

Heterotopia in the Renaissance: Modern Hybrids as Antiques in Bramante, Cima da Conegliano, and the *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*

Lorenzo Pericolo

Despite marked differences in medium and function, the Prevedari print (1481) after Donato Bramante, the *Madonna and Child with Saints Michael and Andrew* (circa 1496–98) by Giovanni Battista Cima da Conegliano, and the illustration of Artemisia’s tomb in Francesco Colonna’s *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* (1499) bear a common relation. These three works of art, all originating in northern or northeastern Italy in the last two decades of the fifteenth century, depict architectures characterized by a hybridization of antique and modern elements. In Bramante’s composition and Cima’s picture, these hybrids are rendered as majestic ruins.¹ The author and the illustrator of the *Hypnerotomachia* instead imagined Artemisia’s tomb as an ancient, intact monument. To be sure, representations of heterogeneous architectures, consisting of modern and ancient components, punctuate the evolution of Italian art from the late Middle Ages onwards. Yet during the quattrocento, modern antiquities—occasionally pictured as ruins—became a frequent, almost obsessive accessory in paintings and, later on, in prints. Artists relentlessly attempted to revive and surpass antiquity. At first glance, then, Bramante, Cima, and the illustrator of the *Hypnerotomachia* do not constitute exceptions to this general trend. Nevertheless, when compared to other similar representations of hybrid architectures, their works stand out in a very specific manner: they are neither reconstructions of nor elaborations on ancient artifacts. They deliberately present the architectures as ambivalent compounds in which antiquity and modernity intersect each other without fusing together, bringing about an effect of estrangement and misrecognition. This artistic phenomenon has not drawn the attention it deserves. Bramante’s work, over which much ink has been spilled, has generally been dismissed as sheer fantasy. Artemisia’s tomb has solely aroused the curiosity of philologists and historians of Italian literature. As for Cima’s painting, Paola Modesti just recently remarked upon the strange “modernity” of the architectural relics it depicts.

I intend to approach these hybrids as figures not of speech, but of fiction: paradigms of artistic forms that should be perceived as both climactic products in the evolution of architecture and prospects of inventiveness. Inspired by Michel Foucault’s minor yet groundbreaking text, “Des espaces autres” (1967),² I will define these figures of fiction as heterotopias: architectures that, through a combination and juxtaposition of elements, intentionally transpose real antiques and actual modern buildings into a space and time

Getty Research Journal, no. 1 (2009): 1–16 © 2009 Lorenzo Pericolo

that is other and unreal. Although Foucault uses heterotopia to describe socio-cultural sites, I believe that the term appropriately applies to images. By using hybridization to concomitantly reflect, denature, and displace actual pieces of architecture, heterotopia serves as a comparative, magnifying mirror through which modernity is either exalted, transfigured into a utopia, or put into a historical perspective projected into the future.

To begin, I will examine Cima's painting (fig. 1).³ Receding toward a distant hill-town, the grandiose ruins of a sumptuous edifice soar in the foreground, thrusting its fragmented crowning beyond the canvas's circular frame. In its shade, at the center, a seated Mary helps the infant Jesus bless the viewer. Sitting on the cornice of a finely carved pedestal, the Child turns his face to the light pouring in from the right. An outward-gazing Michael and a meditative Andrew flank the Virgin and the infant Jesus. In the foreground, slivers of rosettes, cornices, and modillions lay on the ground, amidst weeds and stones in mute, eloquent parity. Due to the oblique point of view chosen by Cima for these ruins, the viewer cannot avoid feeling both the effect of majesty and the impression of the building's ongoing disintegration. Visually, this architecture reads as an ancient ruin, and beholders must have interpreted it as such by force of habit.⁴ Still, what Cima represented here is no antiquity.

As Modesti observes,⁵ the carved pedestal and pilaster in the foreground, in connection with the segment of wall covered with slabs of white marble and bands of pink Verona, must have brought to the mind of every Venetian the elevated chancel of Santa Maria dei Miracoli, recently finished in 1494 after a design by Pietro Lombardo.⁶ Modesti also signals that the free-standing porphyry columns behind the Virgin resemble those that decorate the façade of Saint Mark's in Venice. To these observations, I wish to add that the porphyry architrave, crowned by a cornice supported by flat modillions, may also derive from the façade of Santa Maria dei Miracoli, the architrave belonging to its lower order, the cornice to its higher. Be that as it may, it is evident that Cima never sought to exactly quote the modern architectures at which he hints in the picture. This point merits deeper reflection. Rather than alluding specifically to Santa Maria dei Miracoli, Cima varied and expanded on motifs he took up from various buildings in Venice, most of them freshly constructed. Moreover, these architectural motifs are usually charged with a classical aura: they harken back to the august past of a dreamt-of Rome. For instance, the porphyry columns, though specific to Saint Mark's, were regarded also as exquisite antiques; in the *Martyrdom of Saint Christopher* (1456–57; Padua, Ovetari Chapel), Andrea Mantegna depicted them as integral elements of an ancient architecture. Yet, by highlighting the porphyry column behind the Madonna and the carved pedestal and pilaster in the foreground, Cima creates a visual association that also points to the future of architecture. It is no coincidence that the pairing of independent, marble columns and pilasters decorated with *all'antica* carvings also distinguishes the monumental arches that Mauro Codussi designed for the upper landing of the stairway at the Scuola Grande of San Giovanni Evangelista (Venice).⁷ As evidenced by documentation, the construction of the Scuola Grande's staircase started in 1498, around the same time or slightly after Cima's painting.



