

Today, Raffaello da Montelupo (1504–1566) is best known as Michelangelo's (1475–1564) assistant, principally for his work in the Medici Chapel at San Lorenzo, Florence, in 1533–1534, but also for his assistance of 1542–1545 on the tomb of Pope Julius II in San Pietro in Vincoli, Rome. As a draughtsman, Raffaello is most often recognized for his many drawings copied after and related to the master's work. Bernard Berenson was the first to establish a corpus of the artist's drawings, made up of sheets traditionally ascribed to Raffaello, drawings then attributed to Michelangelo, and new discoveries.¹ From Berenson's foundational account, some subtractions and several additions have been made, yielding a group larger than most sixteenth-century sculptors apart from Michelangelo and Baccio Bandinelli (1493–1560). The present contribution considers Raffaello's drawings made during his formative first moment with Michelangelo and seeks to provide a fuller understanding of their function within his artistic process.

We are well informed about the artist's early career, thanks to a fragmentary autobiography, which documents the artist's life until the Sack of Rome.² Raffaello's autobiography includes the crucial detail that he was left-handed, a fact that proves helpful in identifying his drawings.³ Initially drawn to sculpture, he was steered away from the profession by his father, the sculptor Baccio da Montelupo (1469–1535), who preferred him instead to become either a painter or a goldsmith.⁴ Though he did not feel disposed to either of these arts, Raffaello acquiesced and joined the workshop of the goldsmith Michelagnolo di Viviano (1459–1528), father of Baccio Bandinelli. Raffaello trained in the Viviano workshop for two years (from ages 12 to 14), where he remembers mostly working the bellows and, occasionally, drawing.⁵ His unenthusiastic training as a goldsmith ended following a harsh reprimanding for a workshop accident, and the young Raffaello began working in his father's sculpture workshop, where he undertook a more self-directed approach to drawing by studying the works in local Florentine churches. The artist began his career travelling and assisting others, a trend that would hold for much of his working life. He was briefly in Carrara in 1521 working with the workshop of the recently deceased Bartolomé Ordoñez (1480–1520) to complete a series of tombs. By 1523, he was in Rome, assisting Lorenzo Lotti, called Lorenzetto (1490–1541), and, from 1530–1533, he

¹ Berenson 1903, vol.1, pp.254–62; Berenson 1935, pp. 105–20; Berenson 1938, vol.1, pp.256–63; Berenson 1961, vol.1, pp.384–92.

² For Raffaello's autobiography, see Vasari/Milanesi 1878-85, vol.IV, pp. 551–62.

³ *Ibid.*, 552.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 553.

⁵ *Ibid.*

worked with a team of sculptors under Antonio da Sangallo il Giovane (1484–1546) on the sculptural programme in the Santa Casa. In short, by the time Raffaello da Montelupo joined Michelangelo's Florentine workshop to assist the master with the Medici tombs in the New Sacristy at San Lorenzo, he was well-versed in collaborative work and following other artists' designs.

While working under Michelangelo at San Lorenzo, Raffaello took advantage of his access to the master's drawings and dutifully copied them. In some instances, these drawn records can expand our understanding of Michelangelo's ever-evolving designs for the Medici Chapel tombs. Such is the case with the copy in the Uffizi, Florence (fig.1), after a now-lost design for the *Magnifici* tomb, and first attributed to Raffaello da Montelupo by Lorànd Zentai.⁶ While most of the surviving copies after Michelangelo's design for the double tomb record the composition best known from a version in the Louvre, generally regarded as a demonstration drawing by a member of Michelangelo's workshop, Raffaello's drawing in the Uffizi documents an earlier, rejected idea with a standing Virgin and Child at its centre.⁷ Since it includes this standing sculpture group, the drawing must predate 23 April 1521, when Michelangelo ordered marble from Carrara, including a block for a seated Madonna.⁸ Raffaello's copy and those made after it, thus preserve an otherwise unrecorded moment in the development of the *Magnifici* tomb. As others have observed, the copy records a stage following Michelangelo's decision to organize the monument as a double tomb, but before he settled on a design centred on what would become the *Medici Madonna*, and in which he suppressed Christian iconography in favour of mythological reliefs.⁹

On the recto of the Uffizi sheet, Raffaello drew the entire architectural programme, loosely articulating the sculptural elements; on the verso (fig. 2), he isolated, enlarged, and clarified the reclining nude allegories atop the tombs and the narrative reliefs. The artist here resolved

⁶ Gabinetto disegni e stampe degli Uffizi, Florence, inv. 607E. Petrioli Tofani 1986, p.270 (as Aristotele da Sangallo after Michelangelo Buonarroti); Joannides 1991, pp. 255–62 (as probably Battista da Sangallo); Zentai in Budapest 1998, pp.64–66, under cat.23 (as Raffaello da Montelupo); Joannides 2007, p.188 (as Raffaello da Montelupo).

