Cardinal Pamphilj Builds a Palace
Self-Representation and Familial Ambition in Seventeenth-Century Rome

Among the elite in early modern Italy, conspicuous consumption and palace building developed hand in hand. The fifteenth century witnessed a rise in purchases of “consumer durables,” which were indeed conspicuous. Meant to be seen, these objects functioned as a mode of communication, an expression of status, and an act of competition. Accompanying the new consumption of luxury goods, both big and small, was a changing attitude toward wealth as Christian strictures against personal ostentation and riches gave way to a new set of values that sanctified lavish spending and display. Humanist writers sought to justify the rise in expenditure by linking external appearance to internal virtue. Authors like Leon Battista Alberti and Giovanni Pontano mined their ancient predecessors, especially Aristotle, to articulate a virtue of magnificence: the appropriate use of wealth to express inner dignity and magnanimity. As one of the most costly and noticeable displays of purchasing power, building became an overt mark of social distinction. In fact, the Florentine Giovanni Rucellai exhorted man to do two things in life: to procreate and to build. Palaces, in particular, became synonymous with their builders, a physical and metaphorical embodiment. In his early-sixteenth-century treatise De Cardinalatu, Paolo Cortesi justified the magnificent palaces of cardinals as appropriate external expressions of the men housed within and absolved the prelates of any conflict with their religious role. In retrospect, Cortesi appears prescient: over the course of the next two centuries, the Roman cityscape was transformed by the numerous palaces built by cardinals and men of varied social standing. In the early modern period, ostentatious display was accepted and even expected behavior, and building played no small part in the acquisition and maintenance of social position. The splendor of a family’s residence—measured in size and appearance—was a critical indicator of status, wealth, and taste.

Cardinal Giovanni Battista Pamphilj (1574–1655), the future Innocent X, was no different from his peers in his use of architecture as a means of self-representation. Shortly after he was raised to the College of Cardinals in 1630, he commissioned a palace that doubled the size of his ancestral home in the Piazza Navona. The new palace fulfilled two critical needs of the Pamphilj: more space to accommodate separate households for the cardinal and his brother, and an appropriate display of the family’s position in the upper tier of the Roman court. Both the interior and exterior design aptly expressed the family’s standing, particularly Giovanni Battista’s position as cardinal. Furthermore, the palace represented a culminating moment in the efforts of the Pamphilj to forge and articulate an identity in Rome. After moving to the papal city in the late fifteenth century, the family gradually integrated into its new milieu through a multipartite strategy of marriage to established Roman families, positions in the Curia and civic government, and property ownership. Thus, the cardinal’s palace embodied the aspirations of several generations of Pamphilj to gain a visible and impressive presence in the Piazza Navona. Though the original cardi-
nal’s palace designed by Francesco Peperelli (ca.1585–1641) was expanded into the present Palazzo Pamphilj by the architects Girolamo Rainaldi and Francesco Borromini after Cardinal Pamphilj’s election to the papacy in 1644, its interior space remains largely intact today (Figure 1). Prior to my analysis of the building documents for the palace, which are located in the Archivio Doria Pamphilj, in Rome, historians had neither studied Cardinal Pamphilj’s palace nor considered his patronage during his tenure as cardinal in any significant way. Indeed, the evidence of his patronage remains limited to the commissioning of the palace and its decoration. Unlike the great cardinal-patrns of the early seventeenth century—one thinks of Cardinal del Monte, best known for his support of Caravaggio, or Cardinal Maffeo Barberini (the future Urban VIII), whose artistic interests encompassed old master paintings, contemporary art, architecture, antiquities, poetry, and more—Cardinal Pamphilj did not, as far as we know, indulge in similar habits. Nonetheless, his endeavor in palace building represents a major act of patronage, and the documents reveal that he was an active and engaged participant. This lacuna in our study of Pamphilj patronage might have contributed to the view set forth by Torgil Magnuson almost twenty years ago that Giovanni Battista Pamphilj lacked artistic taste and that the arts suffered during his pontificate, especially in comparison to the preceding and succeeding pontificates of Urban VIII Barberini and Alexander VII Chigi. More recent literature, however, has sought to revise this assessment; in particular, in Sarah McPhee’s book on Gianlorenzo Bernini’s bell towers at St. Peter’s, Innocent X emerges as a man engaged in and excited about architectural design both at St. Peter’s and elsewhere. My study of the Palazzo Pamphilj before 1644 provides another revision of our portrait of Giovanni Battista Pamphilj as patron.

The Pamphilj and Their Casa before 1600

The Piazza Navona was home to the Pamphilj family since 1470, when Antonio Pamphilj (d. 1484) of Gubbio decided to resettle permanently in Rome. The Pamphilj hailed from

Figure 1 Francesco Peperelli, Girolamo Rainaldi, and Francesco Borromini, Palazzo Pamphilj in the Piazza Navona, 1636–38, 1645–50. The present façade was primarily designed by Rainaldi with contributions by Borromini. Peperelli’s earlier façade was obliterated in the reconstruction of 1645–50.
Gubbio’s noble class: Antonio and his brothers had received the distinction of Counts Palatine from the Holy Roman Emperor and resided in the city’s aristocratic neighborhood. Once in Rome, Antonio worked in the Camera Apostolica, practicing his profession as a lawyer and gaining the post of procuratore fiscale (fiscal procurator). Like many late-fifteenth-century men, Italian and otherwise, he sought to take advantage of the career opportunities offered at the growing Roman court, centered on the papacy. Although a social hierarchy was established in Rome, it was characterized by mobility, and the Church offered a viable means for advancement. The very nature of the papacy as a nonhereditary, elective office allowed men of modest and average origins to rise to great heights. Normally, newcomers to the city first sought to integrate themselves into the lower ranks of the Roman nobility, the gentiluomini romani (untitled urban patricians), who were distinguished by eligibility for public office and whose wealth often derived from banking or commerce, and marriage was the key means to do so.

While the Pamphilj were noble in Gubbio, this distinction meant little in the papal city, where Roman roots and property ownership were marks of distinction. Antonio’s actions make clear his intention of entering into the urban nobility: in 1482, he arranged a marriage between his son Angelo Benedetto (ca.1467–1502) and his neighbor’s daughter Emilia di Mario Mellini. The Mellini were Roman gentlemen who made their fortune as bovattieri, or merchants of agricultural products, in the late medieval period. Along with marriage and professional positions in the Camera Apostolica, Antonio pursued a third means of integration by actively participating in the real estate market, with the goal of establishing a family casa (house). Following the lead of many colleagues, Antonio chose as his neighborhood the Rione Parione, the zone of the city from the southern half of the Campo d’Agone (later the Piazza Navona) to the Campo dei Fiori (Figure 2). In 1470, Antonio purchased a house located in the Piazza di Parione (later called the Piazza di Pasquino), on the outside edge of the southwest corner of the Campo d’Agone (Figure 3). By the end of the decade, he had greatly enlarged this property by acquiring four adjacent houses, and in 1497 his son Angelo Benedetto added one more. The Pamphilj’s actions in these early years underline their determination to carve out a visible presence in this densely populated and prestigious neighborhood. The Piazza di Parione gained cachet from the via Papale, which passed through it (see Figure 2). This street was one of the city’s three main thoroughfares; moreover, it held symbolic significance as the route used by the newly elected pope for his possessa, the procession from the Vatican to the Lateran that signified his possession of the city’s cathedral as bishop. During the 1470s, the very years in which Antonio Pamphilj was shaping a casa, Sixtus IV’s improvement of this stretch of the papal route increased the desirability of the Pamphilj’s neighborhood.

The mid-sixteenth century represented a pivotal moment in the development of the Pamphilj property, at a time when the family was upwardly mobile. It could boast
a history of marriages to prominent families—like the Mattei, Mellini, and Porcari—and the present capofamiglia (head of the family) Pamphilio (1500–1562), who was a Roman citizen, bestowed honor on his family by holding public office. The family was now part of the untitled urban elite. During this same period, fortuitous circumstances resulted in the extension of its property to the Piazza Navona. By this time, the Pamphilj house in the Piazza di Pasquino reached the corner of the isola, or block, that jutted out into the piazza (see Figures 2, 3). A portion of their property (part of a house and a shop with living space above) was destroyed when the Piazza di Pasquino and the via dell'Anima were aligned and straightened during Julius III’s improvement of the area, in 1554. The maestri di strade (masters of the streets) compensated the Pamphilj for the loss: they were given the remains of two houses, along with 300 ducats, and their property here was exempted from all future taxes. While the loss of their property can be attributed to chance, the generosity of the compensation might have been influenced by Pamphilio’s prominent position since he served that same year as conservator, the highest elected official in the civic government.

