Commentari: Rivista di critica e storia dell'arte* 12 (1961): 254. Berto is first documented as a painter born in Perugia in 1488 and was active in the city until his death in 1529.

[12] Ibid.

contemporaries. Consequently, Berto's oeuvre reflects the artistic preoccupations of Perugia during his years of activity. Despite his dependence on Perugino, he was in no way an irrelevant figure in Perugia. His service as *camerlengo* of the painters' guild demonstrates that he was an active and engaged member of this community, making Berto an ideal figure through which to consider workshop practice and the legacy of Perugino.

Berto's formative years in the Perugino shop in the 1490s overlapped with those of another prominent pupil, Raphael. Presumably as a result of a relationship formed in the workshop, Berto collaborated with the young Raphael, about ten years his junior, on an altarpiece for Santa Maria di Monteluce. The extent to which Berto's association with Raphael has encouraged the scholarship on Berto is evident in the historiography. Mariotti (1788) was the first to note the 1505 Monteluce commission awarded to Berto and Raphael, while writing about Berto as an artist of the Perugino school,[13] and subsequently, Berto's association with Raphael has been commonly referenced.[14]

According to documentary evidence, in 1503, the Poor Clares of the convent of Monteluce near Perugia commissioned an Assumption of the Virgin from Berto and Raphael. Two years later, the contract remained unfulfilled, and it was revised on 12 December 1505. After further delays, in May/June of 1516 Berto was sent by the nuns to Rome to urge Raphael to fulfill the outstanding contract. Yet another revision to the contract of 1505 was signed on 22 June 1516, but the commission remained unfulfilled upon the death of Raphael in 1520. The

---

[13] Annibale Mariotti, *Lettere pittoriche perugine* (Bologna: Forni, 1975).

[14] For example, see Ferino-Pagden, "The Early Raphael and His Umbrian Contemporaries"; Michelle O'Malley, *The Business of Art: Contracts and the Commissioning Process in Renaissance Italy* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005), 236–239; Vincenzo Golzio, *Raffaello nei documenti, nelle testimonianze dei contemporanei e nella letteratura del suo secolo* (Vatican City: Pontificia Insigne Accademia Artistica dei Virtuosi al Pantheon, 1936), 11–14.

final contract of 1523 with Giulio Romano and Giovanni Francesco Penni revised the terms of Raphael's contract, and the altarpiece was finally delivered in 1525.[15]

In the literature, the account of the Monteluce commission has revolved around Raphael, and Berto is mostly seen as a local collaborator chosen by Raphael as an assistant. Indeed, by the time the commission was fulfilled, Raphael's reputation had long surpassed Berto's. But it is quite possible that in 1503, when the altarpiece was commissioned, the nuns of Monteluce chose Berto, along with Raphael, based on his own merits as an artist. While Berto might not be receiving the credit he deserves, as a result of this association with Raphael and the attention it has garnered, among Perugino's pupils, assistants, and collaborators Berto's activity is comparably well documented.

Largely prompted by his association with Raphael, scholars like Umberto Gnoli and Oskar Fischel initiated the expansion of scholarship on Berto and his oeuvre has been restored, including his graphic works.[16] This research has certainly provided a better picture of Berto as an artist, but perhaps due to his lack of inherent ability, as well as his local rather than broad appeal, Berto has failed to pique the interest of scholars as an independent figure. Berto retains a presence in the literature, but generally as Perugino's pupil and Raphael's collaborator, and still remains a marginal figure.[17] For the purposes of tracing the function of drawings and the

---

[15] Gualdi, "Contributi a Berto di Giovanni," 259; O'Malley, *The Business of Art*, 236–239. Documents in the archives at Monteluce indicate that the nuns paid for Berto's trip to Rome and that he received an additional payment upon his return.

[16] Umberto Gnoli, *Pittori e miniatori dell'Umbria* (Spoleto: Argentieri, 1923), 73–77; Oskar Fischel, *Die Zeichnungen der Umbrer* (Berlin: Grote, 1917), 224, cat. nos. 149 and 150.

[17] Gualdi, "Contributi a Berto di Giovanni." Gualdi's publication of 1961 is still the most comprehensive.

continuity of workshop practices, however, a pupil like Berto is equally significant to Raphael as an heir to Perugino's workshop practice. Berto and Raphael represent the profound influence of Perugino's practice in a local, Perugian, and larger, Florentine, context. The transmission of influence through drawings, as seen in the independent works of Berto, is reflective of a master-pupil relationship that, however long overlooked, was as significant as the relationship between Perugino and Raphael.

Berto's trajectory as an artist was markedly different from those of his master, Perugino, and his contemporary, Raphael. In contrast to the celebrated career of Perugino, which took him to all of the great artistic centers of Italy and beyond, and Raphael's in Florence then Rome, Berto's career was based entirely in Perugia and his independent activity is punctuated by work in Perugino's workshop. The earliest record of payment received by Berto as an independent artist is from the Tesoreria Apostolica di Perugia e dell'Umbria, in 1497,[18] a year after the Società was established, and the same year he is listed in the Matricola dei Pittori per Porta Sole for the first time. Thus, 1497 can be seen as the year Berto's independent career began. We can also assume that, beginning around this time, Berto was retained by Perugino for projects as a subordinate collaborator rather than an assistant.

Throughout his career, Berto produced works closely modeled after Perugino; quotations and references to the older master are widespread in his oeuvre. Berto's drawings, along with his production process, were closely modeled after that of Perugino and document how the stock motifs and types of the master seamlessly became a part of Berto's own repertoire. These characteristics can be directly linked to his role in Perugino's workshop. As demonstrated in the previous chapter, the Perugino workshop drawings that can be attributed to Berto are mostly

[18] Ibid., 254.

ricordo drawings, which suggest that his primary role in the workshop was that of a record-keeper. Established during these formative years, Berto's mature graphic handling is painstakingly regular, and is characterized by the same distinct meticulous cross-hatching. Another point of attribution is the consistent rendering of the drapery with folds terminating in regular loops.[19] Having trained, in essence, to be a copyist in the Perugino shop, Berto was never able to fully shed this reproductive approach, and quotations and derivations of Perugino's *invenzioni* are found throughout his oeuvre, and have become synonymous with his style.

Berto's altarpiece for San Francesco, Montone (1506-7) (fig. 4.1), for instance, was attributed to Perugino by Vasari.[20] This altarpiece is the type of work that has been traditionally attributed to Perugino, and considered a lower-quality workshop production, but more recently, the altarpiece has been restored to Berto. It is typical of his Peruginesque works for the conservative local patronage in which he freely quotes from Perugino. The base of the throne explicitly recalls the throne of Perugino's Fano Altarpiece of 1497, and the figural types are also indebted to Perugino (fig. 4.2). Though Berto's altarpiece was painted close to a decade later than the prototype, Berto replaces Perugino's open loggia with a rather outdated golden background. The command of Perugino's forms, carefully rearranged so that they recall the prototype but remain distinct, is typical of Berto's derivative approach. The execution, on the other hand, is in Berto's characteristic red-dominated palette, markedly different from Perugino's.

After nearly a decade as an independent master, the inspiration he takes from the Fano altarpiece is indicative of his inability to move beyond his reliance on Perugino. This dependence

---

[19] Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, *Disegni umbri del Rinascimento da Perugino a Raffaello*, Gabinetto disegni e stampe degli Uffizi 58 (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1982), cat. no. 26.

[20] Vasari, *Le vite*, 3:580.

is reiterated in the three panels for the predella of the altarpiece, the *Birth of the Virgin*, *Marriage of the Virgin,* and *Assumption of the Virgin* (figs. 4.3-4.5), which are direct copies of the Fano predella (figs. 4.6-4.8). The only change Berto introduces is the addition of arches to the ends of the Birth of the Virgin and Marriage of the Virgin scenes, increasing the width of these panels to span the width of his altarpiece. Rather than reworking Perugino's compositions to fit the altarpiece, Berto resorts to a time- and labor-saving solution. His efforts to reproduce the design exactly through the addition of the arches suggest he must have been working from a comprehensive preparatory drawing and did not subject his versions to a preparatory process. Workshop drawings, and drawings after Perugino, circulated widely among Umbrian artists and the access to Perugino's drawings that is suggested by the panels' design is not surprising in light of Berto's extended affiliation with Perugino's workshop.

Beyond positing that Berto probably did not need to prepare a full sequence of preparatory drawings, not enough related drawings survive to precisely reconstruct Berto's production process. However, drawings related to the design, interpreted with analogy to Perugino's preparatory process, can better define the transmission process. Berto must have worked from compositional drawings, like the sheet at the Albertina (fig. 4.9) that can be linked to the Assumption of the Virgin panel (fig. 4.5). Judging from its precise correspondence to Perugino's version (fig. 4.9), the drawing was mostly likely carried out after a highly finished compositional drawing or a cartoon. It is questionable, however, whether Berto produced it for Perugino in the master's workshop, or for himself. Oskar Fischel published the Vienna sheet as a drawing by a workshop hand for later use in the Perugino workshop.[21] Gualdi, in contrast, attributed the drawing to Berto, and advanced that it was a copy after the finished work,

---

[21] Fischel, *Die Zeichnungen der Umbrer*, 160.

suggesting Berto's initiative in producing the copy for his own use.[22] It is the type of drawing that preserves a successful composition for later use, often the responsibility of Berto in the workshop, but the attention to certain parts of the composition, namely the figures, rather than its entirety, seems to indicate a personal motivation. The sheet attests to the careful copies after Perugino's drawings and paintings later forming the pupil's own inventory of stock motifs and designs. Normally, the compositional study would have been followed by studies of individual figures. However, since Berto was working from Perugino's design, his preparatory process would have bypassed the execution of figural studies.

Besides compositional drawings, Berto's stock probably included highly finished figural drawings such as the Study of a Woman at the Uffizi (fig. 4.10), which corresponds to the figure on the far left of the Birth of the Virgin (fig. 4.3 and 4.6). Though the drawing cannot be attributed to Berto, the finished drawing, heightened in red and white, is an example of exemplum drawings that transmitted Perugino's figural types into the works of the Umbrian school.

Though figural studies were not carried out for the predella panels, for his more independent works, Berto adhered to a preparatory sequence similar to that of the workshop of Perugino. In a study in Stockholm, Standing Nude Man (fig. 4.11, verso), a studio model is depicted in an unusual pose, seen from behind, and is comparable to Perugino's *garzone* studies. On the recto of the same sheet, Berto uses a single sheet to address multiple concerns in metalpoint, recalling Perugino's sheet of metalpoint studies in Düsseldorf (fig. 1.7). They are

---

[22] Gualdi, "Contributi a Berto di Giovanni," 257. I am inclined to suggest that the drawing derives from a mechanical transfer from another drawing rather than from a painting, based on the precision of the contours that are not worked up, such as the head, but I have not seen the drawing in person.

also similar in technique and function, with freely assembled motifs and figures of varying in scale and degrees of finish, dispersed throughout the sheet. The detail study of the evangelist Matthew is more resolved, while the figure on the upper left is more exploratory, and the study is concerned more with the general pose of the figure rather than with details.

More common to Berto's graphic oeuvre is the meticulously executed mechanical copy after Perugino, such as the *Study of a Head of a Woman* by Berto (fig. 4.12). The sheet represents a female head looking slightly downwards and corresponds to the head of the Virgin in Berto's Marriage of the Virgin (fig. 4.13). The precision and density of the modeling is characteristic of Berto's graphic style. The contour of the head appears traced, or set with a compass-like tool, and the profile, especially around the nose, appears mechanically reinforced, which suggests that the drawing was reused. Berto's careful recording of the contours of Perugino's fully resolved motif would aid the reuse of the drawing, and the level of finish would have been an ideal auxiliary for the execution of the painting.[23]

Berto's inventory of his drawings after Perugino also included sheets like Studies of Infants at the Uffizi (fig. 4.15). Several of the infants can be directly traced to different paintings by Perugino, including Perugino's Family of the Madonna (fig. 4.16)[24], which suggests that they derive from a sheet of motifs by Perugino. Copies after Perugino are surrounded by Berto's own, smaller, more exploratory studies. The drawing shows Berto's use of a single sheet to juxtapose Perugino's inventions with his own variations. Such sheets made motifs readily

---

[23] In this case, it is not clear whether Berto carried out the drawing for Perugino's workshop or for himself.

[24] Ferino-Pagden, *Disegni umbri del Rinascimento*, 57–58.

available for integration into his designs long after he left the workshop, and reveal the process of creating his Peruginesque productions.

It was Berto's training in the Perugino workshop as a copyist, and his resulting familiarity with and access to Perugino's drawings that made it natural for him to exploit his master's *invenzioni*. Successful motifs and compositions were preserved for later reuse in Perugino's workshop, and it appears that Berto considered the re-use of Perugino's formal language as a basis for his own design process as similarly acceptable. This copyist mentality resonated in his interactions with his Umbrian contemporaries as well, as Berto consistently exploited the *invenzioni* of other artists.

A case in point is Berto's altarpiece for the Cistercian church of Santa Giuliana in Perugia, now at the Galleria Nazionale dell'Umbria (fig. 4.17). The altarpiece consists of Saint John the Evangelist at Patmos in the main panel, God the Father in the lunette, and scenes from the life of John in the predella. Scholars have noted Saint John's similarity to the figure of Pythagoras in Raphael's *School of Athens* (figs. 4.18 and 4.19). As a result, attribution of the related drawing in Stockholm (fig. 4.20) has fluctuated between Berto and Raphael.

Osvald Sirén, the first to note the connection to Pythagoras, attributed the drawing to Raphael.[25] Gnoli[26] and Fischel[27] subsequently credited the drawing to Berto, citing it as preparatory for the Santa Giuliana Altarpiece. More recently, Gualdi argued for restoring the

---

[25] Osvald Sirén, *Dessins et tableaux de la Renaissance italienne dans les collections de Suède* (Stockholm: Tullberg, 1902), 54–55.

[26] Gnoli, *Pittori e miniatori dell'Umbria*, 75.

[27] Fischel, *Die Zeichnungen der Umbrer*, 152.

traditional attribution to Raphael,[28] but the graphic handling and comparison to Raphael's preparatory drawing for the same figure support Berto's authorship. The Stockholm sheet exhibits Berto's trademark meticulous and controlled handling traceable to the *ricordo* drawings in Perugino's shop. Compared to the corresponding figure of Pythagoras by Raphael in the cartoon for the *School of Athens* at the Ambrosiana (fig. 4.21), the modeling of the drapery with painstaking crosshatching and the resulting plasticity are markedly different from Raphael's flowing drapery, which falls with greater fluidity.[29]

The figural motif undoubtedly stems from Raphael, and in light of Berto's professional connections to his younger contemporary, it is likely that Berto worked from a drawing supplied by Raphael. As mentioned above, in May/June of 1516, Berto was in Rome urging Raphael, on behalf of the nuns of Monteluce, to fulfill their outstanding contract of 1505. During this trip, it seems Berto obtained several drawings from Raphael.[30] Berto was one of many artists in Perugino's circle with whom Raphael had established personal and professional contacts during his training in Perugino's shop and independent years in Umbria, and like Perugino, he often supplied his drawings to his Umbrian contemporaries.[31]

---

[28] Gualdi, "Contributi a Berto di Giovanni," 262–263.

[29] Per Bjurström and Börje Magnusson, *Italian Drawings: Umbria, Rome, Naples* (Stockholm: Nationalmuseum, 1998), cat. no. 398. The authors note that the eagle is a free-hand addition without the rest of the drawing's black-chalk underdrawing.

[30] Ferino-Pagden, "The Early Raphael and His Umbrian Contemporaries," 91, 101; Gualdi, "Contributi a Berto di Giovanni," 259–260. Ferino-Pagden posits he was given "a collection" of Raphael's drawings. The transmission through drawings is most apparent in two works. On Berto's use of Raphael's preparatory drawing for the predella of the Oddi Altarpiece, see Ferino-Pagden, 91. On Berto's use of Raphael's drawing for the S. Agnese altarpiece, see Gualdi.

[31] Ferino-Pagden, "The Early Raphael and His Umbrian Contemporaries," 93–101.

In the preparation of the Santa Giuliana Altarpiece, Berto employed Raphael's figural invention in the same manner he used Perugino's. The sheet exhibits visual evidence that betrays Berto's origins in the Perugino shop. The drawing is based on a silverpoint underdrawing,[32] a technique favored by Perugino, and also by Raphael, who used the medium throughout his career, even after its decline in usage.[33] The less worked-up areas of the figure, the head and upper torso, reveal stiff contours, evidence of mechanical transfer from a previous sheet. Furthermore, contours are reinforced with different ink, and the entire sheet is squared. This evidence of mechanical transfer attests to the development of the composition over multiple sheets. These are practices and techniques typical of Perugino that were inherited by Berto and Raphael. Therefore, it is not surprising that the attribution has oscillated between the two. Berto was clearly working from a smaller exemplum and the drawing is part of a sequence. The drawing suggests that Berto systematically developed Raphael's figural invention from sheet to sheet using mechanical means, enlarging the figure for the scale of his altarpiece and integrating with the background.

For the lunette of the altarpiece, Berto employs a Perugino stock type, recorded in a drawing at the British Museum (fig. 4.22). Though the design is Perugino's the drawing can be securely attributed to Berto based on the meticulous crosshatching.[34] This sheet represents the

---

[32] Sirén, *Dessins et tableaux de la Renaissance*, 54–55; Bjurström and Magnusson, *Italian Drawings*, cat. no. 398. Sirén was the first to note the silverpoint underdrawing but it is not cited in the most recent publication by Bjurström and Magnusson.

[33] Francis Ames-Lewis, *The Draftsman Raphael* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1986), 13.

[34] For example, it corresponds closely with that of *God the Father* above the *Baptism* of 1507 in SS. Annunziata, Foligno; Vittoria Garibaldi, *Perugino: Catalogo completo* (Florence: Octavo, 1999), cat. no. 78.

most common drawing type in the graphic oeuvre of Berto: a copy of a figural invention after a drawing or cartoon by Perugino. Berto's inventory of stock drawings must have included this type of *ricordo* drawing, if not this particular one, that corresponds exactly with the painted lunette.

Though the majority of the sequence of preparatory drawings for the altarpiece do not survive, if we consider the *ricordo* and figure study (figs. 4.20 and 4.22) as representing different points of a single preparatory process, these drawings would illustrate Berto starting with an exemplum of a stock motif. The ideation, supplied by Perugino or Raphael, would then be developed in a series of drawings, as illustrated in the Stockholm sheet, via mechanical means, for a particular requirement. Perhaps Raphael supplied Berto with an exemplum similar in character to the British Museum sheet. Based on this fragmentary reconstruction of the preparatory process, we can conclude, drawing from the *invenzioni* of artists (initially Perugino's and subsequently other artists' as well), Berto closely followed the codified production process of Perugino's workshop, giving rise to his eclectic productions.

