The project to revitalize St. Peter’s basilica as the center of a resurgent Church proceeded in step with the goal to reassert papal authority across the Italian peninsula and to extend that authority to the Eastern Mediterranean by mounting a crusade to recover the Holy Land. By embedding references to the Holy Land in the fabric of the new church, the architecture itself became the expressive voice of the papacy’s political agenda to transform the basilica, and all of Rome, into a New Jerusalem. In tracing the development of these ideas as they were introduced by Nicholas V, (1447-1455) refined by Julius II (1503-1513), and translated into physical form by Donato Bramante, this essay provides a new way of understanding myriad problems – multiple papal patrons, numerous architects, and several distinct designs – associated with the project of rebuilding St. Peter’s over almost two centuries.

Three terms come together in this discussion: the aspirations of the restored papacy, recently back in Rome from Avignon; a renewed interest in the classical heritage and its architectural monuments, and how those two very broad ideas get focused on St. Peter’s with a special emphasis on the Holy Land. The normal way of seeing this is that the interest in ancient ruins was absorbed in the new Renaissance architectural vocabulary. I would like to propose a reversion of that equation. The other way to see it is that the project of revitalizing St. Peter’s engendered an interest in particular ruins which were expressive of Rome’s links to the Holy Land. I want to begin to explore this thesis by looking at two emblematic sources, an old “detto” and an emblematic image.

For more than a hundred years art historians have repeated the purportedly autograph dictum that Bramante intended to raise the dome of the Pantheon on the Temple of Peace. 2 Ironically this phrase tells the story “in

---

1 This article draws on arguments from my book, Jerusalem on the Hill: Rome and the Vision of St. Peter’s in the Renaissance. (Turnhout 2010).

nuce,” and as they say in Italian, “se non e vero e ben trovato.” The Temple of Peace (Fig. 1) guides us to Old Testament Jerusalem; the Pantheon dome leads to Christian Jerusalem. This short essay is limited to a discussion of the former.

Bramante himself introduces us to the Temple of Peace. On the frontispiece to the *Antiquarie Prospetiche romane* (Fig. 2), a heroic figure kneels at the foot of the Colosseum; he holds an armillary sphere and draws on the ground with a compass. Some scholars have identified the document, dated 1504, as Bramante’s manifesto and the image as his portrait. Only a few pages in length, this vernacular poem is dedicated to Leonardo, praises Roman monuments, names the Colosseum, the Temple of Peace and the Arch of Titus, identifies its builders, Emper-
ors Vespasian and Titus, and mentions their role as Christ’s Avengers: “Tempio di pace di grande architettura geometrica per terra fracassato [...] quasi in mezzo (a l’) Colise [...] Vespasiano autosto e divo Tito sublime un arco [...] El padre col figliol ancor qui sta che se gierusalem di sangue un lago poi vendico la morte del messia”. 3

The Temple of Peace, a massive monument still visible today on the old Via Sacra was known throughout the Middle Ages but it had lost its identity. In de Varietate Fortunae, a treatise on the glories of ancient Rome that he ded-

---

icated to Pope Nicholas in 1447, Poggio Bracciolini recounts that he climbed to the top of the Capitoline; there the crumbling ghost of ancient Rome appeared to him like the skeleton of a defeated giant. Among its glories was the “Temple of Peace.” Nicholas’ secretary, Flavio Biondo, confirmed the identification by the monuments’ proximity to the Arch of Titus and the Colosseum, other Flavian monuments erected close in time to celebrate the same victory.

Built in Rome on the morrow of Peter’s martyrdom – which occurred in 67 A.D. according to Eusebius – the Temple of Peace housed the sacred booty brought to Rome by Titus following his destruction of Solomon’s Temple and the quelling of the Jewish revolt (68-69 A.D.). As surprisingly complex as its importance had become for the Church through a layering of meanings added through the ages, that significance was magnified with the Quattrocento rediscovery of the building proper.