The property the Pamphilj received as remuneration extended their holdings to the Piazza Navona for the first time, increasing their prominence in the area through a greater physical presence as well as the significance of the site. The first visual evidence of the Casa Pamphilj is Girolamo Rainaldi’s engraving of the Easter procession of 1592, which shows the modesty of its unornamented, three-bay façade on the Piazza Navona (Figure 4). Nonetheless, by the mid-sixteenth century the Piazza Navona had become a highly desirable address, housing prominent individuals and families such as the Massimi, the Mellini, the Orsini, and Cardinal de Torres, and serving as one of the principal pub-
lic arenas for the ceremonial life of the city. Various interest groups, such as the Spanish national community and the Roman nobility, used it as a stage for their festivities and rituals. In fact, Rainaldi’s print illustrates the most important annual festivity sponsored by the Spanish community. At the same time, the prominence of the via Papale, on the opposite side of the Pamphilj property, had decreased, as the papal possesso lost its significance. Thus, the Pamphilj’s gain of property on the Piazza Navona occurred at an advantageous moment, allowing the family to maintain its connection to a renowned public site.

Following the work of the Renaissance humanists, the seventeenth-century writers of treatises on the Roman court espoused the connection between outward appearance and inner virtue. Etiquette guided all aspects of a cardinal’s deportment, from the manner and color of his dress and the movements of his body to the architectural setting in which he lived. As a prince of the Church, the cardinal was meant to look like his secular counterpart. Architecture as self-representation has been much considered by historians. In discussing the numerous palaces built in seventeenth-century Italy, Peter Burke has demonstrated that architecture was one form of conspicuous consumption, along with other spending on articles such as furnishings and luxury objects, and contemporaries were aware of each other’s buying habits and the messages they conveyed. Such awareness inspired competition as well as a sense of duty to represent oneself in a manner appropriate to one’s position in society.

Through studies of individual monuments or groups of monuments, architectural historians have established the connection between architecture and status. In a seminal work on the seventeenth-century Roman palaces of the Borghese, Barberini, and Chigi families, Patricia Waddy has connected the act of palace building to a rise in social status, specifically the election of a family member to the papacy and the subsequent elevation of a relative to the Sacred College of Cardinals. Since the publication of this magisterial book, scholars, including Waddy herself, have begun to investigate the living and building habits of the nonpapal nobility in seventeenth-century Rome, those cardinals who never reached the papacy, the monsignors, the lower-ranking titled nobility, and the untitled nobility. In particular, Patrizia Cavazzini’s study of the Lancellotti, Patrizi, and Verospi families has shown how this range of palace building reflected shifts in family status. An elevated position often prompted reconstruction and enlargement, as in the case of Cardinal Lancellotti, but mere aspirations could also occasion building. Monsignor Costantino Patrizi added a new wing to his palace in the Piazza Mattei (now the Palazzo Costaguti) as part of his bid for the cardinal’s hat, which, alas, he never attained. Consumption reflected status and was also used to gain it.
In a social milieu where property represented position and architecture embodied identity, we can imagine that the Pamphilj, who were clearly ambitious, were conscious of their social status and the appearance of their *casa*. In fact, a diary entry of 1542 reveals that Pamphilio was aware of the social gap between him and his in-laws, the Mattei. *Gentiluomini romani* who had made their fortune as *bovattieri*, the Mattei were experiencing a period of increased wealth on a par with the new nobility of cardinals. The family responded by building, near their original nucleus of properties on the Piazza Mattei, northwest of the Teatro Marcello. In 1598, Asdrubale Mattei, who had attained the noble title of Marchese di Giove, began the construction of a monumental palace at the corner of the via dei Funari and the via dei Caetani.31 Carlo Maderno's conservative design for the Palazzo Mattei di Giove followed the scheme developed by Antonio da Sangallo and continued by Giacomo della Porta and Domenico Fontana in the late sixteenth century (Figure 5).32 The palace impressed through its sheer bulk wrapped in a uniform façade. In the interior, the sequence of entrance spaces—entrance corridor, open loggia, main stair, and central court—was standard in Roman palace design since the mid-fifteenth century, but Maderno strengthened the focal points in the sequence by creating perspective views (Figure 6). One axial line extended from the entrance on the via dei Caetani to the main stair marked

![Figure 5 Carlo Maderno, Palazzo Mattei di Giove, 1598–1618](image1)

![Figure 6 Maderno, Palazzo Mattei di Giove, view of the court facing the via dei Funari entrance. The via dei Caetani entrance is to the left of the ground-floor loggia, and the main stair is to the right.](image2)
by a beveled arch, and the other connected the via dei Funari entrance through the court to a fountain niche in the blind one-story loggia. Asdrubale Mattei displayed his cultural erudition by installing his collection of antiquities in the entrance spaces, recalling other Roman palaces and villas like the Palazzo della Valle and the Villa Medici, which readily associated the patrons with the illustrious world of the ancient Romans. In the court, busts embellished the superimposed Doric and Ionic loggias, while friezes and statues were placed into framing elements and niches on the solid walls. In the early seventeenth century, the Pamphilj lacked these signs of cultural and social distinction. Their casa paled in comparison to their relative's new palace, and, based on the current evidence, the family did not collect antiquities until reaching the papacy. Given the familial connection, it is not surprising that when it came time for the Pamphilj to build a noble palace, they would look to the Palazzo Mattei as a model.

**Family Strategies, 1600–30**

At the turn of the seventeenth century, the Pamphilj family was led by two brothers, Pamphilio (1563–1639) and Giovanni Battista (1574–1655), who were the grandparents of the above-named Pamphilio and Orazia Mattei. In this generation, the Pamphilj followed a common strategy of patriarchian families of dividing the leadership between secular and religious paths. As the eldest son, Pamphilio assumed the role of secular capofamiglia, which held the responsibility of marriage and the hoped-for progeny. In 1612, at the age of fifty, the childless Pamphilio entered a second marriage. He wed a twenty-year-old widow from Viterbo named Olimpia Maidalchini, who was to become a formidable presence in the family. As the younger son, Giovanni Battista was destined for an ecclesiastical career, which had the potential of advancing the family’s social standing. Although initially reluctant, Giovanni Battista was encouraged and supervised by his uncle, Girolamo (1543–1610), who was the first cardinal in the family and enjoyed the powerful patronage of Popes Clement VIII and Paul V. Familial ties such as these, between an elder relative in an influential position and a younger relative, could be instrumental in establishing a successful ecclesiastical career for the younger man. Indeed, Giovanni Battista Pamphilj did well. After attaining his law degree in 1595 and being ordained a priest two years later, he quickly rose through the ranks of the Church hierarchy. With the help of his uncle, as well as his own ingegno, or intelligence, he attained the position of avvocato consistoriale (consistorial lawyer) in 1601 and three years later the powerful rank of uditore di Rota (papal judge).

The Pamphilj family adhered to the normal pattern of living arrangements in Roman palaces, with two adult males sharing the family house. During the first decade of the seventeenth century, Cardinal Girolamo Pamphilj was at the top of the family hierarchy as both its eldest male member and a cardinal. He divided the family casa with Pamphilio, who was the second-ranking member as the secular capofamiglia. Monsignor Pamphilj lived outside the family complex, in rental property in the Rione Regola, presumably because the family casa could not accommodate a third household. After Girolamo died in 1610, the monsignor returned to the Piazza Navona, where his brother remained, and two years later Olimpia Maidalchini joined them. It might have been this event that precipitated the legal division of the Pamphilj inheritance, over an apparent dispute in 1615. From the settlement came the first surviving plan of the Casa Pamphilj depicting its piano nobile (the main floor in an Italian palace that corresponds to the second floor in present-day American usage) (Figure 7). Giovanni Battista received two-thirds of the house: his property fronted the Piazza di Pasquino, with the larger of the two façades, and continued east up to and including the courtyard in the center. This façade was first depicted in Maggi’s map of 1625, but it is shown as being larger than the actual building, with seven bays rather than five (Figure 8). The monsignor must have moved into the quarters of his uncle, since Pamphilio already occupied the rooms he received, facing the Piazza Navona and continuing westward to, but not including, the court (see Figures 4, 7). Having been awarded only one-third of the house, Pamphilj also received 1,100 scudi. The property division must have been fairly amicable, since Pamphilio was allowed to build a corridor in his brother’s court to access the well, albeit at his own expense. Pamphilio, who was now at the top of the family hierarchy, occupied the most privileged area in the palace, distinguished for its view of the Piazza Navona; however, it seems inequitable that Pamphilio’s space was half the size of Giovanni Battista’s since he had a wife and was certainly hoping for offspring, while his brother was “only” a monsignor. The arrangement foreshadowed events to come.