What we can learn about Berto from the selection of his works surveyed here, though far from comprehensive, shows how Perugino and his shop shaped the technical and stylistic aspects of Berto's work. Furthermore, Berto's activity as an independent master, his continuous employment by Perugino as a subordinate, and his endeavor in a collaborative workshop reflect the unique market conditions in Perugia. He was a beneficiary of the common practice in Perugia of a less skilled artist being supplied with a drawing, and he appears to have taken full advantage of his relationship with Perugino and Raphael. As a local figure catering to conservative patronage, Berto enjoyed a successful career. Berto's use of drawings to exploit or re-present the ideal prototypes of other masters in new contexts reveals the legacy of Perugino's practice.

CHAPTER 5

RAPHAEL

Perugia: Early Experience and Perugino

Raphael was the only one of Perugino's pupils who went on to oversee a large workshop comparable to Perugino's operations. And like his teacher, he met the pressures of great demand with extraordinary productivity at the height of his career. This chapter examines the influence of the Perugino shop experience on both the production methods and managerial approach of Raphael in Florence and Rome. The chapter begins with Raphael's early years in Perugia when, like many of his Perugian contemporaries, he benefited from a privileged relationship with Perugino and had access to the master's workshop exempla and preparatory drawings. This first part of the chapter also examines Raphael's early years in Umbria and the profound influence of Perugino designs and motifs on his works from this period. It is followed by a case study of Raphael's Borghese *Entombment*, and the analysis of the preparatory drawings will show how Raphael's practice is deeply rooted in Perugino's. The final part of the chapter examines Raphael's workshop in Rome. The organization and division of labor will be considered in the context of workshop drawings, and the ways in which Raphael modified Perugino's methods will be highlighted. By recognizing Perugino's contributions to Raphael's genesis and refraining from characterizing their relationship as merely one in which a brilliant young pupil surpasses the older master, this chapter seeks to do two things. First, it will revisit Raphael's career in Umbria, a period for which many questions remain unanswered, and will emphasize his reliance on Perugino. Second, by solidifying the lineage between the two workshops, knowledge about

each that remains incomplete can be used to fill in and derive a more complete understanding of the other and vice versa.

Before examining Raphael's early years in Umbria, the scholarship on Raphael's association with Perugino should be addressed briefly. The nature and duration of this relationship, because of the lack of documentary evidence, has defied definitive resolution, and Perugino's role in the early training and artistic development of his most celebrated pupil remains a subject of great debate. According to Vasari, Raphael entered Perugino's shop while still under the tutelage of his father, Giovanni Santi, sometime before Giovanni's death in 1495.[1] Some scholars who reject the Vasarian account believe Raphael entered Perugino's shop much later, around 1499 or 1500,[2] and support for an even later association, as a collaborator rather than pupil and beginning around 1502-1503, has been mounting in recent years.[3] Although Vasari's account cannot be verified, Raphael executed his first independent commission, the *Saint Nicholas of Tolentino* altarpiece (Città di Castello), in 1500, and it is evident in this work that he had fully absorbed the formal language and techniques of Perugino. This altarpiece and

---

[1] Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori ed architettori* (Florence, 1568), ed. Gaetano Milanesi (Florence: Sansoni, 1906), 4:317–319; Kim E. Butler, "Giovanni Santi, Raphael, and Quattrocento Sculpture," *Artibus et Historiae* 30, no. 59 (2009): 36 n7. For bibliography since Crowe and Cavalcaselle on the proponents of an early apprenticeship, 1495 or before, see Butler.

[2] The hypothesis was advanced by Anton Springer and was upheld by Sydney Freedberg and Rudolf Wittkower. Anton Springer, *Raffael und Michelangelo* (Leipzig: Kröner, 1895), 52; S. J. Freedberg, *Painting of the High Renaissance in Rome and Florence* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961), 62; Rudolf Wittkower, "The Young Raphael," *Allen Memorial Art Museum Bulletin* 20 (1963): 154–162. Wittkower in particular has noted that in the contract for the *Saint Nicholas of Tolentino* altarpiece, Raphael's working with his father's onetime assistant Evangelista di Pian di Meleto confirms the continuity of the Santi workshop, which Raphael remained affiliated with.

[3] For bibliography on a later association, 1502-1503, see Butler, "Giovanni Santi, Raphael, and Quattrocento Sculpture," 36 n4.

the evidence that will be presented in this chapter uphold the view that Raphael entered Perugino's shop shortly before or after his father's death in 1495.[4]

There is no doubt that Raphael received his earliest training in his father's workshop in Urbino. While artists traditionally inherited the family workshop, it was not unusual for a young artist to seek an apprenticeship outside the family shop. From the perspective of Perugino, receiving Raphael after prior training with his father would have been a matter of course. Perugino himself had come under the tutelage of Verrocchio as a more mature apprentice, just a few years before he became an independent master in Florence. Whether Raphael worked with Perugino as an apprentice or a mature assistant, by 1500 Raphael's works exhibit more than a general knowledge of Perugino's formal language. Only an extended stay in Perugino's workshop, beginning around 1495, can explain the obvious visual connections between Perugino's works from 1495-1500 and Raphael's earliest independent designs from 1500-1505.

There are approximately fifteen undated paintings and two securely dated ones, the *Coronation of Saint Nicholas of Tolentino* (1500-1501) and the *Marriage of the Virgin* (1504), from Raphael's Umbrian years. Assigning a chronological sequence to this group has been considerably problematic,[5] but seen as a whole they reflect how thoroughly Raphael absorbed the example of Perugino. This influence is nowhere more apparent than in Raphael's *Marriage of the Virgin* (Pinacoteca di Brera, Milan), which is directly inspired by Perugino's version of the

---

[4] Giovanni Battista Cavalcaselle and Joseph A. Crowe, *Raphael: His Life and Works* (London: Murray, 1882), 26–44; Konrad Oberhuber and John M. Brealey, "The Colonna Altarpiece in the Metropolitan Museum and Problems of the Early Style of Raphael," *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 12 (January 1977): 67.

[5] See for example, Oberhuber and Brealey, "The Colonna Altarpiece"; Francis Russell, "Perugino and the Early Experience of Raphael," *Studies in the History of Art* 17 (1986): 189–201.

same subject in Caen (figs. 5.1 and 5.2).[6] Raphael's version is so similar to Perugino's that the relationship is comparable to Perugino's workshop variants (see case study on the *Baptism* in chapter one, figs. 1.23 through 1.30). Raphael introduced changes and variations and clearly reworked many of the figures the same way Perugino reworked component parts for repetitions, but the overall compositional correspondence can only be a result of access to Perugino's original drawings. Though by 1504, Raphael had already completed several independent projects, his work is a variation derived from an ideal design that was established by the master in the prototype.

Similarly, for the predella of his Colonna Altarpiece, Raphael turned to compositions Perugino designed around 1495 for the Florentine convent of San Giusto alle Mura. Two of Raphael's predella panels, the *Agony in the Garden* and the *Pietà*, are illustrated here along with Perugino's versions for comparison (figs. 5.3 through 5.6). Just as Perugino scaled down compositions and removed modules when adapting a design from a larger panel to a smaller predella, Raphael removed the crowds and cityscape from the background of the *Agony in the Garden* and the architectural setting from the *Pietà*. The effect of the simplified design is similar to Perugino's reworking of larger versions of the *Nativity* for later predella panels (see case study on the *Nativity* in chapter two, figs. 2.20 through 2.24). As pointed out by Konrad Oberhuber, Raphael's versions are characterized by a more rounded, almost bulky form inspired by Perugino's figures from around 1500, like those of the Vallombrosa Altarpiece (fig. 2.6).[7] In other words, Raphael's method of reusing Perugino's design is analogous to the Perugino shop

---

[6]On Raphael's departures from Perugino's model, see Carlo Bertelli, "Caen and Brera: From Marriage to Divorce," *Studies in the History of Art* 17 (1986): 31–34.

[7] Oberhuber and Brealey, "The Colonna Altarpiece," 75.

practice of producing variations while stylistically updating them as well. Perugino himself would have simplified the composition and utilized his current, more monumental treatment of figures, as Raphael has done, attesting to how closely Raphael followed the practices of Perugino's workshop at this time.[8]

These early works not only offer evidence of training in the Perugino shop, but their direct references to Perugino's later designs strongly support the argument that Raphael had continued access to the workshop and its drawings. Oberhuber has suggested that throughout his Umbrian period Raphael used stock figures and compositions from Perugino's workshop, presumably his own copies.[9] This was the primary means by which pupils and followers incorporated Perugino's inventions into their repertoires, by executing carefully drawn copies of the master's paintings and preparatory drawings. However, it is impossible to determine the precise drawings Raphael had access to. As demonstrated above, connections can be drawn by comparing finished works, but this method does not precisely illuminate the exact relationship that gave rise to such similarity. Nevertheless, we can still examine Raphael's drawings in the context of Perugino's in an attempt to identify the presence of the teacher's graphic inventions in the pupil's early works and thus test the plausibility of Oberhuber's theory.

The first work that will be considered is Raphael's first documented work of 1500-1501, the *Coronation of Saint Nicholas of Tolentino* (fig. 5.7 and 5.8). Scholars have noted the

---

[8] Raphael's dependence on Perugino is also evident in the exact quotations. The architectural setting for the *Ansidei Altarpiece*, c. 1505, National Gallery, London is a direct reference to the setting for Perugino's the *Family of the Madonna*, 1500-02, Musée des Beaux-Arts, Marseille. See Luitpold Dussler, *Raphael: A Critical Catalogue of His Pictures, Wall-paintings and Tapestries*, trans. Sebastian Cruft (New York: Phaidon, 1971), 13–14 and plate 35; Pietro Scarpellini, *Perugino* (Milan: Electa, 1991), 105–106 and fig. 210.

[9] Oberhuber and Brealey, "The Colonna Altarpiece," 67, 75 n52.

affinities between the extant fragments of Raphael's altarpiece[10] and Perugino's Vallombrosa Altarpiece (fig. 2.6).[11] The debt to Perugino can be found in the hierarchical and decorative arrangement of the composition and the substantiality of forms, attesting to Raphael's awareness of the developments in Perugino's shop around 1500.[12] A number of preparatory drawings survive, mostly studies of figures and component parts such as heads and hands that reflect a preparatory sequence analogous to Perugino's.[13] Of the drawings, a study at Lille is the only one concerned with the whole composition (fig. 5.9). Ruler-and-compass-work throughout defines the compositional framework with precision and certainty, but it is contrasted by a considerable range of handling and stages of development found in the treatment of the figures. The figures in the upper half of the composition were clearly studied on separate sheets and transferred. God the Father and the Virgin are still *garzone* studies, while the figure of Saint Augustine has been given appropriate attributes. A stylus underdrawing is clearly visible underneath the chalk drawing of Saint Augustine, indicating that the more evolved figural study was transferred by stylus indentation onto the compositional study, a method favored by Perugino for developing a study over multiple sheets. By comparison, the figures in the lower half of the sheet, Saint Nicholas, Satan, and an angel, are more loosely sketched. The angel on the left, the most sketchily rendered, is particularly striking for its affinity to Perugino's figural types, both in

---

[10] There is another fragment in Naples and also one at the Pinacoteca Civica Tosio Martinengo in Brescia.

[11]See for example, Oskar Fischel, "Raffaels Lehrer," *Jahrbuch der Preußischen Kunstsammlungen* 34 (1913): 89–96.

[12] Although Raphael is referred to as a master, he was only seventeen years old.

[13] Paul Joannides, *The Drawings of Raphael: With a Complete Catalogue* (Oxford: Phaidon, 1983), 137–138. See nos. 14-18.

conception and style. The handling recalls the quick notations of Perugino's figural studies like the study for the woman from the Fano *Birth of the Virgin* (fig. 5.10) and his *Study of an Old Man* at the Uffizi (fig. 5.11), though Raphael's handling is not as economical. The figure also recalls the general pose of a Perugino figural invention seen in the figure of Tobias from the Certosa Altarpiece (fig. 5.12) and Scipione from the *Famous Men of Antiquity* in the Cambio (fig. 5.13), both works from the proposed period of Raphael's association with the shop. Perhaps it is Raphael's familiarity with this figural type from Perugino's shop that gives the angel a boldness absent from other figures on the sheet. In this compositional study, Raphael seems to be bringing together component parts in various stages of development for consideration of the whole. The wide range of objectives brought together on a single sheet in the midst of the preparatory process cannot be found in Perugino's highly systematic preparatory process. This difference may be a reflection of the careful consideration that went into the preparation of his first major project and an indication of his meticulous process, even more elaborate than Perugino's.

Vasari considered Raphael's Mond *Crucifixion* (fig. 5.14) to be his work most likely to be mistaken for a Perugino[14] and indeed, compared to Perugino's treatments of the Crucifixion around 1502 (figs. 5.15 and 5.16), the similarities are notable, both in design and execution.[15] In addition to the corresponding compositional organization, the figural arrangement (the position of the Virgin and Saint John) and key motives (the upturned head of the Magdalene and

---

[14] Vasari, *Le vite*, 4:318.

[15] Vittoria Garibaldi, *Perugino: Catalogo completo* (Florence: Octavo, 1999), 135–136, 138. See cat. nos. 65 and 72. The San Francesco al Monte altarpiece was commissioned in September 1502 and the Chigi altarpiece was commissioned by Mariano Chigi for the family chapel in the church of Sant'Agostino in Siena, August 1502.

fluttering angels) derive directly from Perugino's example. Raphael not only references Perugino's treatment of the same iconography, but the figure of Saint Jerome in the left foreground is a direct quote from Perugino's Tezi Altarpiece (fig. 3.30). Raphael must have been guided by highly finished drawings like Perugino's head study for this figure (fig. 1.13), as was the workshop hand that executed the figure in the Tezi Altarpiece, but Raphael achieves far superior results. Although no extant drawings by Raphael can be linked to the Mond *Crucifixion,*[16] the overall design and the number of Perugino's exempla directly quoted affirms that Raphael was privy to certain drawings circulating among Perugino's pupils, assistants, and collaborators. Raphael's inside knowledge of Perugino's workshop practices is further substantiated by his technique, which bears a close resemblance. Recent restoration of the Mond *Crucifixion* has demonstrated that Raphael's oil painting technique—e.g., his method of applying ultramarine blue, modeling drapery, and painting flesh tones—closely conforms to Perugino's practice.[17] The parallels in design, motifs, and technique found in the Mond *Crucifixion* cannot be the result of an indirect, more general influence of Perugino's style but rather a firsthand experience in the workshop.

Two panels of the predella of the altarpiece also survive, now in Lisbon and Raleigh, North Carolina (figs. 5.17 and 5.18). Depicting episodes from the life of Saint Jerome, *Eusebius of Cremona raising Three Men from the Dead with Saint Jerome's Cloak* and *Saint Jerome*

---

[16] Dussler, *Raphael*, 9; Joannides, *The Drawings of Raphael*, 142, cat. no. 36 and 154, cat. no. 90. Dussler cites drawings in Vienna and Oxford as studies for the altarpiece but this connection is generally rejected. See for example, Joannides.

[17] Roy Ashok, Marika Spring, and Carol Plazzotta, "Raphael's Early Work in the National Gallery: Paintings before Rome," *National Gallery Technical Bulletin* 25 (2004): 8, 10. The way in which the Perugino workshop painted flesh tones has its basis in the technique practiced by Verrocchio.

saving Silvanus and punishing the Heretic Sabinianus, both dramatic narratives differ greatly from the Peruginesque sensibility of the main panel.[18] As such, emphasis has been placed on elements of both compositions identified as quotations from works by Pollaiuolo[19] and Ghirlandaio.[20] But a drawing at the Uffizi demonstrates that Perugino's influence is not limited to the main panel. The attribution of the drawing, *Beheading of a Saint* (fig. 5.19), has previously shifted from Fra Angelico to Pintoricchio,[21] but Sylvia Ferino-Pagden has convincingly demonstrated Perugino's authorship of the sheet.[22] Curiously, the literature on the altarpiece has failed to draw a connection between Perugino's drawing and Raphael's *Saint Jerome saving Silvanus and punishing the Heretic Sabinianus*. The executioner and kneeling Bishop Silvanus of the Raleigh panel clearly refer [?] to Perugino's compositional invention recorded in the drawing.[23] The extensive pricking found throughout the drawing attests to

---

[18] Jürg Meyer zur Capellen, *Raphael: A Critical Catalogue of His Paintings: The Beginnings in Umbria and Florence, ca. 1500-1508*, trans. Stefan B. Polter, vol. 1 (Landshut, Germany: Arcos, 2001), 125. No preparatory drawings have been linked to either of the predella panels.

[19] Michael W. Kwakkelstein, "Perugino in Verrocchio's Workshop: The Transmission of an Antique Striding Stance," *Paragone* 55, no. 3 (2004): 56. Kwakkelstein notes Pollaiuolo's design for "The Beheading of Saint John" from the embroideries with "Scenes from the Life of Saint John the Baptist."

[20] Ibid. The author notes that in reverse, the movement of the figure shown fleeing to the right of Saint John the Baptist is identical to that of the Saint John in Ghirlandaio's "Meeting of Christ and the Young Saint John Baptist" in Berlin. Raphael merely changed the position of the man's head.

[21] Emilio Santarelli et al., *Catalogo della raccolta di disegni autografi antichi e moderni donata dal prof. Emilio Santarelli alla Reale Galleria di Firenze* (Florence: Cellini, 1870), 3; Oskar Fischel, *Die Zeichnungen der Umbrer* (Berlin: Grote, 1917), 57.

[22] Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, *Disegni umbri del Rinascimento da Perugino a Raffaello*, Gabinetto disegni e stampe degli Uffizi 58 (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1982), 36–37. Ferino-Pagden attributes both the invention and execution to Perugino.

repeated use in the workshop, and the copy by a pupil, also at the Uffizi (fig. 5.20), suggests circulation of the master's invention amongst members of Perugino's circle, which Raphael was without a doubt a part of.

The most extensive group of preparatory drawings survives for Raphael's Oddi *Coronation of the Virgin,* commissioned by Alessandra degli Oddi for her family chapel in San Francesco al Prato in Perugia (fig. 5.21). For his first major altarpiece for a prominent Perugian patron, Raphael adapted an established compositional model, Perugino's *Ascension of Christ* of 1496 for San Pietro, Perugia (fig. 5.22). Raphael's figures are more voluminous and assert a stronger sense of form in space that recalls Perugino's prophets and Sibyls at the Cambio (fig. 5.13) rather than the figures of the *Ascension.* Although many have suggested that Raphael's more classical sensibilities influenced Perugino, this development in the art of Perugino is completely independent and actually predates Raphael's *Coronation*.[24] Raphael is in fact combining Perugino's compositional model of 1496 with the more monumental style of rendering form seen in Perugino's paintings from around 1500.

Evidence of Raphael's engagement with Perugino at this time is even more compelling when examining the drawings related to the *Coronation*, and they exhibit notable aspects of Raphael's preparatory process at this stage of his career as well. A greater number of drawings survive for the *Coronation* than for any other work of the Umbrian years, yet there are no drawings that can be defined as a preliminary compositional sketch. This is probably because, for the most part, Raphael was working from Perugino's design. However, all of the drawings

---

[23] For bibliography on the drawing, see Ferino-Pagden, *Disegni umbri del Rinascimento da Perugino a Raffaello*. The general consensus is that a related painting is unknown.