Fig. 1. Giovanni Battista Cima da Conegliano (Italian, ca. 1459–1517). *The Madonna and Child with Saints Michael and Andrew*, ca. 1496–98, altarpiece, 194 × 134 cm (76³/₈ × 52³/₄ in.). Parma, Galleria Nazionale. Photo: Alinari/Art Resource, New York

Apart from echoing an antique modernity, Cima's architectural setting is equally configured as a repository of inventions to come, variations on ancient-modern themes. Consider the pilaster's sculpted panel: sprouting from a vase, foliage symmetrically unfolds from the bottom up, incorporating a mask, a blossom-like cup, an eagle with outstretched wings, and the head of a lion. None of these motifs is unattested, even if here they are assembled, and sometimes altered, in a unique way. It bears underscoring that the same eagle, albeit variously poised, appears in Santa Maria dei Miracoli not only as a pilaster's ornament but also in some of the friezes and, out-of-scale, as the principal decoration of the lecterns on either side of the chancel balcony. Akin to a heraldic emblem, the eagle reigns at the center of the circular pediment above the entrance arch in the atrium of the Scuola Grande of San Giovanni Evangelista, designed by Pietro Lombardo and built by 1481. In Venice's San Zaccaria, imperial eagles once again decorate some of the columns' capitals, imitating those of the former Byzantine church, recently renovated by Antonio Gambello, then by Codussi from 1483 onwards.⁸ The eagle's motif is so inherent in the decorative language of contemporary Venice that its depiction in Cima's painting, varied as it is, intuitively conjures up the immanence of modern architecture.

Notably, Cima's disguised evocation of modernity acts as a subtle *paragone*. As a painter, he feigns architectural ruins, inventing unusual sculptural motifs: in the pedestal, an ox's head literally stands for a more orthodox bucrane, and two dolphins relinquish their original posture as capitals' volutes⁹ to morph into bas-relief decoration.¹⁰ More relevantly, Cima assembles a mask—very similar to the ones in Santa Maria dei Miracoli—and a torso from a military trophy, recomposing them as a half-human and half-grotesque figure resting on acanthus leaves and holding a swag. By restoring the likeness of a human figure, Cima in a sense reassembled what architecture and sculpture had dismantled for the sake of ornament. Thus, this reinvention of a modern carving functions as a performative signature. It also declares the richness of the novel Venetian artistic vernacular: a receptacle of hybrid forms, modern and antique, subject to elaboration, and hence endlessly transforming into new motifs through hybridization.¹¹

Cima's architectural hybrid had an illustrious antecedent: Bramante's large composition engraved by Bernardo Prevedari representing the interior of a crumbling temple (fig. 2).¹² Though the subject of Cima's picture is perfectly clear, Bramante's has lent itself to numerous and discordant interpretations. Here I will touch on the few conjectures that I believe are most valid. Since the gigantic candlestick in the middle of the main nave conceals a pagan idol standing in the shell-crowned apse¹³ and supports a rudimentary cross, it is self-evident that Bramante aimed first and foremost to evoke a particular event: the dedication of an ancient temple to the Christian cult. Although I tend to agree with those scholars who believe that the Prevedari print depicts Saint Barnabas's departure from Milan in the aftermath of the city's evangelization—the kneeling monk in the foreground who adores the cross atop the candlestick could be Barnabas bracing himself for a new crusade in Lombardy¹⁴—I shall not insist on this point that seems to me, if not irrelevant, somewhat secondary. Because of its structural role and startling proportions, the



REPRO AS B/W
(no larger than 4x5)

Fig. 2. Bernardo Prevedari (Italian, act. 1469–1524), after Donato Bramante (Italian, 1444–1514). Interior of a ruined church or temple, 1481, engraving, 70.8 × 51.2 cm (27⁷/₈ × 20¹/₈ in.). London, British Museum. © Trustees of the British Museum

real protagonist of Bramante's work is its overwhelming architecture, which is depicted accordingly in lively details. Also of paramount importance are Bramante's indications of the period in which this fiction takes place: a twilight zone between the collapse of the ancient world and the instauration of Christendom. Once again, establishing the exact moment of this epochal change matters little. In fact, the past that Bramante refers to here is the representation of a historical process reconstructed symbolically through hypotheses that nevertheless were based on written sources and ancient vestiges.

In a preliminary analysis, Bramante's architecture marks both a temporal breakdown and an artistic continuity. If Cima's relics mostly reflect the architectural modernity of Venice, Bramante strives instead for stylistic indistinctness so that his temple, unlike Cima's very Venetian remains, belongs neither to Milan, where the print was produced, nor to any other place whatsoever. In addition, it is also impossible to sort out

the ancient from the modern—or for that matter the sacred from the profane—within Bramante’s relics: antiquity and modernity aggregate inextricably and, more importantly, improbably. To start, the edifice’s architectural scheme could be described as either an ancient basilica in accordance with Vitruvius’s precepts¹⁵ or as the proleptic model of an essentially quincunx-plan building similar to Bramante’s designs decades later for the church of Santi Celso e Giuliano and for St. Peter’s, both in Rome.¹⁶ A hypothetical past and a prospective future are thus simultaneously summoned in the plan of this temple. Other elements partake of both antiquity and modernity. In this category are the arabesques and rosettes on the intrados of the arcades as well as the mixed capitals—Ionic and Corinthian—of the pilasters,¹⁷ the Romanesque necking of one of them notwithstanding. But these are only details in comparison with the majority of elements that, however attested, are either misplaced or mismatched on purpose.¹⁸

Indeed, Bramante methodically pursues architectural incongruity, be it chronological or structural. The rose window in the upper right with its baluster-mullions qualifies as substantially Romanesque (an intriguingly similar one is to be found in San Zeno in Oratorio, Verona), even though Giovanni Antonio Medeo employed it in a contemporary building well-known to Bramante: the Colleoni Chapel in Bergamo (1476).¹⁹ As Franz Wolff Metternich correctly pointed out, the latticework necking of one of the pilaster’s capitals in the Prevedari engraving refers to Milan’s early Christian architecture—particularly the ciborium in Sant’Ambrogio,²⁰ to which the polygonal dome hardly visible above the foreground arch in the print may also allude.²¹

By the same token, the fidgeting busts within medallions represented in friezes or on spandrels, though inspired by ancient coins, imitate motifs present in Florentine and central-Italian sculpture and painting.²² Antique, Romanesque, and quattrocento elements coalesce everywhere in the print without transition and in chronological dissonance. Moreover, disparity concerns not only time but also structure. For instance, how would one explain the function of the cross vault pierced with four oculi, a rosette boss hanging at its center?²³ And what about the bull’s-eye in the background with its emperor-like bust seen from behind? Or how to account for the enormous candelabrum in the nave? As represented in the Prevedari print, these architectural inventions are simply incompatible with the repertory of the ancient past, and inapplicable to the future. Yet a rationale is revealed if these elements are viewed as intentionally “heterotopic.” Bramante’s manipulations of canonical architectures in fact conform to rhetorical principles.