⁷ Musée du Louvre, département des arts graphiques, Paris, inv. 837; Joannides 2003, pp.135–40, cat.26 (as Michelangelo); C. Bambach in New York 2017, pp.124–5, 299, cat.98 (as Workshop of Michelangelo [Stefano di Tommaso Lunetti?]) with previous literature. For a list of copies and partial copies, see Joannides 2007, p. 296.

⁸ Milanesi 1875, vol. 4, pp. 694–96, nos XLVIII and XLIX, “*et spetialmente fare delli dicti marmi una figura di Nostra Donna a sedere secondo è disegnata...*”; Joannides 1991, p.257.

⁹ See Perrig 1981, pp. 247–81; Joannides 1991, pp. 255–62.

the sketchy relief figures on the recto into more legible scenes – *Orpheus Lamenting Eurydice* at left and the *Garden of Hesperides* at right¹⁰ – and touched the figures with wash to evoke the fall of light from upper left. He delineated more of the internal musculature for the two reclining nudes, and again suggested lighting effects with parallel hatching and wash. An analogous study, albeit without wash, for the standing *Madonna and Child* survives on another sheet, also in the Uffizi, which also features several studies of animal heads.¹¹ In each case, Raffaello drew the figures directly, without making preliminary studies in chalk or blind stylus, often retracing lightly drawn pen line with increasing pressure. His focus appears to have been recording general poses, and he has simplified or omitted hands, feet, and surface structure.

In the absence of Michelangelo's original drawing for this stage of the *Magnifici* tomb, we cannot know the extent to which Raffaello simplified these elements from his source material. However, his copies after Michelangelo's design for the tomb of Giuliano de' Medici strongly suggest that this shorthand was part of a consistent working practice because, in this case, he seems to have copied the well-known *modello* in the Louvre.¹² Scholars long considered the Louvre drawing a workshop copy, though Joannides' attribution to Michelangelo has met with increasing acceptance.¹³ As he had done with the design for the *Magnifici* tomb, Raffaello made separate studies of the figural components of Michelangelo's design for the Giuliano tomb. A drawing, now in Budapest (fig. 4), features individual studies of *Night*, *Day*, the left river god, and Giuliano crowned by angels.¹⁴ In this case, the scaled-down record of the entire programme survives on a separate sheet, now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (fig. 3).¹⁵ Scholars have known the drawing in reproduction since 1948, but, owing to a miscaptioned

¹⁰ Joannides 1991, pp. 259–60.

¹¹ GDSU, inv. 606E verso; see Petrioli Tofani 1986, pp.269–70 (as Aristotele da Sangallo after Michelangelo Buonarroti). For Dosio's copies after these more detailed sculptural drawings, see Luporini 1957, p.456, fig.8 (fols 74 verso and 75 recto).

¹² Musée du Louvre, département des arts graphiques, Paris, inv. 838.

¹³ See Joannides 1972, pp.541–51 (as Michelangelo); Bambach in New York 2017, pp. 124–5, 299, cat. 98 (as Michelangelo).

¹⁴ See Budapest 1998, pp.64–66, cat.23 (L. Zantai) (as Raffaello da Montelupo).

¹⁵ Inv. 1994.6; see G. Goldner in Jones et al. 1994, p.27 (as attributed to Aristotile [Bastiano] da San Gallo).

image, presumed the sheet to be lost.¹⁶ From this reproduction, Zentai first proposed an attribution to Raffaello.¹⁷