In the Nineteenth Century the archeologist Antonio Nibby recognized the monument as the Basilica of Maxentius. An archrival, the churchman Carlo Fea, immediately challenged the new identification, and indeed imputed ulterior motives to Nibby, but to no avail. Nibby’s reidentification erased a conviction that had been valid for four hundred years. Now reduced to an impressive monument, but one not resonant in Christian terms, this resulted in the almost complete elimination of references to the Temple of Peace in scholarly literature on St. Peter’s. Since from the Renaissance through the Enlightenment the glorious ruin on the Sacra Via was venerated as the Templum Pacis, it is accurate for the period under study to consider it solely in this way. While some of the material that follows is well known, its relevance to a new argument will become clear as the essay unfolds.

As originally conceived by Maxentius, this fourth century shell of brick-covered concrete was more indebted to the design of the imperial baths than to classical basilicas. Among the best-preserved ruins of ancient Rome, the imperial baths were known throughout the Middle Ages, and sketched by an array of the Renaissance’s most famous architects including, Bramante, Palladio, etc, Andrea Fuliaco’s reconstruction of the Severan Baths with its vaulted and sculpted volumes (circa 1510), Serlio’s plan of Titus Baths, and later drawings, as Duperac’s (Fig. 3) indicate the fascination with these great monuments of ancient Rome. Alberti was one of the first of many artists who analyzed these thermal records of the Roman past, and he provided a sacred context for viewing them. In De re Architettura VIII, 10, he asserted that the temple’s centralized atrium with its symmetrical rooms and axial alignment respected the Etruscan Temple, in this way forging a link that traced the genesis of the baths to indigenous temple design. The two genres met

---

4 L. B. Alberti, De re Architettura VIII, 10: “In the middle, as in the center of a house, there is an atrium, roofed, spacious and majestic; off this are rooms, their lineaments taken from the Etruscan Temple, as we have described it.” Translation author. In his chapter on the Etruscan Temple (VII, 4), Alberti provided the guidelines for the arrangement of chambers in the temple proper; disposing them symmetrically to either side of the sanctuary and he articulated the symmetry with cross axial apses.
in the Temple of Peace, the sole structure that corresponded in style and building techniques to the terme. The conformity of style between the Templum Pacis and the proximate Baths of Titus helped to confirm Alberti’s temple-terme analogy. In Renaissance thinking, therefore, this monument was a unique example of the grand scale and structure of the imperial baths in a sacred temple context. Indeed, it is notable that the building, which has a basilical plan, was reconstructed as an equilateral central plan temple by several architects who were involved in the early design of St. Peter’s, as in examples by Baldassare Peruzzi and Antonio da San Gallo.\(^5\)

Since it was defined in a classic study of his mature style, historians have been aware that Bramante gradually moved from a static to a dynamic mode at St. Peter’s as he grasped the principles of thermal construction. Bramante’s Parchment plan of 1506 exhibits the grandiose dimensions, curvilinear forms and dynamic rhythms of the imperial baths; its axially symmetrical block with its three semi-circular apses and eight vestibules separated by columns, its coffered barrel vaults and interlocking spaces of different sizes and shapes adheres to the style of the baths. Even Bramante’s configuration of the building in half plan is typical of the genre; it corresponds to the practice instituted with Vespasian and Titus of drawing the imperial baths in half-plan; the obligatory symmetry of the baths eliminated the need for full views. Bramante’s adoption of the molding properties of concrete established characteristic thermal building techniques for its construction. As critics have noted, a further development of thermal design is charted in Uffizi 8 Ar and 20Ar, with the thicken-

\(^5\) Florence, Uffizi 529A; Uffizi 7800 A.
ing of the piers and walls.

Early designs for St. Peter's already exhibit bath-like properties—cross vaults and thermal type windows appear in Uffizi 3Av; Uffizi 104Av, is isolated and set in the middle of a walled surrounding typical of the imperial bath complexes of Rome. The conceptual interdependence of this early drawing to the terme is underscored by Baths of Diocletian that appears on the recto (Uffizi 104Ar). Assigned to Bramante, it is considered the first datable drawing of the imperial terme.

