Verona and Vitruvius

Chapter 7

Verona and Vitruvius

Paul Davies

University of Reading

David Hemsoll

University of Birmingham

Vitruvius' impact on the Renaissance architecture of Verona was profound and sustained. This influence was initially fueled by esteem for the city's Arco dei Gavi (Fig. 7.1), an ancient arch located close to the Castel Vecchio[1] and widely believed to have been designed by Vitruvius on the basis of its pair of inscriptions naming "Lucius Vitruvius Cerdo" as its architect.[2] A reverential attitude toward this structure persisted well into the sixteenth century, further cemented by the mid-century illustrated publications on ancient Verona by Torello Saraina and Giovanni Caroto.[3] By that time a new and penetrating engagement with the text of Vitruvius' *De architectura* is seen in the works of the Veronese architect Michele Sanmicheli (1489–1559), trained in Rome and supremely well versed in the theoretical

[1] For documentation of the arch and its condition before it was dismantled (1805) and then reconstructed on a nearby site (1932), see Tosi (1983) and also Tosi (1980). Although very dilapidated by the sixteenth century, enough of the ancient structure survived to indicate that the reconstructions produced by Andrea Palladio, Giovanni Caroto, and others are broadly reliable.

[2] For full discussion of this matter, see chapter 4 in this volume, "Who Was Vitruvius," by Paul Davies and David Hemsoll.

[3] Saraina (1540); Caroto (1560).

preoccupations of the moment. His attention to Vitruvius, moreover, had strong local resonances, in addition to establishing Verona as the vanguard for modern *all'antica* architecture in the Venetian territories.

Even by the late fifteenth century, the Arco dei Gavi was attracting much attention from architects. It appears, for example, to have provided a principal point of departure for the narthex of Leon Battista Alberti's church of Sant'Andrea in Mantua (1472), a structure that, like the ancient arch with its roomy interior, is three bays wide and one bay deep, with a façade that has a central arch and narrower side bays, with additional entrances on the sides. As in the Arco dei Gavi, too, the main architectural order is carried upon pedestals and is coupled, in the central bay, by pilasters rising from the ground with capitals carrying the archivolt of the arch directly.[4] The arch's format, a central bay crowned by a pediment, with side bays accommodating niches with pediments and flanking pilasters, found an early echo in Pietro Lombardo's forecourt (late 1470s) to the Scuola di San Giovanni Evangelista in Venice, although the latter has pilasters rather than half-columns and a central pediment that is semicircular rather than triangular. Closer derivatives, with half-columns and triangular pediments over the central bays, include the exterior elevation of the Cappella Zen in Venice (1506), designed by Tullio Lombardo and attached to the southern flank of St Mark's, and the external frontage of the Chapel of Leo X (ca. 1515), an early work by Michelangelo inside Rome's Castel Sant'Angelo.

By this time, moreover, the ancient arch had also become a principal source for many details that were enthusiastically taken up by Renaissance architects and stonecutters. It offered a prime precedent, for example, for pilasters decorated with acanthus swirls. It was

[4] A similar arrangement, but with framing half-columns, had been employed by Alberti for the façade of Santa Maria Novella in Florence (ca. 1458).

the direct source for the particularly popular motif of an archivolt that has its outer band ornamented with fluting.[5] An especially good example of this in Verona is the fifteenth-century Palazzo da Lisca, which has its entrance arch set on pilasters richly decorated with candelabra; others include Palazzo Bassan, Palazzo Colleoni, and Palazzo Zoppi. Early appearances in Venice are seen in the twin altars of Sts Paul and James in St Mark's (ca. 1469), the portal of Santa Maria dell'Orto (1473), the *cappella maggiore* of Pietro Lombardo's San Giobbe (begun 1471), the façade of Pietro Lombardo's Santa Maria dei Miracoli (1481), and the Gussoni chapel in San Lio (1480s/1490s). Another feature of the Arco dei Gavi to make its way into Renaissance architectural design was the coupling of larger and smaller orders,[6] which, following its employment on the façade of Alberti's Sant' Andrea in Mantua, became an increasingly common feature of modern buildings, being seen for example on the façade of Palazzo Vendramin-Calergi in Venice (begun ca. 1502). One more feature of the arch that was to be of some consequence during the Renaissance was the formulation of the main cornice. It consisted of a row of dentils followed by egg-and-dart and then a succession of modillions, a sequence that was followed for the Palazzo Vendramin-Calergi façade and numerous later schemes.[7] Some individuals, including the theorist Sebastiano Serlio, who was writing in the 1530s, found the combination of dentils and modillions unpardonable,[8] for the same reason put forward by Vitruvius in his discussion of the Doric cornice and the error of combining

[5] For further discussion see Burns (1980) 104–7.