Space was indeed a problem. Four years after dividing the family property, the Pamphilj brothers acted in apparent unison concerning housing strategies, perhaps motivated by the birth of Pamphilio and Olimpia’s first child. By 1619, if not before, Monsignor Pamphilj was renting the adjacent “old house” of the Teofili family so his brother could occupy the entire paternal house (see Figure 4). Monsignor Pamphilj’s intent was to remain in the Teofili property: the original contract was for nine years with the possibility to renew for another nine, and he had made a...
private pact to rent it for life, which gave him first priority on its purchase if it were put up for sale. But Monsignor Pamphilj did not enjoy his new quarters for long, since he spent most of the 1620s outside Rome as his career followed an upwardly mobile path. His first foreign assignment was as nunzio (ambassador) to Naples during the pontificate of Gregory XV (1621–23). Urban VIII recalled him and sent him as datary to France (1625) and in the legation of the cardinal nephew, Francesco Barberini, to Madrid (1626). In May 1626, Urban VIII appointed him to the difficult nunciature of Madrid, where he remained until 1630. These posts brought Monsignor Pamphilj greater prestige as well as income, and they offered him an informal cultural education, exposing him to a wide range of architecture, such as French châteaux and Spanish royal castles and gardens, and to erudite men such as Cassiano dal Pozzo, who traveled in the Barberini entourage.

Despite his absence, Monsignor Pamphilj maintained an attentive interest in his rented property. A letter from the monsignor to his brother, written in Madrid in 1629, indicates that the Teofili house was being decorated under Olimpia Maidalchini’s supervision: “The frieze in the sala of the Teofili has been checked . . . and Signora Olimpia has been the author of it.” The addition of paintings, as well as the rental contract and secret pact, suggest that Pamphilj hoped to expand his family’s presence in the ancestral neighborhood permanently. Surely this was on his mind as his election to the Sacred College—the apex of an ecclesiastical career—became assured. Pamphilj was retained in pec-

Figure 7 Stefano Pignatelli, Casa Pamphilj, piano nobile, 1615. The plan shows the two wings of the house: one at the corner of the Piazza Navona and the via di Parione (“Strada Traversale” in the plan), facing east; and the other facing west toward the Piazza di Pasquino. The court (“Cortile”) is at its center.

Figure 8 Maggi-Maupin-Losi, map of Rome, 1625, detail of the Piazza Navona and the Piazza di Pasquino. The façade of the Casa Pamphilj is on the left side of the Piazza di Pasquino.
in 1627, his nomination was published two years later, and he was awarded the cardinal’s hat upon his return to Rome in 1630.53 Now that the monsignor was a cardinal, building a palace commensurate with his newly elevated rank became imperative.

Prior to this moment, despite steady success in joining the gentiluomini romani and in reaching the second-highest tier of the ecclesiastical hierarchy (the Sacred College), the Pamphilj had not participated in the conspicuous consumption common among their peers. The Casa Pamphilj remained modest in size and appearance compared to the residences of other families of similar backgrounds (see Figures 4, 7). The history of the Lancellotti recalls that of the Pamphilj, from their arrival in the papal city in the fifteenth century to their integration into Roman society through marriage and the accumulation of property. The Lancellotti had chosen the via dei Coronari in the Rione Ponte, just to the north of the Piazza Navona, as their neighborhood. Unlike the Pamphilj, though, the Lancellotti marked the ascension of their first member to the Sacred College by building a palace. In 1591, Cardinal Scipione Lancellotti began to unite the properties owned by his family, along with an additional house that he had purchased, into a grand new building occupying the entire block (Figure 9). On his death in 1598, Cardinal Scipione Lancellotti left the unfinished building to his four nephews, who were ordered to live together in the completed palace; clearly, the cardinal understood the palace as an embodiment of the family and its elevated status.54

Maffeo Barberini (the future Pope Urban VIII), who was to become Giovanni Battista’s patron, acted similarly when he was awarded the cardinal’s hat in 1606. Between 1609 and 1612, he enlarged and remodeled his family’s “Casa Grande” on the via dei Giubbonari, where his brother Carlo, who was married with children, and their widowed mother also lived. Cardinal Barberini enlarged the property by incorporating a contiguous house and completely renovated the piano nobile to create a suitable setting for the reception of visitors. Adjacent to the old salone, a large anticamera was created by combining two existing rooms, a new chapel was built next to it, and six more rooms physically followed it. Walls were straightened and rooms were embellished with new stone doorframes and fireplaces. The apartment was meant for year-round use, as space restrictions did not allow for seasonal apartments. Cardinal Barberini also bought two small houses in the vicolo, or small alley, leading to the palace entrance, which were destroyed to create a piazzetta—a small forecourt—to the main portal. The ground floor and mezzanine were used for shops, palace services, and housing for servants. Even this extensive renovation might not have been enough to reflect adequately Cardinal Barberini’s status, as it was reported that he was interested in selling the old “Casa Grande” and moving elsewhere.55

Surely the Pamphilj were aware of the architectural endeavors of their peers and doubtless acutely so after Girolamo became a cardinal in 1604. But as far as we know, the first Cardinal Pamphilj did not attempt to express his rise in status through building, and the only evidence of Monsignor Giovanni Battista Pamphilj’s interest in the arts is the above-mentioned fresco frieze in the Teofili house. While it is possible that the Pamphilj were simply uninterested in patronage, a greater deterrent might have been a lack of financial means. Although the Pamphilj had successfully, albeit gradually, climbed Rome’s social ladder, their financial resources remained limited well into the seventeenth century. Mirka Beneš has determined that in 1615 their yearly income was approximately 1,000 to 1,500 scudi, which was commensurate with the annual revenue of a Roman gentleman of merchant origins and below that of the urban nobility to which they belonged.56 Even the poorest of urban nobles had an average annual income of about 5,000 scudi. After almost a century and a half of the right marriages and prestigious civic and, finally, religious careers, the family was relatively impoverished. Monsignor Pamphilj’s appointments of the 1620s brought him additional incomes but also generated greater expenses.57 Building a career in the Curia was costly; an ambassador required approximately 6,500 scudi annually to maintain an appropriate lifestyle, which included wearing the right clothes and hosting banquets. Revenues often did not match expenditures until he was made a cardinal, and Giovanni Battista
Pamphilj's wealth seems to have remained limited even at this level. His total annual income, which included an additional stipend as a "poor cardinal," probably amounted to only 7,000 to 8,000 scudi.58

While finances surely were a factor in preventing Pamphilj from becoming a great cardinal-patron, he did manage to mark his arrival in the Sacred College with two significant property purchases. In 1630, he bought a vineyard on the Janiculum Hill, and four years later he purchased the entire Teofili property in the Piazza Navona, consisting of the "old house" that he had been renting and the "large house," for 22,000 scudi (see Figures 3, 4).59 The mere purchase of these properties does not classify Cardinal Pamphilj as a patron, but the *misure e stime* (the piece-by-piece record of construction), which I have recovered, demonstrate that the cardinal did indeed build a noble palace between 1636 and 1638.60 Pamphilj hired the architect Peperelli to incorporate the Casa Pamphilj and the Teofili properties into a cohesive and impressive residence, in accordance with contemporary expectations.61 To meet the price of the property purchases and construction (which cost an additional 8,400 scudi), Cardinal Pamphilj likely received financial help from his sister-in-law, Olimpia Maidalchini, whose dowry of 25,000 scudi more than doubled the estimated worth of the Pamphilj.62 Having perceived that the family's potential rested with her brother-in-law, Olimpia Maidalchini used her intelligence and wealth to support and advance his career.63 In building and decorating a palace, Cardinal Pamphilj was acting similarly to many colleagues in the Sacred College, who used this form of conspicuous consumption to articulate an identity in the competitive world of the Roman court.