Consider the candelabrum topped by a cross:²⁴ it is nothing but the metonymy of an antique column surmounted by idols. In his Saluzziano codex (before 1486), one of his manuscript treatises on architecture, Francesco di Giorgio Martini inserted the representation of a candelabrum and a baluster in the chapter devoted to columns. Nearby, he specified: “column-candelabrum” and “column-baluster,” as if to clarify that candelabra, balusters, and columns fall into the same category.²⁵ Bramante stressed the point by furnishing the candlestick in the print with an Ionic capital, which nevertheless conflicts with the stand underneath.²⁶

In another case, Bramante plays with oxymoron instead of analogy. For instance, the bull’s-eye, a diaphragm by definition, accommodates a bust that obstructs the stream of light from outside. It is possible that here Bramante adopted some architectural ideas from the façade of the Colleoni Chapel (the shell niches with the busts of Caesar and Trajan and the rose window on the façade), crossing and inverting their roles—full versus empty, open versus closed, inside versus outside. Now observe the cross vault in the middle ground: what else are its four oculi than a hypallage and hyperbole of an antique oculus, such as the famous one in the Pantheon in Rome?²⁷ By quadruplicating this motif and denaturing its function, Bramante not only alerts the beholder to the fictitious character of the edifice but also glorifies the infinite potential of the architectural elements on display; he in fact pushes their adaptability to the extremes of paradox. In this regard, the decaying temple of the Prevedari engraving is a pure example of heterotopia. Through the awkwardness of its components and by comparison, it accentuates the intrinsic value of Bramante’s new architecture, whether carried out in the present (Santa Maria presso San Satiro in Milan²⁸) or applicable in the future. For this reason, the print does not revivify the ancient past through antiquarian reconstruction but showcases it as an incongruous amalgam of select architectures—no Gothic barbarism indeed sneaks in. In this way, the past manifests itself as a virtually inexhaustible but incomplete repository of forms ready for future arrangements.

This interpretation does not completely elucidate why Bramante’s heterotopia also involves architectures evolving in time. A visual, almost tactile, impression of passage and temporality is conveyed through perspective and lighting. The print’s oblique point of view, not to mention the broken arch suspended almost frontally in the foreground, contributes to the illusion of an architecture shifting backward and forward, in balanced motion. More poignantly, Bramante transforms the kneeling monk into a human sundial by casting his elongated shadow toward the candelabrum and the cross atop it. In doing so, Bramante allegorically evokes the image of an ancient gnomon, measuring the course of time and announcing both the dawn of Christendom and the dusk of paganism. I believe that the evocation of space and time in motion is intrinsically subordinate to the stylistic heterogeneity of the architectures in the print. Because Bramante makes no effort to classify or divide the architectural elements into chronological subsets, but instead increases their temporal and structural discrepancies, he does not intend to visually summarize the history of architecture from the ancient times on. Rather, he portrays architecture as a historical force, an irresistible flow of forms combining with each other in potentially endless configurations. Through stylistic indistinctiveness, Bramante therefore does not annihilate time or the notion of time’s evolution: he simply annuls the distinction between antiquity and modernity, blending them into a hybrid yet wondrous scheme. Even as its ruinous condition attests to a chronological fracture, his monument of mistimed architectural styles heralds the impending reconciliation and restoration of antiquity and modernity under the aegis of a new, broader art language.



Fig. 3. Artemisia's tomb. From Francesco Colonna, *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* (Venice: Aldo Manuzio, 1499). Image courtesy Getty Research Institute

Hybridization also characterizes Colonna's depiction of Artemisia's tomb in the *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* (fig. 3). Unlike Bramante, Colonna and his anonymous illustrator (or illustrators) tried to harmonize modernity and antiquity,²⁹ avoiding contrasts by blurring specificities in melodious yet estranging ambiguity. As described in the text, Poliphilus, Colonna's hero, encounters the ruins of a funerary chapel among the "most noble and ancient" epitaphs and sepulchres in the cemetery of the unfortunate lovers, placed in the land of Venus. In front of him, miraculously intact, is a porphyry tomb inserted into a wall. As he learns shortly thereafter, it is the tomb of Artemisia, King Mausolos's faithful wife.³⁰

In a pioneering essay of 1963, Giovanni Pozzi and Lucia Ciapponi postulate that many motifs imagined by Colonna and rendered by his illustrators stemmed from Venetian or northeast-Italian works of art.³¹ Indeed, as exemplified in the *Hypnerotomachia*, the

very concept of a monumental tomb framed by pilasters and arches relies on the typology of funerary monuments specific to contemporary Venice and, generally, northern Italy. Yet the overall layout of Artemisia's tomb also mirrors that of contemporary Venetian altarpieces, whether sculpted³² or painted. Compare the *Hypnerotomachia* engraving with the Pesaro triptych of 1488 by Giovanni Bellini (Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, Venice), particularly the central element. If one concentrates on Artemisia's figure and her sarcophagus-throne within the niche, one will immediately realize their visual connection with Bellini's Frari Madonna in majesty and, more broadly, with the representations of enthroned Virgins as developed by Bellini from the 1470s on.³³

Evidently, the designer of Artemisia's tomb refashioned a religious iconographic scheme (the Virgin in majesty) into a profane and allegedly ancient formula. This intermixture of the sacred and the secular diverges intrinsically from the bipolarity of antiquity and modernity that, according to Aby Warburg, was embedded in the late-fifteenth-century artistic culture of Florence. In Venice, intermixture incorporates blending and furthers ambivalence, whereas in Florence bipolarity engenders iconographic intermittence and verges on dichotomy. The illustrator of the *Hypnerotomachia* blurs actuality by shifting it into an indeterminate antiquity. Moreover, he employs the religious patterns of modern art as catalysts for the visualization and reenactment of the ancient past. This is why Poliphilus's ancient world has a certain familiarity. In depicting Artemisia's tomb, Colonna and his illustrator preserved the basic structure of a Venetian altarpiece, adjusting it to an ancient funerary monument. Unlike Bramante, they did not seek out dissonance. Their procedure of transfiguring actuality—besides switching contemporary religious formulas into profane, both lyrical and heroic contents—mainly consists of dislocating or upgrading ornamental motifs that, though related more or less to antiquity, turn out to be perfectly contemporaneous.