The interest in thermal architecture at St. Peter’s dovetailed with the impact of a specific model—the Temple of Peace. In the finished fabric, structural and design parallels that relate to the Temple of Peace’s massive scale, architectural vocabulary, spatial organization, use of concrete, etc. are evident commencing with Bramante’s lifetime and continuing throughout the Church’s building history, whether central, as in Peruzzi’s birds-eye perspective and exterior views of the 1520’s and 30’s (Uffizi 2A, Uffizi 27A), or longitudinal plan. Maderno’s nave reflects the form and atypically rustic materials—granite columns, stucco pilasters, and brick floors—characteristic of the baths.

Bramante’s interest in thermal design has previously been explored from a literal point of view; my discussion brings out how pervasive was the thermal idea in all of its permutations, and the explanation is that it was not simply to rival ancient architecture on its own terms, but to focus with a particular point of view on the Temple of Peace. Another level of interest revolves on the fact that this is where the Jewish relics were kept.

**Pope Nicholas V**

Thermal concerns were intrinsic to Nicholas V’s plans for the church. According to Nicholas Muffel who accompanied Frederick II to Rome for his imperial coronation in 1452, Nicholas V imported enormous spolia columns from Agrippa’s Baths behind the Pantheon for the transepts of St. Peter’s. The massive columns, thick walls, and the monumental dimensions visible on the underdrawing of Uffizi 20A that has been identified as a sketch of Nicholas plan, suggest that Roman vaulting techniques—perhaps the earliest use of the type—were intended. According to Poggio Bracciolini, the Pope’s death interrupted “his soul’s desire to destroy the old basilica and rebuild it in the form of the Terme, “Basilicam insuper ipsam testudine in formam thermarum Diocletianarum reducere struca priori structura, destinarat animo.” The new architectural mode is the mark of St. Peter’s and of ecclesiastical architecture in its wake, yet its long and pervasive influence has never been traced back to its source at the court of Pope Nicholas V (1447-55) and the programmatic redesign of Rome on the model of Jerusalem, for which Titus and the Flavian Temple of Peace was a fundamental reference.

---

Titus is set apart from other Roman conquerors of Jerusalem by the destruction of Solomon’s Temple, which was never rebuilt. His transport of its holy relics to Rome appears (Fig. 4), opposite Titus’ triumphant entry into the capital on the Arch in the Forum (Fig. 5). Titus’ spoliation of the Temple dislodged the icons of the faith, and ended its long line of High Priests. His subjugation of the Jews and the domination of the East that it connoted
became a core idea in Western religious and political ideology. In the late fourth century, Hegesippus, an aide to Pope Damasus, construed the destruction of the Temple as God’s vengeance for the killing of Christ. Shortly afterward, Sulpicius Severus (d. ca A.D. 420) recorded that to “eliminate the superstitious beliefs of the Jews,” Titus made a conscious decision to destroy the Synagogue. This attribution laid the foundation for later Christian exegetes who molded a new persona for Titus as the Avenger of Christ’s death. From the Middle Ages forward, this supplied a rhetoric of revenge to papal drives for the Crusades.

The earliest mention of Titus’ revenge in a crusading context dates to an Encyclical attributed to Pope Sergius IV (1009-1012); it calls for armed aid to regain the Holy Sepulcher from Muslim control. The Pope assured certain victory to would-be soldiers by recalling the precedent of Titus who avenged Jesus’ death when he attacked Jerusalem. Sergius’ dates concur with Caliph el-Hakim’s destruction of the Holy Sepulcher in 1009. Often portrayed in the guise of a crusading knight, Titus continued as a model for crusaders into the sixteenth century, as we shall shortly see.

A new chapter in the revisionist history of the Jewish War began in the later Middle Ages when the Papacy’s pretensions to primacy in the Universal Church drew strength from Titus’ transfer of the sacred icons from Solomon’s Temple to Rome. To the concept of the destruction of the Temple as divine retribution, was added the corollary interpretation that God had removed His Kingdom from the unbelieving Jews to transpose it to a deserving people. In this argument, the election of Rome became a central issue. The commonplace concepts of Rome as the New Jerusalem and the Roman pope as the successor to the sacerdotal dignity of the Old Testament priest-kings were sustained by this transfer, which was visually documented on the Arch of Titus. These served as material proof that God’s Covenant with the Jews was transferred to the Christian Faith and repositioned in Rome.