**Cardinal Pamphilj's Palace: Construction and Uses**

Necessity motivated the building of the Palazzo Pamphilj, as the family's ancestral home no longer met its practical or symbolic needs. Even before Monsignor Pamphilj's elevation to the Sacred College, the *casa* was small, and now it failed to conform to the expected architectural setting of a seventeenth-century cardinal: the exterior was nondescriptive and unimposing, the interior lacked representational spaces of entry, and the disposition of space did not conform to the standardized sequence of reception rooms (see Figure 7).64 Like other Roman families, such as the Lancellotti and Barberini, the Pamphilj solved their housing predicament through expansion, which allowed the brothers to remain together under the same roof.65 By doubling the living space, the Pamphilj were able to create an architectural setting that met the demands of Roman etiquette and aptly expressed their status. No contemporary drawings of Cardinal Pamphilj's palace survive, but I have reconstructed the building history and design based on several pieces of evidence: the *misure e stime*, the 1615 plan of the Pamphilj *casa*, plans for the palace's expansion after 1644, and the existing structure. The Palazzo Pamphilj featured a ground floor with three principal floors above, separated by two mezzanines (one between the ground floor and piano nobile and the other between the piano nobile and second floor) (Figures 10, 11; see Figures 21-24). While the interior spaces of this palace have largely survived, there is no contemporary record of its façade, which was remade in the later expansion.

Even though the Pamphilj property remained legally divided (following the 1615 settlement), it was treated as a single entity during the reconstruction: work occurred throughout the old and new properties, and a single cost was estimated.66 To accommodate the two households, the Palazzo Pamphilj was divided into two distinct quarters, facing the Piazza Navona and the Piazza di Pasquino—via dell'Anima just as the Casa Pamphilj had been previously. However, the changed status within the family—Cardinal Pamphilj had superseded his brother as the highest-ranking member—precipitated a redistribution of space in the new palace.67 Cardinal Pamphilj moved to the more privileged location facing the Piazza Navona, while Pamphiljo and Olimpia transferred to the opposite wing (see Figure 11).68 In designing the palace Peperelli maintained much of the existing structures, as was customary in early modern Italian building. His major interventions focused on the cardinal's wing, where the new entrances, large court, monumental stair, and new apartment were created, while only lesser changes, repairs, and new decoration were carried out in the rooms on the Piazza di Pasquino.

Not surprisingly, the Piazza Navona wing was renovated first. On the ground floor, Peperelli replaced the single, unobtrusive door of the Casa Pamphilj with two grand portals (compare Figures 7, 10). The southern entrance (room 16a in Figure 10), which replaced the former *vicolo* between the Pamphilj and Teofili properties, functioned as the service access, while the northern one (10.18) served as the ceremonial entrance to the palace.69 The customary sequence of spaces followed the northern portal. The cross-vaulted entrance corridor (10.18) replaced a former shop on the site, while the cross-vaulted loggia (10.19) took the place of some existing rooms and a smaller loggia.70 The loggia flanked the ample new court (14 x 15.6 m), which was carved out of existing rooms, a smaller court, and an open area around the well.71 Since the fifteenth century,
courts had served a representational function, meant to impress visitors entering the palace, but in the seventeenth century they also fulfilled the practical need for an area for the ubiquitous coaches to enter and turn to exit. The east and west façades of the Pamphilj court featured three-bay arcades supported by pilasters of superimposed orders—Doric on the ground floor and Ionic on the piano nobile—with the Pamphilj dove placed in the spandrels of the arches (Figure 12). On the east (entrance) façade the superimposed loggias were open, while on the west they were enclosed. The ground floor on this side housed the new entrance leading to the via dell'Anima (10.4b) and the rimesse (10.4a, 10.5), which were used to store carriages. The south façade of the court was not articulated with orders, while the north wall was not mentioned at all, presumably because it belonged to the neighboring Casa de’ Rossi.

The monumental stair was constructed in the south-east corner of the court, to the left of the entrance, with a beveled arch marking its entry (10.20; Figure 13). This feature was lacking in the Pamphilj casa but was of course mandatory in the cardinal’s palace as an appropriate entrance to the apartment. The recess in its ground floor landing (to the right of the entrance) was equipped with benches to serve as a waiting area for visitors (Figure 14), representing a seventeenth-century solution to the external benches that girdled Renaissance palaces, such as the Palazzo Farnese. The landings were covered with sail-vaults and cross-vaults, and the flights with barrel vaults, all supported by Doric pilasters. The new stair ascended to the top floor of the palace, yet expensive slabs of travertine were only used for the flight leading to the piano nobile.

As was typical in the work of Peperelli, the architectural form of the entrance corridor, loggia, court, and stair was characterized by restraint and linearity, featuring pilasters rather than columns, a preference for the Doric order,
Peperelli’s reliance on the Palazzo Mattei might have been partially motivated by the Pamphilj’s association with this family, yet it also points to a connection between Peperelli and Maderno, which has not yet been considered. Contemporary sources do not record the training of Peperelli, who was born in Rome around 1585, but the frequent confusion between his works and those of Girolamo Rainaldi (1570–1655), who was trained in the workshop of Domenico Fontana, has been used to suggest a similar formation. Although Peperelli could not have trained with Fontana, because he was only eleven years old when Fontana left Rome in 1596, he could have trained with...
Clockwise from upper left:

**Figure 12** Francesco Peperelli, Palazzo Pamphilj, Rome, 1634–38, detail of the east façade of the new court

**Figure 13** Peperelli, Palazzo Pamphilj, detail of the entrance to the main stair (Figure 10, room 20)

**Figure 14** Peperelli, Palazzo Pamphilj, detail of the waiting area in the main stair (Figure 10, room 20)
Fontana’s nephew, Maderno, who took over his architectural practice. It was shortly after this transition that Peperelli must have begun his training. The new attribution of the Palazzo Pamphilj to Peperelli and its reliance on Maderno’s palace design suggest that Peperelli was educated in Maderno’s workshop. Beyond a formal relationship, the patronage of the architects further supports this connection, as families tended to hire architectural firms: between 1620 and 1622 Peperelli worked for Maderno’s patrons, the Mattei, on their villa, and he finished the Palazzo Santacroce, which the elder architect had begun.

At the Palazzo Pamphilj, Peperelli designed an apartment for Cardinal Pamphilj on the piano nobile that was suitable to his newly elevated position in the Roman court. Its design conformed to the standardized sequence of spaces that accorded with the etiquette of the Roman court as outlined in conduct books. The architectural setting served as a guide in navigating one of the major rituals at court, that of the visit: a guest was met by a gentleman attendant and then by the host at a point commensurate with the respective ranks of host and guest. From the new salone of the Palazzo Pamphilj, the visitor entered an open loggia directly below, it was more elaborate, as was appropriate to a piano nobile: columns flanked its piers, and stucco decoration (volutes with “pods” holding the Pamphilj dove) embellished the bases of the vault arches, neither of which remains today. From here, the visitor entered the customary sala dei palafrenieri, or waiting room (11.18). To build this ample chamber (15.14 x 7.76 m), existing rooms in the Teofili casa were dismantled, and two floors were united to make a two-storied salone like those in the Palazzo Farnese and the Palazzo Borghese. The Pamphilj sala dei palafrenieri was well illuminated: two windows opened to the adjacent loggia, providing light from the west, while on the opposite side facing the piazza, three existing windows were enlarged, a balcony door was opened in the space of a fourth window, and four mezzanine windows were made above them. Appropriate to its function as the first representational space, the sala dei palafrenieri was enhanced with a painted frieze, but little is known of its imagery other than the bees on five plaques above the paintings. The inclusion...
Figure 17 Elevation drawing of the vicolo between the Pamphilj and Teofili properties, 1612, showing Casa Pamphilj (left) and Palazzo Teofili (right).

of this Barberini symbol surely represented Cardinal Pamphilj’s tribute to his patron Urban VIII. Here the cardinal became personally involved in the work when he ordered the painters to redo two panels, which he ostensibly deemed unsatisfactory.