[24] Russell, "Perugino and the Early Experience of Raphael," 192–193. The iconographic program was devised by the Perugian humanist Francesco Maturanzio and as Russell notes, Perugino's study of classical motifs would not have been lost on Raphael.

document Raphael's thorough reworking of the design by using Perugino's own systematic methods and graphic techniques. Two of the most enduring practices Raphael inherited from Perugino are the execution of *garzone* studies and his usage of the metalpoint medium. From this practice and technique, Raphael gained a mastery of the figural form and was one of the last masters to adhere to the medium. Raphael's regular practice of making preliminary studies of pose and gesture from workshop models in metalpoint is illustrated in a pair of life studies at the Ashmolean (fig. 5.23). Raphael here addresses the stance and gesture of the music-making angels, and they are almost indistinguishable from life studies created in Perugino's workshop.

In a *modello* at the Louvre of the bottom half of the composition (fig. 5.24), an earlier conception of the altarpiece is recorded. Although it appears to be a copy after Raphael, it is interesting for the evolution of the design it documents.[25] Compared to the final painting, minor adjustments to the position and expression of the apostles have yet to be incorporated, and the tomb is fully visible from front to back in contrast to the more sharply angled placement in the painting. The earlier conception is of interest here, for the affinities to Perugino's prototype are more pointed in the drawing. Saint Thomas in the center of the drawing corresponds more closely to the Virgin Mary gazing upward in the center of Perugino's *Ascension*. The apostle holding a book in the right foreground of Perugino's painting is directly quoted in the figure in the left foreground of the drawing; Raphael simply gave him a more animated gesture in the final painting. We know that careful copies of the figural group of Perugino's altarpiece (figs. 5.25

---

[25] Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, "The Early Raphael and His Umbrian Contemporaries," *Studies in the History of Art* 17 (1986): 93–107. It is uncertain who would have had access to and made such a copy after Raphael. Ferino-Pagden has very tentatively suggested the possibility that Raphael set up a workshop jointly with Umbrian contemporaries but this remains highly conjectural.

and 5.26) were carried out in Perugino's workshop and widely circulated.[26] Perhaps Raphael initially drew from such drawings to arrive at his conception, or he may have had direct access to Perugino's original preparatory drawings. We cannot determine the exact source, but Raphael's debt to Perugino's prototype in formulating his arrangement around the tomb cannot be denied.

A pair of drawings also related to the *Coronation* illustrates how the transmission of an *invenzione* is intricately linked to practice. The two drawings are related to the figure in the right foreground of the painting, Saint James, who ushers the viewer into the composition (fig. 5.21). Raphael's study at the Ashmolean for the head of Saint James (fig. 5.27) was without a doubt inspired by the complex foreshortening of a head gazing upward perfected by Perugino, as seen in Perugino's *Study of the Head of a Youth Gazing Upwards* in New York (fig. 1.8). Raphael's drawing directly addresses the angle of the head and fraught expression characteristic of the Peruginesque motif. The "tonal imbalance" between the drawing in metalpoint and reinforcements in pen in the Ashmolean study has long thought to be a result of later reworking,[27] but a similar emphasis on contours seen in Perugino's drawing strongly suggests that the pen work is related to the function of the drawing in the preparatory process. Raphael's pen work was used to reinforce and fix the exact position of the profile, facial features, and ear in the same way Perugino secured these elements in his study in New York. Such reinforced contours would also facilitate a mechanical transfer technique such as tracing, a practice Raphael was surely exposed to in Perugino's shop and continued to employ throughout his career. Furthermore, on the sheet, Raphael used the same mechanism used by Perugino for alignment

---

[26] Reinforced contours indicate that the copies are based on mechanical transfer, presumably, from the original preparatory drawings.

[27] Karl T. Parker, *Catalogue of the Collection of Drawings in the Ashmolean Museum: The Italian Schools* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1956), 512.

during transfer that leaves markings above the pupils (figs. 5.27 and 3.7). As this example shows, the assimilation of Perugino's motifs was accompanied by the adaptation of the older master's techniques and use of drawings.

The second drawing by Raphael related to Saint James is a chalk auxiliary cartoon at the British Museum (fig. 5.28). An auxiliary cartoon is made by pricking and pouncing through a drawing onto a blank sheet and using the *spolvero* transferred from the pricked drawing. *Spolvero* visible around the eyes and hairline of the British Museum drawing confirms that the outlines of the head were indeed pounced from a pricked drawing. Oskar Fischel, the first to recognize this drawing type, defined the auxiliary cartoon as a drawing, usually of the head, pounced from a final cartoon and made for further refinement of details before painting. [28] According to Fischel's definition, Raphael would have used this study of Saint James to further refine details such as the modeling of the upturned head, and it would have been a useful guide during execution of the painting. It thus seems reasonable to assume that the drawing was derived from the full-size cartoon before painting.

Auxiliary cartoons for the *Coronation* are the earliest known examples that survive, and Raphael used these highly finished studies of heads to refine details throughout his career.[29] Examples from the Stanze survive; the most extensive group stems from the Vatican *Transfiguration*. Many of these auxiliary cartoons curiously exhibit visual evidence that

---

[28] Oskar Fischel, "Raphael's Auxiliary Cartoons," *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 71, no. 415 (1937): 167–170; Carmen Bambach, "The Tradition of Pouncing Drawings in the Italian Renaissance Workshop: Innovation and Derivation" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1988), 373–395. An auxiliary cartoon is a product of mechanical transfer. A substitute cartoon, in contrast, is a means of mechanical transfer. Bambach notes that it is possible for auxiliary cartoons to be derived from other drawing types such as a substitute cartoon.

[29] John Arthur Gere and Nicholas Turner, eds., *Drawings by Raphael* (London: British Museum Press, 1983), 218–223.

contradicts the traditional understanding about their function and place in the production process. For example, the auxiliary drawing on top often deviates from the guiding pounce marks, but the finished painting corresponds more closely to the pounce marks.[30] If the pounce marks were transferred from the final cartoon, and the auxiliary cartoon was produced with the intention of refining details prior to painting but the refinements were not integrated, then the function of the auxiliary cartoon is brought into question. Bambach has suggested broadening the definition of the auxiliary cartoon and considering other preparatory drawings, besides the final cartoon, from which the auxiliary cartoon might derive.[31]

The fact that Raphael added the auxiliary cartoon to his preparatory process so soon after leaving Perugino's workshop and while still under his influence gives us additional insight into its function. In technique, form, and function, Raphael's auxiliary cartoon can be seen as a codification of Perugino's employment of head studies. The practice of drawing on an underdrawing obtained from mechanical transfer is a defining characteristic of Raphael's auxiliary cartoons, and this basic method, as we saw in chapter one, permeated all aspects of Perugino's practice. Perugino's *Head of a Man Wearing a Knotted Headscarf* (fig. 1.10), at the British Museum, is a chalk drawing derived from a stylus underdrawing; further examples involving *spolvero* and tracing were discussed in chapters one and two. Like Raphael's *Head of Saint James* (fig. 5.28), Perugino's British Museum study (fig. 1.10) is technically a "copy" derived via mechanical transfer from a preceding drawing. But it is also a working drawing transferred to the current sheet with the intention of further development and subsequently

---

[30] Bambach, "The Tradition of Pouncing Drawings," 391–392; Joannides, *The Drawings of Raphael*, 128.

[31] Bambach, "The Tradition of Pouncing Drawings," 373–395.

worked up in chalk. And like Raphael's auxiliary cartoon, Perugino's study is concerned with form, detail and lighting. Both Perugino and Raphael used dense cross-hatching across the span of the neck to create a sense of structural volume, though Raphael's handling of the medium is not as fluent as Perugino's, and careful attention was paid to the definition of the jawline. Their preoccupations result in a highly nuanced and finished drawing. Although the auxiliary cartoon represents a new and distinct step in Raphael's preparatory process, it has much in common, both formally and technically, with Perugino's head studies and should not necessarily be associated strictly with the final cartoon and pricking and pouncing.

In addition to the formal and technical similarities between Raphael's auxiliary cartoon and Perugino's head study, Raphael's objectives in creating auxiliary cartoons can be explained by Perugino's practice as well. It has been suggested that auxiliary cartoons may be "souvenirs" of the cartoons destroyed in the process of transfer, but Bambach has noted this explanation is problematic because the drawings are exploratory, working drawings.[32] However, both observations are plausible if auxiliary cartoons have their origins in Perugino's practice. The highly finished head study in Perugino's practice was in essence a "souvenir" of a successful *invenzione* with the function of preserving the motif for later use. The *Head of a Man Wearing a Knotted Headscarf* is not only an exploratory drawing exhibiting evidence of mechanical transfer and subsequent refinement, it also guided the workshop in the process of execution and preserved the motif for later use. Raphael's auxiliary cartoons reflect these very objectives. They are working drawings but also detailed exemplars for later reference, and the labored modeling makes them ideal auxiliary guides to painting. In light of Raphael's exposure to Perugino's

---

[32] Ibid., 382–383; Eve Borsook, "Technical Innovation and the Development of Raphael's Style in Rome," *Racar* 12 (1985): 131.

model-book approach to utilizing drawings and his consolidation of functions into a single sheet, Raphael's auxiliary cartoons may indeed have been working drawings as well as *ricordi* of successful motifs.

The diversity present in the auxiliary cartoon and its ties to Perugino's head studies are further illustrated by yet another example for the Oddi *Coronation*. The drawing at Windsor (fig. 5.29) is related to the heads of the two apostles standing to the right of Saint Thomas (fig. 5.30) and corresponds in both position and size with the heads in the painting. The sheet has been worked up in chalk from *spolvero*, presumably pounced from the finished cartoon before final transfer, and is thus considered an auxiliary cartoon. As in other auxiliary cartoons, the contours of the drawing do not correspond to the *spolvero* marks exactly[33] and a stylus underdrawing is visible under both heads. Fischel's definition of the auxiliary cartoon, as previously mentioned, assumes a direct relationship via pouncing from the final cartoon, but these observations of considerable revision from pounce marks and stylus indentation once again raise questions about their relationship to the final cartoon.[34]

Scholars have noted that the head to the left in the Windsor sheet (fig. 5.29) also corresponds to the head of Saint Jerome in the *Madonna and Child with Saints Jerome and Francis* at the Staatliche Museen in Berlin (fig. 5.31).[35] The correspondence to Saint Jerome in the painting is striking when the Windsor sheet is seen in reverse (fig. 5.32). Further comparison to the preparatory study for Saint Jerome in Lille (fig. 5.33) makes it apparent that Raphael

---

[33] The deviations are especially apparent in the left side of the head, across the forehead, down the side of the nose, and down the shoulder.

[34] Fischel, "Raphael's Auxiliary Cartoons," 167–168.

[35] Martin Clayton, *Raphael and His Circle: Drawings from Windsor Castle* (London: Merrell Holberton, 1999), 48–50; Joannides, *The Drawings of Raphael*, 139.

worked from a single exemplum. Furthermore, the second apostle's head in the Windsor drawing is essentially the head of Saint Francis in the painting. As Bambach has pointed out, the sheet does feel like a collage of two drawings of heads that were rotated and reversed.[36] Though she does not go any further, her observation of the unresolved spatial relationship between the two heads precisely describes Raphael's method of reusing a single motif for multiple productions; in this particular case, the source of the motif can also be identified.

Since the Berlin *Madonna and Child* was painted before the *Coronation*, Raphael probably re-used preparatory drawings from the Berlin panel for the apostles of the *Coronation*. Reusing a motif in a new context and preserving an *invenzione* through the innovative use of drawings are highly reminiscent of Perugino's practice. The large-scale format of the head study and the fact that it is worked up from marks of mechanical transfer also recall Perugino's practice (see figs. 1.9 and 1.10). Formally, the Windsor sheet is strongly Peruginesque as well. The strokes of black chalk used to articulate the soft and lively strands of hair and beard can be directly identified with Perugino's graphic language. Not only is the handling of the medium similar, but the same model appears to be depicted in Perugino's cartoon fragment for the head of *Joseph of Arimathea* at Christ Church in Oxford (fig. 1.12). Considering the similar treatment of facial features like the eyes, the consistency of the internal proportions, and the overall positioning of the head, Raphael must have had access to a workshop drawing or exemplum by Perugino from which he derived both the saints in the Berlin panel and the apostles in the *Coronation*. Unfortunately, it is impossible to determine the exact drawing type or types Raphael had at his disposal, whether it was a mechanical copy or a highly finished exemplum. The latter seems more likely: by utilizing the mechanical techniques he was obviously familiar with from

---

[36] Bambach, "The Tradition of Pouncing Drawings," 311–312.

Perugino's shop he rescaled, reversed, and repositioned the motif according to his requirements, fully exploiting Perugino's *invenzione*.

As Fischel has pointed out, Raphael introduced the auxiliary cartoon to his sequence of preparatory drawings when he was still uncertain of his technique and heavily reliant on Perugino.[37] Examining the two earliest examples that survive, both related to the Oddi Altarpiece and discussed above, we see that the production of the auxiliary cartoon was integrated into Raphael's practice in the process of assimilating Peruginesque motifs. In the addition of this extra preparatory step, Raphael built upon his familiarity with Perugino's practice and revised Perugino's methods according to his own needs. In many ways, his willingness to add to an already laborious process prefigured the meticulous and complex production process that would be employed in his Roman workshop.[38] The significant number of auxiliary cartoons that survive for the Vatican *Transfiguration* confirms that the practice was maintained until the very end of his career. By the time the Roman workshop began work on it in 1516, the auxiliary cartoon was obviously no longer necessary for the assimilation of motifs. However, the increase in the number of participants in the workshop and the compartmentalization of labor that accompanied it made the auxiliary cartoon a useful tool for communicating and preserving the intentions of the master, for which it appears to have been readapted,[39] attesting to the flexibility and innovation that characterizes Raphael's Roman workshop practice.

---

[37] Fischel, "Raphael's Auxiliary Cartoons," 167–168.

[38] Ibid., 167.

The remainder of the Oddi altarpiece also reflects a similar reliance on Perugino. For the panels of the predella, Raphael completely adhered to Perugino's designs for his Fano Altarpiece of 1497. Comparison of the *Presentation in the Temple* (figs. 5.34 and 5.35) and the *Annunciation* (figs. 5.36 and 5.37) scenes shows Raphael imposing his own sensibilities on Perugino's designs, as the figures move with greater ease and relate to each other with more directness, but compositionally, they are variations of Perugino's prototype. Raphael reworked Perugino's designs through a full sequence of preparatory drawings, two stages of which are represented in sheets in Oxford and Paris (figs. 5.38 and 5.39). The Oxford drawing is a *pensiero* sketch in which Raphael reworked Perugino's figural group by bringing Joseph closer in and achieving a stronger sense of balance with this slight adjustment. The Paris sheet is a fully worked-up pricked cartoon from the very final stage of the preparatory process and served as both the means for transfer of the outlines from the drawing to panel and an exact guide for the painting. Using Perugino's designs for independent works was a common practice among Raphael's Umbrian contemporaries associated with the workshop. What distinguishes Raphael's practice from a contemporary like Berto, who also used the Fano designs for his altarpiece at Montone (see chapter four), is the fact that, rather than slavishly copying, Raphael introduces changes and variations. Whereas Berto's versions are copies, Raphael's are variations. Both artists' direct references to Perugino would have been appreciated by prominent but conservative Perugian patrons like the Oddi; Raphael's distinct changes, however, would have warranted evaluation independent of the original and added appreciation.

For the third predella panel, the *Adoration of the Magi* (fig. 5.40), Raphael referenced

---

[39] Carmen Bambach, *Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop: Theory and Practice, 1300-1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 321–328; Francis Ames-Lewis, *The Draftsman Raphael* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1986), 36–38.

Perugino's predella panel of the same subject from his San Pietro polyptych (fig. 5.41). A comparison of the two versions reveals specific means by which Raphael achieved variety with Perugino's design. Raphael's introduction of a new architectural element was common to Perugino's practice of producing variations as well. However, Raphael also expanded the compositional space to the right with the addition of a figural group and placed the Virgin and Child away from the foreground for a more organic circular arrangement. Despite these changes, Raphael's *Adoration* retains a strong affinity to Perugino's design. This effect can be attributed to Raphael's employment of many of the same component parts; rather than introducing new *invenzione*, he effectively re-presented Perugino's motifs. Using techniques such as pivoting, turning Perugino's motifs like pieces of sculpture, as seen in the horse and figures in the left foreground, he reimagined these forms in three dimensions. This was actually a common practice among Renaissance artists: for example, Masaccio used the technique for the two poses of the tax collector in his *Tribute Money* (fig. 5.42),[40] and the sleeping apostles in the left and right foreground of Perugino's *Agony in the Garden* (fig 5.3) are the same figure rotated. As Laurie Fusco has noted, the viewer does not necessarily sense a turning of the same form because the resulting pose is in fact different. This would become a technique favored by Raphael throughout his career.[41] In his *garzone* study for the *School of Athens* (fig. 5.43), the draftsman and the turbaned figure are both rotated and rendered twice from different angles.[42]

Raphael's complete command of Perugino's motifs, designs, formal language, and

---

[40] Laurie Fusco, "The Use of Sculptural Models by Painters in Fifteenth-Century Italy," *The Art Bulletin* 64 no. 2 (June 1982): 177–179.

[41] Ibid.

[42] Joannides, *The Drawings of Raphael*, 189.

technique would not have been possible without an intimate knowledge of the inner workings of Perugino's workshop and access to the workshop drawings.[43] The formative influence of the older master was absorbed in an entirely personal way, which distinguishes Raphael from his Umbrian contemporaries, but the works of Raphael's Umbrian years are thoroughly Peruginesque and demonstrate the effect of training with Perugino.

Florence: Preparation of the Borghese Entombment

According to a letter of recommendation written on behalf of Raphael on October 1, 1504, by the *Prefetessa* Giovanna, mother of Francesco Maria della Rovere,[44] the artist left Perugia for Florence with the intention of furthering his study. It is generally accepted that he arrived in Florence in late 1504 and remained until his departure for Rome in 1508. While Raphael had already undertaken major commissions such as the Oddi *Coronation* in Perugia, he was little known outside of Umbria, and in his Florentine years he mostly produced small panel paintings. Two notable exceptions are the *Madonna del Baldacchino* and the Borghese

---

[43] Perugino's attempts via legal means to stop the copying of his work are documented. See Fiorenzo Canuti, *Il Perugino* (Siena: La Diana, 1931), 1:27. Therefore, access to the drawings appears to have been limited to those professionally associated with Perugino's shop.