---

7 Hegesippus (identifiable with Jude Isaak, (Anklager) in the service of Pope Damasus in 372. Considered a Latin revision of a Greek text that originated ca 370, (BAV, Vat. gr. 148, 10/11). See Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, LXVI, Hegesippi, libri V, ed. V. Ussani, Leipzig 1932; Vienna 1960. Scholars have traced the probable origin of this idea to Origen (d. 253/254 A.D), For a survey of the literature on this theme, see H. Schreckenberg, Die Christlichen Adversus-Judaeo-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (1-11 JH), Frankfurt and Bern 1982.

8 Sulpicius Severus (d.420), Chronicon II, 30, 6, 9, 8, quoted in G.F. Brandon, The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church, London 1951, Appendix IV.

9 “Nosstram erit victoriam, sicut fuit in diebus Titii et Vespasiani, qui Dei Filium mortem invenitur et adhuc baptismum non receperunt sed post victoriam ad imperialis honorem Romanorum pervenerunt et de suis peccatis indulgentiam receperunt.” A. Gieysztor, The Genesis of the Crusades: The Encyclical of Sergius IV (1009-1012), “Medievalia et Humanistica” V, 1948, pp. 3-23; VI, 1949, pp. 3-34. The quote is from Part 1, 21. The Encyclical is appended to the article.

10 See G. F. Brandon, Fall of Jerusalem, cit. p.229.
A number of twelfth century challenges by rival churches brought an emphasis on spoils to the fore. In the Descriptio Lateranensis Ecclesiae, written on the orders of Pope Alexander III (1149/59-81), John the Deacon claimed the Spoils for the Lateran’s high altar. He added the Ark of the Covenant, the Tables of the Law, and four columns from Solomon’s temple and other spoils to Josephus’ original list. In the same period, contemporary mosaic images of Vespasian and Titus approaching Jerusalem in the portico underscored the Lateran’s position as the spiritual and physical locus of the New Solomon’s Temple. Scholars of the period have shown that much of the jockeying for primacy in the intra-mural battle between the Lateran and the Vatican was played out in these claims. This early development and the rivalry it reflects set the stage for the increase in the number, properties and importance of the Spoils that took place following the papacy’s return to Rome from Avignon. As other relics were added, their provenance traced to Solomon’s Temple, and Titus credited with their transport, the history of papal possession of the objects was antedated to provide a seamless record of papal authority resting on Titus and the Spoils.

Turkish incursions into Byzantium that brought about the fall of the Orthodox emperor and patriarch signaled new opportunities to assert papal prerogatives in the East. Because St. Peter’s basilica contained the Apostle’s earthly remains that corroborated the Roman pontiff’s claim to primacy in the entire world. St. Peter’s stood in the position of becoming the center of a global Christianity ruled by the Roman pope. These goals were given ambitious architectural direction with Pope Nicholas V’s plans for the new St. Peter’s. During Nicholas’ reign, the sourcing of Petrine Spoils in the Holy Land increased St. Peter’s status as the global mecca of Christendom. The rediscovery of the Temple of Peace, the “shell” that once held Jerusalem booty, complemented the augmentation of Jerusalem spoils at St. Peter’s claimed for Titus by humanists affiliated with the Nicholine court. In a number of instances Titus replaced Constantine as the donor; as an argument for Petrine primacy, this could draw on the fact that Titus’ “donation” not only preceded Constantine’s in chronological terms, but it directly conveyed Old Testament authority, a distinction that Constantine could not claim. Legends of Titus’ Christian conversion brought added strength to this line of thought.