[6] This coupling is also seen on Verona's ancient Porta dei Borsari, Porta dei Leoni, and the now-vanished Arch of Jupiter Ammon.

[7] Many distinguished ancient buildings in Rome have cornices of the same arrangement, such as the Arch of Constantine and the Temple of Castor.

[8] Serlio (1619): 3, fol. 112 and 4, fol. 170.

dentils with mutules there. The error arises from the fact that dentils and mutules both represent rafters and to have them both would therefore be a contradiction (*De arch.* 4.2.5). For Serlio, in fact, the combination would be sufficient reason for him to reject the view that the Arco dei Gavi was designed by Vitruvius the treatise writer.

Determining how a particular Renaissance building would have been understood at this early time presents considerable problems. Verona's civic assembly hall, the Loggia del Consiglio, was designed around 1482 and under construction from 1485 (Fig. 7.2).[9] Situated on the northern side of one of the city's central squares (Piazza dei Signori), an open area with a length around twice its width, it has a lower-storey loggia and an upper-level assembly room crowned with a row of statues; its façade presents some allusions to the Arco dei Gavi by way of its flute-decorated archivolts, its acanthus-ornamented pilasters, and its combinations of orders of different sizes, although in most other respects it is very different in both composition and detailing. Yet its associations with Vitruvius could well have been prompted by the fact that one of its skyline statues actually depicts the ancient architect (albeit labeled "Lucius Vitruvius").[10] The connection was certainly made by one early commentator who, in 1505, referred to the statue and described the building as having been "erected using the methods" that Vitruvius "gave in his writings."[11] Such a view may have been widely shared, and the idea that the building was somehow "Vitruvian" could easily have found confirmation from, say, the striking regularity of its design: two storeys of equal height and lower-storey sequences of arches beneath upper-storey bays separated by pilasters.

[9] See Newman (1980).

[10] The figure is identified by the inscription "L. VITRV."

[11] Panteo (1505) (unpag.): "Sub pedibus Cerdo spectat Vitruvius aedem / Extructam scriptis quis dedit ille modis."

This design provides at least a parallel for the insistent emphasis on design regularity that underpins the *De architectura*. Further support for this possibility comes from a plate in Cesare Cesariano's edition of that text (1521) depicting the ancient Roman forum, which the ancient author had specified should be twice as long as wide (*De arch.* 5.1.1–2), and which Cesariano shows as bordered by buildings of a design remarkably similar to that of the Loggia del Consiglio (Fig. 7.3).[12] These buildings are not obviously ancient in architectural character, at least to judge by the standards of rather later times; but they tally very closely with the Verona building in having loggias beneath assembly rooms, façades that have lower storeys with column-supported arches, upper levels with pilasters, and double-arched windows crowned with pediments, and then rows of statues above. All of this may suggest that the Loggia del Consiglio served as a model for the illustration, and that it was indeed regarded originally as authentically antique in its appearance.

After the turn of the new century, and following the recovery of Verona by Venice at the conclusion of the Wars of the League of Cambrai (1516), a marked change becomes apparent in the city's outlook toward Vitruvius and its ancient architectural heritage. This is seen, for instance, in a more exacting engagement with the Arco dei Gavi, which provided not only a source for details in church altars from this time forward but a model for their entire compositions. A new attention to ancient architecture can already be noted in the Saraina altar in the church of San Fermo, erected by the antiquarian Torello Saraina in 1523, although the composition is actually based on ancient models from further afield, such as the Arch of Titus in Rome.[13]

[12] Vitruvius (1521) fol. 72v.

[13] For the Saraina monument, see Aurenhammer (1995) 172–5. Certain details, such as the bull's-head keystone, are of local Veronese pedigree.