[44] Vincenzo Golzio, *Raffaello nei documenti, nelle testimonianze dei contemporanei e nella letteratura del suo secolo* (Vatican City: Pontificia Insigne Accademia Artistica dei Virtuosi al Pantheon, 1936), 9–10; Cecil H. Clough, "Daughters and Wives of the Montefeltro: Outstanding Bluestockings of the Quattrocento," *Renaissance Studies* 10, no. 1 (March 1996): 53–54; John K. G. Shearman, *Raphael in Early Modern Sources (1483-1602)* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003), 2:1457–1462. The letter is written to Pietro Soderini, *Gonfaloniere* of Florence. The authenticity of the letter, first published in the eighteenth century and lost since 1856, has been questioned. Most recently, Clough has maintained the authenticity of the letter while Shearman believed it to be an eighteenth-century forgery.

Entombment (fig. 5.44).[45] The *Entombment* was actually a Perugian commission most likely obtained during a visit to Perugia in late 1505. The altarpiece was commissioned by Atalanta Baglioni for San Francesco, where Raphael's Oddi *Coronation* was already in place. Most scholars agree that though the painting was executed in Perugia, the planning and preparatory work were completed in Florence.[46] Therefore, the *Entombment* is considered to be the most reflective of his early Florentine experience. Because of the extensive number of drawings related to the painting that survive, it is possible to reconstruct Raphael's preparatory process, which again illustrates that Raphael rationalized his design and production process on foundations laid by Perugino.

The twenty drawings attributed to the preparation of the *Entombment* demonstrate a controlled and systematic production process modeled after Perugino's.[47] The number of compositional studies included in the group is unusual, but examined in sequence, they document the evolution of Raphael's creative process that gave rise to the unusual iconography depicting the carrying of the body of Christ to the sepulcher.[48] The final painting is a result of two separate design phases. Earlier compositional studies reflect Raphael's initial attempts at designing a composition based on Perugino's *Lamentation* of 1495 (fig. 1.11). The initial

---

[45] Ames-Lewis, *The Draftsman Raphael*, 65; Dussler, *Raphael: A Critical Catalogue of His Pictures, Wall-paintings and Tapestries*, 26. *The Madonna del Baldacchino* is the only large-scale public work by Raphael for a Florentine patron from his pre-Roman years. It was commissioned for the family chapel in Santo Spirito under the will of Rinieri di Bernardo Dei in July 1506.

[46] John Pope-Hennessy, *Raphael*, The Wrightsman Lectures 4 (New York: New York University Press, 1970), 50.

[47] Joannides, *The Drawings of Raphael*, 163–171.

[48] Traditionally an *Entombment* shows the body being lowered into a sarcophagus. This type of sepulcher, illustrated by Raphael according to the description in the gospels, is seldom represented in medieval or Renaissance *Entombment* scenes.

conception, in other words, is a reworking of a Perugino design, the approach employed throughout his Umbrian period. In the later design phase, Raphael's preparatory process remains consistent, but the drawings themselves reflect the impact of his Florentine experience.

Two drawings are considered to be the genesis of the *Entombment*: a compositional study at the Ashmolean (fig. 5.45) and an unfinished *modello* at the Louvre (fig. 5.46). The initial concept reflected in these two drawings is clearly based on Perugino's *Lamentation*. Technically, they also recall drawing types of Perugino's practice. The Oxford sheet recalls the fully formulated compositional sketches of Perugino (fig. 1.1), in which the placement of each of the figures is fully established. The Paris *modello* possesses the lyricism frequently associated with Perugino, and the dense cross-hatching that throws the figures into relief evokes the technique employed in the execution of *ricordi* in Perugino's shop. Although a *modello* usually represents a later phase of the production process, the Paris *modello* is unfinished, making it difficult to determine its precise relationship to the Oxford compositional sketch. Nevertheless, the two studies document Raphael seeking a new resolution within the framework of Perugino's design.

The compositional sketch was followed by a number of studies of individual motives. A double-sided sheet of studies at the Ashmolean (fig. 5.47) is for the apostles at the right (*recto*) and the body of Christ (*verso*).[49] The sheet has been meticulously pricked on both sides for transfer to other sheets and further development, which parallels Perugino's systematic

---

[49] Parker, *Catalogue of the Collection of Drawings in the Ashmolean Museum: The Italian Schools*, 530. Parker has observed that the figure of Saint John was traced through on to the Louvre *modello* where it appears in the same pose and scale with the addition of the drapery. The evidence of transfer is not apparent and Raphael is likely to have carried out an additional study for the addition of drapery prior to transfer onto the *modello*. Additional evidence that the sheet may represent an even earlier part of the preparatory process is the nude study of Christ on the *verso,* which is closer to Perugino's Christ in the *Lamentation* in pose and is similarly propped up on an outcropping unlike either of the Christ figures in Raphael's drawings.

development of figures on multiple sheets using mechanical means. What distinguished Raphael's process from Perugino's, and for that matter his own earlier practice in Umbria, is the development of the figure from a nude rather than clothed *garzone*. Raphael demonstrated a new concern for the underlying anatomical structure by introducing this drawing type. Drapery and attributes would have been added to the nude studies in subsequent sheets in the same manner in which *garzone* studies in contemporary costume were developed, but the addition of this extra step to reflect new concerns illustrates the increasing thoroughness of an already laborious process.[50]

Detailed studies of heads were also carried out, as illustrated in another sheet of studies at the Ashmolean (fig. 5.48). The heads depicted along the top of the sheet correspond to the figures in the Oxford compositional study (fig. 5.45), identifying the sheet with the initial *Lamentation* design phase. However, on the same sheet, underneath the study of heads, Raphael rendered the bearers struggling with the body of Christ, an innovation that reflects a concern with movement and the problems of weight and stress on the human body that cannot be linked to the *Lamentation*. In the study of the figural group, Raphael appears to be considering adding a more active element to the design, and his decision to reconceive the *Lamentation* has been linked to this particular drawing. Scholars have also noted the influence of Leonardo's *Battle of Anghiari* and Michelangelo's *Battle of Cascina,* and many have suggested that this influence manifested itself in Raphael's transformation of the *Lamentation* into a more unitary scheme by fusing numerous active figures into a more integrated whole.[51] John Pope-Hennessy noted that action

---

[50] Joannides, *The Drawings of Raphael*, 163–164. For additional studies related to this stage, see nos. 126 and 128.

in a *Lamentation* was unnecessary, so Raphael's initial conception did not require the skills he wanted to demonstrate, leading him to revise the subject completely.[52] Another source for the reconception of the design, identified by Arnold von Salis, is a well-known ancient relief depicting the story of the death of Meleager[53] in which warriors bearing the body are met by a group of women on the right. A copy after the relief by Raphael at the Ashmolean (fig. 5.49) shows the body being borne from right to left, and it is certainly possible that such antique models gave Raphael the idea for the transporting of the body.[54]

The merging of the Meleager theme and a new consciousness of human form, tension, and movement take more definitive shape in a sheet at the British Museum representing a newly conceived *Entombment* (fig. 5.50). At this stage of development, the movement from right to left has yet to be incorporated, and the design retains some of Perugino's static emotionality and general inactivity that we find in the initial conception. However, the body of Christ is supported well above ground as it is being lowered into a tomb. The final design is definitively suggested by a compositional sketch at the British Museum, London (fig. 5.51), in which the movement of the bearers to the left and back contrasts with the pull to the right and outward. A squared drawing at the Uffizi (fig. 5.52) of the central group represents an even more advanced stage of the preparatory process, in which the dynamic sense of movement is strengthened by the

---

[51] Sir John Charles Robinson, *A Critical Account of the Drawings by Michel Angelo and Raffaello in the University Galleries, Oxford* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1870), 154; Charles M. Rosenberg, "Raphael and the Florentine *Istoria*," *Studies in the History of Art* 17 (1986): 175–188. Robinson was the first to note the development from the *Lamentation* to the *Entombment*. On the influence of Florentine art theory and contemporary models, see Rosenberg.

[52] Pope-Hennessy, *Raphael*, 53.

[53] Arnold von Salis, *Antike und Renaissance: Über Nachleben und Weiterwirken der alten in der neueren Kunst* (Erlenbach-Zürich: Rentsch, 1947), 61–75.

[54] Rosenberg, "Raphael and the Florentine *Istoria*," 179.

inclusion of the steps to the sepulcher. The squaring in red chalk lies underneath all the layers of the medium and the squaring in pen and ink lies on top.[55] This indicates that the drawing is a synthesis of previous studies that had been drawn in a different scale. The squaring on top indicates that the design was enlarged for further elaboration, corresponding to Perugino's methodical way of synthesizing component parts. But unlike Perugino, who conceived of the design at the onset of the preparatory process with a definitive compositional sketch, this series of drawings shows that the compositional sketch for Raphael was the primary means by which he elaborated upon an idea towards a final resolution. This practice drastically increases the number of compositional drawings in the preparatory process, as demonstrated by the number of extant drawings associated with the *Lamentation* phase compared to the number associated with the *Entombment* phase, assuming it is proportional to the actual number executed.[56] When Raphael was essentially reworking Perugino's design, the number of drawings required was limited. However, compositional studies were used throughout the *Entombment* phase and document the evolution of a new *invenzione.*

Raphael used drawings much more extensively to refine ideas; he inherited his methodical approach from Perugino but expanded the process to include new drawing types. Still, these additional drawings were integrated into a sequence determined by his Perugian training. He continued to produce g*arzone* studies in metalpoint[57] and reinforced the contours of his studies for mechanical transfers and further refinement (figs. 5.53 through 5.55). Though the

---

[55] Carmen Bambach, "The Early Italian Drawings in Berlin," *Master Drawings* 37 no. 1 (1999): 122.

[56] Joannides, *The Drawings of Raphael*, 165–168.

[57] The study is for *God the Father*, the lunette of the altarpiece.

Entombment is unlike any of his works from the Umbrian period, the design and preparatory process seen in its entirety illustrate that, even at this watershed moment, Raphael consistently reached back to his Perugian roots. This is most evident in the careful differentiation and elaboration of drawings, a practice inherited from Perugino that was crucial to the evolution of the *Lamentation* to the *Entombment*. This methodical approach proved to be instrumental in Raphael's Roman workshop as well.

Rome: The Workshop

Just as the systematic preparatory process of Perugino's workshop became the foundation of Raphael's own practice as it crystalized in Florence, Perugino's simultaneous operations in Perugia and Florence and his ability to respond to the pressures and demands brought on by the staggering number of commissions had a formative influence on Raphael's managerial style and the organization of his own workshop. The scale and scope of the projects of Raphael's Florentine years did not warrant a large operation, but soon after Pope Julius II summoned him to Rome in 1508, he was overseeing an enterprise of unprecedented scale. This final part of the chapter considers the organization and management of Raphael's Roman workshop. Raphael's constant reformulation of the labor structure and the flexibility with which he imposed his design and production process on the workshop made him an extremely effective manager of a highly productive enterprise. When compared to Perugino's workshop, continuities and divergences emerge both in structure and working methods, highlighting how Raphael refashioned the example of Perugino but remained his most direct heir.

Shortly after his arrival in Rome, Raphael essentially displaced Julius's assembly of artists working collaboratively in the Vatican apartments and became solely responsible for the

entire project, a decorative cycle unprecedented in scale and scope for his growing workshop.[58] The pressures facing Raphael were comparable to those facing Perugino at the height of his career. He was not only leading the creative effort but also overseeing the operations of a commercial enterprise and its work force. Perugino, in order to coordinate the efforts of his large workshop, drew from his Verrocchian training and realized the full potential of drawings to facilitate his production process, and Raphael emulated this approach. Perugino's sequence of preparatory drawings was at the core of his workshop's preparatory process. For Raphael's workshop, the practice was even further codified, the process of analysis and synthesis being broken down further into delegable steps for his growing number of pupils, assistants, and collaborators. The range and variety of preparatory drawings, combined with the scale and scope of the projects, resulted in the production of an extraordinary number of drawings for each project.[59] Raphael was able to manage the decoration of the Stanza della Segnatura with limited assistance; the execution of the Stanza d'Eliodoro and tapestry cartoons, however, indicates an increased involvement by the workshop. Eventually, the rigorous demands of the preparatory process on the workshop become apparent in the rather unsuccessful results found in the Stanza dell'Incendio.[60] Raphael's response was immediate as he changed, modified, and improvised his organizational structure for the individual demands of the remaining major projects of his career, the Vatican Loggia, Villa Farnesina, and the Vatican *Transfiguration*.

---

[58] Bette Talvacchia, *Raphael* (London: Phaidon Press, 2007), 190.

[59] John K. G. Shearman, "The Organization of Raphael's Workshop," *Museum Studies* 10, The Art Institute of Chicago Centennial Lectures (1983): 42. Shearman estimates that for the *Disputa* alone, the total number of drawings was somewhere around 300.

[60] Joseph R. Giuffre, "Design in Raphael's Roman Workshop" (Ph.D. diss., Rutgers University, 2008), 48–84; Shearman, "The Organization of Raphael's Workshop," 52.

Like Perugino, and Verrocchio before him, Raphael maintained a wide variety of affiliations from which he could formulate ideal teams for each project. And just as Perugino bolstered his work force from his roster of local assistants and collaborators when multiple projects were undertaken, we can assume the same occurred around 1514 when Raphael was appointed chief architect for the rebuilding of Saint Peter's. Artists like Giovanni da Udine, Baldassare Peruzzi, Polidoro da Caravaggio, and Perino del Vaga were brought on as assistants and collaborators and worked alongside long-term pupils like Giulio Romano and Giovanni Francesco Penni, who were most likely trained in the workshop by Raphael himself and were the only two that that remained with the shop until Raphael's death.

From the teams formulated by Raphael, distinct artistic personalities emerge and are suggestive of the division of labor. Udine was known for his *all'antica* decorative motifs, and most of the drawings from his tenure in Raphael's shop represent the subject matters in which he specialized: birds, animals, and still-life details (figs. 5.56 through 5.58).[61] Penni was responsible for record-keeping secretarial functions[62] in the workshop, and a large number of *modelli* can be attributed to him. These careful copies after the master synthesize resolutions, clean up the master's creative drafts, or preserve earlier conceptions of a design. Although Penni inherited the workshop with Giulio, Giulio is the one seen as the true artistic heir of Raphael. By about 1518, Giulio was Raphael's most trusted assistant and contributed to the conception of

---

[61] Talvacchia, *Raphael*, 193. Talvacchia points out that he was also responsible for all of the animal life in the Vatican Loggia.

[62] Shearman, "The Organization of Raphael's Workshop," 48–49.

many works,[63] and many of his drawings have the same function in the production process as those of Raphael.

A precise labor structure is impossible to identify because Raphael was constantly revising his system according to the circumstances of each project. The level of Raphael's participation, which depended on the patronage and prestige of the project as well as the number of projects on hand, often determined the specific production process and reflects the flexibility of Raphael's process and managerial style. And yet for each project, independent of the level of his participation, the workshop maintained a rigorous production process, and Raphael engaged the members of the workshop in all aspects of both preparation and execution. Consequently, the scholarship on Raphael's workshop and on the division of labor among its members is intricately linked to the study of the workshop drawings.[64] Despite the lack of consensus on the attribution of individual drawings, the debates surrounding attribution[65] and the emphasis on the function of drawings have significantly enhanced our understanding of the role of specific members of the shop as well as the composition and organization of the workshop. In the following, rather than addressing questions of attribution, a selection of drawing types for which there is general agreement on authorship will be examined to highlight the function of specific

---

[63] Frederick Hartt, *Giulio Romano*, 2 vols. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1958); Frederick Hartt, "Raphael and Giulio Romano: With Notes on the Raphael School," *The Art Bulletin* 26 (June 1944): 67–94; Giuffre, "Design in Raphael's Roman Workshop."

[64] For additional bibliography, see Clayton, *Raphael and His Circle*; Philip Pouncey and John Arthur Gere, *Italian Drawings in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum: Raphael and His Circle* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1962); Giuffre, "Design in Raphael's Roman Workshop," 1–27; Roseline Bacou and Sylvie Béguin, eds., *Autour de Raphael: Dessins et peintures du Musée du Louvre* (Paris: Réunion des Musées Nationaux, 1983).

[65] Paul Joannides, "Raphael, His Studio and His Copyists," *Paragone Arte* 44 no. 523–525 (November 1993): 3–29.

types and the role of the pupil, assistant, or collaborator indicated. In addition, this selection of drawings provides a framework through which the similarities and differences between Raphael's workshop and Perugino's can be seen.

A number of drawings by pupils, assistants, and collaborators that serve the same function as those executed by Raphael himself attest to their engagement in the production process, but the majority of such workshop drawings are those that synthesize resolutions, clean up rough sketches, and serve record keeping purposes; these will be examined first. A surprising amount of resources were allocated for record keeping, and as such, copying practices played a vital role in the daily activities of the studio. A technique Raphael appears to have favored for making copies is the offset, made by pressing a damp sheet of paper onto a chalk drawing to produce a reversed impression. An offset at Windsor (fig. 5.59) is a counterproof of a compositional study for the tapestry cartoon of *Christ's Charge to Saint Peter*. The original compositional study in red chalk is a life study of *garzoni* in contemporary dress, and fragments of the drawing survive at the Louvre and the National Gallery in Washington, DC (figs. 5.60 and 5.61).[66] Offsets were traditionally used during the preparatory process to check the compositional effect of reversing mediums like prints and tapestries. In this case, based on the fragmentation of the original drawing and the subsequent substitution of the figure of Christ, John Shearman has convincingly demonstrated that the Windsor offset was made to preserve the original design before revision rather than to check the compositional effect.[67] The exactness

---

[66] Clayton, *Raphael and His Circle*, 104; Ames-Lewis, *The Draftsman Raphael*, 131; Joannides, *The Drawings of Raphael*, 223–224. Clayton emphasizes that the offset could not have been reworked because it corresponds line for line with the original. However, he does not address the passages of stylus indentations visible underneath the chalk drawing, nor do Ames-Lewis or Joannides.

and evenness of detail of the counterproof is unusual and has been attributed to the use of a printing press, in which case the offset illustrates the incorporation of mechanical resources to quickly produce copies in the workshop for record-keeping.[68]

Although additional offsets were produced at various points in Raphael's career,[69] the vast majority of copies are meticulous drawings after the master by various workshop hands. For example, there are three separate *modelli* of an earlier conception of the *Miraculous Mass at Bolsena* at the Ashmolean (figs. 5.62 and 5.63).[70] The multiples by different hands may have been a result of training members of the workshop, but they also record lost drawings and early designs that were altered or abandoned as well, "preserving for posterity the steps in the master's creative path."[71] Considering the number and range of workshop copies, Raphael must have imposed the careful record keeping of his process as well as his *invenzioni*. Copying was as vital in Raphael's shop as it was in Perugino's and attests to the enduring influence of Perugino's emphasis on copying.

The production of definitive drawings that were laborious to produce was consistently delegated; they often included the production of a tidy draft of an invention by the master or the synthesis of multiple resolutions into a compositional whole. In a compositional study by Penni for *The Miraculous Draught of Fishes* in Vienna (fig. 5.64), an earlier design is represented.