Relatively few major structural changes were required to form the remaining rooms facing the Piazza Navona (compare Figures 7, 11). A dividing wall was built to separate the sala dei palafrenieri (11.18) from room 11.17, and the next room, 11.16, was created by incorporating a room in the Teofili house with the vicolo between the two properties. The exterior walls of the Casa Pamphilj had to be raised to meet the height of the Teofili property. The discrepancy in height is evident in the drawing from 1612 that depicts their respective façades facing the vicolo (Figure 17). The height of rooms 11.15–11.17 was increased to a nearly uniform 5.59 meters. Other than these structural changes, existing walls were merely repaired, replaced, aligned, and covered with new plaster as necessary. Uniformity was imparted to the apartment by enlarging the existing windows to match the new façade design and by opening a balcony door in 11.16 (in the space of the former vicolo) to balance the balcony in 11.18. Furthermore, the doors connecting the rooms were enlarged and aligned, creating an uninterrupted sight line from 11.14 to 11.18, a much desired feature in noble apartments. The uninterrupted vista was enhanced by an illusionistic trick: in the north wall of the sala dei palafrenieri (11.18), a fictive door was built at the property border of the palace to suggest that space extended farther than it actually did, creating an effect similar to that of the beveled arch at the entrance to the stair. Such perspectival devices continued to be employed in palace design throughout the seventeenth century, as in the gallery at the Palazzo Borghese by Carlo Rainaldi (1671).
Following the sala dei palafrenieri were the minimum number of anticamer (anterooms) required of a noble apartment (11.17, 11.16), which were embellished with pavements of patterned red and white bricks and painted friezes.94 In the first anticamera (11.17), an elaborate stucco frame—two sphinxes and a shell in low relief above each scene, and a vase in each corner of the room—enclosed twelve painted scenes.95 The stucco sphinxes have not survived, but the painted panels of the frieze have. Although these were described as “landscape paintings,” they are seascapes, which have been attributed to Agostino Tassi (Figure 18). Cardinal Pamphilj seems to have been on the cutting edge of domestic decoration: his artist was sought after for his skills as a decorative painter, and the theme of seascapes became popular around this time.96 In the second anticamera (11.16) a stucco frame was made around the “four paintings, or histories,” which accord with the present scenes illustrating the story of Moses (Figure 19).97 Patrizia Cavazzini has linked this room to the one mentioned in a lawsuit, dated July 1635, which recorded the presence of the painters Angelo Caroselli, Francesco Lauri, Antonio Pastore, and Agostino Tassi at work in a room in the Pamphilj palace, thereby dating these paintings to before July 1635.98 While Cavazzini’s attribution of the frieze is convincing, the dates of the misure e stime imply that the room was constructed later, at some point between 1636 and 1638. Given the contradictory evidence, the issue cannot be resolved with certainty. Cardinal Pamphilj again expressed his interest in the decoration: while checking the work in one anticamera (11.17), he ordered the painter to retouch the putti in the frieze, and in the other (11.16) he ordered the gilder to return to work on the ceiling.

The chapel was placed—in its expected position off the anteroom—in a space that was mostly preexisting (Figure 20; 11.21).99 In the apartments of cardinals and other noblepersons, provisions were made so that the occupant could hear Mass in seclusion, either in an oratory designated for this purpose or an adjacent room. For instance, in Cardinal Francesco Barberini’s apartment at the Palazzo Barberini alle Quattro Fontana (b. 1632), a grate connected his chapel to an anticamera, which served as his oratory during Masses.100 At the Palazzo Pamphilj, two rooms—11.16 and 11.22—communicated with the chapel through small grated openings. Since members of the household normally gath-
Figure 20 Peperelli, Palazzo Pamphilj, detail of the chapel vault (Figure 11, room 21)

Figure 21 Author’s reconstruction, Palazzo Pamphilj, 1634–38, second mezzanine between piano nobile and second floor
ened in an anteroom to hear Mass, they probably used room 11.16, while room 11.22, with an image of the Madonna above its door, likely served as the cardinal’s oratory. Presumably Pamphilio and Olimpia Maidalchini came to hear Mass, too, as it is unlikely that their apartments included chapels (barring special circumstances, only kings, cardinals, bishops, and regular prelates were awarded the privilege). Pamphilio could have met his brother in room 11.22, at least on occasion, since a corridor connected it to one of his rooms (11.9). Olimpia and her attendants could have listened from the “stanzino pensole [sic],” the small, low mezzanine room, above the corridor at the end of the chapel (room 21 in Figure 21), which was accessible, via a room on the second floor (room 22 in Figure 22), from the quarters of the women attendants in the Piazza di Pasquino wing. This arrangement would have kept the women appropriately separated from the men, as the genders occupied strictly segregated spaces in Roman palaces.

On the piano nobile, the linear sequence of rooms was interrupted by the location of the cardinal’s sala dell’audienza, or audience room, where the visit took place. One would expect the audience room to follow the second anteroom along the Piazza Navona, which would have placed it in 11.15; instead, the new sala dell’audienza (11.23) was made by incorporating several preexisting spaces to the west of the enfilade. The result was a much larger, and therefore more appropriate, chamber than the preexisting room facing the Piazza Navona. A passageway at the end of the

Figure 22 Author’s reconstruction, Palazzo Pamphilj, 1634–38, second floor
chapel connected the second anticamera to the audience room. As Waddy has aptly shown, flexibility and adaptation characterized palace design, and this particular type of arrangement was not unprecedented. In Prince Marcantonio’s apartment in the Palazzo Borghese (ca. 1620), the chapel was situated within the linear sequence of rooms, which meant that it had to be traversed to reach the reception rooms that followed. To maintain its sanctity despite the traffic, a passageway was made using a wooden screen, much like the partition wall built at the Palazzo Pamphilj. Cardinal Pamphilj’s sala dell’audienza was treated appropriately to its function: it was embellished with a new painted frieze (which has since disappeared) and marble doorframes. A portiera, or door hanging, was installed at its entrance, which would be lowered to maintain privacy during the visits of high-ranking persons. At the end of the meeting, Cardinal Pamphilj would have subtly signaled his attendant to raise the portiera so that he could accompany his guest out of the apartment, to a point commensurate with their respective ranks.

As was customary, the sala dell’audienza marked the end of the suite of ceremonial rooms of the cardinal’s apartment, and those beyond served as his private space. From the audience room, the sequence shifted back to the Piazza Navona enfilade, where the bedroom (11.15) was contiguous to the second anteroom (11.16). A new stucco frieze was made, and Cardinal Pamphilj, attentive even to seemingly minute details, ordered that its frame be raised. The frieze (still extant) was painted with scenes from the life of Joseph, which were originally attributed to Giacinto Gimignani, but more recently Herman van Swanevelt has been proposed as their author. The well-situated bedroom communicated with the surrounding spaces, offering the cardinal ease of movement. On the piano nobile, it connected to the second anticamera (11.16) and the audience room (11.23). Stairs were built to reach the floors above and below: contiguous to its west wall was a “secret stair” that ascended to the cardinal’s study above (22.14), and below this stair was a “small stair,” joining the “old stairs of the Casa Panfilia,” which let the cardinal enter and exit the palace without being observed (see Figure 10). The final room of the enfilade, the so-called quarta stanza, or fourth room (11.14), functioned as the cardinal’s service room and, therefore, did not receive painted embellishment or a new brick floor, unlike the preceding rooms.

At a right angle to the Piazza Navona rooms was a series of three spaces facing the narrow via di Pasquino (11.11–11.13). These rooms also seem to have been at the cardinal’s disposal since a door was opened between his audience room (11.23) and 11.13, but their use was not specified in the building documents. Given their position beyond the audience room, they were not involved in the ceremony of official visits but could have served as additional personal space for the cardinal. It was not uncommon to find such a grouping next to the bedroom, as was evident in all three noble apartments of the Palazzo Barberini.

Comfort played a role in the design of palaces. Strategies for climate control included the orientation of rooms with respect to the sun, appartamenti doppii (two contiguous rows of rooms, with the insulated, inner apartment occupied in cool weather), and fireplaces. To control the amount of sunlight received, rooms were positioned according to the compass: east for spring and fall (and sometimes summer), north for summer, and south (and possibly west) for winter. Like the “Casa Grande” of Cardinal Maffeo Barberini, the Palazzo Pamphilj did not have the luxury of two apartments for a single occupant. However, most of the rooms in Cardinal Pamphilj’s apartment faced east, toward the Piazza Navona, so they were comfortable during the majority of the year. In the winter months, he could have used room 11.13 rather than 11.15 as a bedroom, since its southern orientation should have made it warmer. Like seasonal apartments, the double-apartment plan was also unfeasible due to the limited space in the Palazzo Pamphilj. Instead, climatic comfort primarily depended on the new fireplaces installed in all rooms along the Piazza Navona. The one in the sala dei palafrenieri was especially ornate but also a work of economy: the stones from an old fireplace in the Teofili house were reused as the frame, which was adorned with the Pamphilj coat-of-arms and stucco decoration of vases surrounded by fruits and grain.