By this date, however, the Arco dei Gavi was already being viewed as a preferred alternative to other models, as in the Faella altar in Sant'Anastasia of 1520.[14] Although this work does not follow its ancient prototype nearly as rigorously as the Saraina altar, it still makes unambiguous reference to the arch. Like the ancient structure, the altar has a central arch bordered by pilasters and then framed by fluted half-columns rising from tall pedestals, which support a central pediment and come forward from narrower bays to either side, although these are far less wide than the flanking bays of the Arco dei Gavi and terminate with pilasters rather than half-columns. Much more closely dependent on the Arco dei Gavi is the Pindemonte altar in Sant'Anastasia, a work of 1529 by Francesco da Castello, the same architect who designed the Faella altar.[15] This composition is a near copy of the Arco dei Gavi, featuring a central arch framed by acanthus-ornamented pilasters (carrying a fluted archivolt), which are coupled with fluted half-columns rising from pedestals and supporting a dentilated cornice and a central pediment, with side bays beyond accommodating niches set in tall tabernacles, and with further half-columns at the extremities. This scheme would be followed by the Alighieri altar in San Fermo of around 1547, which was closely dependent on the Arco dei Gavi; the altar was commissioned by Francesco Dante Alighieri,[16] who is known to have produced a translation of Vitruvius' *De architectura*.[17] Alighieri--like Saraina and no doubt many other Veronese *literati* of the period--may well have considered the designer of the ancient arch and the writer of the ancient treatise to be one and the same person. Whether this opinion was shared by Sanmicheli is unknown, but he certainly drew heavily on the Arco

[14] Aurenhammer (1995) 170–2.

[15] Aurenhammer (1995) 175–8.

[16] Aurenhammer (1995) 176.

[17] Davies and Hemsoll (2004) 17, citing Maffei (1731–2), 2: col. 54.

dei Gavi for his early Cappella Pellegrini (1528) attached to the church of San Bernardino, and he is even recorded as designing an ephemeral arch closely resembling the Arco dei Gavi (described as "un gran portone o arco antico che in Verona presso al castel vecchio anchor si vede") to celebrate the entry of Bona Sforza, queen of Poland, into Padua in 1556.[18]

Sanmicheli returned to his native Verona at an especially opportune moment. He had previously transferred to Rome (1505), likewise at a critical time.[19] There he witnessed at first hand the architectural revolution spearheaded by Bramante (1443/4–1514) and Raphael (1483–1520) and was steeped in the methods and priorities of new *all'antica* practice. He had profited perhaps most especially from his close acquaintanceship with Antonio da Sangallo the Younger (1484–1546), who had attached the greatest importance to ancient precedent observable in surviving antiquities, and to ancient theory as codified in Vitruvius' *De architectura*. To many in Verona, therefore, Sanmicheli would have appeared to be ideally equipped to introduce into the city a new and different kind of architecture that would forge a link to its ancient and illustrious past. He may well have been encouraged in this plan by the several commissions he had already secured upon his arrival in 1526.[20] His greatest achievement, however, was to devise schemes that could be regarded as being aligned at least as closely with Verona's antiquities as they were with Rome's, while also giving the unprecedented attention to the doctrines of Vitruvius[21] that would eventually earn him a place among the select group of modern architects whom Pietro Aretino called "Vitruviuses in

[18] For this arch, see Davies and Hemsoll (2004) 374–5. The quotation comes from an anonymous pamphlet of 1556.

[19] For this period of Sanmicheli's career, see Davies and Hemsoll (2004) 20–30.

[20] For Sanmicheli's early years in Verona, see Davies and Hemsoll (2004) 33–9.

[21] See Davies and Hemsoll (2004) 302–13.

beautiful buildings."[22] In other words, he devised a kind of architecture that appealed to the antiquarian sentiments of a great many of his new patrons and was presumably calculated to constitute an overt expression of Veronese civic pride.

The design of the Cappella Pellegrini, one of the first commissions Sanmicheli received on his return to Verona, was already very much in accordance with that agenda (Fig. 7.4).[23] Its plan is based ultimately on that of the Pantheon in Rome, but its interior borrows liberally from the Arco dei Gavi and other Veronese antiquities.[24] It is set out in four wide and four narrow bays, with the larger bays on the main axes, which, with their flanking narrow bays, form compositions that are very similar to that of the arch. Like the ancient arch, the larger bays are occupied by arches carried on pilasters, and these are framed by fluted half-columns carrying dentilated cornices and pediments, while the narrower bays accommodate niches in pedimented tabernacles. Unlike the ancient arch, however, the half-columns on the cross axis have spiraling rather than standard vertical flutes, creating an added degree of complexity and providing a reference to the spirally fluted columns on Verona's Porta dei Borsari as well as those on the Porta dei Leoni and the now-vanished Arch of Jupiter Ammon. Moreover, the tabernacles enclose arched niches rather than rectangular recesses, a similar arrangement to that of the tabernacled arches likewise seen on the Porta dei Borsari, while the framed panels above them recall similar panels on the Arch of Jupiter Ammon. Also contrasting with the Arco dei Gavi and the near-contemporary Pindemonte