Maffeo Vegio, canon of St. Peter’s under Nicholas, made significant contributions to these developments. The central doors of St. Peter’s are

---


aligned with the tomb of the Apostle, the principal relic of papal power (Fig. 6). A new source for the doors in the historiated portals of Solomon’s Temple transformed them into silent sentinels supporting papal authority. Josephus described the carved wooden doors of the Holy of Holies that were covered with leaves of gold. In Maffeo’s *De rebus antiquis memorabilibus Basilicae Sancti Petri Romae* of 1455, Maffeo first claims that “the central doors

---

(of St. Peter’s) ... commemorate the doors of Solomon’s Temple, which Titus set on fire during the war against the Jews. These were lost to the Saracens during the reign of Alexander III, restored by Leo IV and replaced in bronze by Eugenius IV”.

The doors of St. Peter’s had always pointed to Jerusalem, but never before had they been associated with the Temple of the Jews. The Liber Pontificalis records that Pope Honorius’ (625-38) covered the doors with silver; these doors celebrated Heraclius’ victory over Cosroes. A Jerusalem context was derived from the late medieval tradition that viewed the deposition of Cosroes and the restoration of Christian rule to the Holy Land as the first crusade. A later passage in the same papal chronicle notes the Saracens’ theft of the silver from the doors and mentions Leo IV’s replacement with sculpted panels; yet gives no model for the conception. The connection between Titus the Doors of St. Peter’s and Solomon’s Temple is Maffeo Vegio’s addition; with it he built a retroactive history that placed a Flavian gloss on origins.

Other expansions of the Petrine church’s claim to Jerusalem spoils occur in a concentrated moment during Nicholas V’s papacy. According to the Liber Pontificalis, Constantine adorned Peter’s tomb with spiral, vine-covered columns “from Greece.” Later popes increased this number to a dozen. In

---


18 Gregory the Great found six in front of the Confessio, and he brought the number to 12. Today eight of these figure in the piers of the cupola of St. Peter’s, one is in the Cappella della Pietà; one as lost, cf. T. ALFARANO, De basilicae Vaticanae antiquissima et nova structura. ed. M. CERRATI, Rome 1914, editor’s notes to chapter III, p. 53ff.
Giovanni Rucellai’s account of Nicholas’s Jubilee, a more venerable provenance became part of official history; he notes “sixteen marble columns surrounding Peter’s Tomb are said to come from Jerusalem”. 19 Nikolaus Muffel, who accompanied Frederick III to Rome in 1452 for his imperial coronation, counts fourteen Solomonic columns; twelve in the choir, and two in Veronica’s altar; he adds to this the Colonna Santa, and attributes their transport to Titus and Vespasian. 20 In a contemporary illustration to Josephus’s Jewish Antiquities, the columns assume the Old Testament authenticity that was now attributed to them. They adorn Solomon’s Temple in Jean Fouquet’s Pompey Entering the Holy of Holies, which may reflect developments in Rome when the artist re-
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ceived concessions from Nicholas V (Fig. 7). Later, they adorn the Beautiful Gate in Raphael’s cartoon for Peter Healing the Lame Man for the Sistine Chapel tapestries. During Julius II’s reign, Fra Mariano reasserts their origins in Solomon’s Temple and their transport to Rome by Titus and Vespasian. They have lost their Greek anonymity and taken on this venerable Jerusalem veneer in Giulio Romano’s depiction of Peter’s tomb in the Baptism of Constantine.

An emphasis on Passion relics brought by Titus also characterizes the Nicholaine period. The most poignant vestige of Christ’s Passion was Veronica’s Sudarium, Continuously held in the highest regard, Nicholas IV’s Bull of 1289 established the Sudarium as the basilica’s most precious relic at St. Peter’s, even surpassing in venerability Peter’s tomb. By the beginning of the eighth century, Saint Veronica’s legend had been integrated into the legendary history of the Jewish war. Called to Rome from Jerusalem by the ailing Emperor, Veronica cures him with the impression of the Holy Face, and he dispatches Titus to destroy Jerusalem (Fig. 8). According to Nikoaulus Muffel, Titus brought Veronica’s veil to Rome. Muffel also credited the Porta Aurea at St. Peter’s to Titus; through it Christ carried the Cross. He and Giovanni Ruccellai recorded devotions during Nicholas’ Jubilee at the Scala Santa, the blood-spattered steps in Pilate’s House that Christ ascended to His Passion. Fra Mariano listed the steps as a Titus-borne relic.