A typical example of this upgrading is represented by the crowning of Artemisia's tomb, in which a coin's obverse—or possibly a Byzantine seal or the back of a cameo—morphs into and expands onto a monumental disc (with transfer of medium from metal to black stone),³⁴ while a standing heroic sculpture like Tullio Lombardo's *Shield-Bearers* in the Tomb of Doge Andrea Vendramin (1489–90), no longer a lateral acroterion, seems to turn into a monumental pinnacle (with transfer from marble to bronze).³⁵ This tendency to overinflate and dislocate ornamental elements in the *Hypnerotomachia* is corroborated by the fact that some motifs used by Colonna are also frequent in early Renaissance or sixteenth-century plaquettes.³⁶ For instance, the portrait of Mausolos that fills and somehow overflows the medallion within which it is inserted recalls decorative masks, like the bronze satyr serving as the hinge of a doorknocker now at the Bargello (Florence).³⁷ The lion's paws of Artemisia's throne, linked to each other through acanthus leaves, are not dissimilar from the half-acanthus and half-leonine feet of a small bronze box (circa 1500) by Severo da Ravenna, also at the Bargello.³⁸

I am not saying that these or other motifs in the *Hypnerotomachia* belonged specifically to the decorative arts. The usage of lion's paws on a monumental seat was, at

that time, considered canonically ancient, as proven by one of Francesco di Giorgio Martini's drawings at the Uffizi (Florence) that represents two similar antique thrones, one of them in Santo Stefano Rotondo (Rome) during the quattrocento.³⁹ I only argue that through the dilation and dislocation of ornamental motifs, half-antique and half-modern, Colonna sparks a pervasive, but not intrusive, effect of estrangement. Only on this condition could modernity be perceived as ambivalently antique.

Colonna's language in the *Hypnerotomachia* is substantially a Venetian vernacular inlaid with Latin prefixes and suffixes, infixes and diminutives—all of which might be defined as grammatical adornments—just as Artemisia's tomb connotes a Venetian architecture Latinized through the misplacing and anamorphosis of decorative hybrids. Colonna, like many of his compatriots, was so convinced that modern art—whether religious or secular—conformed to, incorporated, and surpassed ancient art that, in imagining an allegorical antiquity, he modeled it on contemporary Venice. From this point of view, Artemisia's tomb, although situated in the utopia of Venus's land, more pertinently constitutes a heterotopia. In fact, Colonna does not project the tomb's architecture into the future. The heroic queen's sepulchre could well belong in modern Venice, a virtual Venice transfigured not in reaction to, but as an epiphany of its new architecture. The effect of estrangement I mentioned earlier is the means by which Colonna unveils the architectural underground of a Venice as even grander than ancient Rome. But Artemisia's tomb, unlike the relics in Cima's Parma painting, tends to simultaneously obscure Venice as its original referent. By shifting from the religious to the profane, the monument loses its actuality, emerging instead as a visual riddle honoring love, death, fidelity, and heroism. Colonna thereby avails himself of Venice as a substratum, a bridge between fiction and reality, an anchor of allegory. That Venice loomed in the background of Colonna's novel was probably self-evident to the cultivated Venetian elite for whom the *Hypnerotomachia* had been destined from the outset. The city's amorphous presence helped the reader empathize with Poliphilus, while alienating him from Venice at the same time. Fiction and actuality therefore run parallel in view of one another. Antiquity is no longer a temporal dimension, but a vector of estrangement. Nor is it a metaphor of transgression, but a device of trespassing. Thus, in the *Hypnerotomachia*, heterotopia works out differently than in Bramante's Prevedari print or in Cima's Parma altarpiece.

Despite these differences, there exists a common denominator in these three works of art: antiquity cannot be singled out from modernity. Although the ancient and the modern never blend together—they only add up to a hybrid space, neither antique nor modern—they constitute a unity of artistic forms, deployed as a unified repertory of architectural elements. Perhaps because the lure of antiquity affected Venice and Milan later than other Italian centers like Florence and Padua, the distance between the classical past and the resurgent present was perceived with much less intensity. In the Venetian representations and the Milanese print that I have examined here, the modern and the ancient, without being identical, do not prevail over each other; they possess an equivalent value. Bramante, Cima, and Colonna's goal is no longer to recover or to transcend

antiquity, but to develop an already antique-imbued modernity for the purpose of higher artistic expressions. In retrospect, for Bramante, Cima, and Colonna, heterotopia entails a peculiar synthesis of antiquity and modernity: Hegel might have called it an artistic *Aufhebung* (sublation). But this synthesis, instead of concluding a historical dialectic between a canonical past and a self-conscious present, opens up innumerable, unpredictable, and blissfully divergent possibilities of invention.

Lorenzo Pericolo is professor in the Department of Art History at the University of Montreal. He is currently working on a new book entitled *The Poetics of Dislocation: Narrative in the Painting of Caravaggio*.

Notes I would like to thank Paola Modesti for allowing me to hear and discuss her first ideas about Cima da Conegliano's hybrid architectures before they were published, sparking my interest in this fascinating topic. Among friends and colleagues who heard or read this text in its previous stages, I must mention with gratitude Elizabeth Cropper, Marzia Faietti, Thomas Gaehtgens, Keith Moxey, Alessandro Nova, Philippe S  n  chal, Tristan Wedding, and Christopher S. Wood.

1. To my knowledge, there is no specific bibliography on this topic. For the nineteenth century, see Philippe Junod, "Future in the Past," *Oppositions* 26 (1984): 43–63. One can also read the rather confused essay by Anne-Marie Senkovitch, "Anachronism and Simulation in Renaissance Architectural Theory," *Res* 49/50 (2006): 188–203. For a new approach to this topic, see Alexander Nagel and Christopher S. Wood, "Toward a New Model of Renaissance Anachronism," *Art Bulletin* 87 (2005): 403–32.

2. Michel Foucault, "Des espaces autres: H  t  rotopies," *Architecture, Mouvement, Continuit  * 5 (1984): 46–49:

Il y a   galement, et ceci probablement dans toute culture, dans toute civilisation, des lieux r  els, des lieux effectifs, des lieux qui sont dessin  s dans l'institution m  me de la soci  t  , et qui sont des sortes de contre-emplacements, sortes d'utopies effectivement r  alis  es dans lesquelles les emplacements r  els, tous les autres emplacements r  els que l'on peut trouver    l'int  rieur de la culture, sont    la fois repr  sent  s, contest  s et invers  s, des sortes des lieux qui sont hors de tous les lieux, bien que pourtant ils soient effectivement localisables.