[22] Aretino (1957–60), 2: 378. The other architects mentioned are Girolamo Genga, Sebastiano Serlio, and Giovanantonio Rusconi.

[23] For Cappella Pellegrini, see Davies and Hemsoll (2004) 87–101, 356–7.

[24] For other Veronese antiquities and Renaissance drawings of them, see Marini (1980) 50–82.

altar is the design's overall coherence. The pilasters carrying the arches in the larger bays are the same sizes as those belonging to the tabernacles in the smaller bays, while the pilasters and the half-columns all rise from the same level, suggesting that Sanmicheli's intention was to regularize--and even improve upon--his city's ancient heritage. At the same time, he also set out to give his scheme a degree of Vitruvian respectability. Thus the interior follows Vitruvius' recommendation for circular temples by being much taller than wide (*De arch*. 4.8.2–3), and its dome was once conspicuously ornamented, as Vitruvius had stipulated, with a "flower" (*flos*) (*De arch* 4.8.3).[25]

Notably Vitruvian, too, is Sanmicheli's Palazzo Canossa, whose design was produced for the influential Count Ludovico Canossa, bishop of Bayeux, around 1526/28.[26] The building has a highly innovative façade expressed as two storeys – basement and *piano nobile* – on the model of recent palaces in Rome, although it also takes a cue from certain recent palaces in Verona of symmetrical disposition. The plan follows suit, but it also appears to have been conceived in conscious imitation of Vitruvius' description of the ancient Roman house (Fig. 7.5). To conceive of a modern palace in this way was not in itself a new idea, since it had already been taken up by Antonio da Sangallo for his Palazzo Farnese (commissioned ca. 1515) and in a design for a Palazzo Pucci in Orvieto, known from a surviving drawing, that dates from the same period as Palazzo Canossa,[27] and both these schemes are similar in arrangement to the theoretical reconstructions of the Roman house later drawn by Sangallo's brother, Giovanni Battista, in the margins of a copy of Giovanni

[25]. The flower is recorded in early drawings but was removed to make way for an oculus in the early nineteenth century.

[26] Davies and Hemsoll (2004) 170–82, 355–6.

[27] Uffizi 969A; Davies and Hemsoll (2004) 175–6.

Sulpizio da Veroli's 1486 edition of Vitruvius.[28] For Palazzo Canossa, however, the ideal of the Roman house was seemingly carried through with a stricter attention to the ancient literary sources than perhaps ever before. This is manifested, as it is in Sangallo's schemes, in the sequential disposition of vestibule, *androne,* and courtyard (enclosed on all four sides in the original plan), which accords with the familiar format of the ancient Roman house with its vestibule, atrium, and peristyle.[29] Sanmicheli's attempt to reconstruct the ideal Roman house is also reflected in the very particular internal arrangements of the vestibule and the *androne*. The vestibule follows literary descriptions of the ancient Roman vestibule with unprecedented detail, as in the seating provided, following Aulus Gellius' description of the space being used by waiting visitors.[30] It also has the portal jambs decorated with military spoils, with the portal itself flanked by an additional pair of pilasters in imitation, presumably, of the paired entrance antae or pillars mentioned by several ancient writers and illustrated by Fra Giocondo in his 1511 edition of Vitruvius.[31] The *androne* follows Vitruvius' discussion of the atrium in its matching pair of side recesses, conceived, very

[28] See esp. Pagliara (1988). For the drawing most similar to Palazzo Canossa, see Vitruvius (2003) 131.

[29] Cf. *De arch*. 6.5.1 ("vestibula, cava aedium, peristylia"); 6.5.2 ("vestibula …, atria et peristylia amplissima").

[30] See e.g. Davies and Hemsoll (2004) 180–1, 229–30n65. For vestibules more generally, see Pellecchia (1992) 400–7; Clarke (2003) 107–10 (mentioning Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 4.1.1).