---

[67] John K. G. Shearman, *Raphael's Cartoons in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen and the Tapestries for the Sistine Chapel* (London: Phaidon, 1972), 97.

[68] Lisa Pon, *Raphael, Dürer, and Marcantonio Raimondi: Copying and the Italian Renaissance Print* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004), 110–111.

[69] Shearman, "The Organization of Raphael's Workshop," 48.

[70] For two other versions, see Parker, *Catalogue of the Collection of Drawings in the Ashmolean Museum: The Italian Schools*, 642–643.

[71] Shearman, "The Organization of Raphael's Workshop," 48.

Penni followed a chalk underdrawing, possibly traced from a drawing or drawings by Raphael,[72] and synthesized multiple component parts into a unified composition. But in many passages, Penni did not follow the underdrawing precisely, the deviations recording the adjustments he made as he integrated Raphael's resolutions into a composition.[73] Though the primary function of the drawing is synthesizing the master's motifs, Penni was nevertheless intricately involved in the progression of the design. Raphael apparently disapproved of the resulting composition, for in a quick sketch on the verso (fig. 5.64), the design is newly conceived with the background group of the recto becoming the central scene.[74] It is impossible to determine Raphael's role in the subsequent development of the sketch that would have followed, but based on a later compositional sketch at Windsor by Penni (fig. 5.65), we can assume that Penni was engaged in the process.

By having such highly finished compositional studies or *modelli* of his inventions produced, Raphael was seeking not only to preserve the contours of his designs but the subtle modeling of forms as well. Assigning the task of producing this drawing type to Penni, who clearly possessed a keen ability to achieve subtle effects in brush and wash, demonstrates Raphael's ability to take advantage of the individual talents in his work force. Penni's *modelli,* in addition to preserving a design, were working drawings from which the final cartoon was derived. This functionality can be seen in the *modello* for *Saint Paul Preaching at Athens* (fig.

---

[72] Joannides, *The Drawings of Raphael*, 223.

[73] Ibid.

[74] Clayton, *Raphael and His Circle*, 101–102; Joannides, *The Drawings of Raphael*, 223. Though the general consensus is that the verso followed the recto, in light of Raphael's economy, if Raphael already addressed the motif for Penni to follow on the recto, why the sketch on the recto would have been necessary remains unclear.

5.66). Carefully calculated points on the sides of the sheet were used to fix the perspective for the *modello,* and a scale along the top was drawn with a compass for proportional enlargement into the full-scale cartoon, further evidence of Penni's responsibility for mechanical and definitive tasks.[75]

Although Penni was the shop's *modelli* specialist, the collaborative working structure of the shop was not based on a strict division of labor. For example, the hand of Perino del Vaga, who worked for Raphael primarily on the Vatican Loggia, can be seen in *modelli* for loggia scenes such as *David and Bathsheba* and *Jacob's Dream* at the British Museum (figs. 5.67 and 5.68).[76] Furthermore, according to the visual evidence, Penni and other members of the shop carried out this stage of the production process along with the master himself. Though much debate surrounds the attribution of *modelli*, those by Raphael are clearly distinguishable from those by pupils. In Perino's *modelli*, he clearly worked from designs supplied by Raphael, for the compositional resolution has been fully realized and is a clean copy. In contrast, significant *pentimenti* found throughout *Moses Receiving the Tablets of the Law* (fig. 5.69) are indicative of Raphael's hand and his search for a final resolution.[77] This comparison is informative not only with regard to the collaborative structure; it also sheds light on the preparatory process. In Raphael's drawing, multiple steps were consolidated into one. He addressed his concerns and the sheet was worked up in brush and wash and squared for transfer. In contrast, the

---

[75] Shearman, "The Organization of Raphael's Workshop," 49.

[76] Konrad Oberhuber and Achim Gnann, *Roma e lo stile classico di Raffaello: 1515-1527* (Milan: Electa, 1999); Joannides, "Raphael, His Studio and His Copyists." All of these drawings have been reassessed by Oberhuber and attributed to Raphael. See Joannides for a response to this reassessment.

[77] Here Raphael appears to be consolidating several steps, which previously would have been addressed in multiple drawings, into a single drawing.

involvement of a pupil, in this case Perino, required the breakdown of the production process into further steps: a compositional study by Raphael and a more finished *modello* by Perino. These examples attest to a systematic yet highly flexible labor structure; at any single point in the design process, drawings could be executed either by Raphael or by members of the studio.

The *modelli* by pupils represent an advanced stage in the preparatory process by which point Perino, for example, was working from a design fully resolved by the master. Penni's assistance in the synthesis of designs, as noted above, was also somewhat removed from the ideation or conception of the work. These examples are in line with the traditional notion that Raphael always retained creative control over all of the workshop products. However, the attributions of drawings to pupils, assistants, and collaborators are bringing to light their participation in earlier stages of the preparatory process as well, and drawings by significant pupils like Giulio suggest the possible role of the studio in the conception of the works of art.[78] These workshop drawings are of the same type and function as those produced by Raphael and illustrate the master's innovative methods of delegating throughout the entire production process. This is suggested, for instance, in two studies for the *Holy Family of Francis I* at the Louvre. The first drawing is a study from a studio model for the figure of Mary by Giulio (fig. 5.70) in which he defined the pose of a figure reaching forth. In a related study at the Uffizi (fig. 5.71), also in red chalk, Raphael repeated the figure after Giulio's initial study and addressed the drapery.[79] While adding swaths of drapery, he subtly refined the arrangement of the limbs and

---

[78] Hartt, "Raphael and Giulio Romano"; Giuffre, "Design in Raphael's Roman Workshop."

[79] Joannides, *The Drawings of Raphael*, 116, 233; Talvacchia, *Raphael*, 189. This pairing is most frequently cited as evidence of Giulio's increasing role in the workshop. The relationship between the drawings is almost unanimously accepted and two references are cited here.

the figure attains a graceful monumentality in the process. Representing two different functions and two different points of the preparatory process, the drawings illustrate Raphael's delegation to Giulio of an intermediate phase of realizing the central component of the design. Despite the weaknesses of Giulio's study, it sufficiently secures the pose of the figure, and Raphael used his own subsequent drawing to address the drapery and correct, improve, and refine the study. He delegated the execution of the life study, and in the next step he consolidated two separate objectives into a single drawing, efficiently moving the production process along. Raphael's inclusion of a trusted assistant so directly in the design process is indicative of a flexible and constantly evolving labor structure; it is also extremely innovative by taking full advantage of the systematic nature of his production process. Such codification of the production process into delegable steps, inherited from Perugino, allowed him to intervene whenever necessary and ensure that every product of the workshop was identifiable as a Raphael. In both workshops, drawings were critical to maintaining the standards of workshop productions while maintaining high levels of execution. Perugino achieved this by realizing the full potential of mechanical modes of production; Raphael achieved this by increasing the level of delegation yet participating when necessary to maintain conceptual and creative control. From the emphasis on copying practices and meticulous record keeping to the innovative method of workshop management, Raphael's internalization of the production methods and organization of Perugino's shop is apparent.

This overview of Raphael's activities in Perugia, Florence, and Rome highlights both his exceptional ability to constantly reconceive Perugino's model and the enduring influence of Perugino's practice. As demonstrated in the examination of his early work in Umbria—the

---

Physical evidence, such as corresponding pricking and pouncing marks, would more definitively confirm the relationship between the two drawings, but none is visible.

period of his greatest engagement with the older master—Raphael established himself on the foundations of Perugino's formal language and working technique. His reworkings of Perugino's designs were conceived precisely in the manner in which variations were produced in Perugino's own workshop. These observations are significant not only as an indicator of the formative influence of Perugino and the privileged access to workshop drawings Raphael enjoyed, but also as a confirmation of Raphael's firsthand experience in the workshop. Raphael's response to Perugino's formal language and practice fully materialized in the meticulous preparation of works in Florence like the Borghese *Entombment.* His careful differentiation and extensive elaboration of drawings and the application of mechanical modes of production, assumed from Perugino's practice, would characterize his practice for the remainder of his career. The influence of Perugino's organizational principles can be seen in the collaborative model of Raphael's Roman workshop. Like Perugino, he took advantage of the individual talent of not only pupils and assistants, but also of mature collaborators, and he utilized drawings to oversee multiple projects simultaneously during periods of extraordinary productivity. As the number of participants increased, labor was further compartmentalized, and Raphael introduced innovative ways to integrate significant input from the workshop throughout the production process while retaining complete creative control. Finally, the prominent role that copying practices assumed in Raphael's workshop is one of the most striking legacies of his association with Perugino. Not only is it prevalent in the training and working methods, such as the production of offsets and the careful recordings of final as well as preliminary designs, it is also identifiable in Raphael's general interest in printmaking. Lisa Pon has attributed Raphael's enthusiastic participation in the making of prints, compared to his contemporaries, to his habits

of drawing.[80] As this chapter has demonstrated, Raphael's methods and techniques were deeply rooted in Perugino's practice, so Raphael must have perceived the prints he produced in collaboration with Marcantonio Raimondi in light of the same function of *ricordi* in Perugino's workshop. Having experienced firsthand the transmission of Perugino's visual language through copies and the influence they had on an entire generation of Umbrian painters, Raphael must have quickly realized the potential for prints to bring him Europe-wide recognition, further demonstrating how closely Raphael's practice was modeled after Perugino's.[81]

---

[80] Pon, *Raphael, Dürer, and Marcantonio Raimondi*, 102.

[81] Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, "A Master-Painter and His Pupils: Pietro Perugino and His Umbrian Workshop," *The Oxford Art Journal* 3 (1979): 11.

CONCLUSION

From this study of Perugino's working methods, characteristics that distinguished his workshop's practice and made the shop experience so influential have been established. Even in periods of extreme productivity, Perugino never resorted to relaxing the intensity of his preparatory process, and the careful differentiation of drawings became a hallmark of his practice. Methods of efficiency were also emphasized and are illustrated in his practice of generating more than one product from a single *invenzione*. Perugino's re-use of drawings was rooted in tradition. The function of the workshop's graphic inventory of the drawn copies (exemplum, *simile*, or *ricordo*) is in fact comparable to the employment of model-books in the medieval workshop. Perugino literally deconstructed the traditional instrument of the medieval workshop, and his reinvention of the model-book was combined with mechanical and technical methods of transfer to achieve endless variety and unprecedented productivity. Perugino's innovative use of drawings reconciled a traditional practice with the realization of the full potential of drawings. His exploitation of the function of drawings was also intricately linked to the organization of his workshop. The preparatory process was broken down into manageable steps, and drawings facilitated a more efficient delegation of labor

The very techniques that made his practice so innovative, however, resulted in previously conceived motifs and designs reappearing in later works. Vasari's disapproval of Perugino's practice has been echoed by modern scholars, but the use of a model or a prototype is an inherent part of Renaissance artistic production. In fact, the re-use of motifs and designs is prevalent in

Vasari's own working procedures.[1] Vasari exploited the same workshop tradition, re-using models, but he and his contemporaries rationalized the practice as a source of greater variety of invention. The examination of variants by Perugino and the workshop in chapters one and two demonstrates that Perugino was occupied by similar concerns. The works were not conceived as copies, but rather revisions of his earlier paintings. Perugino's oeuvre is in fact notable for the fact that he rarely produced exact replicas. The later variations evolved and matured and were a presentation of a more developed design rooted in an established ideal. Furthermore, the introduction of changes and variations was consistently worked out in drawings. Creighton Gilbert uses the term "intermediate drawing" in reference to Girolamo Savoldo's preparatory drawings for a second version of a painting,[2] and many of the workshop drawings examined in this dissertation are in fact intermediate drawings for the next variation. In Perugino's preparatory process, drawings were more frequently produced for preserving and revising than for creating, and the assiduous production of *ricordi* attests to Perugino's planning for a later variant as he was executing the original.

Each of the variations, conceived through independent preparatory processes based on intermediate drawings, therefore possesses what Walter Benjamin referred to as aura. And the aura of a work of art, whether "original" or variant, was perceived and experienced differently by different Renaissance consumers of Perugino's works. While a younger generation of Florentine painters vehemently rejected his SS. Annunziata Polyptych for the re-use of figures, the patrons of the altarpiece had no objections to the work and displayed it on the high altar of the basilica as planned. Francesco del Pugliese specifically wanted the original *Lamentation* that had been

---

[1] Alessandro Nova, "Salviati, Vasari, and the Reuse of Drawings in Their Working Practice," *Master Drawings* 30, no. 1 (1992): 83–108.

[2] Creighton Gilbert, "Milan and Savoldo," *The Art Bulletin* 27 (1945): 112–113.

painted for the nuns of S. Chiara in Florence and offered to pay three times the price paid by the nuns.[3] When Perugino delegated the execution of the Tezi Altarpiece to Eusebio and Berto, the patrons accepted the collaborative production. In contrast, when Perugino delegated the execution of the Monteripido Altarpiece to Berto, the patrons found the workshop product unacceptable and the commission became a subject of a dispute between Perugino and the patron. The Renaissance audience's response to repetition, the notion of the original, and collaboration in the workshop indicated in each of these instances reflects the complexity that governed the market for variations, copies and workshop products.

A recurring theme throughout the chapters has been the prominent role of copying practices in Perugino's workshop. The formative influence of this practice on his pupils was also examined and, like Perugino, copying and conserving drawings was central to the working methods of both Berto and Raphael. The drawings were presented as a rich source of insight into the preservation and transmission of *invenzioni* among artists. However, due to the nature of the drawings, i.e., drawn copies, the measure of uncertainty that inevitably surrounds the investigation of copying, imitation, and design reproduction must be noted. Because Perugino often delegated the production of mechanical drawings, copies of Perugino's inventions made by pupils, assistants, and collaborators for use in the shop are often indistinguishable from those made for their own purposes, both in the shop and later while associated with the shop in the capacity of a collaborator. The challenge of distinguishing this difference is further complicated by drawings by Perugino that circulated among Umbrian associates. Despite this measure of uncertainty, it has proved possible to establish workshop procedure and enhance our ability to

---

[3] Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori ed architettori* (Florence, 1568), ed. Gaetano Milanesi (Florence: Sansoni, 1906), 3:569–570.

interpret the nuances present in these drawings. The study of technique and the function of drawings can clarify, more definitively, the process of transmission and exchange between painters.

Possible explanations for Perugino's repetition, such as the use of a workshop model-book and cartoon re-use, have previously been alluded to in the literature and compelling arguments for cartoon re-use have been made, despite the fragmentary visual evidence. However, in this project, repetition has been considered in the broader context of the workshop and its practices. Though many questions remain, the connections that have been drawn between repetition and drawing types, tools and techniques, and workshop organization underscore the potential value of better understanding the diversity and complexity found in an artist's practice. The traditional explanations that have been advanced have tended to place an emphasis on a "tradition of design replication" particular to Umbria, but it is important to remember that the practice was not particular to Umbria or to Perugino.[4] Copying permeated all aspects of Renaissance culture across Italy. The effort to emulate a model closely enough for the influence to be recognized but refashion it into something new is found in Renaissance literature and even the prescribed behavior of an ideal courtier. In art, it is not only the basis of artistic education but also of production. As seen in the artist's preparatory process, it is an inherent part of the process of producing a work of art. The composition is developed and component parts integrated through mechanical transfer, i.e., copying, from one drawing to the next. The final design is then copied onto the surface to be painted and the *invenzione* is copied yet again for

---

[4] See for example Bette Talvacchia, "Raphael's Workshop and the Development of a Managerial Style," in *The Cambridge Companion to Raphael*, ed. Marcia B. Hall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 176; Carmen Bambach, *Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop: Theory and Practice, 1300-1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 86–90.

later use. While copies are an aspect of Renaissance art that requires further research, the questions asked in this dissertation about copying practices in the workshop of Perugino and the repetition found in his oeuvre highlight the value of seeing copies, variations, and replicas in more complete context.

The independent careers of Berto and Raphael examined in chapters four and five represent two different case studies in which the rationalization of the workshop experience was traced. The assumption of Perugino's practice and visual language is more direct with Berto, compared to the more personal interpretation of Perugino's influence by Raphael. The examination of their relationship to Perugino has also brought to light how the terms of their dependence on Perugino in the early stages of their careers influenced how they responded to the art of other masters later in their careers. For example, Berto's employment of Raphael's designs and Raphael's vociferous experimentation inspired by Leonardo and Michelangelo in Florence attest to the foundations laid by their early experience.

The formative influence of the emphasis on copying and conserving in Perugino's workshop is especially apparent in the practices of Raphael's Roman workshop. Just as Berto was largely responsible for *ricordo* drawings in the Perugino shop, Raphael delegated the production of *modelli* after his inventions to Penni. The production of these "retrospective *modelli*"[5] became a drawing type and a sequence of Raphael's production process, demonstrating how the practices of the older master were further elaborated and codified by Raphael. He was, in many ways, the most direct beneficiary of Perugino's practices because of the scale of his Roman operations. Economy and efficiency concerned the practices of both artists and like

---

[5] Martin Clayton, *Raphael and His Circle: Drawings from Windsor Castle* (London: Merrell Holberton, 1999), 15.

Perugino, Raphael rarely let an invention go to waste. Designs discarded in the preparatory process, or devised for a project never executed, consistently reappear in later works. For example, Marcantonio Raimondi's *Lamentation* after Raphael (fig. C.1) is based on a study from the Lamentation-phase of the preparation of the Borghese *Entombment* (fig. 5.42). Furthermore, Raphael's modes of draftsmanship can be attributed to his contact with Perugino, and his approach to invention and execution was shaped by Perugino's practice as well. According to Giovanni Battista Armenini, Raphael's process of invention was actually based on an inventory of stock drawings.

> It is said that Raphael had another very easy method. He would set out many of his own drawings which seemed near to the subject matter which he had already conceived in his mind in great part. Looking first at one drawing, then at another while sketching swiftly, Raphael thus created his entire invention which seemed to be born because the mind was helped in such a manner and was enriched by the multitude of drawings.[6]

While we tend to think of the conception of works of art in the sixteenth century, compared to the fifteenth, as much more spontaneous, Armenini's characterization of Raphael's method presents a different picture. Raphael's quick sketches actually derive from a graphic archive of stock motifs, and expose the lingering model-book mentality found in Perugino's practice, thus underscoring Raphael's roots in the craft tradition.

Continuity in workshop structure and organization has also been established. Because documents pertaining to the structure and organization of specific workshops are so rare, the chapters on Perugino's workshop and Raphael's in Rome sought to demonstrate the possibility

---

[6] Giovanni Battista Armenini, *De' veri precetti della pittura* (Ravenna, 1587); Giovanni Battista Armenini, *On the True Precepts of the Art of Painting*, trans. Edward J. Olszewski (New York: Franklin, 1977), 146.

of inferring managerial elements from the study of workshop drawings. In Perugino's workshop, his drawings served as the prototype or model and the workshop, composed of a purposeful combination of subordinates, employed a full range of mechanical tools and techniques to facilitate the preparatory process. Just as systematic and rigorous as Perugino's, in Raphael's practice, his drawings were used to convey his *concetto* and control the level of his participation. Both used drawings to retain creative control of the design and preparatory process, and though mechanical tools and techniques are just as significant in Raphael's practice, there is a gradual shift in the division of labor reflecting the increasing emphasis on invention over execution.