For an English translation of the text, see Michel Foucault, "Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias," in Neil Leach, ed., *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 350–55.

3. Although its original destination is still a matter of debate, *The Madonna and Child with Saints Michael and Andrew* was most likely painted for the Franciscan church of Santissima Annunziata in Parma. See Peter Humfrey, *Cima da Conegliano* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1983), 36, 138–39 (cat. no. 119); and Lucia Fornari Schianchi, ed., *Galleria Nazionale di Parma: Catalogo delle opere dall'antico al Cinquecento* (Milan: Franco Maria Ricci, 1997), 140–43 (cat. no. 127; entry by Luisa Viola).

4. The cases of antiquities functioning as backdrops in the iconographic tradition of the Madonna with Child, especially in the representation of the nativity, are numerous indeed. Among several examples, I would like to mention two nativities by Francesco di Giorgio Martini in San Domenico and Sant'Agostino (Siena), dating to circa 1485–95, in which the Holy Family is represented against the ruins of a triumphal arch and of an ancient building, respectively. See Ralph Toledano, *Francesco di Giorgio Martini: Pittore e scultore* (Milan: Electa, 1987), 102–5 (cat. no. 39); 111–16 (cat. no. 42). For the ancient buildings represented in these nativities, see Christoffer H. Ericsson, *Roman Architecture Expressed in Sketches by Francesco di Giorgio Martini: Studies in Imperial Roman and Early Christian Architecture* (Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 1980), 187–89.

5. Paola Modesti, “Quasi come in un dipinto: La città e l’architettura nel De situ urbis Venetae di Marcantonio Sabellico (1491 ca.),” *Annali di architettura* 21 (forthcoming). For more on Cima da Conegliano and for other quotations on contemporary Venetian architecture, see Ennio Concina, “Dal Medioevo al primo Rinascimento: L’architettura,” in Alberto Tenenti and Ugo Tucci, eds., *Storia di Venezia dalle origini alla caduta della Serenissima*, vol. 5, *Il Rinascimento, società ed economia* (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia italiana, 1996), 165–306, especially 221–22.

6. John McAndrew, *Venetian Architecture of the Early Renaissance* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1980), 150–81; Mario Piana and Wolfgang Wolters, eds., *Santa Maria dei Miracoli a Venezia: La storia, la fabbrica, i restauri* (Venice: Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere & Arti, 2003). See also Alison Luchs, “Lo scalpello e la pagina: I Lombardo e l’illustrazione del libro a Venezia,” in Andrea Guerra et al., eds., *I Lombardo: Architettura e scultura a Venezia tra ’400 e ’500* (Venice: Marsilio, 2006), 137–60.

7. Codussi did not use porphyry, a material much more adequate for an imperial or ducal edifice, but rather a similarly streaked marble. See Loredana Olivato and Lionello Puppi, *Mauro Codussi* (Milan: Electa, 1977), 218–21; McAndrew, *Venetian Architecture* (note 6), 364–77.

8. McAndrew, *Venetian Architecture* (note 6), 144–49. The eagle with outspread wings also appears as an ornamental motif on some capitals crowning the columns in the main nave of San Zaccaria, Venice. Unfortunately, it is impossible to establish whether Codussi introduced this motif in 1483 when he replaced Gambello, the architect who had been in charge of the construction of the church since 1458. According to Francesco Sansovino, San Zaccaria possessed ancient capitals decorated with eagles executed in the ninth century:

Fra tutti i monisteri di donne monache, quello di San Zaccaria è nobilissimo per diverse sue qualità. Giustiniano Participatio, doge decimo, lo fabricò o restaurò l’anno 407 dell’edificazione di Venetia, et l’anno 827 di Christo, pregato da Leone Quarto imperatore di Costantinopoli, il quale non solamente gli mandò danari, ma huomini e maestri eccellenti nell’architettura, acciòché si facesse una bella chiesa e si finisse tosto. In gratia del quale Leone, il doge fece scolpire ne’ capitelli delle colonne l’aquile imperiali che si veggono ancora nella chiesa vecchia.

Francesco Sansovino, *Venetia città nobilissima et singolare... Le chiese, fabbriche, edifici, & palazzi pubblici, & privati... con altre cose appresso notabili, & degne di memoria* (Venice: Iacopo Sansovino, 1581), 1:26. See also Olivato and Puppi, *Mauro Codussi* (note 7), 190–95.

9. An ancient capital with dolphins is now in the Museo Civico in Padua. See Francesco Paolo Fiore and Manfredo Tafuri, eds., *Francesco di Giorgio architetto*, exh. cat. (Milan: Electa, 1994), 263 (no. IX.1.7). For the use of such motifs in architecture by Francesco di Giorgio Martini, see Fiore and Tafuri, *Francesco di Giorgio architetto* (this note), 303–6 (cat. no. XIV.1.1b). As capitals’ volutes, dolphins are also depicted in Martini’s *Nativity* in San Domenico (Siena). See Toledano, *Francesco di Giorgio Martini* (note 4), 102 (cat. no. 39).

10. Jacopo Bellini had already morphed dolphin motifs into colossal ornaments on the spandrels of an arched gate in a drawing from the Louvre album (circa 1440–60), and Pietro Lombardo had carved dolphin-like acanthus leaves in Santa Maria dei Miracoli. Jacopo Bellini, *Mourners in Front of the Empty Tomb of Christ on Eastern Morning*, pen on parchment, Musée du Louvre, Département des Arts graphiques (RF 1520, 65 [Ancien numéro 57]), fol. 62r in the “Louvre Bellini Album.” See Bernhard Degenhart and Annegrit Schmitt, *Jacopo Bellini: Die Zeichnungen des Louvre* (Munich: Prestel, 1984), 25; and Colin Eisler, *The Genius of Jacopo Bellini: The Complete Paintings and Drawings* (New York: Abrams, 1989), 352–53.