[31] See Davies and Hemsoll (2000) 261–2 (citing *inter alia* Cicero, *Phil.* 2.28; Pliny, *HN* 35.2; Servius, *In Vergilii Aeneidem commentarii* 2.469). For Fra Giocondo's illustration, see Vitruvius (1511) fol. 64v.

possibly, as the "wings" (*alae*) he mentions (*De arch*. 6.3.4), while its lack of free-standing columns may suggest that the design was based specifically on Vitruvius' "vaulted" atrium, described as being particularly suitable when "spacious apartments" are situated above it (*De arch*. 6.3.2).

Sanmicheli's interest in Vitruvius even extended to his conception of the architectural orders. Like Vitruvius, and like Sangallo, Sanmicheli seems to have thought of the orders as being fundamentally of three sorts --Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian--viewing the Composite, as Sangallo did, simply as a variant of the Corinthian.[32] Rather as Vitruvius had implied, moreover, Sanmicheli deployed the orders in accordance with a general principle of architectural propriety, tending to choose different orders for different kinds of buildings. Thus he normally used the Doric order for militaristic city gates, beginning with the Porta Nuova (ca. 1530), in rather the way that Vitruvius had associated it with temples dedicated to Mars (*De arch.* 1.2.5), and the Corinthian order for religious structures, including the Cappella Pellegrini, or buildings of special magnificence, such as his Palazzo Bevilacqua façade (designed ca. 1532). He departed, however, from Vitruvius, and from all his predecessors, by subjecting his orders to an unprecedented degree of regulation, one that in fact constituted an overriding architectural system that he retained for the rest of his career (Fig. 7.6). In effect, therefore, he readdressed the rules provided by Vitruvius for the different types of column and their entablatures, hoping to improve on the ancient theorist by differentiating the three main orders but making them far more comparable with each other. In accordance with this system, he fixed the proportions of his Doric order at around 1:8 or less, those of his Ionic order at around 1:9, and those of his Corinthian order at around 1:10 or more. He then selected forms for the various parts or ornaments of each individual order so as to complement those of the others, even if this

[32] For Sangallo's use of the Composite order, see Pauwels (1989) 37; Pagliara (1992) 147–9.

meant that he sometimes had to contravene a Vitruvian rule or recommendation. This explains, for example, why he always designed the Ionic capital with a neck, a feature not mentioned by Vitruvius but one that makes the capital more like a Doric capital in its shape, and puts it midway between the Doric and Corinthian capitals in its proportions. It also explains why, when he used flutes for a Doric column as in the case of the Porta Palio (designed in the 1540s), these do not meet at arrises, as the relevant Vitruvian passage (*De arch*. 4.3.9) was interpreted by Fra Giocondo in an illustration,[33] but have fillets in between, like those of an Ionic or Corinthian shaft (*De arch*. 3.5.14). His system, at the same time, allowed much flexibility: each individual order had the potential to be made either plain and simple, as with the Doric order of the Porta Nuova, or ornamental and elaborate, as with the Doric order of the Porta Palio, although this could, again, mean departing from Vitruvian orthodoxy. Thus he gave the Doric entablature of the Porta Palio dentils as well as mutules, contravening Vitruvius' prohibition of this combination (*De arch.* 4.2.5) but making the entablature comparable to a Corinthian one of the kind seen on the Arco dei Gavi and used by Sanmicheli for the Cappella Pellegrini, which has both dentils and modillions.

Sanmicheli nevertheless paid particular attention to Vitruvius for a whole range of specific details that he employed for his orders. For example, he appears to have been among the first architects to adopt the unusual kind of base described by Vitruvius in his discussion of Ionic temples (*De arch.* 3.5.3).[34] This type of base, then unknown in surviving ancient

[33] Vitruvius (1511) fol. 28v. See also Serlio (1619), 4, fol. 141.