The other half of the palace, or the “Palazzo di Pasquino,” belonged to Pamphilio and Olimpia. In the grander palaces of the period, such as the Palazzo Barberini alle Quattro Fontane, the apartments of husband and wife typically paralleled one another or rested one above the other. However, such a luxurious arrangement was not possible at the more modest Palazzo Pamphilj. Here, the piano nobile of the “Palazzo di Pasquino” was divided into rough halves, the southern one for Olimpia and the northern one for Pamphilio (see Figure 11). In accordance with the family hierarchy, their apartments were more humble in size and appearance than Cardinal Pamphilj’s. Moreover, they did not conform to the linear sequence of squared rooms that characterized aristocratic apartments and instead featured clusters of irregularly shaped rooms reflecting the preexisting matrix of walls. Such irregularity also characterized the casa of Giacinto Del Bufalo, who was a member of the untitled urban nobility. In the 1650s, Del Bufalo
undertook the renovation of his house in the via di Pietra: five rooms were added, and at least eight rooms were decorated with new painted friezes. While the casa of this gentiluomo romano featured comfortable, multiroom apartments, the rooms were probably not arranged in the linear sequence found in the apartments of cardinals or other higher-ranking persons.

The location of Olimpia’s and Pamphilio’s apartments in respect to one another offers further insight into the family hierarchy. Corroborating the conclusion of Olimpia’s biographer that she played a more prominent role than her husband, the “apartment of the signora” was adjacent to the main stair of the Piazza di Pasquino side. Room 11.1, the “old sala toward Pasquino,” was originally decorated with a painted frieze (no longer extant) appropriate to its function. The sala was followed by an anticamera (11.2a) and the “saletta of the apartment of the signora” (11.2b). Room 11.6, also identified as a “sala,” communicated with the “hanging” garden (11.24), which rested on the roof of the room below and was open to the sky above. Gardens were commonly found in the quarters of female occupants since they required greater leisure space, but at the Palazzo Pamphilj it seems that the cardinal and Pamphilio also had access to the “hanging” garden, since their rooms 11.23 and 11.9, respectively, communicated with it. The final room in Olimpia’s suite (11.7) can be identified as “the old chapel,” with presumably no longer functioning as consecrated space.

The other rooms on this side of the palace formed “the apartment toward the Piazza di Pasquino and toward the street, which goes to Anima.” The description of room 11.3 as the “stanzia [sic] of Sig[nor] Panfilio” securely identified the apartment’s occupant. Other than the great efforts expended to rebuild the wall facing the new court, work here was limited to repairs and refurbishment. The well-lit rooms facing the court, the “Salotto or Stanza grande” (11.4) and the “Stanza . . . next to the Casa dei Rossi” (11.5), featured painted friezes and window jambs, implying an important function for these rooms. The frieze in room 11.5 was new, while the one in room 11.4 was “retouched” on three sides and new only on the fourth; perhaps this was the decoration added by the Pamphilj in the 1620s discussed above. The use of room 11.8, described as the stanza “where the harpies frieze is,” was not clear since it was included in a different section of the misure e stime, but it might have belonged to Pamphilj since the contiguous room 11.9 was identified as the “stanzetta del Sig[nor] Panfilio.” As was typical of the apartments of husband and wife, Pamphilj’s and Olimpia’s apartments communicated with one another; doors connected room 11.2b to 11.3, as well as 11.7 to 11.8 and 11.9.

In the seventeenth century, the grandest palaces of papal families housed few servants within their walls, but the palaces of the lesser nobility made space for the famiglia (household staff) in the mezzanines and upper floors. At the Palazzo Pamphilj, the upper floors were divided into two distinct “palaces” in the same manner as the piano nobile (Figure 23; see Figure 22). In the 1630s, Cardinal Pamphilj’s famiglia included about twenty-five people, a modest size compared to those of his wealthier counterparts; for instance, just before Cardinal Maffeo Barberini was elected to the papacy, his famiglia, considered moderate in size, comprised forty-six persons. Cardinal Pamphilj’s maestro di camera, who headed the household hierarchy and whose job was to attend to the needs of the cardinal, lived on the floor above his master’s apartment, in either room 16 or 17 in Figure 22, and must have used the “secret stair” between rooms 15 and 23 to reach the cardinal’s rooms, as such ease of access was recommended in the etiquette handbooks. The coppiero (cupbearer), who oversaw the work of the wine steward, occupied either 22.16 or 22.17. The cardinal’s auditor, responsible for financial matters, resided in both 22.13 and the apartment above the audience room (22.23), divided into a saletta, camera, and latrine, which was accessed through the spiral stair in the southeastern corner of the old court. The third floor housed the cardinal’s secretary, perhaps in room 17 in Figure 23, as well as the guardaroba (storage room for personal and household goods, 23.18), which was in its recommended position at the top of the house, adjacent to a loggia.

In the 1630s, Pamphilj and Olimpia’s famiglia included an average of fifteen persons. The top floor of the “Palazzo di Pasquino” housed one of Pamphilj’s attendants and someone named Don Gironimo, who was presumably another household member, in either rooms 23.2a and 23.2b, or 23.2b and 23.3. The small stair between room 23.4 on the third floor and 22.4 on the second floor suggests that these and the contiguous rooms (23.5 and 22.5) belonged to Pamphilj’s attendants or Pamphilj himself, who had the rooms below them on the piano nobile. Women attendants normally lived in an isolated part of the palace (not uncommonly a mezzanine), apart from their male counterparts but close to their mistress’s apartment. The floor below Don Gironimo’s room, called a mezzanine on this side of the palace, housed the women attendants (probably room 3 in Figure 22), and a small stair in this area seems to have connected their rooms to Olimpia’s apartment below. The identification is confirmed by Olimpia’s involvement in the renovation of the rooms in this area: she ordered a new brick floor for room 22.8. A rota (turnbox) was made in the upper wall of room 11.10 so that the women could
Figure 23  Author's reconstruction, Palazzo Pamphilj, 1634–38, third floor
Figure 24 Author’s reconstruction, Palazzo Pamphilj, 1634–38, first mezzanine, between ground floor and piano nobile
receive food and supplies without contact from the outside world, a required feature of women’s apartments. In addition to the servants, the upper floors must have housed the couple’s three children (aged fifteen, twelve, and five in 1634) whose quarters, however, were not recorded.

The floors below the piano nobile functioned as service and commercial space except for the ceremonial spaces of the new entrance, court, and monumental stair discussed above. Normally, each household within a palace was equipped with its own set of services, but at the Palazzo Pamphilj the cardinal and his brother seem to have shared them. Existing rooms in the mezzanine between the ground floor and the piano nobile were converted into service spaces related to the daily life of the palace. The credenza (butler’s pantry) occupied rooms 8 and 10 in Figure 24, and the bottiglieria (wine steward’s room) was located in room 24.9. Existing doors between these spaces and the surrounding mezzanine spaces were sealed off to secure the contents of the rooms, which were normally kept under lock and key. To prepare the cardinal’s table, the butler and wine steward presumably exited their rooms through the doors to the main stair, which they used to reach the piano nobile. The dispensa (24.23), the dispensing storeroom to which supplies arrived and from which they were distributed, was also located in this mezzanine nearby.

The ground floor housed additional services. In contrast to the ample new court at the northern end of the Palazzo Pamphilj, the “old court” of the former Casa Pamphilj, at its southern end, served as work space (see Figure 10). In the basement surrounding the court were cellars, such as the one for the hens, and storage rooms for items like grain. The small kitchen in the former Casa Pamphilj was replaced with a new one (10.15 and 10.22, respectively); extensive work was undertaken to transform the former stable on the site into a kitchen with all the necessary accoutrements: the counters, food warmer, stove, hearth, fireplace, and rinsing sink. The new kitchen was conveniently located next to the service court so that supplies could be delivered easily, and running water was readily available. The kitchen was also appropriately removed from the cardinal’s reception rooms so that the heat and smells produced would not disturb him. Food could have been carried from the kitchen (10.22) to his apartment through two possible routes: the first via the main stair (10.20), which communicated with the kitchen through a door in the ground floor landing, and the second by means of a service stair in the palace’s southeast corner that led to a bedroom on the piano nobile (11.15). Although the etiquette handbooks recommended separate kitchens for each principal resident and for each famiglia, the Palazzo Pamphilj appears to have had only a single kitchen, indicating that space remained at a premium despite the palace’s expansion; however, it was equipped with the suggested small dining hall for the household staff.

The other key feature of the ground floor, which had characterized Roman houses since antiquity, was the bottega, or income-producing shops, lining both façades, on the Piazza Navona and the Piazza di Pasquino–via dell’Anima. Most were existing spaces, already used as shops, which required only general repairs and added conveniences like toilets and fireplaces. However, some major changes were carried out: one shop was converted into the new ceremonial entrance (10.18), while the contiguous old entrance of the Teofili property became the shop of the fruit seller (10.18a). In addition, the former entrance of the Casa Pamphilj (10.15a) was converted into the “small shop” of the flax maker, who also rented the adjacent “large shop” (10.15b). The professions of the renters demonstrate the diversity of the commerce in the area: along with those already mentioned, the shops on the Piazza Navona housed a leather-goods seller (10.18b), barber (10.17b and possibly 10.17a), and ostelia (10.16b and possibly 10.17a). The “Shops behind the Palace” along the Piazza di Pasquino–via dell’Anima housed a grocer (10.1), tailor (10.2a), barber (10.2b), and lute maker (probably 10.8).