By the middle of the fifteenth century, the Confessio columns, the Sudarium, the golden door, and the historiated portals – all owed their presence at St. Peter’s to Titus. As the Quattrocento advanced, the list of Spoils grew incrementally, providing heightened evidence of the Church’s standing as the New Jerusalem. The integration of Flavian-inspired architectural motifs in ecclesiastical buildings in Rome was a counterpoint to these claims, the process begins in 1461 with the Colosseum-influenced Bene-
diction Loggia which served as the scaffold for the Pope’s blessing of the faithful, (Fig. 9).

In the following decade, Julius II’s uncle, Pope Sixtus IV (1471-84) had debris removed from the Arch of Titus. Lilio Tifernate, a humanist at Sixtus’s court affirmed the significance of Titus’ deed: is the translation of the Church of God and the transfer of sacerdotal dignity to the Pope in Rome: “Candelabrum signum ecclesia dei a tua sanctitate translatae.”

8. Veronica guarisce l’Imperatore, arazzo, Tournai, XV sec., Collezione privata (per cortesia del Warburg Institute).

presented this argument as revealed truth that came to light through Sixtus’ efforts.

A general interest in the monuments of the past that is reflected in the Quattrocento restoration of papal Rome gradually matured under Julius II (1503–13) into the most focused Flavian associations, and indeed in the frontispiece to Nagonius’s *Prognosticon Hierosomilytani* (ca. 1508) (Fig 10), a treatise dedicated to Julius in anticipation of his success in a planned crusade to wrest Jerusalem from the Turk,26 Julius has slipped into the persona of Titus as he appears on the Arch in the Forum (See Fig 5). At the Cortile del Belvedere (1502), the basin from Titus’s baths that forms the organizing principle and the Laocoon from Titus’s palace that is a focus of its sculpture court, carry Flavian imagery into the papal palace in the first year of Julius’ pontificate.

26 Nagonius, *Prognosticon Hierosomilytani*, BAV, Vat Lat 1682 C. STINGER, *Renaissance in Rome*, 109ff provided an important investigation of this manuscript. Paul Gwynne placed emphasis on the Jerusalem issue as its primary focus; he proposes a date of 1509 and notes that the manuscript is recorded among the books in the inventory of Julius’s private library made on 5 June 1509. See P. GARETH GWYNNE, *Poets and Princes: the Panegyric Poetry of Johannes Michael Nagonius*, (Medieval and Renaissance Court Cultures, Vol 1), Turnhout 2010.
Bramante’s turn to the Temple of Peace points to a reassessment of Flavian models that best addressed contemporary papal concerns. The history of the Colosseum-inspired Benediction Loggia’s is a case in point. In late 1505, Pope Julius II ordered Bramante to extend the construction of the Benediction Loggia to the Cortile of San Damaso. In 1507, the determination to remove the existing Benediction Loggia from the church heralded the change. Designs attributed to Peruzzi and Raphael indicate it was to be replaced with alternating large and small columns typical of the imperial baths and sacralised with a temple pediment to mark the place of the Pope. As the idea matured, and with increasing clarity, St. Peter’s was redesigned in this way. At St. Pe-
ter’s, Bramante created a physically powerful architecture that reflects the sacred temple status and thermal architecture of the Temple of Peace. With this change, he maintained the reference to the Flavians that was prepared by Nicholas V and his fifteenth century successors, now appropriating an architectural model that specifically evoked the spoils and the Temple of Jerusalem.

In looking back we see that the resurgence of interest in Flavian monuments, the reuse of Flavian architectural motifs in ecclesiastical buildings; the emphasis on Titus’ transport of Spoils housed at St. Peter’s, the “rediscovery” of the Temple of Peace, and the intention to adapt its thermal principles in the new church all belong to Nicholas’ time. Can we assume that a common Jerusalem mindset bridged the intervening decades and that the new St. Peter’s was a collaboration between Nicholas V and Julius II, and the genial architects who evolved the architectural formulae to express them? I cast my vote with Alberti and Bramante.