

UCLA

Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies

Title

Imperial and Urban Ideology in a Renaissance Inscription

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5cr4s93z>

Journal

Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 9(1)

ISSN

0069-6412

Author

Horrigan, J. Brian

Publication Date

1978-10-01

Peer reviewed

IMPERIAL AND URBAN IDEOLOGY IN A RENAISSANCE INSCRIPTION



J. Brian Horrigan

On the facade of a house in the Via dei Banchi Nuovi in Rome, near the Ponte Sant'Angelo, a large marble plaque engraved with an inscription *all'antica* commemorates the urbanistic endeavors of Pope Julius II (1503-1513). The inscription, erected by the city building magistrates in 1512, reads:

IULIO II PONT OPT MAX QUOD FINIB
DITIONIS S.R.E. PROLATIS ITALIAQ
LIBERATA URBEM ROMAM OCCUPATE
SIMILIOREM QUAM DIVISE PATEFACTIS
DIMENSISQ VIIS PRO MAIESTATE
IMPERII ORNAVIT
DOMINICUS MAXIMUS
HIERONYMUS PICUS AEDILES F.C. MDXII

To Julius II, Pontifex Maximus, who, having extended the dominion of the Holy Roman Church and having liberated Italy, beautified the city of Rome, which was more similar to an occupied (appropriated, conquered) city than a divided one, by opening up and measuring out streets in accordance with the dignity of the empire.

This important document regarding Julius' self-conception as an urban planner has been given short shrift.¹ For a thorough understanding of its meaning several related factors need to be explained: the location, the precedents, the internal structure of the inscription, the sources for the structure and the language, and the date.

Commemorating one's urban improvements by means of inscriptions, coins, or other images is, of course, a commonplace from antiquity onwards. However, the antique connections of Julius' plaque are to be found more in written histories than in engraved remains, as will be seen further on. More important as prototypes are several inscriptions from the last decades of the fifteenth century.

Julius' most distinguished predecessor in urban improvement was his uncle, Pope Sixtus IV della Rovere (1471-1484), who changed the face of Rome and charted new directions for its subsequent development. His efforts are recorded in the laudatory verses of the humanist poet and sycophant Brandolini. The prevailing image of Sixtus in Brandolini's lauds is that of the worldly ruler who rebuilds the capital, extends the papal domain, defeats the enemy, and thus brings welfare and peace to his people—in short, the bringer of the new Golden Age. Sixtus is remembered by inscriptions on the Capitoline as "Restaurator Urbis," and by medals which proclaim him "Urbis Renovator et Restaurator."²

In 1477 Sixtus completed his greatest secular building project, the Ospedale di Santo Spirito. Probably in the following year the vast fresco cycle in the so-called Corsia Sistina (the hospital's enormous ward) was begun. Under the direction of Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere (later to become Pope Julius II) and the Vatican librarian, Platina, a team of artists filled the upper reaches of the walls of the *corsia* with scenes from the early history of the *ospedale* (an earlier building was erected by Innocent III) and from the life of Sixtus.³ These later scenes extend from the vision of Luchina, mother of Francesco della Rovere, to Sixtus' meeting with St. Peter before the Gates of Paradise. Several of the scenes commemorate his achievements in architecture and urban improvement—the construction of

the Ponte Sisto, of Santa Maria del Popolo, and of the Ospedale itself. One of the scenes commemorates in particular Sixtus' role in regularizing the streets and piazzas of Rome. Seated on his throne in three-quarter profile (much like the Emperor in the Aurelian relief *Liberalitas* on the Arch of Constantine), Sixtus receives the *maestri di strada* and approves their urban plans. The inscription beneath states that Sixtus instituted the office of the *maestri*, a patent but convenient distortion.⁴

AEDILES VIARUMQ MAGISTROS QUI URBIS VICOS
 UT ERANT INFLEXOS AC SINUOSOS PLATEAS
 ITEM INAEQUALES ET INDISTINCTAS IN PRAESTANTIOREM
 DISTINTIOREMQUE FORMAM REDIGERENT
 PUBLICAS DENIQ STRUCTIONES
 IN AUGUSTIOREM SPECIUM RENOVARENT
 INSTITUIT

He institutes the *aediles* and the *maestri di strada*, who made the twisted and sinuous streets and the irregular and indistinct piazzas into a useful and elegant form and renewed the public buildings into a more dignified appearance.