[34] . See also Serlio (1619) 4, fols 158v–59. A near-Vitruvian Ionic base, however, is illustrated in Cesariano's 1521 edition of Vitruvius, with a single astragal rather than a double one between the two scotias, and this same type of base was used in the Giardino Secreto of the Palazzo Ducale in Mantua, designed by Battista Covo in the early 1520s.

architecture, has a bottom scotia followed by a pair of astragals, another scotia, and an upper torus. Sanmicheli first used it for his portal (1532) to the Palazzo del Podestà (albeit with an additional astragal at the top), thereby predating Serlio's discussion of the base in Book 4 of his treatise (1537).[35] Sanmicheli was also the first architect to use a Doric order with no base (for the Palazzo Bevilacqua façade), presumably in the knowledge that Vitruvius had described the order with no mention of any base. Sanmicheli was certainly aware of Vitruvius' stipulation that Doric columns should have twenty rather than twenty-four flutes (*De arch*. 4.3.9, 3.5.14), since he gave the half-columns used for the Porta Palio half that number, treating the half-columns on the façade of Palazzo Pompei (designed in the 1530s) in the same way, and allocating five flutes--a quarter of the total stipulated number--to the pilasters, or antae, at either end.

Sanmicheli again took note of Vitruvius when designing the Corinthian capitals for the Cappella Pellegrini and Palazzo Bevilacqua. He deviated from current practice and reduced their height by following the Vitruvian rule of making it equal to the base-diameter of the shaft (*De arch*. 4.1.11), in exactly the way that Serlio would later discuss and illustrate.[36] Sanmicheli may also have had Vitruvius in mind when formulating the entablatures of the Ionic orders used for the Podestà portal and the Tornacoro in the Verona Cathedral (1532/3). Here he positioned a band of dentils just above the frieze, in accordance with the Ionic entablature of Rome's Theater of Marcellus, but also in line with rules for the Ionic entablature specified by Vitruvius (*De arch*. 3.5.10–11).[37] Sanmicheli's handling of the Doric frieze, as used for Porta Nuova, Porta Palio, and Palazzo Pompei's façade, similarly

[35] Serlio (1619) 4, fols 158v-159r.

[36] Serlio (1619) 4, fols 169–71.

[37] Serlio (1619) 4, fol. 161.

shows his careful attention to the ancient writer. In all three cases, the frieze has triglyphs alternating with metopes, just as Vitruvius describes (*De arch*. 4.3.2–5, 8). The arrangement of the corners also makes specific reference to Vitruvius, who ordains that the final triglyph needs to be positioned over the center of the final column, with just enough space for a "half-metope" to be fitted in beyond it (*De arch*. 4.3.5). Since there was actually insufficient space at the end to accommodate half of a metope the same size as the others,[38] Sanmicheli resorted to giving the impression of conforming to the Vitruvian ideal. He did this principally by ornamenting the partial metope at the end with precisely half a disc (*patera*) and then gained extra space in the frieze by positioning the corner just a little beyond its obligatory alignment with the edge of the anta below.

One final scheme would also appear to have been profoundly indebted to Vitruvius: the Lazzaretto, a quarantine compound for the gravely ill located just outside the city boundaries. Commissioned around 1540, it was mostly realized long after Sanmicheli's death.[39] As eventually completed, the now-ruinous complex was a large rectangular enclosure bordered by individual cells for the afflicted. A circular chapel at the center with two rings of columns once surrounded an altar visible to all. Evidence suggests that in Sanmicheli's original scheme, the enclosure was intended to be square and could have been regarded as resembling an ancient *palaestra* of the kind described by Vitruvius (*De arch.* 5.11.1).

---

[38] Vitruvius allocates two modules to the base diameter of the columns and requires the centers of triglyphs to be aligned with column centers, specifying that triglyphs are to be one module wide and metopes one-and-a-half modules wide. According to the system he describes, his "half-metopes" measure one module in width, and thus not half the allocated width of the metopes.

[39] Davies and Hemsoll (2004) 114–25, 368.

Certainly the central chapel, which seems likely to follow Sanmicheli's design, is very closely informed by Vitruvian ideas. The arrangement of the central part of the building is reminiscent of a monopteral temple, or open *tholos*, where the roof is supported on a single ring of columns, a building type described in Vitruvius' treatise (*De arch.* 4.8.1); but the building as a whole is very much a hybrid of Vitruvian types. With its outer circuit of columns, it also recalls a round peripteral temple, which is likewise discussed by Vitruvius (*De arch.* 4.8.2–7). Its tall interior is in accordance with Vitruvius' description of such buildings; likewise the dome, once decorated, like the Pellegrini chapel, with a "flower."[40] Both the inner and the outer rings have twelves columns, the number also seen in a drawing by Andrea Palladio (1508–80) of the Vitruvian monopteral temple,[41] and the number recommended for a monopteral temple by Daniele Barbaro in his commentary on Vitruvius of 1556.[42] In addition to all of this, the very widely spaced columns themselves are of the Vitruvian Tuscan type, with robust proportions, simple torus bases, and simplified capitals and entablatures (*De arch.* 4.7). The use here of this Vitruvian Tuscan order, which precedes its employment by Palladio at the Villa Trissino at Meledo (1553), may seem surprising but can perhaps be explained by the fact that Vitruvius had described the order in close proximity

[40] See above at n. 25. Such a flower is recorded in a mid-eighteenth-century print by Adriano Cristofali.