The Façade on the Piazza Navona: Announcing the Pamphilj’s Arrival

As we have seen, the interior spaces of Cardinal Pamphilj’s palace conformed to contemporary expectations of appearance and use, at last giving visual expression to his family’s position among the Roman elite. Seen by approaching visitors, as well as passersby who would never enter the palace, the palace façade served as one of the most obvious and lasting forms of articulating identity in the early modern period. The Pamphilj’s construction of a prominent and cohesively designed façade on the Piazza Navona signaled a culminating moment in their family history after over a century and a half of gradually carving out a presence in the cityscape. For Giovanni Battista Pamphilj, it also underscored his personal determination and interest in engaging in conspicuous consumption, specifically architecture, as a means of self-representation.

We have no accurate depiction of the façade of Cardinal Pamphilj’s palace, designed by Peperelli, but it can be reconstructed using the building documents, which recorded extensive work on the façade of the united palace, joining the two façades of the two houses of the Teofili and Panfilij. First, the walls of the Casa Pamphilj had to be raised to reach the height of the Teofili house, and the cor-
nices of both properties were united. Its fenestration reflected the preexisting system of windows in both properties; where necessary, the windows were adjusted, enlarged, and aligned, often reusing the old blocks of stone, to create a unified appearance. Peperelli’s design for the façade followed the tradition established by Antonio da Sangallo: the disposition of windows in the twelve bays formed the principal articulation, travertine dados separated the four floors, and ashlar pilasters marked the corners. On the ground floor, the two new portoni, or large portals, were installed in bays four and ten (10.16a and 10.18). The Pamphilj coat-of-arms was placed in the architrave of the northern portone, distinguishing it as the ceremonial entrance. The result was an asymmetrical façade, which was not highly desirable but can be explained as a response to the exigencies of the site. The location of the southern entrance, on the site of the old vicolo, was probably chosen to minimize reconstruction; it was already an open space, and the new entrance maintained its width. The location of the northern entrance was determined by the position of the new court. Since the Renaissance, the ideal palace plan dictated that the portone and androne intersect the court symmetrically, as was followed in the Lancellotti and Mattei palaces discussed above. On the piano nobile of the Palazzo Pamphilj, doors with balconies were installed above the portoni, replacing the existing windows. The other ten bays were filled with windows whose decoration of a vegetal swag motif with flanking volutes mimicked the niches in the scalone (see Figure 14). On the second floor and the mezzanine above it, simple stone blocks framed the rectangular and square windows, respectively.

The wall surfaces of the façade were united using a preparatory layer of lime impasto (arriccio) and then a final layer of “colla granita, e riccia [applied] with the brush without grains.” In some entries of the building documents, this finish was described as “imbiancato ricco” or “il bianco riccio,” suggesting a white-toned surface. Colla granita (also called colla brodata, colla genovese, and granitura) likely referred to the particular type of substance, consisting of lime and relatively large grains of sand in a highly fluid base. It resulted in a scabrous surface, which reflected vibrantly under different light effects and created the appearance of shimmering movement on a solid wall surface, simulating travertine or marble veneer. The “color of travertine” was applied to the parts made of stone, such as the window frames and the dados, and a “stucco of marble dust” was put on the cornice. These substances made from the powder of stones were meant to simulate them. Thus, we can imagine the Palazzo Pamphilj’s façade as a white-toned surface that imitated a monolithic work in stone, recalling such grandiose palaces as the late-fifteenth-century Palazzo Cancelleria but without the expense of a travertine veneer.

Despite the lack of contemporary depictions of the Palazzo Pamphilj, which was completed in 1638, we can surmise that its new façade attracted the attention of passersby in the Piazza Navona and was understood as the public face, or embodiment, of those housed within. While the coat-of-arms above the main portal unmistakably announced the owner’s identity, as it did on almost all Roman palaces, locals would have known even without it to whom the palace belonged, as the family had lived in the neighborhood for over one hundred and fifty years. Since the late fifteenth century in Rome, the palace façade had served as a means of expressing identity; for a façade to speak, it had to be seen, and preferably from afar. We have already noted how earlier in the century Cardinal Maffeo Barberini sought to carve out a piazzetta in front of his palace, whose entrance was tucked in a narrow alley. Cardinal Pamphilj was much more fortunate: situated on one of the largest open spaces in the densely built center of the city, his palace enjoyed optimal visibility.

In commissioning a palace as a form of self-representation, Cardinal Pamphilj had numerous examples to emulate, but the Palazzo Mattei, the Palazzo Lancellotti ai Coronari, and the Palazzo Santacroce ai Catinari were especially relevant. The latter two were recently built for cardinals of similar status and, while grand, were moderate in size compared to the palaces of papal families. Beyond the similarities between the Lancellotti and Pamphilj families and their palaces noted above, the façades of the palaces were also similar, both relying on the Sangallo type (see Figure 9). However, the Pamphilj façade was less severe, enlivened by the decorative work of the piano nobile windows. The Palazzo Santacroce also relied on Sangallo’s design and like the Palazzo Pamphilj was embellished with stucco decoration above its windows, in fact, the same vegetal swag motif with flanking volutes (Figure 25). The resemblance is not surprising since Peperelli also designed the Palazzo Santacroce, which was built for Cardinal Antonio Santacroce and his family between 1630 and 1640. Santacroce and Pamphilj were colleagues in the Sacred College, having been made cardinals only a year apart. Both men reacted similarly to their elevated position by expanding and rebuilding the family palace, demonstrating the primary role of architecture in communicating identity. Furthermore, they hired the same architect, who had also been commissioned for other palaces like the Del Bufalo, suggesting that Peperelli was a favored palace designer among this social milieu. The connections between Pam-
philj and Santacroce, and their palaces, help to clarify our understanding of palace design among cardinals in early-seventeenth-century Rome.

Since the late fifteenth century, the Pamphilj had striven to integrate themselves into Roman society and to articulate their identity through building; these ambitions were at last fulfilled in the person of Cardinal Giovanni Battista. By participating in the conspicuous consumption practiced by his peers, specifically by building an urban palace, Pamphilj joined the rank of cardinal-patrons and even outshone some of them. The Palazzo Pamphilj boasted a façade that was conventional yet fashionable and a handsome interior that conformed to the expected architectural setting of a cardinal. It was situated in one of the most desirable locations in seventeenth-century Rome. Not only did Cardinal Pamphilj commission a palace, but he was also an active patron who demonstrated great interest in the details of building and decoration. After his election to the papacy, Pamphilj’s enthusiasm for architecture flourished. As Innocent X he was to exploit the potential of building to perpetuate his family name (see Figure 1), but this is yet another story.169
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Measurements: 1 palmo = .2234 m. I have converted palmi to meters in the text but retain the measurements as recorded in the building documents in the notes. All translations are my own.

1. My definition of conspicuous consumption is based on Richard Goldthwaite, Wealth and the Demand for Art in Italy 1300–1600 (Baltimore and London, 1993), esp. 176–224, who studied the development of this new consumption model and its social meanings, and Peter Burke, The Historical Anthropology of Early Modern Italy (Cambridge, England, 1987), ch. 10, who studied the competitive nature of expenditure in seventeenth-century Italy, based on the model of sociologists beginning with Veblen in 1899. 2. Goldthwaite, Wealth and the Demand for Art, 204–10. Burke, Historical Anthropology, 133–34. For another important study on magnificence, which considers its development in the Northern Italian courts, see L. Green,


4. Burke, Historical Anthropology, ch. 10. Conspicuous expenditure did occasionally meet with resistance but society at large generally supported it.

5. Leone, “The Palazzo Pamphilj,” chs. 4, 5. See n. 6 below for further bibliography.


8. Torgil Magnusson, Rome in the Age of Bernini, vol. 2, From the Election of Innocent X to the Death of Innocent XI (New Jersey, 1986), 31; Haskell, Patrons and Painters, ch. 6, offered a similar view.