This image alone, which honors Sixtus for his improvement of the entire urban fabric of Rome, would provide a strong prototype for the Julius inscription of 1512; the fact that it was the young Giuliano himself who planned this fresco programme makes the connection even stronger.

However, an even more immediate model was available to Julius. On a wall of a house in the Via dei Balestrari at the southeast corner of the Campo dei Fiori is a marble plaque with an inscription which very closely parallels the *aediles* inscription of 1512. Set up by two "street magistrates" in 1483, it reads:

QUAE MODO PUTRIS ERAS ET OLENTI SORDIDA COENO
 PLENAQUE DEFORMI MARTIA TERRA SITU
 EXUIS HANC TURPEM XYSTO SUB PRINCIPE FORMAM
 OMNIA SUNT NITIDIS CONSPICIENDA LOCIS
 DIGNA SALUTIFERO DEVENTUR PRAEMIA XYSTO
 O QUANTEM EST SUMMO DEVITA ROMA DUCIS
 VIA FLOREA
 BATTISTA ARCHIONIS ET LUDOVICUS MARGANUS

CURATORES VIAR
ANNO SALUTIS MCCCCLXXXIII⁵

which roughly translates:

Campo Marzio, up to a little while ago damp, filthy with smelly mud, full of disorder, now, under the pontificate of Sixtus, you are shedding this sordid aspect and all things appear splendid in their places. Just praise is owed to Sixtus, bringer of health! O how much Rome owes to his rule!

Several parallels with the later inscription are immediately obvious. Both are promulgated by the *maestri di strada*; that is, both inscriptions record praise and thanks given to the pope by civic magistrates and are not simply self-congratulatory. The rhetoric of both inscriptions is similar; that is, a gloomy picture must first be painted before one can fully appreciate how good things have become.⁶ Both plaques were installed near sites which were given particular attention by the two popes. Sixtus was vitally concerned with the improvement of the Campo dei Fiori; it was to this piazza that Sixtus transferred the Capitoline market in 1479. Part of the rationale for building the Ponte Sisto in 1473 was to facilitate the flow of commercial traffic to the Campo dei Fiori.⁷ Julius concentrated on an area north of the Ponte Sisto, near the bend in the Tiber. The Via dei Banchi Nuovi, where the plaque is located, emerges almost directly from the Ponte Sant'Angelo, the critical link between the city proper and the Vatican. Julius had the operations of the *Zecca* (the papal mint) transferred to this area, the financial nerve center of the city. It is known that he also planned to span the Tiber with another bridge near this point, built on the ruins of the ancient Pons Neronianus. In conjunction with this never-built "Ponte Giulio," Julius projected a small piazza on the east bank. This piazza (also never executed) would have also served as the northern node of Julius' most complete and most successful urban project, the Via Giulia, a broad, perfectly straight avenue destined to be lined with private and governmental palaces.⁸

A pride in urbanistic accomplishment strikingly similar to that of the Rovere popes was expressed by Ludovico Maria Sforza, "il Moro," at Vigevano in 1492. Thirty-five kilometers from Milan, the *castello* at Vigevano (built 1341) had served as the Visconti country residence. At the death of the last Visconti in 1447 the castle was taken over by the populace and in part destroyed. Less than three

years later the Sforza were in power in Milan and at the end of 1449 Duke Francesco reclaimed the castle and town of Vigevano (though not without some difficulty) as the rightful property of the Milanese duchy. Four decades later Ludovico il Moro, the son of Francesco, undertook a massive restoration of the castle and the adjacent market, in the process destroying the old marketplace, the *palazzo comunale*, and several other buildings. In their place he created one of the most beautiful piazzas in Italy, the first in the Renaissance to be surrounded by a uniform system of arcades.⁹

Anyone entering this piazza from its principal entry would immediately be confronted by the dominating element of the entire ensemble, the tower which rose high above the main portal of the castle. It was here that Ludovico chose to erect a marble plaque commemorating his achievements:

LUDOVICUS MARIA SFORTIA VICECOMES PRINCIPATU JO-
ANNI GALEACIO
NEPOTI AB EXTERIS ET INTESTINIS MOTIBUS STABILITO
POSTEA QUAM
SQUALLENTES AGROS VIGLEVANENSES IMMISSIS FLUMI-
NIBUS FERTILES
FECIT AD VOLUPTUARIOS SECESSUS IN HAC ARCE VE-
TERES PRINCIPUM
EDES REFORMAVIT ET NOVIS CIRCUMEDIRICATIS SPE-
CIOSA ETIAM TURRI
MUNIVIT POPULI QUOQUE HABITATIONES SITU ET SQUA-
LORE OCCUPATAS
STRATIS ET EXPEDITIS PER URBEM VIIS AD CIVILEM
LAUTICIAM
REDEGIT DIRUTIS ETIAM CIRCA FORUM VETERIBUS
EFICISIIS AREAM
AMPLEAVIT AC PORTICIBUS CIRCUMDUCTIS IN HANC
SPECIEM EXTORNAVIT
ANNO A SALUTE CHRISTIAN NONAGESIMO SECUNDO
SUPRA MILLESIMUM
ET QUADRIGENTESIMUM

Ludovico Maria Sforza, in the reign of his nephew Gian Galeazzo, having quieted external and internal disorder, made the poor land of Vigevano fruitful by diverting rivers; he remade this castle, the seat of preceding princes, into a beautiful residence, enlarged it by additions and fortified it

with a splendid tower. By laying and paving streets, he made the squalid residential quarters of the populace into an ornament of the community. Finally, after the old buildings surrounding the forum had been torn down he made the square more beautiful by enlarging it and surrounding it with arcades. In the year of grace 1492.

Wolfgang Lotz has analyzed the theoretical sources and political implications of this project. For my purpose it will only be necessary to point out the close similarities in urban ideology between the powerful northern despot and Julius II. Unlike the earlier Sistine inscription but like that of Julius, Ludovico's inscription posits the attainment of political stability as a prerequisite for urban renewal. The implication is, of course, that the renewed city is the visual reflection of the new political order. Like Julius, Ludovico was attentive to successful utilization of river resources.¹⁰ Like Julius, with his Cortile del Belvedere, Ludovico extended and beautified his palace, for he clearly intended the piazza to be read as part of his personal domain and not just as "ad civilem laudicium."

The connections are not accidental, for the designs of Julius' Rome and Ludovico's Vigevano share a common architect—Bramante.¹¹ Julius, who had spent much of his cardinalate in northern Italy, learned valuable lessons in statecraft and rhetoric from Ludovico. Now, as pope, he had at his disposal the man who had so clearly articulated, in the language of architecture, the Sforza position.¹²

In the Julius inscription of 1512 the rhetorical structure as well as the actual language used and its sources reveal the pope's self-conception not only as an urbanist but more generally as a ruler.

The sequence of phrases in the first part of the inscription suggests a clear order of priorities; urban renewal follows, and is a result of the political stability gained by military force. Julius, in fact, did not begin work on any major urban project until 1506, that is, not until after nearly three years of intense military activity. However, as will be seen further on, by the end of the inscription attention shifts away from the causal relationship between military conquest and urban improvement, and both are seen as aspects of a single force, the good government of Julius.

The enigmatic phrase "URBEM ROMAM OCCUPATE SIMILIOREM QUAM DIVISE" has never been satisfactorily explained. The source is Livy, *Ab urbe condita*, Book 5, Chapter 55, Line 5, where it refers to the haphazard reconstruction of Rome after its

near-total sack by Gallic tribes in 390 B.C. The entire passage is:

Festinatio curam exemit vicis dirigendi, dum omissio sui alienique discrimine in vacuo aedificant. Ea est causa ut veteres cloacae, primo per publicum ductae, nunc privata passim subeant tecta, formaque urbis sit occupatae magis quam divisae similis.

In their haste men were careless about making straight the streets, and, paying no attention to their own and others' rights, built on vacant spaces. This is the reason that the ancient sewers, which were at first conducted through the public ways, at present frequently run under private dwellings, and the appearance of the city is like one where the ground has been appropriated rather than divided.

It is my contention that what we are confronted with in the Julius inscription of 1512 is far more than a simple borrowing of a suitable phrase from a classical text. Indeed, the phrase and its immediate context are hardly suitable since, taken at its face value, the passage shows the Romans at a moment of deep humiliation and then concludes by deprecating the reconstruction of their devastated city.