11. Looked at within the broader purview of the religious tradition, Cima’s heterogeneous ruins cannot signify the end of the ancient world on the eve of the Christian era. Indeed, all the elements of the picture’s architectural remnants typologically pertain to sacred edifices. In the end, even the most unorthodox motifs carved on the limestone panels, in spite of their apparent paganism, would pale in

comparison with the cortege of mermaids, single- or double-tailed, sculpted on the cushions below the pilasters of the central arch in Santa Maria dei Miracoli.

12. Luca Beltrami, “Bramante e Leonardo praticarono l’arte del bulino? Un incisore sconosciuto: Bernardo Prevedari,” *Rassegna d’Arte antica e moderna* 4 (1917): 187–94; Peter Murray, “Bramante milanese: The Printings and Engravings,” *Arte Lombarda* 7 (1962): 25–42; Franz Graf Wolff Metternich, “Der Kupferstich Bernardo de Prevedari aus Mailand von 1481: Gedanken zu den Anfängen der Kunst Bramantes,” *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 11 (1967–68): 9–108; Germano Mulazzani, “Ad civitatem Mediolani veni: Il senso dell’incisione Prevedari,” in *Studi sulla cultura lombarda in memoria di Mario Apollonio* (Milan: Vita & Pensiero, 1972), 1:76–90; Arnaldo Bruschi, *Bramante* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1977), 31–34; Clelia Alberici, “L’incisione Prevedari,” *Rassegna di Studi e di Notizie* 6 (1978): 37–55; Arnaldo Bruschi, “Problemi bramanteschi,” *Rassegna di Studi e di Notizie* 6 (1978): 57–66; Germano Mulazzani, “Il tema iconografico dell’incisione Prevedari,” *Rassegna di Studi e di Notizie* 6 (1978): 67–71; Marisa Dalai Emiliani, “Secundum designum in papiro factum per magistrum Bramantem de Urbino...: Riflessioni sulla struttura prospettica dell’incisione Prevedari,” *Rassegna di Studi e di Notizie* 6 (1978): 73–82; Giorgio Lise, “Un ricordo della stampa Prevedari negli affreschi di Donato da Montorfano a S. Maria delle Grazie,” *Rassegna di Studi e di Notizie* 6 (1978): 83–87; Clelia Alberici, ed., *Leonardo e l’incisione: Stampe derivate da Leonardo e Bramante dal XV al XIX secolo*, exh. cat. (Milan: Electa, 1984): 41–46; Clelia Alberici, “Bernardo Prevedari incisore di un disegno del Bramante,” *Arte Lombarda* 23 (1988): 5–13; Henry A. Millon and Vittorio Magnago Lampugnani, eds., *The Renaissance from Brunelleschi to Michelangelo: The Representation of Architecture*, exh. cat. (New York: Rizzoli, 1994), 502–4 (cat. no. 121; entry by Claudio Strinati); Stefano Borsi, *Bramante e Urbino: Il problema della formazione* (Rome: Officina Edizioni, 1997), 101–30; Arnaldo Bruschi, “La formazione e gli esordi di Bramante: Dati, ipotesi, problemi,” in Christoph L. Frommel, Luisa Giordano, and Richard Schofield, eds., *Bramante milanese e l’architettura del Rinascimento Lombardo* (Venice: Marsilio, 2002), 33–66; and Patricia A. Emison, “Whittling Down the Istorìa,” in Alexander Nagel and Lorenzo Pericolo, eds., *Subject as Aporia in Early Modern Art* (London: Ashgate, forthcoming). The influence of Fra Carnevale on Bramante, and the relation between the Prevedari print and his architectural scenes in Boston (Museum of Fine Arts) and New York (Metropolitan Museum of Art) are well-known, and the bibliography insists systematically on these points. For Fra Carnevale, see more recently Keith Christiansen, *From Filippo Lippi to Piero della Francesca: Fra Carnevale and the Making of a Renaissance Master*, exh. cat. (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2005), especially 258–66 (cat. no. 45).

13. The representation of the apse in the Prevedari print has been related, correctly in my opinion, to Piero della Francesca’s Montefeltro altarpiece (Pinacoteca di Brera, Milan). See Wolff Metternich, “Der Kupferstich” (note 12), 29–30.

14. Mulazzani, “Ad civitatem” (note 12), 78–87, identifies the temple represented by Bramante as the church of San Giovanni alle Quattro Facce in Milan; Alberici, “Bernardo Prevedari incisore” (note 12), 7, also tries to identify some of the figures in the Prevedari print as portraits of members of the Sforza court. For the church of San Giovanni alle Quattro Facce, see Gisberto Martelli, “Indagine su alcune contrade del vecchio centro di Milano: Le chiese scomparse,” *Bollettino d’Arte* 23 (1984): 59–78, especially 65–67.

15. At least, this is the way Cesare Cesariano interpreted the temples’ plans in Vitruvius’s *De architectura*. See Vitruvius Pollio, *De architectura: Nachdruck der kommentierten ersten italienischen Ausgabe von Cesare Cesariano* (Como, 1521), ed. Cesare Cesariano ([Como]: Gotardus de Ponte, 1521; reprint, Munich: Fink, 1969), 3:52r. This reprint features an introduction by Carol Herselle Krinsky.

16. Wolff Metternich, “Der Kupferstich” (note 12), 25–26; 61–66; Bruschi, *Bramante* (note 12), 32, reconstructs the plan of the temple represented by Bramante in a way dissimilar from Wolff Metternich. I share Bruschi’s opinion.

17. Wolff Metternich, “Der Kupferstich” (note 12), 32, mentions a few examples of similar capitals by Michelozzo di Bartolomeo and Martini.