The Metropolitan copy features Raffaello's characteristic left-handed hatching on the front of the sarcophagus and the abbreviations of form are likewise typical of the artist. These simplified figures are comparable to his copy after the *Magnifici* tomb design or related studies in the Lille codex, an incomplete and dismembered architectural drawing-book, the majority of which is by Raffaello, as Arnold Nesselrath first argued.¹⁸ The Met study is, for example, comparable to Raffaello's record in Lille after Michelangelo's first design for the San Lorenzo façade.¹⁹ In both studies, Raffaello's figures are abstracted, with stick appendages and the statues in the niches, which are in both cases buried under horizontal hatching, feature the same tapered legs.²⁰ These stylistic affinities support Zentai's proposed attribution and confirm his suspicion that the Met sheet's dimensions correspond with those sheets discussed thus far: Uffizi inv. 606E (202 x 139 mm) and 607E (200 x 136 mm, fig. 1), the Budapest sheet (190 x 140 mm, fig. 4), and the Lille codex (210 x 138 mm).²¹ Based on the shared dimensions, technique, style, and, in some cases, the subject matter of the drawings, Zentai pointed to the possibility that the now dispersed sheets were once part of the same sketchbook.²²

Another sheet in the Uffizi (fig. 5), currently classified as anonymous and of about the same dimensions (199 x 138 mm) seemingly belongs to this group.²³ The recto features two studies of a male torso, seen from front and back. Both views depict the same arching pose with missing limbs, broken in the same location with the arms exhibiting the same fracture pattern,

¹⁶ Tolnay 1948, p.271, cat.230 (as 'Follower of Michelangelo, Free paraphrase of the Ducal tombs. Dresden, Kupferstichkabinett'). The drawing was instead in a private British collection and, understandably, subsequent commentators could not locate the sheet. See L. Zentai in Budapest 1998, p.64; Joannides 2003, p.142; Joannides 2007, p.188.

¹⁷ Budapest 1998, pp.64–66, under cat.23 (L. Zentai).

¹⁸ Nesselrath 1983, pp.46–47; Nesselrath 1994, pp.35–52; Lemerle 1997, pp.47–57; Brejon de Lavergnée 1997, pp.283–322, cats.717–808 (F. Lemerle).

¹⁹ Lille, Palais des Beaux-Arts, *Livre de dessins de Michel-Ange Buonarroti*, fol. 56 verso; Brejon de Lavergnée 1997, p.308, cat.772 (F. Lemerle).

²⁰ This graphic shorthand and the horizontal hatching through figures recurs in Raffaello's copies in the Lille codex of Benedetto da Maiano's pulpit in Santa Croce (both sides of fol. 74). See Brejon de Lavergnée 1997, p.314, cat.790 (F. Lemerle).

²¹ Budapest 1998, p.64, under cat.23.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ Petrioli Tofani 1992, p.111 (as anonymous sixteenth century), but independently identified by Petrioli Tofani as by Raffaello da Montelupo in an undated note on the mount. In addition to its size, the sheet shares the same material properties as the others discussed above in the same collection, all featuring chain lines spaced at around 4 cm intervals.

revealing the source for both to be the same sculptural fragment. With a few light strokes, the artist projected the beginning of an extended leg and delineated ground beneath the torso seen from behind. From this introduction of environment, we can see that the artist interpreted the source as upright, read in this orientation, we find left-handed hatching throughout including areas of shading that pass through the top study's arm. Johannes Myssok connected the Uffizi drawing with a wax model in the Casa Buonarroti, which is generally attributed to Michelangelo.²⁴ The drawn studies are similar, if in the opposite orientation to the model, and are therefore not direct copies. Nevertheless, Myssok's observation highlights the drawings' formal relationship with several three-dimensional models widely accepted as by Michelangelo, made in preparation for the Slaves on the tomb of Pope Julius II,²⁵ and it is possible that Raffaello's source was a similar now-lost model.

The Uffizi verso contains a study of a child's face and a snake's head, both with left-handed hatching. Giovanni Antonio Dosio (1533–1609), who worked in Raffaello's Roman workshop from 1549–51, copied the snake on a sheet in his drawing album, now in the Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin.²⁶ The same sheet in the Berlin album also copies Raffaello's studies of animal heads that accompany his record of the standing Madonna and Child from the Magnifici tomb design discussed above, supporting the attribution of the Uffizi sheet to Raffaello. Several studies in another Dosio album, now in the Biblioteca Estense, Modena, also reproduce Raffaello's copies discussed here, including the source's left-handed hatching.²⁷ The left-handed hatching in Dosio's studies of the mourning figures of *Heaven* and *Earth*, and the attic decorations of Michelangelo's design for the Giuliano tomb, thus show his probable source to have been a now-lost drawing by Raffaello. Combined with the Budapest sheet, these would have completed a group of studies of the tomb's sculptural programme.