What is needed, then, is a more thorough inspection of the larger context of this phase of Roman history, an examination of its cast of characters, and a consideration of the source—Livy's history—and its own peculiar biases.

The end of the fifth century B.C. saw the Romans in an extraordinarily vigorous offensive against the Etruscan towns. The successful campaign in 396 against Veii, essentially the last town in southern Etruria to fall to Roman aggression, has been seen as the opening of a new epoch in Roman history.¹³ Rome's circle of international relations began to grow as well; it is at this point that the first mention of "Rome" is recorded in Greece and Sicily.

Yet Rome's new stature was destined for a short life. In 391 B.C., a massive horde of "Gauls" (probably a mixture of Celtic tribes) swept down from northern Italy, where they had settled in the previous few decades, and raided several Etruscan towns. These Gauls entered Rome shortly thereafter, meeting little resistance, and began a siege and sack which lasted seven months. The Romans, huddled on the Capitoline, finally bought off the Gauls, who then departed for the north, virtually unimpeded on their journey. This, in its basic outlines, is what was generally reported in early histories, and what is now accepted as fact. However, later Roman historians (Livy amongst them), finding this ignominious version hard to take, equipped the story with a hero and a fortuitous nick of time. Marcus

Furius Camillus, an extraordinary palimpsest of fact and fiction, had led the Roman conquest of Etruria but was exiled soon after for allegedly appropriating booty. He is credited in the doctored version of the Gallic invasion with appearing at the precise moment of the pay-off, whereupon he broke the agreement and with sword in hand cleared the Roman territory of the barbarian invaders. He was then fêted with a lavish triumphal procession. The Romans, however, were discouraged, to say the least, by the devastation of their city; much enthusiasm was to be found for moving the entire population to Veii, which had somehow remained unsullied by all the recent events and had a reputation for being paradisiacal. Upon hearing this, a furious Camillus harangued the crowd in one of the most famous (but probably entirely fictitious) speeches in all of Livy's history, exhorting the Romans to remain faithful to their *patria*, and to rebuild their shattered city (Livy, V. li. ff.). Despite his inflated image (the puncturing of which is primarily an achievement of modern scholarship), Camillus was in fact a towering figure. A man of ideas and action, he personified the national recovery for twenty-five years.

By now the relevance of all of this to Julius and his inscription should be clear. Julius (or whoever authored the inscription) chose from a classical text a key phrase whose immediate context is far from pleasant but which closes an otherwise glorious chapter in Roman history. The choice thus made, the words are then used to establish the requisite *topos*—employed by Sixtus IV and Ludovico il Moro—of former squalor opposed to present glory. The broader context—Roman victory, patriotism, and advancement in the hands of a capable leader—then comes into play. It is insinuated, almost subliminally, that Julius is a new Camillus.

The use of Camillus as a politically emblematic figure finds a precedent in fourteenth-century Siena, where he appears as an exemplar of civic virtue and as one of the city's founders in the fresco cycle in the Palazzo Pubblico.¹⁴ The Roman hero often appeared in political propaganda in the sixteenth century. An account of the Festa di San Giovanni Battista of 1514 in Florence records the presence of a *tableau vivant* representing the Triumph of Camillus, a clear reference to the recently elevated Medici pope, Leo X.¹⁵ Thirty years were to pass, however, before Camillus arrived as a full-blown political emblem, in Salviati's sumptuous cycle in the Palazzo Vecchio in Florence, painted between 1543 and 1545 at the behest of

the greatest political *arriviste* of the Renaissance, Duke Cosimo I de Medici.¹⁶

In the Julius inscription, the identification is far from explicit. Yet the similarities are too close to escape notice. Both Camillus and Julius were "exiles" at some point in their careers before being called back to assume the highest office in the land. Both were, before all else, soldier-leaders, who conquered central Italy and thus ushered in new eras of Roman territorial expansion ("DITIONIS PROLATIS"). Both defeated and drove out northern invaders ("ITALIA LIBERATA"). It was this last similarity which struck a chord with Giano Vitale, a humanist poet, who wrote a paean to Julius in 1512, attributing to the pontiff the soul of Camillus for having driven the French from Italy.¹⁷

One further note on the use of Livy may be made. It should be remembered that Livy, a staunch supporter of the empire, was writing at the time of Augustus. When he records that

The dictator [Camillus' official title], having recovered his country from her enemies, returned in triumph to the city and...was hailed in no unmeaning terms of praise as a Romulus and a father of his country and a second founder of Rome (*parens patriae conditorque alter urbis*) (Livy, V. xlix. 7),

he pays homage to the current emperor. Thus, when the Livian image of Camillus is evoked by the *aediles* in 1512 they project, perhaps quite consciously, a double image, republican and imperial, onto their subject.