18. Two friezes are discernable in the print above the arches: a procession of chariots in what appears to be a nuptial ceremony and scenes of a workshop, one of which has been interpreted as a mythological narrative. See Wolff Metternich, “Der Kupferstich” (note 12), 18–19. Whatever their subjects may be, this kind of representation—an interesting fifteenth-century precedent of which can be found in the ornamental frieze of the fireplace in the Sala della Jole (Urbino, ducal palace)—is more specific to triumphal arches or Roman sarcophagi. For more on the ornamental frieze, see Metternich, “Der Kupferstich” (note 12), 45; Borsi, *Bramante e Urbino* (note 12), 119. For more on triumphal arches, see for instance, Jacopo Bellini, *Christ before Pilate*, pen on parchment, Musée du Louvre, Département des Arts graphiques (RF 1503, 40 [Ancien numéro 39]), fol. 35r in the “Louvre Bellini Album”; Eisler, *The Genius of Jacopo Bellini* (note 10), 200, 327, 330 (pl. 194), 443, 452. In a basilica, whether ancient or modern, these friezes are absolutely out of place. The same can be said of the masterfully foreshortened centaurs depicted in the lunette above the apse. It is noteworthy that Bramante succeeded in having such ornamental motifs accepted, albeit with variations, in the decorative scheme of the sacristy of San Satiro, Milan. See Bruschi, *Bramante* (note 12), 36–38. There, Agostino de’ Fondulis embellished the second order’s frieze with a parade of nymphs riding centaurs, probably after Bramante’s design. Yet, shortly thereafter, Bramante relinquished such a curious ornamentation: he would never again use this motif in his long career, perhaps on account of its thematic inappropriateness in a religious building. For Agostino de’ Fondulis, see Sandrina Bandera, *Agostino de’ Fondulis e la riscoperta della terracotta nel Rinascimento Lombardo* (Bergamo: Bolis, 1997).

19. Richard Schofield, “The Colleoni Chapel and the Creation of a Local All’Antica Architectural Style,” in Christoph L. Frommel, Luisa Giordano, and Richard Schofield, eds., *Bramante milanese e l’architettura del Rinascimento Lombardo* (Venice: Marsilio, 2002), 167–92.

20. Wolff Metternich, “Der Kupferstich” (note 12), 78–80; Borsi, *Bramante e Urbino* (note 12), 116–18. See also Maria Luisa Gatti Perer, ed., *La basilica di S. Ambrogio: Il tempio ininterrotto* (Milan: Vita & Pensiero, 1995), with extensive bibliography on the church.

21. Wolff Metternich, “Der Kupferstich” (note 12), 44. Besides comparing the polygonal dome with the similar ones in Santo Stefano al Ponte (Florence), dating probably to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Metternich also mentions a painting by an anonymous artist in Hampton Court representing Federico da Montefeltro with his court, in which a similar vault is depicted.

22. For instance, Vecchietta’s fresco *Allegory of the Origins of the Siena Ospedale* (1441; Siena, Ospedale di Santa Maria della Scala).

23. In the Turin codex, Martini represented a thermal hall (in Perugia) covered with a cross vault and pierced with a central oculus. The presence of the oculus here is understandable, because it served as an outlet for the smoke produced in the thermal hall. See Francesco di Giorgio Martini, *Trattati di architettura, ingegneria e arte militare*, ed. Corrado Maltese and Livia Maltese Degrassi (Milan: Il Polifilo, 1967), 1:281–82, pl. 149 (fol. 81r); 2:554, pl. 188 (fol. 12v) [Magliabechiano codex]. For Martini and his treatises on architecture, see also Giustina Scaglia, *Il Vitruvio Magliabechiano di Francesco di Giorgio Martini* (Florence: Gonnelli, 1985); Giustina Scaglia, *Francesco di Giorgio: Checklist and History of Manuscripts and Drawings in Autographs and Copies from ca. 1470 to 1687 and Renewed Copies (1764–1839)* (London: Associated University Presses, 1992); Massimo Mussini, *Il “Trattato” di Francesco di Giorgio Martini e Leonardo: Il Codice Estense restituito* (Parma: Università di Parma, Istituto di storia dell’arte, 1991). For treatises on architecture in the early Renaissance, see Vaughan Hart and Peter Hicks, eds., *Paper Palaces: The Rise of the Renaissance Architectural Treatise* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1998). For Martini as an architect, besides Fiore and Tafuri, *Francesco di Giorgio architetto* (note 9), see Roberto Papini, *Francesco di Giorgio: Architetto* (Milan: Electa, 1946).

24. Borsi, *Bramante e Urbino* (note 12), 116.

25. See Martini, *Trattati* (note 23), 1:257, pl. 25 (fol. 15r). For Martini and antiquity, see Howard Burns, “Restaurator delle ruine antiche: Tradizione e studio dell’antico nell’attività di Francesco di Giorgio,” in Francesco Paolo Fiore and Manfredo Tafuri, eds., *Francesco di Giorgio architetto*, exh. cat. (Milan: Electa, 1994), 151–83; see also pp. 226–27 (cat. no. III.2.1) for the candelabrum in the Museo Albani (Urbino) ascribed to Martini.

26. Analogously, Bramante replaced the more canonical column-mullions of the rose window with balusters. On a smaller scale, Mantegna prefigured this solution in the wheel decorating the Virgin’s throne in the San Zeno altarpiece (San Zeno, Verona), depicted in 1457–60. See more recently Matteo Ceriana, “L’architettura della pala di San Zeno,” in Sergio Marinelli and Paola Marini, eds., *Mantegna e le arti a Verona: 1450–1500*, exh. cat. (Venice: Marsilio, 2006), 53–61. See also on Mantegna and antiquity, Irene Favaretto and Giulio Bodon, “Cultura antiquaria e imagine dell’arte classica negli esordi di Mantegna,” in Davide Benzato, Alberta de Nicolò Salmazo, and Anna Maria Spiazzi, eds., *Mantegna e Padova: 1445–1460*, exh. cat. (Milan: Skira, 2006), 51–61.

27. Borsi, *Bramante e Urbino* (note 12), 113.

28. Wolff Metternich, “Der Kupferstich” (note 12), 80–92.

29. Emanuela Kretzulesco-Quaranta, *Les jardins du Songe: “Poliphile” et la mystique de la Renaissance* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1976); Dorothea Schmidt, *Untersuchungen zu den Architektur-ekphrasen in der Hypnerotomachia Poliphili: Die Beschreibung des Venus-Tempels* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1978); Maurizio Calvesi, *Il Sogno di Polifilo prenestino* (Rome: Officina Edizioni, 1980); Stefano Borsi, *Polifilo architetto: Cultura architettonica nell’Hypnerotomachia Poliphili di Francesco Colonna (1499)* (Rome: Officina Edizioni, 1995); Liane Lefaivre, *Leon Battista Alberti’s “Hypnerotomachia Poliphili”: Re-Cognizing the Architectural Body in the Early Italian Renaissance* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1997); and Martine Furno, “Imaginary Architecture and Antiquity: The Fountain of Venus in Francesco Colonna’s *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*,” in Alina Payne, Anne Kuttner, and Rebekah Smick, eds., *Antiquity and Its Interpreters* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000), 70–82.