[41] London, Royal Institute of British Architects, Palladio, X: 4v.

[42] Vitruvius (1556), commentary on 4.7: "partisco poi la circonferenza del minor giro in dodici parti, per porvi dodici colonne perli dodici segni del Zodiaco, perche io credo, che quel Tempio senza parete significava alcune cose del cielo, gli effetti delle quali sono nello scoperto."

to his discussions of circular temples; in early editions of the *De architectura,* the two subjects are actually treated together in the same extended chapter.[43]

Following Sanmicheli's death, the allure of Vitruvius and of the city's antiquities swiftly dissipated. Even during his lifetime, it had been principally Sanmicheli who kept these architectural aspirations alive and explored their potential in an environment where they had particular resonance. Such concerns were far less pressing, and were far less exploited, elsewhere. In Padua, for example, Giovanni Maria Falconetto (ca. 1468–1534/5) had started to introduce a similar kind of architecture even before Sanmicheli's arrival in Verona (ca.1526), but with much less emphasis on Veronese antiquities or the particularities of Vitruvius. His designs for Padua's Porta San Giovanni (1528) and Porta Savonarola (1530), although conceived very much in the new *all'antica* manner, are designed with little or no heed to the Veronese arch, and are instead--rather like the Saraina altar in Verona--more reminiscent of the Arch of Titus in Rome. [44] And yet Falconetto was Veronese by birth and familiar with the antiquities of his native city.[45] His main concession to Veronese antiquity was in adapting the Arco dei Gavi's Vitruvian "signature" to signal his authorship of the buildings he designed.

Later on, although concerns with antiquity, and with Vitruvius, would be kept alive by Palladio in nearby Vicenza, these would be significantly different from Sanmicheli's concerns. Palladio's schemes would be far more dependent on the antiquities of Rome and Central Italy than those of Verona and the Venetian territories, while his attention to

[43] See, for example, Vitruvius (1521) fol. 70r–v; Vitruvius (1556) fols 192–201.

[44] See e.g. Beltramini (2006).

[45] Falconetto included depictions of Verona's amphitheater and Porta dei Leoni in his frescoes in Palazzo d'Arco, Mantua (ca. 1520); see e.g. Schweikhart (1980) 92–4.

Vitruvius would now be focused more specifically on the uses of free-standing columns. Yet there is still one instance in his architectural treatise, the *Quattro libri di architectura* (1570), where Palladio would appear to be indebted to a specifically Veronese tradition: his illustration of one of two formulations of the Tuscan order. The first of these prescriptions is for an order of free-standing columns,[46] and it closely follows the rules supplied by Vitruvius and adopted by Sanmicheli for the Lazzaretto. The second, however, which is for an order applied to an arcade, is rather different.[47] This has a capital with an S-profiled echinus and a rusticated frieze that forms part of a more elaborate cornice, and in these respects it finds a close parallel in the pilaster order used for Verona's ancient amphitheater, which, in his accompanying commentary, Palladio also declared to be Tuscan.[48] It would seem at least possible, therefore, that he was still being influenced by an authority attached to this building, one that was linked to the longstanding belief, recorded by Marin Sanudo and others, that the Verona amphitheater was designed, like the Arco dei Gavi, by Vitruvius himself.[49]

[46] Palladio (1570), 1: 17, 20.

[47] Palladio (1570), 1: 18, 21.

[48] Palladio (1570), 1: 19. Palladio referred to the amphitheater and theater at Pula but made no mention of the fact that the external orders of the amphitheaters are far more attenuated than in his Tuscan illustration.

[49] As discussed in chapter 4 above.

ILLUSTRATIONS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aretino, P. (1957–60) *Lettere sull'arte*. Edited by E. Camesasca. 3 vols. Milan: Edizioni del Milione.