The last part of the inscription ("PRO MAIESTATE IMPERII ORNAVIT"), unlike the phrase just examined, seems conventional enough. But the idea it expresses is not to be found in quite the same form in any previous Renaissance inscription. This phrase, too, turns out to be classically inspired. The source is Suetonius' *Vita* of Augustus:

Urbem neque pro maiestate imperii ornatam et inundationibus incendiisque obnoxiam excoluit adeo ut iure sit gloriatus marmoream se relinquere, quam latericiam accepisset. Tutam uero, quantum provideri humana ratione potuit, etiam in posterum praestitit.

Since the city was not adorned as the dignity of the empire demanded, and was exposed to flood and fire, he so beautified it that he could justly boast that he had found it built of brick and left it in marble. He made it safe, too, for the future, so far as human foresight could provide for this (*De Vita Caesarum*, II. xxviii. 3).

The rhetorical structure is by now familiar—previous disorder supplanted by new order. It is important to note that these sentences close a chapter which describes not the urban achievements of Augustus but the idea of good government of the state and the necessity of control being invested in a sole leader. The lines directly follow a report of an Augustan edict:

May it be my privilege to establish a state in a firm and secure position and reap from that act the fruit I desire; but only if I may be called the author of the best possible government and bear with me the hope that when I die the foundations which I have laid for the state will remain unshaken (*De Vita Caesarum* II. xxviii. 2).

Thus, in Suetonius, Augustus' adornment of the city is an act directly connected with his own political hegemony and the concepts of good government. The juxtaposition is clearly intended to suggest to the reader that replacing bricks with marble has a metaphorical as well as a literal value.

Again, it is clear that in the *aediles* inscription of 1512 we are confronted with more than an adaptation of a classical convention. As Augustus had done before him, Julius adorns the city. In doing so, he is performing a political, imperialistic act. The inscription at first seems to state a clear order of priorities—only by first ordering the empire politically can the ruler then order the city physically. However, in the last line the distinction between imperialism and urbanism becomes blurred. The well-ordered city reflects the well-ordered empire.

The inscription, then, emerges as a rich, subtle exercise in political symbolism. If it failed to jog the memories of most of the *popolo*, it hardly mattered. Its implications would not have been lost on Julius, whose personal library contained copies of both Livy and Suetonius.¹⁸ Nor would one expect the message to have escaped that segment of society who would have seen the plaque every day, that is, the educated bankers and curials for whom the area around the *Zecca* was planned.

In retrospect, the appearance of this assertion of imperial and urban power in 1512 seems particularly appropriate in light of both the disruptions and the triumphs which Julius faced in this, his last full year as pope.

During the latter half of 1511 Julius' fortunes reached an exceptionally low point. In August, Julius fell extremely ill, and for

several days was close to death. During this vulnerable period, the fragile political stability of the city ruptured. The hostility of the old Roman noble families toward Julius, occasioned at least in part by his urban renewal schemes and grandiose building projects, led to the famous *Pax Romana* of August 28, 1511, an agreement aggressively foisted on Julius which limited papal powers in civic affairs.¹⁹

At the same time, the papal armies, in league with Venice and Spain, were engaged in a fierce effort to expel French and Imperial troops from central and northern Italy. In connection with the hostile French presence in Italy, Julius was involved in an acrimonious struggle with French ecclesiastics. In November of 1511, a schismatic council, principally supported by the French, opened in Pisa. Julius himself had summoned a council a few months before, an epochal event which opened in the Lateran in May of 1512. The first purpose of the Lateran Council was to defend the liberties of the Church against the revolutionary French.²⁰

By the middle of 1512 this bleak situation had significantly changed. Julius had miraculously recovered his health, the *Pax Romana* had in great part been countermanded, and the Council of Pisa had proven to be a miserable failure. The greatest triumph was the final defeat and rout of the French armies in June of 1512. On the 27th of June, Julius made a triumphal procession through the city, hailed on all sides as the liberator of Italy.²¹ In November, the third session of the Lateran Council opened, this time made all the more portentous by the presence of Matthaeus Lang, ambassador of the Holy Roman Empire. The charismatic Lang was received in what was described at the time as the most splendid procession in Roman memory,²² a joyous event for which Giano Vitale wrote the "Camillus" panegyric to Julius discussed earlier. Through Lang, Julius struck a critical alliance with the German emperor, Maximilian. At last Julius was at peace with his empire, his church, and his city.