In these drawings, Raffaello remained quite faithful to his sources. In his copies after Michelangelo's tomb designs, he seems to have followed a regularized process in which he

²⁴ Myssok 1999, p.354 (as after the Casa Buonarroti torso).

²⁵ See O'Grady 1999, pp.226–241, cats.2–5.

²⁶ See Hülsen 1933, p.20, cat.89.

²⁷ See Luporini 1957, pp.442–67 for Dosio's copies in the Modena album of Raffaello's Uffizi copy of the *Magnifici* tomb (fol.74 recto), the Uffizi studies of the *Magnifici* reliefs and sculptures (fols.74 verso and 75 recto), the Met copy of the Giuliano tomb (fol.73 verso) and the Budapest study of the Giuliano tomb statuary (fol.72 verso). In the case of Dosio's drawing (fol.73 recto) after Raffaello's Lille copy of the San Lorenzo façade, the original contained only horizontal hatching, which Dosio reproduced along with Raffaello's inscription.

made quick and generalized records of the entire composition, with separate, clearer studies of its figural elements. Joannides observed that Raffaello inserted the leftmost figure in the design for the Garden of the Hesperides relief (fig. 1) in his study for a Bacchanal, now in the Royal Collection, Windsor, an instance in which the artist mined his repository for an original composition and repurposed a figural motif with little alteration.²⁸ The Uffizi studies of a torso appear to share a similar, though elaborated, function. The graphic approach is here comparable to Raffaello's copy in the Louvre after Michelangelo's carved *Medici Madonna*.²⁹ The Louvre recto features similar parallel and cross-hatching to define the volumetric surface; on the verso, he employed the popular archaeological approach seen in the Uffizi drawing and studied the sculpture group from a second viewpoint.

In other instances, Raffaello's drawings show him thinking on paper and attempting to assimilate and adapt the master's figural language. This is the case with Raffaello's interpretations of Michelangelo's carved *Dawn* for the tomb of Lorenzo de' Medici. In a drawing, now in Copenhagen (fig. 6), Raffaello experimented with Michelangelo's allegorical times of day, with the study at upper left deriving from the carved *Dawn*.³⁰ The drawing deviates from its source, with the figure's head now turned to her left, and her enlarged right hand now resting on her abdomen. Though Michelangelo had completed the allegory two years before Raffaello entered the master's workshop, it remained uninstalled on the Chapel floor. The Copenhagen study depicts the figure upright and parallel to the picture plane. This translation appears to proceed from a study of the sculpture seen from above, possibly made from a ladder.³¹ A similar approach can be found in a drawing, now in the Rijksmuseum (fig. 7), in which Raffaello irreverently satirized the carved *Dawn*, surrounding a variation on the figure with rude putti.³² The Amsterdam drawing is almost certainly an end in itself, in which Raffaello responded to Michelangelo's presentation drawings.³³ Again, Raffaello took a view from above the sculpture as his point of departure, in this case altering the figure's pose and

²⁸ Royal Collection, Windsor Castle, inv. RL O0505 recto (Washington and London 1996-1998, p.62, cat.10 [P. Joannides]). The author notes that an echo of the same figure recurs on the verso of Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, inv. no. WA1846.126 (Joannides 2007, p.331, cat.77). See also Joannides 1991, pp.255–62, for a drawing in the Harvard Art Museums, Cambridge, inv.1932.152, which Joannides connected to the design for the Hesperides relief, and in which Michelangelo isolated the same figure.

²⁹ Musée du Louvre, département des arts graphiques, Paris, inv. 715; see Joannides 2007, pp.203–205, cat.55.

³⁰ The drawing was first attributed to Raffaello by Hugo Chapman. See Fischer 2001, pp.54–55, cat.10.

³¹ See Rosenberg 2000, p.249.

³² Meijer 1995, pp.99–101, cat.10.

³³ Ibid.

context. As in the Copenhagen study, he has here reduced the figure's torsion and draped her right arm across her body. In both drawings, Raffaello's interpretation involved flattening the spatial presence of the original model so that it became readable on a lateral plane. The drawings thus sacrifice the source's spatial presence and dynamism, but, in the case of the Amsterdam sheet, facilitating Raffaello's practice of overlaying alternatively positioned limbs.³⁴