By the latter part of the Quattrocento, this shift became even more pronounced. For artists like Vasari, the role of the artist lay in the intellectual process of conceiving the program, and design became just as delegable as the execution.[7] When Vasari was engaged simultaneously on several major projects, including the Sala dei Cinquecento, from 1567-68, the responsibility of designing parts of the project was delegated to his assistants Battista Naldini and Giovanni Stradano.[8] Though the practices of Raphael's pupils (particularly those of Vasari's generation) are beyond the scope of this project, a quick review of the working methods of Giulio Romano in Mantua hints at his Perugino lineage.[9] He also employed a highly articulated procedure using meticulously and systematically executed preparatory drawings. Giulio's re-use of *invenzioni* and his tools and techniques recall the practices of his teacher Raphael as well as Perugino.

---

[7] Marcia B. Hall, "The Operation of Vasari's Workshop and the Designs for S. Maria Novella and S. Croce," *Burlington Magazine* 115, no. 841 (April 1973): 208–209.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Janet Cox-Rearick, ed., *Giulio Romano: Master Designer* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1999), 28–31.

Giulio's repetition and recycling of his repertoire of stock figures has long been noted.[10] Armenini,[11] who was familiar with Giulio's technique, describes how he frequently transferred designs by means of *calco*, then deliberately erased traces left from the transfer process by daubing them away with a piece of fine cloth, thus giving the appearance of having drawn without a preliminary guide. This habit of tracing and transferring designs from one sheet to another was so fundamental to his practice that he generally used only one side of a sheet to accommodate transfer. The fact that artists inherited workshop practices is evident in his recognizably Peruginesque practices.

The questions answered in this dissertation, however, also leave some issues unresolved. Though the case for Raphael's training in Perugino's workshop has been further substantiated, the exact nature of Raphael's association with Perugino will continue to elude us unless documentary evidence becomes available. Nevertheless, the reexamination of Raphael as a pupil of Perugino, in the context of the older master's workshop, brings to light Raphael's place among a large circle of Umbrian artists associated with Perugino. His personal relation with Berto is a case in point. The composition and organization of Perugino's workshop and Raphael's place in it can be further illuminated by these local Umbrian artists, as the study of Berto has demonstrated. Additional developments can also be anticipated from the emerging scientific analysis of paintings by Perugino. Scientific and technical data is proving to be invaluable to understanding his practice and underscores the need for technical examination of

---

[10] Ibid., 24. This is based on compositional sketches that have been attributed to Naldini and Stradano.

[11] Armenini, *De' veri precetti della pittura*; Armenini, *On the True Precepts of the Art of Painting*, 147–148; Bambach, *Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop*, 80.

drawings. This scientific and technical data is bound to further transform our understanding of the Renaissance workshop.

This in-depth study of the practices of three related artists was motivated by the belief that despite the variability and diversity that characterize Renaissance workshops, the investigation of individual workshops and individual practices can contribute to the formulation of a better picture of this social structure within Renaissance society. Furthermore, the continuity and divergence found in the practices of a group of related artists can be correlated to both practical and theoretical developments of the time. The conclusions drawn about the way in which drawing was conceived and used by Perugino and his pupils demonstrate how the function of workshop drawings is a rich source for the consideration of artistic objectives, strategies, and ideals as well as socio-economic elements of the workshop, such as training, collaboration, and organization.

APPENDIX

DRAWINGS BY COLLECTION

Unless otherwise noted, all works of are attributed to Perugino and his workshop.

Musée Bonnat, Bayonne
- Fig. 3.7. *Head of a Youth*

Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin
- Fig. 1.19. *Study for Saint Augustine*

Moravská Galerie, Brno
- Fig. 5.56. Giovanni da Udine, *Studies of Nuts*

Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland
- Fig. 1.5. *Saint Sebastian*

Kunstmuseum, Düsseldorf
- Fig. 1.7. *Sheet of Studies*

Gabinetto dei Disegni e delle Stampe degli Uffizi, Florence
- Fig. 1.2. *Nativity of the Virgin*
- Fig. 1.3. *Study for Cumaean Sibyl*
- Fig. 1.4. *Study of a Woman*
- Fig. 1.36. *Study for the Baptism*
- Fig. 2.16. *Christ Child Reclining on a Cushion*
- Fig. 2.17. *Shepherd with a Lamb on his Shoulders*
- Fig. 3.6. *Sketch of a Battle*
- Fig. 3.12. *Blessed James of the Marches*
- Fig. 3.16. *A Friar Standing with a Book and Studies of Hands*
- Fig. 3.17. *A Friar Standing with a Book*
- Fig. 3.19. After Furio Camillo and Numa Pompilio, *Famous Men of Antiquity*, Collegio del Cambio
- Fig. 3.21. *Moses*
- Fig. 3.22. Berto di Giovanni, *Socrates*
- Fig. 3.23. Berto di Giovanni, *Prophet Elijah*
- Fig. 3.28. *Angels with Ropes*
- Fig. 4.10. Copy after Perugino, *Study of a Woman*
- Fig. 4.15. Berto di Giovanni, *Studies of Infants*
- Fig. 5.10. *Study of a Woman*
- Fig. 5.11. *Study of a Man*
- Fig. 5.19. Raphael, *Beheading of a Saint*
- Fig. 5.20. Raphael, *Beheading of a Saint*

Fig. 5.25. Copy after Perugino, *Apostles, Ascension of Christ*
Fig. 5.26. Copy after Perugino, *Apostles, Ascension of Christ*
Fig. 5.52. Raphael, *Modello for the Entombment*
Fig. 5.55. Raphael, *Study for the Virgin Mary*
Fig. 5.71. Raphael, *Virgin and Child*

Städel Museum, Frankfurt
Fig. 1.35. *Study for the Baptism*

Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lille
Fig. 5.33. Raphael, *Saint Jerome*
Fig. 5.54. Raphael, *Study for God the Father Blessing of Lunette*

British Museum, London
Fig. 1.1. *Adoration of the Magi*
Fig. 1.9. *Head of a Young Woman Wearing a Cap*
Fig. 1.10. *Head of a Man Wearing a Knotted Headscarf*
Fig. 1.13. *Head of an Old Man with Long Beard*
Fig. 1.33. *Standing Man in an Attitude of Prayer*
Fig. 2.27. *Study for Adoration of Christ*
Fig. 3.4. *A Seated Woman Holding a Child, and a Standing Male Figure*
Fig. 3.18. Fabius Maximus and Socrates, *Famous Men of Antiquity*, Collegio del Cambio
Fig. 4.22. Berto di Giovanni, *God the Father*
Fig. 5.28. Raphael, *Head of Saint James*, Study for the Coronation of the Virgin
Fig. 5.50. Raphael, *Study for the Entombment*
Fig. 5.51. Raphael, *Study for the Entombment*
Fig. 5.67. Perino del Vaga, *David and Bathsheba*
Fig. 5.68. Perino del Vaga, *Jacob's Dream*

Private Collection, London
Fig. 3.5. *Head of an Angel*

Ambrosiana, Milan
Fig. 4.21. Raphael, Cartoon for the lower section of the *School of Athens*

Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York
Fig. 1.6. *Landscape* (recto and verso)
Fig. 1.8. *Study of the Head of a Youth Gazing Upward*
Fig. 1.20. *Study of a Kneeling Youth and of the Head of Another*
Fig. 1.38. *Two Figures of Angels Standing*
Fig. 3.1. *Two Studies of a Standing Youth in Quattrocento Clothing*
Fig. 3.25. *Group of Warriors Standing*

Morgan Library and Museum, New York
Fig. 3.3. *Head of Saint Lawrence*

National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa
Fig. 1.39. *Youth with Hands Folded in Prayer*

Ashmolean Museum, Oxford
Fig. 1.32. *Study for Saint John the Baptist*
Fig. 2.14. *Adoration of the Shepherds* (recto); *Infant Christ, Saint Joseph, the Virgin and Two Angels* (verso)
Fig. 3.2. *Studies of a Head and a Hand*
Fig. 3.10. *Christ and the Woman of Samaria*
Fig. 5.23. Raphael, *Two Studies (bisected) of a Young Man Making Music*
Fig. 5.27. Raphael, *Head of a Young Man Gazing Upwards*
Fig. 5.38. Raphael, *Presentation in the Temple*
Fig. 5.45. Raphael, *Study for the Pietà*
Fig. 5.47. Raphael, *Study of Four Standing Men in a Pietà* (recto); *Study of the Body of Christ in a Pietà* (verso)
Fig. 5.48. Raphael, *Study for the Entombment and Studies of Heads*
Fig. 5.49. Raphael, *Study after a Death of Meleager Relief*
Fig. 5.53. Raphael, *Study for God the Father Blessing of Lunette*
Fig. 5.58. Giovanni da Udine, *Studies of Ornamentation in the Grotesque Style*
Fig. 5.62. Copy after Raphael, *Study for the Miraculous Mass at Bolsena*

Christ Church, Oxford
Fig. 1.12. *Joseph of Arimathea*

Département des Arts Graphiques du Musée du Louvre, Paris
Fig. 1.34. Copy after Perugino, *Baptism*
Fig. 2.11. *Study of a Head of a Woman*
Fig. 3.26. *Group of Warriors Standing*
Fig. 3.29. *Angels with Ropes*
Fig. 4.12. Berto di Giovanni, *Study of a Head of a Woman*
Fig. 5.24. Copy after Raphael*, Twelve Apostles Around the Tomb of the Virgin* (recto)
Fig. 5.39. Raphael, *Cartoon for the Annunciation*
Fig. 5.46. Raphael, *Modello for the Pietà*
Fig. 5.60. Raphael, *Study for Christ*
Fig. 5.66. Giovanni Francesco Penni, *Saint Paul Preaching at Athens*
Fig. 5.69. Raphael, *Moses Receiving the Tablets of the Law*
Fig. 5.70. Giulio Romano, *Seated Woman*

Nationalmuseum, Stockholm
Fig. 4.11. Berto di Giovanni, *Studies for the Evangelist Mathew, a Bishop and other Figures* (recto); *Standing Nude Man* (verso)
Fig. 4.20. Berto di Giovanni, *Study for Saint John the Evangelist*
Fig. 5.57. Giovanni da Udine, *Study of a Parrot and Other Birds*

Galleria dell'Accademia, Venice

Fig. 1.37. *Two Figures of Angels Standing*
Fig. 1.17. *Study for Apollo and Marsyas*

Albertina, Vienna

Fig. 3.27. *Study of Figures with Ropes*
Fig. 4.9. Berto di Giovanni, *Study for the Assumption*
Fig. 5.43. Raphael, *Study for Pythagoras and His Students*
Fig. 5.64. Giovanni Francesco Penni, *Study for the Miraculous Draught of Fishes* (recto); Raphael, *Study for the Miraculous Draught of Fishes* (verso)

National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC

Fig. 1.31. *Study for the Baptism*
Fig. 5.61. Raphael, *Study for Apostles*

Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, Williamstown

Fig. 1.21. *Kneeling Figure and Two Heads*

Royal Collection, Windsor

Fig. 2.5. *Man in Armor*
Fig. 5.29. Raphael, *Auxiliary Cartoon (?) for the Heads of Two Apostles*
Fig. 5.59. Raphael, *Study for Christ's Charge to Saint Peter*
Fig. 5.65. Giovanni Francesco Penni, *Study for the Miraculous Draught of Fishes*

Private Collection, England

Fig. 2.23. *Study for Adoration of Christ*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adorno, Theodor. *Aesthetic Theory*. New York: Continuum, 2004.

Alberti, Leon Battista. *On Painting and On Sculpture: The Latin Texts of "De Pictura" and "De Statua."* Translated by Cecil Grayson. London: Phaidon, 1972.

Ames-Lewis, Francis. *Drawing in Early Renaissance Italy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981.

———. "Modelbook Drawings and the Florentine Quattrocento Artist." *Art History* 10, no. 1 (1987): 1–11.

———. *The Draftsman Raphael*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1986.

Ames-Lewis, Francis, and Joanne Wright. *Drawings in the Italian Renaissance Workshop*. London: Victoria & Albert Museum, 1983.

Armenini, Giovanni Battista. *De' veri precetti della pittura*. Ravenna, 1587.

———. *On the True Precepts of the Art of Painting*. Translated by Edward J. Olszewski. New York: Franklin, 1977.

Ashok, Roy. "Raphael's Early Work in the National Gallery: Paintings Before Rome." *National Gallery Technical Bulletin* 25 (2004): 4–35.

———, ed. *Raphael's Painting Technique: Working Practices Before Rome; Proceedings of the Eu-ARTECH Workshop*. Florence: Nardini, 2007.

Bacou, Roseline, and Sylvie Béguin, eds. *Autour de Raphael: Dessins et peintures du Musée du Louvre*. Paris: Réunion des Musées Nationaux, 1983.

Bambach, Carmen. "The Tradition of Pouncing Drawings in the Italian Renaissance Workshop: Innovation and Derivation." Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1988.

———. "Review of *Michelangelo and His Drawings* by Michael Hirst." *The Art Bulletin* 72, no. 3 (1990): 493–498.

———. "On 'La testa proportionalmente degradata': Luca Signorelli, Leonardo, and Piero della Francesca's *De prospectiva pingendi*." In *Florentine Drawing at the Time of Lorenzo the Magnificent*, edited by Elizabeth Cropper, 17–43. Villa Spelman Colloquia 4. Bologna: Nuova Alfa, 1992.

———. "A Substitute Cartoon for Raphael's 'Disputa'." *Master Drawings* 30, no. 1 (Spring 1992): 9–30.

———. *Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop: Theory and Practice, 1300-1600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

———. "The Early Italian Drawings in Berlin." *Master Drawings* 37, no. 1 (1999): 55–62.

Barocchi, Paola, ed. *Scritti d'arte del Cinquecento*. 3 vols. Milan: Ricciardi, 1971.

———. *Trattati d'arte del Cinquecento fra Manierismo e Controriforma*. Bari: Laterza, 1960.

Bauer, Linda Freeman. "A Letter by Barocci and the Tracing of Finished Paintings." *The Burlington Magazine* 128 (1986): 355–357.

Baxandall, Michael. *Giotto and the Orators: Humanist Observers of Painting in Italy and the Discovery of Pictorial Composition, 1350-1450*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

———. *The Limewood Sculptors of Renaissance Germany*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1980.

———. *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth-Century Italy: A Primer in the Social History of Pictorial Style*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

Becherer, Joseph Antenucci. *Pietro Perugino: Master of the Italian Renaissance*. New York: Rizzoli, 1997.

Bell, Charles F., ed. *Drawings by the Old Masters in the Library of Christ Church, Oxford*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914.

Bellucci, Roberto. "Un mito michelangiolesco e la produzione seriale: Il cartone di Venere e Cupido." In *Venere e amore: Michelangelo e la nuova bellezza ideale*, edited by Franca Falletti and Jonathan Katz Nelson, 109–146. Florence: Giunti Editore, 2002.

———. "The Myth of Cartoon Re-use in Perugino's Underdrawing: Technical Investigations." In *The Painting Technique of Pietro Vannucci Called Il Perugino: Proceedings of the LabS TECH*, 71–80. Florence: Nardini, 2004.

———. "Piero della Francesca's Process: Panel Painting Technique." In *Contributions to the Dublin Congress, 7-11 September 1998: Painting Techniques, History, Materials and Studio Practice*, edited by Ashok Roy and Perry Smith, 89–93. London: Maney Publishing, 1998.

Bellucci, Roberto, and Cecilia Frosinini. "Ipotesi sul metodo della restituzione pittorica di Piero della Francesca: Il caso dei ritratti di Federico da Montefeltro." In *La Pala di San Bernardino di Piero della Francesca: Nuovi studi oltre il restauro*, edited by Emanuela Daffra, 167–187. Florence: Centro Di, 1997.

Benazzi, Giordana, ed. *Pietro Perugino e il Santuario della Nunziatella a Foligno*. Foligno: Numeister, 2005.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." In *Illuminations*, edited by Hannah Arendt, translated by Harry Zohn, 219–253. New York: Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group, 1968.

Bernacchioni, Anna Maria. "Le botteghe di pittura: Luoghi, strutture e attività." In *Maestri e botteghe: Pittura a Firenze alla fine del Quattrocento*, edited by Mina Gregori, 23–34. Cinisello Balsamo: Silvana Ed., 1992.

Bertelli, Carlo. "Caen and Brera: From Marriage to Divorce." *Studies in the History of Art* 17 (1986): 31–34.

Biadene, Susanna, ed. *Titian: Prince of Painters*. New York: Prestel, 1990.

Binazzi, Gianfranco. "In margine alla mostra dei disegni umbri agli Uffizi: Una copia antica dal 'Compianto' di Pietro Perugino a Palazzo Pitti." *Esercizi* 5 (1982): 34–40.

Bjurström, Per. *Italian Drawings: Florence, Siena, Modena, Bologna*. Stockholm: Nationalmuseum, 2002.

Bjurström, Per, and Börje Magnusson. *Italian Drawings: Umbria, Rome, Naples*. Stockholm: Nationalmuseum, 1998.

Bombe, Walter. "Eusebio da San Giorgio." *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* 39 (1916): 30–51.

Bomford, David, ed. *Art in the Making: Underdrawings in Renaissance Paintings*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, London, 2002.

Bomford, David, and Nicholas Turner. "Perugino's Underdrawing in the 'Virgin and Child Adored by an Angel' from the Certosa di Pavia Altarpiece." In *Perugino, Lippi e la Bottega di San Marco alla Certosa di Pavia*, edited by Barbara Fabjan, 49–54. Florence: Cantini Edizioni d'Arte, 1986.

Borghini, Raffaello. *Il riposo*. Florence: Giorgio Marescotti, 1584.

Borsook, Eve. "Technical Innovation and the Development of Raphael's Style in Rome." *RACAR* 12 (1985): 127–136.

Brown, Beverly Louise. "Replication and the Art of Veronese." *Studies in the History of Art* 20 (1989): 111–124.

Brown, David Alan. *Leonardo da Vinci: Origins of a Genius*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998.

Brown, David Alan, and Serafina Hager. “Raphael, Leonardo, and Perugino: Fame and Fortune in Florence.” In *Leonardo, Michelangelo, and Raphael in Renaissance Florence from 1500 to 1508*, 29–53. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1992.

Bury, Michael. “Perugino, Raphael and the Decoration of the Stanza dell’Incendio.” In *Rethinking the High Renaissance: The Culture of the Visual Arts in Early Sixteenth-century Rome*, edited by Jill Burke, 223–244. Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2012.

———. “Review of *Perugino: L’opera completa* by Pietro Scarpellini.” *The Burlington Magazine* 128 (1986): 750.

Butler, Kim E. “Giovanni Santi, Raphael, and Quattrocento Sculpture.” *Artibus et Historiae* 30, no. 59 (2009): 15–39.