Aurenhammer, H. (1995) "'Reliquiae antiquitatis urbis': Altari veronesi all'epoca di Sanmicheli e il recupero dell'architettura classica," in *Michele Sanmicheli: Architettura, linguaggio e cultura artistica nel Cinquecento*, edited by H. Burns, C. L. Frommel, L. Puppi, and M. Tafuri, 170–9. Milan: Electa.

Beltramini, G. (2006) "Mantegna e la firma di Vitruvio," in *Mantegna e le arti a Verona 1450–1500*, edited by S. Marinelli and P. Marini, 139–47. Venice: Marsilio.

Burns, H. (1980) “Le anitichità di Verona e l’architettura del Rinascimento,” in Marini (1980) 103–17.

Caroto, G. (1560) *De le antiqità de Verona*. Verona: Raagnan.

Clarke, G. (2003) *Roman House--Renaissance Palaces: Inventing Antiquity in Fifteenth-Century Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, P., and Hemsoll, D. (2000) “I portal dei palazzo veronesi del Rinascimento,” in *Edilizia privata nella Verona rinascimentale*, edited by P. Lanaro, P. Marini, and G. M. Varanini, 252–66. Milan: Electa.

------ (2004) *Michele Sanmicheli*. Milan: Electa.

Maffei, S. (1731–2) *Verona illustrata*. Verona: Vallarsi and Berno.

Newman, G. (1980) “La Loggia del Consiglio,” in Marini (1980) 122–3

Marini, P. (ed.) (1980) *Palladio e Verona*. Verona: Neri Pozza.

Pagliara, P. N. (1988) “Studi e practica vitruviana di Antonio da Sangallo il Giovane e di suo fratello Giovanni Battista,” in *Les Traités d’architecture de la Renaissance*, edited by J. Guillaume, 179–206. Paris: Picard.

------ (1992) “Antonio da Sangallo il Giovane e gli ordini,” in *L’emploi des ordres dans architecture de la Renaissance*, edited by J. Guillaume, 137–56. Paris: Picard.

Palladio, A. (1570) *I quattro libri dell’architettura*. Venice: De’ Franceschi

Panteo, G. A. (1505) *Annotationes Ioannis Antonii Panthei Veronensis ex trium dierum confabulationibus ad Andream Bandam iurisconsultum*. Verona: (publisher unknown)

Pauwels, Y. (1989) “Les origines de l’ordre composite,” *Annali di architettura* 1: 29–46.

Pellecchia, L. (1992) “Architects Read Vitruvius: Renaissance Interpretations of the Atrium of the Ancient House,” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 51: 377–416.

Ronzani, F., and Luciolli, G. (1823) *Le fabbriche civilli, ecclesiastiche e militari di Michele Sanmicheli*. Verona: Moroni.

Saraina, T. (1540) *De origine et amplitudine civitatis Veronae*. Verona: Antonius Putelletus.

Schweikhart, G. (1980) “Giovanni Maria Falconetto,” in Marini (1980) 85–102.

Serlio, S. (1619) *Tutte l’opere d’architettura et prospetiva*. Venice: De’ Franceschi.

Tosi, G. (1980) “L’Arco dei Gavi,” in Marini (1980) 34-54.

------(1983) *L’Arco dei Gavi.* Rome: “L’Erma” di Bretschneider.

Vitruvius (1511) *M. Vitruuius per Iocundum solito castigatior factus cum figuris et tabula vt iam legi et intelligi possit*, edited by G. Giocondo. Venice: Ioannis de Tridino alias Tacuino.

------ (1521) *Di Lucio Vitruuio Pollione de Architectura libri dece*, edited and translated by Cesare Cesariano. Como: Gotardo da Ponte.

------ (1521) *Di Lucio Vitruuio Pollione de Architectura libri dece*, edited and translated by Cesare Cesariano. Como: Gotardo da Ponte.

------ (1556) *I dieci libri dell'architettura di M. Vitruvio*, edited and translated by D. Barbaro. Venice: Francesco Marcolini.

------ (1934) *On Architecture*, edited and translated by F. Granger. London and Cambridge, MA: Heinemann and Cambridge University Press.

------(2003) *Ten Books on Architecture: The Corsini Incunabulum*. Edited by I. Rowland. Rome: Edizione dell’Elefante.