Both studies of times of day on the Copenhagen sheet share the same bent arm and folded wrist, a motif which Raffaello studied twice more at upper right. The motif repeats throughout Michelangelo's career, and Raffaello was evidently eager to incorporate the gesture into his designs. In a drawing at the Ashmolean (fig. 8), the younger artist synthesized two recurrent Michelangesque motifs, combining the bent arm studied in the Copenhagen drawing and the arched torso of the Uffizi sheet (fig. 5). The large study depicts the nude *Risen Christ* carrying the cross.³⁵ The artist used red chalk to delineate contours, making summary indication of anatomical details, before following this linework with a brush and dilute brown wash to suggest volume and the fall of light. As Joannides observed, Raffaello has framed the figure within a square niche, bisected vertically, and partially measured the width with a scale below, which indicates that the drawing was made with a sculptural figure in mind, though, to date, the study has not been connected to a finished work.³⁶ The double-sided Ashmolean sheet agrees in style and subject matter with Raffaello's drawings made during his time with Michelangelo in Florence, and probably dates to this moment or shortly after.³⁷ The drawing was, at any rate, almost certainly made before the spring of 1536 he again worked with Antonio da Sangallo il Giovane, now papal architect, on the triumphal entries of Emperor Charles V into Florence and Rome, respectively. For this project, Raffaello was assisted by a young Battista Franco (ca. 1510–1561), and a drawing by Franco in the Albertina, which responds to the Ashmolean study for a *Risen Christ*, provides a *terminus ante quem* for Raffaello's study.³⁸

³⁴ For other examples of this practice, see British Museum, London, inv. 1946-7-13-373(recto); Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, inv. WA1846.131(verso); Harvard Art Museums, Cambridge, inv. 1932.154; Royal Collection, Windsor Castle, inv. RL O0505(verso).

³⁵ Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, inv. WA1846.126(verso). Parker 1956, pp.203–204, cat. 405, suggested that the figure might depict *St John the Baptist Preaching*. Joannides 2007, pp.328–31, cat.77, questioned Parker's identification of the cross at right and did not suggest a subject.

³⁶ Joannides 2007, pp.328–31, cat.77.

³⁷ The watermark, close to Briquet 6086 (replicated in Florence, 1533) supports but does not confirm a dating to the early to mid-1530s.

³⁸ Albertina, Vienna, inv. 125. Joannides 2007, p.331, first observed that the Albertina drawing reflects the Ashmolean study.

Raffaello's design seems to have only materialized in three-dimensions about a decade after its initial conception, in his marble *Risen Christ* (fig. 9) for Orvieto Cathedral. Payment to Raffaello for the work is documented in 1544, and the artist had completed the sculpture by 1547.³⁹ Though the sculpture has lost the much of the arched torso, it retains the corresponding raised right hip and the slight inward bend of the left knee. The proper right leg remains straight, and the elongated right arm hangs by his side, pulled behind his hip, as in the drawing. As carved, Raffaello's *Risen Christ* turns his palm to exposing the stigmata, a type that echoes Quattrocento precedents, as Till Verellen observed.⁴⁰ The Orvieto Christ holds the cross against his left arm, bent in the Michelangelesque gesture seen in the Ashmolean study. As in the drawing, the carved cross recedes obliquely into the niche, though the angle is slightly altered in the final work. Scholars have noted Raffaello's dependence on Michelangelo's *Risen Christ* at Santa Maria sopra Minerva in Rome. However, in planning his treatment of the subject, Raffaello seems to have sourced Michelangelo's example more broadly, recombining motifs absorbed during his time with the master in Florence.

Along with stylistic evidence, this process of absorption and translation might help us identify further drawings by Raffaello and better understand their context. With this in mind, we may turn to a study at the Metropolitan Museum of Art (fig. 10). Ludwig Goldscheider seems to have been the first to attribute the drawing to Bartolomeo Ammannati (1511-1592), and subsequent scholars have not challenged the attribution.⁴¹ The recto studies a river god, while the verso contains loose sketches related to Michelangelo's the Laurentian Library vestibule. For this reason, the sheet has been dated around 1559, when Ammannati began completing the vestibule.⁴² However, the drawing seems to date from a quarter century earlier and is here attributed to Raffaello da Montelupo.⁴³ The verso can be related to Raffaello's keen interest in the Laurentian Library designs, revealed through nineteen pages of detailed studies in the Lille codex.⁴⁴ Though these architectural studies are looser than those at Lille, they agree with the

³⁹ Piagnani and Principi 2010, pp.608. The work was moved twice, settling in the niche to the left of the entrance to the Cappella Corporale in 1559.