Though it is impossible to know with certainty when the *aediles* installed their plaque honoring Julius, it is my belief that, in its tone and language, the inscription is an unmistakable product of the confident security which both Rome and Julius enjoyed in the last half of 1512.

The epic terms on which Julius scaled his papacy extended from his vigorous military leadership to his sweeping plans for reshaping the Roman urban fabric. To an extent unparalleled by previous

popes, Julius sought a *renovatio imperii*, a goal which colored all of his projects with the tones of antiquity. The new St. Peter's, the immense Cortile del Belvedere, the frescoes of the Sistine Chapel ceiling, the frescoes of the papal *stanze*—all begun during Julius' reign—recall in form and scale the glories of imperial Rome. Likewise, the inscription of 1512, in language redolent of ancient authority, bears eloquent witness to Julius' bold new claim to empire.²³

Notes

1. Ludwig von Pastor, *Die Stadt Rom zu Ende der Renaissance* (Freiburg-im-Breisgau: Herder and Co., 1925), pp. 21-27, where a loose translation is offered without further comment. Manfredo Tafuri, Luigi Salerno, and Luigi Spezzaferro, *Via Giulia, una utopia urbanistica del '500* (Rome: A. Staderini, 1973), p. 67, was the first to call attention to the use of Livy as a source, but offers a brief and very muddled explanation of its meaning.
2. For general information on Sixtus' urbanistic activities, see: Ferdinando Castagnoli, et al., *Topografia e urbanistica di Roma*, Storia di Roma, 22 (Bologna: L. Cappelli, 1958); *Via Giulia*, pp. 38-44; P. Tomei, "Le strade di Roma e l'opera di Sisto IV," *L'Urbe*, July, 1937, pp. 12-20. The verses of Brandolini have never been completely published. Some are available in *Via Giulia*, pp. 42-43, and Giuseppe de Luca, "Un umanista fiorentino e la Roma rinnovata di Sisto IV," *Rinascita* 1, no. 1-2:74-90. Further biographical information and an exposition of the Brandolini image of Sixtus are found in L.D. Ettliger, "Pollaiuolo's Tomb of Sixtus IV," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 16(1953): 239-274.
3. Pietro DeAngelis, *L'architetto e gli affreschi di Santo Spirito in Sassia* (Rome, 1961), p. 20.
4. This fresco is one of five that were almost completely repainted by Cavalieri D'Arpino in a 1599 "restoration." Cf. Mario Petrassi, "I Fasti di Sisto IV," *Capitolium* 48, no. 1 (1973): 18. Sixtus only reconfirmed the statutes of 1410, which instituted the office of the *maestri di strada*, roughly equivalent to "city planning magistrates," placing the magistracy under the direct control of the cardinal *camerlengo*, at that time Guillaume d'Estoutville; Emilio Re, "Maestri di strada," *Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria* 43 (1920): 30ff.; Camillo Scaccia Scarafoni, "L'antico statuto dei 'Magistri stratarum'," *Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria* 50(1927): 239-250.
5. Castagnoli, *Topografia*, p. 359.
6. This is a common, seemingly unavoidable conceit. A similar feeling is expressed by the famous inscription of 1468 on the house of Lorenzo Manili in the Piazza Giudea ("URBE ROMA IN PRISTINA FORMA RENASCENTE..."), Castagnoli, *Topografia*, p. 356.
7. Castagnoli, *Topografia*, p. 358.
8. Tafuri, et al., *Via Giulia*, pp. 65-73.
9. Wolfgang Lotz, "The Piazza Ducale in Vigevano: A Princely Forum of the Late