Butterfield, Andrew. *The Sculptures of Andrea del Verrocchio*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997.

Cadogan, Jean K. “Verrocchio’s Drawings Reconsidered.” *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 46, no. 4 (Jan.1983): 367–400.

Camesasca, Ettore. *Artisti in bottega*. Milan: Feltrinelli, 1966.

———. *L’opera completa del Perugino*. Milan: Rizzoli, 1969.

Campbell, Stephen John, ed. *Artistic Exchange and Cultural Translation in the Italian Renaissance City*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Canuti, Fiorenzo. *Il Perugino*. 2 vols. Siena: La Diana, 1931.

Cassanelli, Roberto, ed. *La bottega dell’artista tra Medioevo e Rinascimento*. Milan: Jaca Book, 1998.

Castiglione, Baldassare. *The Book of the Courtier*. Edited by Daniel Javitch. Translated by Charles Southward Singleton. New York: Norton, 2002.

Cavalcaselle, Giovanni Battista, and Joseph A. Crowe. *Raphael: His Life and Works*. 2 vols. London: Murray, 1882.

Cellini, Pico. “Per un disegno d’Andrea d’Assisi detto l’Ingegno.” *Bollettino d’arte* 3 (1932): 368–372.

Cennini, Cennino. *Il libro dell’arte o trattato della pittura*. Edited by Gaetano and Carlo Milanesi. Florence: Le Monnier, 1859.

———. *Il libro dell’arte*. Edited by Mario Serchi. Florence: Le Monnier, 1991.

———. *The Craftsman's Handbook: The Italian "Il libro dell'arte*." Translated by Daniel V. Thompson, Jr. Reprint New York: Dover, 1960.

Chapman, Hugo, and Marzia Faietti. *Fra Angelico to Leonardo: Italian Renaissance Drawings*. London: British Museum Press, 2010.

Ciardi Duprè dal Poggetto, Maria Grazia. "Riflessioni sulla 'riscoperta' di Giovanni Spagna." *Antichità viva: Rassegna d'arte* 33, no. 5 (1994): 13–19.

———, ed. *Urbino e le Marche prima e dopo Raffaello*. Florence: Salani, 1983.

Clark, Kenneth. *Leon Battista Alberti on Painting*. Annual Italian Lecture of the British Academy 30. London: British Academy, 1946.

Clayton, Martin. *Raphael and His Circle: Drawings from Windsor Castle*. London: Merrell Holberton, 1999.

Constable, William Georges. *The Painter's Workshop*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954.

Coonin, Arnold Victor. "The Interaction of Painting and Sculpture in the Art of Perugino." *Artibus et Historiae* 24, no. 47 (2003): 103–120.

———. "New Documents Concerning Perugino's Workshop in Florence." *The Burlington Magazine* 141 (1999): 100–104.

Cordellier, Dominique, and Bernadette Py. *Raphaël: Autour des dessins du Louvre*. Paris: Réunion des Musées Nationaux, 1992.

Cox-Rearick, Janet, ed. *Giulio Romano: Master Designer*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1999.

Dempsey, Charles. "Introduction." In *Drawing Relationships in Northern Italian Renaissance Art: Patronage and Theories of Invention*, edited by Giancarla Periti, 3–10. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2004.

Dussler, Luitpold. *Raphael: A Critical Catalogue of His Pictures, Wall-paintings and Tapestries*. Translated by Sebastian Cruft. New York: Phaidon, 1971.

Elam, Caroline. "Lorenzo de' Medici and the Urban Development of Renaissance Florence." *Art History* 1 (1978): 43–66.

Elkins, James, ed. *Renaissance Theory*. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Ellis, Lloyd Harris. "Raffaello Borghini's *Il Riposo*: A Critical Study and Annotated Translation." Ph.D. diss., Case Western Reserve University, 2002.

Ettlinger, L.D. *The Sistine Chapel Before Michelangelo: Religious Imagery and Papal Primacy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

Fabjan, Barbara, ed. *Perugino, Lippi e la Bottega di San Marco alla Certosa di Pavia, 1495-1511*. Florence: Cantini Edizioni d'Arte, 1986.

Faietti, Marzia. "Perugino disegnatore nel fondo storico degli Uffizi." *Proporzioni: Annali della Fondazione Roberto Longhi* 7/8 (2009): 174–189.

Falletti, Franca, and Jonathan Katz Nelson, eds. *Venere e amore: Michelangelo e la nuova bellezza ideale*. Florence: Giunti: Firenze Musei, 2002.

Ferino-Pagden, Sylvia. "Gli affreschi della 'Madonnuccia' in San Martino in Campo e l'enigma di Andrea d'Assisi detto L'Ingegno." *Esercizi: musica e spettacolo* 4 (1981): 68–85.

———. *Disegni umbri del Rinascimento da Perugino a Raffaello*. Gabinetto disegni e stampe degli Uffizi 58. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1982.

———. *Disegni umbri: Gallerie dell'Accademia di Venezia*. Milan: Electa, 1984.

———. "The Early Raphael and His Umbrian Contemporaries." *Studies in the History of Art* 17 (1986): 93–107.

———. "Iconographic Demands and Artistic Achievements: The Genesis of Three Works by Raphael." 13–29. Rome: Edizioni dell'Elefante, 1986.

———. "A Master-Painter and His Pupils: Pietro Perugino and His Umbrian Workshop." *The Oxford Art Journal* 3 (1979): 9–14.

———. "Perugino al servizio dei della Rovere: Sisto IV e il cardinale Giuliano; (appunti per l'attività di Perugino a Roma)." In *Sisto IV e Giulio II*, edited by Silvia Bottaro and Anna Dagnino, 53–72. Savona: Coop Tipograf, 1990.

———. "Perugino's Use of Drawing: Convention and Invention." In *Drawings Defined*, edited by Walter Strauss and Tracie Felker, 77–102. New York: Abaris Books, 19

———. "Pintoricchio, Perugino or the Young Raphael?: A Problem of Connoisseurship." *The Burlington Magazine* 125 (1983): 87–88.

———. "A Predella Designed by the Young Raphael?" In *Scritti di storia dell'arte in onore di Federico Zeri*, edited by Mauro Natale, 303–311. Milan: Electa, 1984.

———. "Raphael's Activity in Perugia as Reflected in a Drawing in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford." *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 25, no. 2 (1981): 231–252.

———. “A Re-Examination of the ‘Raphael’ Drawing in the National Gallery of Canada.” *Annual Bulletin (National Gallery of Canada)* 3 (1980): 57–66.

Ferino-Pagden, Sylvia, and Konrad Oberhuber. *Maestri umbri del Quattro e Cinquecento: Perugino, Pinturicchio, Spagna, Signorelli, Viti, Raffaello*. Biblioteca di disegni 15. Florence: Istituto Alinari, 1977.

Fischel, Oskar. “Raffaels Lehrer.” *Jahrbuch der Preußischen Kunstsammlungen* 34 (1913): 89–96.

———. “Raphael’s Auxiliary Cartoons.” *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 71, no. 415 (October 1937): 167–170.

———. *Die Zeichnungen der Umbrer*. 2 vols. Berlin: Grote, 1917.

Fontana, Walter. “Aggiunte a Raffaello giovane.” In *Studi su Raffaello: Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Studi*, edited by Micaela Sambucco Hamoud, 151–169. Urbino: QuattroVenti, 1987.

Freedberg, S. J. *Painting of the High Renaissance in Rome and Florence*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Fusco, Laurie. “The Use of Sculptural Models by Painters in Fifteenth-Century Italy.” *The Art Bulletin* 64, no. 2 (June 1982): 175–194.

Galassi, Maria Clelia. “The Re-use of Design-models by Carta Lucida in the XVIth Century Italian Workshops: Written Sources and an Example from Michele di Ridolfo del Ghirlandaio.” In *Le dessin sous-jacent et la technologie dans la peinture*, edited by Hélène Verougstraete and Roger van Schoute, 205–213. Leuven: Peeters, 1999.

Garibaldi, Vittoria. “Da Perugino a Giannicola di Paolo: Il Cenacolo di Perugia.” In *Perugino a Firenze : Qualità e fortuna d’uno stile*, edited by Rosanna Caterina Proto Pisani, 45–49. Florence: Pagliai Polistampa, 2005.

Garibaldi, Vittoria. *Perugino: Catalogo completo*. Florence: Octavo, 1999.

———. *Pintoricchio*. Cinisello Balsamo: Silvana Editoriale, 2008.

———, ed. *Perugino: Il divin pittore*. Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 2004.

Gere, John Arthur, and Nicholas Turner, eds. *Drawings by Raphael*. London: British Museum Press, 1983.

Giantomassi, Carlo, and Donatella Zari. “Il restauro del Battesimo di Pietro Perugino alla Nunziatella.” In *Pietro Perugino e il Santuario della Nunziatella a Foligno*, edited by Giordana Benazzi, 149–162. Foligno: Numeister, 2005.

Gilbert, Creighton. “Milan and Savoldo.” *The Art Bulletin* 27 (1945): 124–138.

———. “A Miracle by Raphael.” *North Carolina Museum of Art Bulletin* 6, no. 1 (1965): 3–31.

———. “Savoldo’s Drawings Put to Use: A Study in Renaissance Workshop Practices.” *Gazette des beaux-arts: la doyenne des revues d’art* 6 (1953): 5–23.

Giovio, Paolo. *Fragmentum trium dialogarum*. Edited by Girolamo Tiraboschi. Vol. 7. Storia della letteratura italiana. Florence: Molini Landi, 1809.

Giuffre, Joseph R. “Design in Raphael’s Roman Workshop.” Ph.D. diss., Rutgers University, 2008.

Gnoli, Umberto. “Documenti inediti sui pittori Perugini.” *Bollettino d’arte del Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione* 9 (1915): 305–312.

———. “Giannicola di Paolo: Nuovi documenti.” *Bollettino d’arte del Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione* 12 (1918): 33–43.

———. *Pittori e miniatori dell’Umbria*. Spoleto: Argentieri, 1923.

———. “Raffaello, ‘Il Cambio’ di Perugia e i profeti di Nantes.” *Rassegna d’arte* 13 (1913): 75–83.

Goldner, George. “New Drawings by Perugino and Pontormo.” *The Burlington Magazine* 136 (1994): 365–367.

Golzio, Vincenzo. *Raffaello nei documenti, nelle testimonianze dei contemporanei e nella letteratura del suo secolo*. Vatican City: Pontificia Insigne Accademia Artistica dei Virtuosi al Pantheon, 1936.

Gombrich, Ernst H. “The Style all’antica: Imitation and Assimilation.” In *The Renaissance and Mannerism*, 2:31–41. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Gould, Cecil. “Raphael Versus Giulio Romano: The Swing Back.” *The Burlington Magazine* 124 (1982): 479–487.

Gregori, Mina, ed. *Maestri e botteghe: Pittura a Firenze alla fine del Quattrocento*. Cinisello Balsamo: Silvana Ed., 1992.

Gualdi Sabatini, Fausta. “Contributi a Berto di Giovanni pittore perugino.” *Commentari: Rivista di critica e storia dell’arte* 12 (1961): 253–267.

———. *Giovanni di Pietro detto Lo Spagna*. Spoleto: Accademia Spoletina, 1984.

Hall, Marcia B. "The Operation of Vasari's Workshop and the Designs for S. Maria Novella and S. Croce." *Burlington Magazine* 115, no. 841 (April 1973): 204–209.

———, ed. "Introduction." In *The Cambridge Companion to Raphael*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Hannelore, Glasser. "Artists' Contracts of the Early Renaissance." Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1965.

Hartt, Frederick. "Raphael and Giulio Romano: With Notes on the Raphael School." *The Art Bulletin* 26 (June 1944): 67–94.

———. *Giulio Romano*. 2 vols. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1958.

Henry, Tom. "Berto di Giovanni at Montone." *The Burlington Magazine* 138 (1996): 325–328.

———. "La formazione di Pietro Perugino." In *Perugino: Il divin pittore*, edited by Vittoria Garibaldi, 73–79. Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 2004.

Henry, Tom, and Francesco Federico Mancini, eds. *Gli esordi di Raffaello: Tra Urbino, Città di Castello e Perugia*. Città di Castello: Edimond, 2006.

Higgitt, Catherine. "Working with Perugino: The Technique of an Annunciation Attributed to Giannicola di Paolo." *National Gallery Technical Bulletin* 27 (2006): 96–110.

Hiller von Gaertringen, Rudolf. "A Madonna and Child with the Infant St. John in the Städel: Between Perugino's Formulas and Raphael's Interest in Narrative." In *Le dessin sous-jacent et la technologie dans la peinture*, edited by Hélène Verougstraete and Roger van Schoute, 189–203. Leuven: Peeters, 1999.

———. "Eine 'Madonna mit Kind und Johannesknaben ' im Städel: zwischen Peruginos Formelhaftigkeit und Raphaels Erzählkunst." *Städel-Jahrbuch* 16 (1998): 227–238.

———. "Nuove ipotesi sulla formazione di Raffaello nella bottega del Perugino." *Atti e studi* 2 (2006): 9–44.

———. "The Practice of Erasing 'Spolvero' Dots in Italian Renaissance Panel Paintings: A Hypothesis." In *Le dessin sous-jacent et la technologie dans la peinture*, edited by Hélène Verougstraete and Roger van Schoute, 196–206. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.

———. *Raffaels Lernerfahrung in der Werkstatt Peruginos: Kartonverwendung und Motivübernahme im Wandel*. Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1999.

———. “L’uso del cartone nell’opera di Perugino.” In *Perugino: Il divin pittore*, edited by Vittoria Garibaldi, 155–165. Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 2004.

———. “Uso e riuso del cartone nell’opera del Perugino: l’arte fra vita contemplativa e produttività.” In *Pietro Vannucci, il Perugino: Atti del convegno internazionale di studio, 25 - 28 ottobre 2000*, edited by Laura Teza, 335–350. Perugia: Volumnia, 2004.

Hirst, Michael, and Carmen Bambach. “A Note on the Word Modello.” *The Art Bulletin* 74, no. 1 (1992): 172–173.

Holmes, Megan. “Copying Practices and Marketing Strategies in a Fifteenth-Century Florentine Painter’s Workshop.” In *Artistic Exchange and Cultural Translation in the Italian Renaissance City*, edited by Stephen J. Campbell, 38–74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Howard, Helen, and Scott Nethersole. “Two Copies of Perugino’s ‘Baptism of Christ’.” *National Gallery Technical Bulletin* 31 (2010): 78–95.

Hughes, Anthony. “Authority, Authenticity and Aura: Walter Benjamin and the Case of Michelangelo.” In *Sculpture and Its Reproductions*, edited by Anthony Hughes, 29–45. London: Reaktion Books, 1997.

———, ed. *Sculpture and Its Reproductions*. London: Reaktion Books, 1997.

Hulse, Clark. *The Rule of Art: Literature and Painting in the Renaissance*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Joannides, Paul. *The Drawings of Raphael: With a Complete Catalogue*. Oxford: Phaidon, 1983.

———. “Giulio Romano in Raphael’s Workshop.” *Quaderni di Palazzo Te* 8 (2000): 35–45.

———. “The Northbrook Madonna.” *Paragone Arte* 35, no. 411 (1984): 4–9.

———, ed. *Raphael and His Age: Drawings from the Palais des Beaux-Arts, Lille*. Paris: Réunion des Musées Nationaux, 2002.

———. “Raphael Drawings.” *The Burlington Magazine* 127, no. 983 (1985): 93.

———. “Raphael, His Studio and His Copyists.” *Paragone Arte* 44, no. 523–525 (November 1993): 3–29.

Kanter, Laurence B. “Luca Signorelli, Piero della Francesca, and Pietro Perugino.” *Studi di storia dell’arte* 1 (1990): 95–111.

Kemp, Martin. *Behind the Picture: Art and Evidence in the Italian Renaissance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997.

———. “The ‘Madonna of the Yarnwinder’ in the Buccleuch Collection Reconsidered in the Context of Leonardo’s Studio Practice.” In *I leonardeschi a Milano: Fortuna e collezionismo*, edited by Maria Teresa Fiorio, 35–48. Milan: Electa, 1991.

Knab, Eckhart, Erwin Mitsch, and Konrad Oberhuber. *Raffaello: I disegni*. Edited by Sylvia Ferino-Pagden. Florence: Nardini, 1983.

Kwakkelstein, Michael W. “Perugino in Verrocchio’s Workshop: The Transmission of an Antique Striding Stance.” *Paragone* 55, no. 3 (2004): 47–61.

Ladis, Andrew. “Perugino and the Wages of Fortune.” *Gazette des beaux-arts: La doyenne des revues d’art* 131 (1998): 221–234.

———, ed. *The Craft of Art: Originality and Industry in the Italian Renaissance and Baroque Workshop*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995.

La Malfa, Claudia. “Invenzioni, modelli e copie: Pintoricchio disegnatore e il rapporto con Perugino, la bottega umbra del primo Rinascimento e Raffaello.” In *Pintoricchio*, edited by Vittoria Garibaldi and Francesco Federico Mancini, 347–365. Cinisello Balsamo: Silvana Editoriale, 2008.

Landau, David, and Peter Parshall. *The Renaissance Print: 1470-1550*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994.

Lanfranc de Panthou, Caroline, and Benjamin Peronnet. *Autour de Pérugin, Filippino Lippi et Michel-Ange*. Edited by Dominique Cordellier. Paris: Réunion des Musées Nationaux, 1995.

Ledderose, Lothar. *Ten Thousand Things: Module and Mass Production in Chinese Art*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Lee, Rensselaer Wright. *Ut Pictura Poesis: The Humanistic Theory of Painting*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1967.

Lehmkuhl-Lerner, Hanna. *Zur Struktur und Geschichte des florentinischen Kunstmarktes im 15. Jahrhundert*. Wattenscheid: Busch, 1936.

Leonardo da Vinci. *Trattato della pittura: Condotto sul Codice Vaticano Urbinate 1270*. Edited by Silvia Bordini. Rome: Grandi Tascabili Economici Newton, 1996.

———. *Treatise on Painting*. Edited by Amos Philip McMahon. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1956.

Lightbown, Ronald. *Sandro Botticelli: Complete Catalogue*. 2 vols. London: Elek, 1978.

Lomazzo, Giovanni Paolo. *Scritti sulle arti*. Edited by Roberto Paolo Ciardi. Florence: Marchi & Bertolli, 1973.

Lunghi, Elvio. "Da Andrea d'Assisi a Pietro Perugino (e ritorno)." *Bollettino della Deputazione di Storia Patria per l'Umbria* 103, no. 2 (2007): 37–68.

———. "Perugino e i suoi imitatori." In *Pietro Vannucci e i pittori perugini del primo Cinquecento*, edited by Paola Mercurelli Salari, 27–46. Perugia: Quattroemme, 2005.

Maffei, Raffaele. *Commentariorum rerum urbanorum liber primus*. Rome: Ioannem Besicken Alemanum, 1506.