⁴⁰ Verellen 1981, pp.105–108, cat.30. For an additional Florentine sculptural source that similarly shows Christ's long right arm positioned behind his hip, see Middeldorf 1962, pp.273–289.

⁴¹ See Porter, in *Notre Dame-Binghamton* 1970, pp.72–73, cat.D3 (as Ammannati); Zikos, in *Florence* 2011, pp.432–435, under cats. 26–27 (as Ammannati); Carrara 2018, p.48 (as Ammannati).

⁴² Zikos, in *Florence* 2011, pp.435.

⁴³ Christ Church Picture Gallery, Oxford, inv.0151; Byam Shaw 1976, p.73, cat.137.

⁴⁴ Brejon de Lavergnée 1997, pp.283–322, cats.794–803 (F. Lemerle); Hemsoll 2003, p.47, note 54.

tremulous sketch of Antonio da Sangallo's projected *tribuna* in a drawing, now in Berlin, connected with Raffaello's work on the papal tombs in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, left unfinished by Baccio Bandinelli in 1541.⁴⁵ The Met river god contains left-handed hatching throughout and is stylistically consistent with Raffaello's draughtsmanship. The river god features an elongated proper left arm that is typical of Raffaello's related interpretations of Michelangelo's figures.⁴⁶ The river god's proper left hand features the elongated fingers of a type that recur in Raffaello's drawings. For example, the same odd combination of hands (one exaggeratedly long, the other shown in schematic contour) seen in the Met study is also found in a study for a Bacchic scene, now at Christ Church.⁴⁷ The figure's undulating left pectoral muscle is also characteristic and is comparable to those on a sheet of figure studies now in the Albertina.⁴⁸

The Met river god seems to be another instance in which Raffaello synthesized and developed multiple sources. The figure reflects knowledge of Michelangelo's presentation drawings illustrating the *Fall of Phaeton*, made in 1533 as gifts for the young nobleman Tomasso de' Cavalieri. That Raffaello freely altered Michelangelo's *Fall of Phaeton* is shown by his interpretation of the Windsor version in a study now also conserved in the Royal Collection, in which the artist drew freely, liberally altering the river god and attendant Heliades.⁴⁹ Raffaello's drawing in the Met combines the frontal torso, head position, and the arrangement of the bottom leg found in Michelangelo's presentation drawing at Windsor⁵⁰ with the motif of the outstretched arm that resting on the raised knee from the British Museum version.⁵¹ Although no related to Raffaello's extant sculpture, it may have been an exploration that, like the Ashmolean drawing, he made without a specific commission in mind. Although Raffaello spent much of his career assisting, completing, or following others, such cases show his use of drawing as a medium to record, combine, and invent for future reference.

⁴⁵ Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. KdZ 5608; see Verellen 1987, pp.292–5.

⁴⁶ In addition to the Rijksmuseum and Ashmolean drawings discussed above, compare GDSU, Florence, inv.619E (Barocchi 1962, pp.255–56, cat.204); Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie, inv.90/3970 (Geissler and Riether 1989, pp.71–2, cat.31).

⁴⁷ Christ Church Picture Gallery, Oxford, inv. 0151; Byam Shaw 1976, p.73, cat.137.

⁴⁸ Albertina, Vienna, inv. 257; see Birke and Kertész 1992, p.153, cat.258.

⁴⁹ Royal Collection, Windsor Castle, inv. RL O0505; Washington 1996-7, pp.60–61, cat.10 (P. Joannides).

⁵⁰ Royal Collection, Windsor Castle, inv. RL 12766; Tolnay 1976, pp.108–9, cat.343.

⁵¹ London, British Museum, inv. 1895-9-15-517; Tolnay 1976, pp.107–8, cat.340.

During his time working in the Medici Chapel, Raffaello da Montelupo systematically recorded Michelangelo's two- and three-dimensional output, likely in a drawing album. This procedure involved first documenting the overall scheme and then elaborating the sculptural figures and reliefs in separate studies. In these studies, Raffaello shows little interest in absorbing Michelangelo's anatomical language or the master's laborious practice of making detailed anatomical drawings for his figures. Instead, the copies focus on fixing the source's pose, rendered in schematic form, which facilitated his practice of developing them in further drawings. In these subsequent studies, Raffaello recombined elements of different sources, synthesizing them into variations on Michelangelesque themes. Although these studies belong to one of several periods in which the artist was not responsible for providing original designs, they nevertheless reflect his use of drawing as an intellectual medium, which, in at least one case, later informed his sculptural output.