- Fifteenth Century," in *Studies in Italian Renaissance Architecture*, trans. Margaret Breitenbach, Renate Franciscano, and Paul Lunde (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1977), pp. 117-139. Translation of 1972 article, "Die Piazza Ducale von Vigevano—ein fürstliches Forum des späten 15. Jahrhunderts," in *Kunsthistorische Forschungen: Otto Pächt zu Ehren* (Salzburg, 1972), pp. 243-257.
10. Julius, probably imitating the model of Augustus as reported by Suetonius, had the Tiber dredged and widened, the first time since antiquity that such a project had been undertaken. Julius also may have been the initiator of the most audacious engineering project of the Renaissance, a visionary and never-built "Gran Canale" through the heart of Rome itself. On the dredging operations, see Arnaldo Bruschi, *Bramante architetto* (Bari: Laterza, 1969), p. 663; on the flood canal, see Luca Beltrami, "Bramante e la sistemazione del Tevere," *Nuova Antologia* 198 (1904): 418-423; Christoph Frommel, *Der Römische Palastbau der Hochrenaissance*, I (Tübingen: E. Wasmuth, 1973), p. 16.
 11. Bruschi, *Bramante*, pp. 804-809.
 12. On Ludovico in general, see: Francesco Malaguzzi-Valeri, *La Corte di Lodovico il Moro*, 4 vols. (Milan: U. Hoepli, 1913-1923); on his political use of architecture, see: Stanislaus von Moos, *Turm und Bollwerk: Beiträge zu einer politischen Ikonographie der italienischen Renaissancearchitektur* (Zurich: Atlantis Verlag, 1974), pp. 61-62.
 13. S. A. Cook, et al., *Cambridge Ancient History*, VII, *The Hellenistic Monarchies and the Rise of Rome* (New York: Macmillan, 1928), p. 511.
 14. Nicolai Rubinstein, "Political Ideas in Sieneese Art: The Frescoes by Ambrogio Lorenzetti and Taddeo di Bartolo in the Palazzo Pubblico," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 21 (1958): 200-201.
 15. Césaire Guasti, *Le feste di San Giovanni Batista* (Florence: Società di S. Giovanni Batista, 1908), p. 34.
 16. Iris Cheney, *Francesco Salviati (1510-1563)*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, Institute of Fine Arts, 1963, II, pp. 363-373.
 17. Sac. Girolamo Tumminello, "Giano Vitale, umanista del secolo XVI," *Archivio Storico Siciliano*, ser. 2, v. 8(1883): 16. My thanks to Elliott Kai-kee for this reference.
 18. Léon Dorez, "La bibliothèque privée du pape Jules II," *Revue des bibliothèques* 6(1896): 109, 111, 117.
 19. Clara Gennaro, "La 'Pax Romana' del 1511," *Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria* 90(1967): 17-60.
 20. Ludwig von Pastor, *The History of the Popes*, VI, ed. by Frederick Ignatius Antrobus (London: Routledge, 1923-1953), p. 406.
 21. Pastor, *Popes*, VI, p. 417.
 22. Pastor, *Popes*, VI, p. 424.
 23. This article originally formed part of a larger study of Roman urban planning under Pope Julius II, prepared in 1976 for a joint seminar in the Departments of History and Art History at the University of California at Berkeley. I would like to thank the participants in that seminar, especially Profs. Randy Starn and Loren Partridge, for their valuable contributions to my work. I would also like to thank Prof. Spiro Kostof of the Department of Architecture at Berkeley, who read this article in manuscript and offered several helpful suggestions. Finally, I am grateful to Amy Levine for her thoughtful criticism.

J. Brian Horrigan received a B.A. in art history at the University of Chicago in 1972 and a master's degree in art history at the University of California at Berkeley in 1975. He is currently a candidate for a Ph.D. at Berkeley, specializing in the history of modern architecture and planning. He plans to spend the next year in Washington, D.C., doing research for his dissertation on utopian planning and ideal homes in the 1930's.



INSCRIPTION OF POPE JULIUS II FROM 1512
 Facade of a house in the via dei Banchi Nuovi

Reproduced from Manfredo Tafuri, Luigi Salerno, and Luigi Spezzaferro, *Via Giulia, una utopia urbanistica del '500* (Rome, A. Staderini, 1973), by courtesy of Stabilimento Aristide Staderini, Rome.