30. Francesco Colonna, *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*, eds. Giovanni Pozzi and Lucia A. Ciapponi (Padua: Antenore, 1980), 1:258–62; 2:189–90. See also Francesco Colonna, *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*, eds. Marco Ariani and Mino Gabriele (Milan: Adelphi, 1998), 2:929–31.

31. Giovanni Pozzi and Lucia A. Ciapponi, “La cultura figurativa di Francesco Colonna e l’arte veneta,” in Vittore Branca, ed., *Umanesimo europeo e umanesimo veneziano* (Florence: Sansoni, 1963), 317–36, especially 322–33. According to Pozzi and Ciapponi, Mausolos’s portrait as represented in Artemisia’s tomb recalls a mask within a medallion in *St. James Speaking to the Demons Sent to Him by the Magician Hermogenes*, one of Mantegna’s earlier frescoes at the Ovetari Chapel (destroyed during World War II). See also Giuseppe Fiocco and Terisio Pignatti, *The Frescoes of Mantegna in the Eremitani Church, Padua* (London: Phaidon, 1978); and Alberta de Nicolò Salmazo, Anna Maria Spiazzi, and Domenico Toniolo, eds., *Andrea Mantegna e i maestri della Cappella Ovetari: La ricomposizione virtuale e il restauro* (Milan: Skira, 2006). The naval trophy in the socle finds its equivalent in Pietro Lombardo’s *Tomb of Doge Sebastiano Mocenigo* in Santi Giovanni e Paolo (Venice), executed between 1476 and 1481. Finally, the putti holding the candelabra above Artemisia’s tomb reminded Pozzi and Ciapponi of the infants atop the circular pediment of the Saint Jerome altarpiece at the Badoer-Giustinian Chapel in San Francesco della Vigna (Venice), now ascribed to Giovanni Buora and sculpted most probably in the last decade of the fifteenth century. For more on this work, see Anne Markham Schulz, *La cappella Badoer-Giustinian in San Francesco della Vigna a Venezia: The Badoer-Giustinian Chapel in San Francesco della Vigna, Venice* (Florence: Centro Di, 2003), especially 64–66. As philologists and historians of Italian literature, Pozzi and Ciapponi were interested in these and other parallels between text and image inasmuch as they revealed—compellingly, in my opinion—the Venetian origins of Colonna and his

Hypnerotomachia. Consequently, they focused to a far lesser extent on interpreting Artemisia's tomb and what it betrays about Colonna's vision of antiquity.

32. Put side by side, the *Hypnerotomachia* print and the Saint Paul altarpiece, sculpted by Antonio Rizzo from 1465 to 1469 in Saint Mark's in Venice, unveil their structural kinship. See Peter Humfrey, *The Altarpiece in Renaissance Venice* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1993), 124. Like Artemisia, Rizzo's Saint Paul figures at the center of a wide and shallow niche, surmounted by an archivolt and framed by two large pilasters with composite capitals on either side. Although Rizzo's entablature presents a more complex arrangement of moldings and cornices, it likewise supports a crowning, at the top of which a standing statuette reigns. Instead of Rizzo's circular pediment, the illustrator of the *Hypnerotomachia* resorted to a hybrid ornamental crowning: a tapering low plinth upon which a medallion rests wedged between two putti—a hemispherical motif. But the conception of Artemisia's tomb seems at least equally, if not more, indebted to Venice's contemporary painting.

33. It is evident that the illustrator of the *Hypnerotomachia* drew on a lexicon and a syntax characteristic of Venice's contemporary painting and sculpture. For this reason, I would not be surprised if further comparisons could—and certainly will—be made with other Venetian altarpieces. For instance, I have always been struck by the similarity between Lazzaro Bastiani's *Saint Veneranda* in an altarpiece from circa 1490 now at the Accademia in Venice and Artemisia's figure in the *Hypnerotomachia*. For *St. Veneranda*, see Humfrey, *The Altarpiece in Renaissance Venice* (note 32), 91. Bastiani's female saint sits on a lofty throne, likewise cloaked in her royal mantle and holding a slender crucifix like a scepter; the position of her knees, one advanced, the other receding, and the convexity of her long torso all might have inspired Colonna's illustrator. In any event, the typologies of the two figures are noticeably similar.

34. It is noteworthy that this numismatic motif can also be found in painting and illumination. For instance, in Andrea Mantegna's *Madonna of the Victory* (1457–60; Louvre, Paris), a Latin inscription (REGINA CELI LET[ARE] ALLELUIA) appears at the Virgin's feet; and in the frontispiece of the illuminated manuscript of Livy's *Historiarum Deca Prima* (executed by Giovanni Corenti in circa 1460–65 for the Gonzaga, and now in the Biblioteca Universitaria, Turin), the title of the Latin text appears within a medal surrounded by garlands.

35. *The Shield-Bearers*, now in the Bode-Museum in Berlin, is preserved with its companion in a fragmentary state. See Serena Romano, *Tullio Lombardo: Il monumento al doge Andrea Vendramin* (Venice: Arsenale, 1985); and Michael Knuth, "I paggi del monumento Vendramin nel museo di Berlino: Storia e stato di conservazione," in Matteo Ceriana, ed., *Tullio Lombardo: Scultore e architetto nella Venezia del Rinascimento: Atti del convegno di studi, Venezia, Fondazione Giorgio Cini, 4–6 aprile 2006* (Verona: Cierre, 2007), 15–22.

36. Wolfgang Wolters, *Architektur und Ornament: Venezianischer Bauschmuck der Renaissance* (Munich: Beck, 2000).

37. Giuseppe Toderi and Fiorenza Vannel Toderi, *Placchette, secoli XV–XVIII, nel Museo Nazionale del Bargello* (Florence: SPES, 1996), 129 (cat. no. 232). The mask dates to the mid-fifteenth century.

38. Toderi and Vannel Toderi, *Placchette* (note 37), 117–18, (no. 211).

39. For a discussion of this drawing (Uff. 334 recto), see Ericsson, *Roman Architecture* (note 4), 145; Fiore and Tafuri, *Francesco di Giorgio architetto* (note 9), 370–71 (cat. no. xx.31).