Mainardi, Patricia. "Copies, Variations, Replicas: Nineteenth-Century Studio Practice." *Visual Resources* 15, no. 2 (1999): 123–147.

———. "Review of *Déjà Vu? Revealing Repetition in French Masterpieces*, The Walters Art Museum." *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide (e-journal)* 7, no. 1 (Spring 2008). http://www.19thc-artworldwide.org/

Majo, Ippolita di. *Raffaello e la sua scuola: Giovan Francesco Penni, Giulio Romano, Giovanni da Udine, Perino del Vaga, Polidoro da Caravaggio*. Florence: E-Ducation.it, 2007.

Mancini, Francesco Federico. "Considerazioni sulla bottega umbra del Perugino." In *Pietro Vannucci, il Perugino: Atti del convegno internazionale di studio, 25 - 28 ottobre 2000*, edited by Laura Teza, 329–334. Perugia: Volumnia, 2004.

———. "Un episodio di normale 'routine': L'affresco cinquecentesco dell'Oratorio di Sant'Agostino a Perugia." *Commentari d'arte* 1, no. 1 (1995): 29–48.

———. *Raffaello in Umbria: Cronologia e committenza; Nuovi studi e documenti*. Perugia: Volumnia, 1987.

Mancini, Francesco Federico, and Pietro Scarpellini, eds. *Pittura in Umbria tra il 1480 e il 1540: premesse e sviluppi nei tempi di Perugino e Raffaello*. Milan: Electa, 1983.

Mariotti, Annibale. *Lettere pittoriche perugine*. Bologna: Forni, 1975.

Meder, Joseph. *Die Handzeichnung: Ihre Technik und Entwicklung*. Vienna: Schroll, 1919.

———. *The Mastery of Drawing*. Translated by Winslow Ames. New York: Abaris Books, 1978.

Meller, Peter. "Two Drawings of the Quattrocento in the Uffizi: A Study in Stylistic Change." *Master Drawings* 12 (1974): 261–278.

Melli, Lorenza. “Sull’uso della carta lucida nel Quattrocento e un esempio per il Pollaiolo.” *Paragone Arte* 52, no. 3 (2001): 3–9.

Merrifield, Mary Philadelphia. *Original Treatises on the Arts of Painting*. 2 vols. New York: Dover, 1967.

Meyer zur Capellen, Jürg. *Raphael: A Critical Catalogue of His Paintings: The Beginnings in Umbria and Florence, ca. 1500-1508*. Translated by Stefan B. Polter. Vol. 1. Landshut, Germany: Arcos, 2001.

Monbeig-Goguel, Catherine. “Le tracé invisible des dessins de Raphaël: Pour une problématique des techniques graphiques à la Renaissance.” In *Studi su Raffaello: Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Studi*, edited by Micaela Sambucco Hamoud, 377–389. Urbino: QuattroVenti, 1987.

Monfasani, John. “A Description of the Sistine Chapel Under Pope Sixtus IV.” *Artibus et Historiae* 4, no. 7 (1983): 9–18.

Mozzati, Tommaso. “Produzioni in serie, derivazioni e modelli: Perugino e la bottega di Andrea del Verrocchio.” In *Perugino: Il divin pittore*, edited by Vittoria Garibaldi, 95–103. Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 2004.

Natali, Antonio. “Nel giro del Verrocchio.” In *Perugino: Il divin pittore*, edited by Vittoria Garibaldi, 81–87. Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 2004.

Nelson, Jonathan Katz. “‘Botticelli’ or ‘Filippino’?: How to Define Authorship in a Renaissance Workshop.” In *Sandro Botticelli and Herbert Horne*, edited by Rab Hatfield, 137–167. The Villa Rossa Series 5. Florence: Syracuse University in Florence, 2009.

———. “La disgrazia di Pietro: L’importanza della pala della Santissima Annunziata nella Vita del Perugino del Vasari.” In *Pietro Vannucci, il Perugino: Atti del convegno internazionale di studi, 25 - 28 ottobre 2000*, edited by Laura Teza, 65–73. Perugia: Volumnia, 2004.

Neri di Bicci. *Le ricordanze 1453-1475*. Edited by Bruno Santi. Pisa: Marlin, 1976.

Nova, Alessandro. “Salviati, Vasari, and the Reuse of Drawings in Their Working Practice.” *Master Drawings* 30, no. 1 (1992): 83–108.

O’Malley, Michelle. “The Business of Art: Contracts and Payment Documents for Fourteenth and Fifteenth-century Italian Altarpieces and Frescoes.” Ph.D. diss., Warburg Institute, University of London, 1994.

———. *The Business of Art: Contracts and the Commissioning Process in Renaissance Italy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005.

———. “Commissioning Bodies, Allocation Decisions and Price Structures for Altarpieces in Fifteenth- and Early Sixteenth-Century Italy.” In *The Art Market in Italy*, edited by Marcello Fantoni, 163–180. Modena: Panini, 2003.

———. “Finding Fame: Painting and the Making of Careers in Renaissance Italy.” *Renaissance Studies* 24, no. 1 (2010): 9–32.

———. “Late Fifteenth- and Early Sixteenth-century Painting Contracts and the Stipulated Use of the Painter’s Hand.” In *With and Without the Medici*, edited by Eckart Marchand, 155–178. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 1998.

———. “Memorizing the New: Using Recent Works as Models in Italian Renaissance Commissions.” In *Memory & Oblivion*, edited by Wessel Reinink, 803–810. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1999.

———. “Pietro Perugino and the Contingency of Value.” In *The Material Renaissance*, edited by Michelle O’Malley, 106–130. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.

———. “Quality, Demand, and the Pressures of Reputation: Rethinking Perugino.” *The Art Bulletin* 89, no. 4 (2007): 674–693.

———. “Subject Matters: Contracts, Designs, and the Exchange of Ideas Between Painters and Clients in Renaissance Italy.” In *Artistic Exchange and Cultural Translation in the Italian Renaissance City*, edited by Stephen J. Campbell, 17–37. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

———, ed. *The Material Renaissance*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.

Oberhuber, Konrad. “Una copia precisa dell’originale perduto della Madonna Northbrook.” *Arte cristiana* 73 (1985): 279–284.

———. “Raphael and Pinturicchio.” *Studies in the History of Art* 17 (1986): 155–172.

Oberhuber, Konrad, and John M. Brealey. “The Colonna Altarpiece in the Metropolitan Museum and Problems of the Early Style of Raphael.” *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 12 (January 1977): 55–91.

Oberhuber, Konrad, and Achim Gnann. *Roma e lo stile classico di Raffaello: 1515-1527*. Milan: Electa, 1999.

Offner, Richard. “A Portrait of Perugino by Raphael.” *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 64/65 (1934): 245–257.

Padovani, Serena. “Il Cenacolo del Perugino.” In *Perugino a Firenze: Qualità e fortuna d’uno stile*, edited by Rosanna Caterina Proto Pisani, 29–44. Florence: Pagliai Polistampa, 2005.

Panofsky, Erwin. *The Codex Huygens and Leonardo da Vinci's Art Theory: The Pierpont Morgan Library Codex M.A. 1139*. London: Warburg Institute, 1940.

———. *Meaning in the Visual Arts*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1955.

Parker, Karl T. *Catalogue of the Collection of Drawings in the Ashmolean Museum: The Italian Schools*. Vol. 2. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1956.

———, ed. *Raphael Drawings Selected from the Collection in the Ashmolean Museum*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953.

Passavant, Günter. "Review of *Umbrian Renaissance Drawings from Perugino to Raphael* by Sylvia Ferino-Pagden." *Kunstchronik* 36, no. 5 (May 1983): 217–227.

Pérez Sánchez, Alfonso E. *Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando*. Madrid: Rivadeneyra, 1967.

Peronnet, Benjamin. *Raphaël et son cercle*. Paris: Réunion des Musées Nationaux, 1997.

Perrig, Alexander. *Michelangelo's Drawings: The Science of Attribution*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991.

Petrioli Tofani, Annamaria. *Gabinetto disegni e stampe degli Uffizi: Inventario*. 4 vols. Florence: Olschki, 1986.

Pigman, G. W. III. "Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance." *Renaissance Quarterly* 33, no. 1 (April 1980): 1–32.

Plazzotta, Carol, Michelle O'Malley, Ashok Roy, Raymond White, and Martin Wyld. "'The Madonna di Loreto': An Altarpiece by Perugino for Santa Maria dei Servi, Perugia." *National Gallery Technical Bulletin* 27 (2006): 72–95.

Plesters, Joyce. "Technical Aspects of Some Paintings by Raphael in the National Gallery, London." In *The Princeton Raphael Symposium*, edited by John K. G. Shearman, 15-37. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Pon, Lisa. *Raphael, Dürer, and Marcantonio Raimondi: Copying and the Italian Renaissance Print*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004.

Pope-Hennessy, John. *Raphael*. The Wrightsman Lectures 4. New York: New York University Press, 1970.

Popham, A. E. *Catalogue of Drawings in the Collection Formed by Sir Thomas Phillipps, Bart., F.R.S., Now in the Possession of His Grandson T. Fitzroy Phillipps Fenwick of Thirlestaine House, Cheltenham*. London: Privately printed, 1935.

Pouncey, Philip, and John Arthur Gere. *Italian Drawings in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum: Raphael and His Circle*. London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1962.

Procacci, Ugo. "The Technique of Mural Paintings and Their Detachment." In *The Great Age of Fresco: Giotto to Pontormo*. Exh. cat. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1968.

Proto Pisani, Rosanna Caterina. "All'ombra di Raffaello: Vicende di un museo, ragioni di una mostra." In *Perugino a Firenze: Qualità e fortuna d'uno stile*, edited by Rosanna Caterina Proto Pisani, 9–27. Florence: Pagliai Polistampa, 2005.

———, ed. *Perugino a Firenze: Qualità e fortuna d'uno stile*. Florence: Pagliai Polistampa, 2005.

Quednau, Rolf. "'Imitatione d'altrui': Anmerkungen zu Raphaels Verarbeitung entlehnter Motive." In *De arte et libris*, edited by Abraham Horodisch, 349–367. Amsterdam: Erasmus, 1984.

Reynolds, Ted. "The Accademia del Disegno in Florence: Its Formation and Early Years". Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1974.

Richardson, Carol M., ed. *Renaissance Art Reconsidered: An Anthology of Primary Sources*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007.

Richter, Jean Paul, ed. *The Literary Works of Leonardo da Vinci*. 2 vols. Oxford: Phaidon, 1977.

Robinson, Sir John Charles. *A Critical Account of the Drawings by Michel Angelo and Raffaello in the University Galleries, Oxford*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1870.

Rosenberg, Charles M. "Raphael and the Florentine Istoria." *Studies in the History of Art* 17 (1986): 175–188.

Rubin, Patricia Lee. *Giorgio Vasari: Art and History*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995.

Rubin, Patricia Lee, and Alison Wright. *Florence in the 1470s*. London: National Gallery Publications, 1999.

Rupprecht, Annette, and Sheri Francis Shaneyfelt. "School of Pietro Perugino, Saint Sebastian." In *Studying and Conserving Paintings: Occasional Papers on the Samuel H. Kress Collection*, 132–142. London: Archetype Publications, 2006.

Russell, Francis. "A Late Drawing by Perugino." *Master Drawings* 15 (1977): 257–258.

———. "Perugino and the Early Experience of Raphael." *Studies in the History of Art* 17 (1986): 189–201.

———. “Towards a Reassessment of Perugino’s Lost Fresco of the ‘Adoration of the Magi’ at San Giusto alle Mura.” *Burlington Magazine* 116 (1974): 646–652.

Salis, Arnold von. *Antike und Renaissance: Über Nachleben und Weiterwirken der alten in der neueren Kunst*. Erlenbach-Zürich: Rentsch, 1947.

Sambucco Hamoud, Micaela, ed. *Studi su Raffaello: Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Studi*. Urbino: QuattroVenti, 1987.

Santarelli, Emilio, Emilio Burci, Aurelio Gotti, and Ferd Rondoni. *Catalogo della raccolta di disegni autografi antichi e moderni donata dal prof. Emilio Santarelli alla Reale Galleria di Firenze*. Florence: Cellini, 1870.

Santi, Bruno. *Le ricordanze (10 marzo 1453-24 aprile 1475)*. Pisa: Marlin, 1976.

Santi, Francesco. *Galleria nazionale dell’Umbria: Dipinti, sculture e oggetti dei secoli XV-XVI*. Rome: Istituto poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, 1985.

Sapori, Giovanna, ed. *Giovanni di Pietro: Un pittore spagnolo tra Perugino e Raffaello*. Milan: Electa, 2004.

Sartore, Alberto Maria. “Novità documentarie sui perugineschi.” In *Pietro Vannucci e i pittori perugini del primo Cinquecento*, edited by Paola Mercurelli Salari, 91–102. Perugia: Quattroemme, 2005.

Scarpellini, Pietro. *Perugino*. Milan: Electa, 1991.

Schwartz, Hillel. *The Culture of the Copy: Striking Likenesses, Unreasonable Facsimiles*. New York: Zone Books, 1996.

Shaneyfelt, Sheri Francis. “Giannicola di Paolo’s Collaboration with Pietro Perugino at the Cenacolo di Foligno, Florence.” *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 73, no. 4 (2010): 573–586.

———. “A Reappraisal of Giannicola di Paolo’s Early Career.” *The Burlington Magazine* 149, no. 1246 (2007): 39–42.

Sheard, Wendy Stedman, and John T. Paoletti, eds. *Collaboration in Italian Renaissance Art*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1978.

Shearman, John K. G. *Andrea del Sarto*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

———. “The Organization of Raphael’s Workshop.” *Museum Studies* 10. The Art Institute of Chicago Centennial Lectures (1983): 41–57.

———. *Raphael in Early Modern Sources (1483-1602)*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003.

———. *Raphael's Cartoons in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen and the Tapestries for the Sistine Chapel*. London: Phaidon, 1972.

Sinibaldi, Giulia. "Drawings by Perugino." *Master Drawings* 2, no. 1 (Spring 1964): 27–79.

Sirén, Osvald. *Dessins et tableaux de la Renaissance italienne dans les collections de Suède*. Stockholm: Tullberg, 1902.

Spear, Richard E. "Notes on Renaissance and Baroque Originals and Originality." *Studies in the History of Art* 20 (1989): 97–99.

———. "What Is an Original?" *Melbourne Art Journal* 7 (2004): 15–32.

Springer, Anton. *Raffael und Michelangelo*. Leipzig: Kröner, 1895.

Staley, John E. *The Guilds of Florence*. London: Methuen & Co, 1906.

Strehlke, Carl Brandon, and Cecilia Frosinini. *The Panel Paintings of Masolino and Masaccio: The Role of Technique*. Milan: 5 Continents, 2002.

Summers, David. "Figure come fratelli: A Transformation of Symmetry in Renaissance Painting." *Art Quarterly* 1 (1977): 59–88.

———. *Michelangelo and the Language of Art*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981.

Talvacchia, Bette. *Raphael*. London: Phaidon Press, 2007.

———. "Raphael's Workshop and the Development of a Managerial Style." In *The Cambridge Companion to Raphael*, edited by Marcia B. Hall, 167–185. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Tanimoto, Satoko, and Giovanni Verri. "A Note on the Examination of Silverpoint Drawings by Near-Infrared Reflectography." *Studies in Conservation: The Journal of the International Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works* 54, no. 2 (2009): 106–116.

Tempesti, Anna Forlani. *Italian Fifteenth- to Seventeenth-Century Drawings in the Robert Lehman Collection*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1991.

Teza, Laura. "Un dipinto in società: Perugino, Berto di Giovanni e la bottega del 1496." In *Pietro Vannucci e i pittori perugini del primo Cinquecento*, edited by Paola Mercurelli Salari, 47–61. Perugia: Quattroemme, 2005.

———. "Precisazioni su Eusebio da San Giorgio." *Commentari d'arte: Rivista di critica e storia dell'arte* 5, no. 14 (1999): 13–22.

Thiébaut, Dominique, and Marie-Alice Debout. *Le Pérugin et l'école ombrienne*. Paris: Réunion des Musées Nationaux, 1979.

Thomas, Anabel. *The Painter's Practice in Renaissance Tuscany*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Todini, Filippo. "Il Perugino, le sue botteghe e i suoi seguaci." In *Perugino a Firenze: qualità e fortuna d'uno stile*, edited by Rosanna Caterina Proto Pisani, 51–68. Florence: Pagliai Polistampa, 2005.

———. *La pittura umbra dal Duecento al primo Cinquecento*. Milan: Longanesi, 1989.

Tolnay, Charles de. *History and Technique of Old Master Drawings: a Handbook*. New York: Bittner, 1943.

Troncelliti, Latifah. "The Making of Cennino Cennini." *Explorations in Renaissance Culture: EIRC* 30, no. 2 (2004): 290–325.

———. *The Two Parallel Realities of Alberti and Cennini: The Power of Writing and the Visual Arts in the Italian Quattrocento*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2004.

Vasari, Giorgio. *Lives of the Painters, Sculptors and Architects*. Edited by David Ekserdjian. Translated by Gaston du C. de Vere. 2 vols. New York: Knopf, 1996.

———. *Vasari on Technique*. Edited by G. Baldwin Brown. Translated by Louisa S. Maclehose. New York: Dover, 1960.

———. *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori ed architettori* (Florence, 1568). Edited by Gaetano Milanesi. 9 vols. Florence: Sansoni, 1906.

Venturini, Lisa. "'Copie' da dipinti illustri." In *Maestri e botteghe: Pittura a Firenze alla fine del Quattrocento*, edited by Mina Gregori, 165–170. Cinisello Balsamo: Silvana Ed., 1992.

Wackernagel, Martin. *Der Lebensraum des Künstlers in der florentinischen Renaissance: Aufgaben und Auftraggeber, Werkstatt und Kunstmarkt*. Leipzig: Seemann, 1938.

———. *The World of the Florentine Renaissance Artist: Projects and Patrons, Workshop and Art Market*. Translated by Alison Luchs. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981.

Waetzoldt, Wilhelm. *Dürer and His Times*. Translated by R.H. Boothroyd. London: Phaidon Press, 2006.

Williams, Robert. *Art Theory: An Historical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.

———. *Art, Theory, and Culture in Sixteenth-Century Italy: From Techne to Metatechne*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Wittkower, Rudolf. "The Young Raphael." *Allen Memorial Art Museum Bulletin* 20 (1963): 150–168.

Wood, Jeryldene. "The Early Paintings of Perugino." Ph.D. diss., University of Virginia, 1985.

Woods, Kim W., ed. *Making Renaissance Art*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007.

Zanardi, Bruno. *Il cantiere di Giotto: Le storie di San Francesco ad Assisi*. Milan: Skira, 1996.

———. "Giotto and the St. Francis Cycle at Assisi." In *The Cambridge Companion to Giotto*, edited by Anne Derbes and Mark Sandona, 32–62. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Zanelli, Gianluca. "Disegni perugineschi di primo Cinquecento del Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe di Palazzo Rosso." *Studi di storia dell'arte* 9 (1998): 305–313.