9. Sarah McPhee, Bernini and the Bell Towers: Architecture and Politics at the Vatican (New Haven and London, 2002). Based on archival evidence, McPhee also demonstrated Innocent X’s involvement in the architectural projects at the fief of S. Martino al Cimino (92–94). Emphasizing the connection between art and power, the essays in Alessandro Zuccari and Stefania Macioce, eds., Innocenzo X Pamphilj. Arte e potere a Roma nell’età barocca (Rome, 1990), made an important contribution to our understanding of Pamphilj’s patronage and contributions to the Pamphilj family’s role in patronage as well as to the Pamphilj’s property document purchasers in the middle of the 16th century.

10. Benedetta Borello, “Strategie di insediamento in città. I Pamphilj a Roma nel primo Cinquecento,” in Maria Antonietta Visceglia, ed., La nobiltà romana in età moderna (Rome, 2001), 43: Antonio had worked in the Camera Apostolica since 1445 but did not settle permanently in Rome until 1470. Borello’s discussion of the Pamphilj family’s integration into Roman society through marriage was preceded by Beneš, “Villa Pamphilj,” ch. 1, who wrote a thorough account of the Pamphilj family history tracing their integration into Roman society through land ownership, marriage, and civic office. On the family’s origins, see Teodoro Amedyden, Manoscritti delle famiglie romane nobili, 6 vols. (Rome, 1568–1656) was a Flemish lawyer who had transferred to Rome; his history of Roman noble families has been published as Carlo A. Bertini, ed., La storia delle famiglie romane, 2 vols. (Rome, 1910). Regarding his relation with the Pamphilj, see Beneš, “Villa Pamphilj,” 23–24; and Donata Chiomonti Vassalli, Donna Olimpia o del nepotismo nel Settecento. Storia e documenti 31 (Milan, 1979), 214–20.


13. Nussdorfer, Civic Politics in the Rome of Urban VIII, ch. 6, on the urban nobility; and Renata Ago, Carriere e clientele nella Roma barocca (Rome and Bari, 1990), 35–38, on marriage as a means of integrating into Roman society and the maternal lineage as an important social tie.

14. Beneš, “Villa Pamphilj,” ch. 1, recorded the Pamphilj’s property purchases but did not reconstruct their boundaries.

15. The change in terminology from Campo d’Agone to Piazza Navona occurred gradually around 1500.

16. The house was bought from Melchiorre Antonio Meritoni for 700 gold ducats. This purchase and the subsequent ones were cited in Luigi De Gregori, “Piazza Navona prima d’Innocenzo X,” Roma 4 (1926), 111–12; Pietro Romano and P. Partini, Piazza Navona nella storia e nell’arte (Rome, 1947), 49; and Beneš, “Villa Pamphilj,” 33, 36–37, 59 n. 33, 60 n. 37, who published the collocation of the property documents: Scaff. 88, b. 33, int. 1, Archivio Doria Pamphilj, Rome (hereafter, for example, ADP 88.33.1).

17. See n. 16. The properties included the house of Marco Niccola di Pietro Matteucci (380 gold ducats), 1471; the house of Alessandro di Giuliano del Montino de Luzij and the dello Specchi women (90 gold ducats), 1472; two houses owned by S. Maria in Vallicella (450 gold ducats), whose sale occurred gradually around 1500. The property of Mastro Lorenzo Egidi (600 gold ducats). In the 1470s, the average value of property in the Rione Parione was 350 to 400 gold ducats; Esposti, “Il rione Parione durante il Pontificato Sisto,” 712.


19. On this generation, see Beneš, “Villa Pamphilj,” 44–66. Pamphilj (Angelo Benedetto’s son) married Orazia Mattei in 1530 and held government office in 1532, 1548, 1554, and 1559. He bought two properties in the Rione Parione: two-fifths of a house belonging to Antonina Colagioianni (1530) and the property of Mastro Lorenzi Egidi (600 gold ducats). In the 1470s, the average value of properties in the Rione Parione was 350 to 400 gold ducats; Esposti, “Il rione Parione durante il Pontificato Sisto,” 712.
of the Colagiovanni property did not include the Pamphilj property and those of the Palmieri property were not listed in the 1527 document.

20. The registers of the “Taxae viarum” of 1535, 1548, and 1554 recorded the Pamphilj property as the “house in the corner.” De Gregori, “Piazza Navona prima d’Innocenzo X,” 112 n. 76.


22. Nussdorfer, Civic Politico, 66–69, 71–74 (see n. 11). Only members of the Roman People, “a vague but privileged body,” were able to serve in the civic government. Nussdorfer estimated that this group constituted 10 to 12 percent of the adult laymen in the 1580s. Conservators were elected three at a time for three-month terms.


25. In his Il maestro di camera di nuovo ricorretto secondo il Ceremoniale Romano del Popolo Romano (Venice, 1660), Francesco Sestini da Bibbiena commenced with a lengthy discussion of a cardinal’s clothing and followed with a precise description of the ritual of the visit at the Roman court, outlining the actions and movements of the visitor and the host. Similar treatises on the Roman court include Cesare Evitascandalo, Il maestro di casa, 2nd ed. (Viterbo, 1620); Francesco Liberati, Il perfetto maestro di casa (Rome, 1658); and Gregorio Leti, Relazione della corte di Roma (Padua, 1650).

26. Burke, Historical Anthropology, ch. 10 (see n. 1). David S. Chambers, “The Economic Predicament of Renaissance Cardinals,” Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History 3 (1966), 287–313, made the same point for Renaissance cardinals, and demonstrated that their incomes often did not meet the expenses required by such display.


30. The point was also made by Burke, Historical Anthropology, 135–36; as an example, he cited the Montanari family in Vicenza, which was admitted into the nobility in 1687 shortly after building a grand palace.

31. Beneš, “Villa Pamphilj,” 47–48, cited Pamphilj’s diary (ADP 86.1.4), in which he lamented that none of his Mattei relatives came to the dinner he hosted in honor of his Pamphilj relatives who were visiting from Gubbio. The clannish nature of the Mattei, who lived in the same neighborhood, was typical of old Roman noble families; Ferraro, “The Nobility of Rome,” 130 (see n. 11).

32. Howard Hibbard, Carlo Madsen and Roman Architecture 1580–1630 (London, 1971), 43–47. The family’s original property was the Palazzo Mattei on the Piazza Mattei (bordered by the Vie de’ Funari, Caetani, delle Botteghe Oscure, and Paganica).

33. Hibbard, Carlo Madsen and Roman Architecture, 46. In the use of axial lines, Madsen was again following Antonio da Sangallo who used one in the ground-floor loggia of the Palazzo Farnese.

34. Ibid. The frames and niches were probably designed by Madsen. On the Mattei’s collection, see Lucia Guerrini, ed., Palazzo Mattei di Giove. Le antichità (Rome, 1982).

35. No inventory of the palace in the 1630s exists, but later inventories do not show antiquities in either the courtyard or the stair niches. ADP 88.40.5. After the election of Innocent X, the Pamphilj strongly promoted their “romanitas,” using antiquities as one means to do so. It was the pope’s nephew, Camillo, who formed the family’s collection and was especially interested in declaring the family’s “antiquitas”; Carla Benocci, Villa Doria Pamphilj (Rome, 1996); and Pieter-Matthijs Gijbbers, “‘Resurgit Pamphilij in Templo Pamphiliana Domus’: Camillo Pamphilij’s Patronage of the Church of Sant’Andrea al Quirinale,” Mededelingen van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome 60 (1996), 293–335.

36. The practice of modeling oneself on others who had appropriately represented identity through architecture was common in Rome. See Ehrlich, Landscape and Identity in Early Modern Rome, 36–45, 318 n. 81, regarding the Farnese as an example for papal families and especially the Borghese; and ch. 3 for the influence of predecessors on the Borgheses’ estate building at Frascati.

37. Beneš, “Villa Pamphilj,” 90–115. Besides Pamphilj and Giovanni Battista, Camillo Pamphilj and Flaminia del Bufalo Cancellieri had two other sons and four daughters. One son died very young, while another (Benedetto) died at age thirty-five without having married. Two daughters, Orazia (1571–1656) and Maria (1575–1650), entered convents, while the other two married. Porzia (1569–1639) wed Ferrante Scotti, a low-ranking Roman nobleman, and Antonia (b. 1579) married Paolo Glautieri, a wealthy nobleman from Viterbo.

38. Ago, Carriere e clientele, 45–51 (see n. 13).


40. Ago, Carriere e clientele, 54–56. Maffeo Barberini, who became Urban VIII, followed a similar route through the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Nussdorfer, Civic Politico, 38 (see n. 11).


42. Ferraro, “The Nobility of Rome,” ch. 2, esp. 169–79 (see n. 11); Ago, Carriere e clientele, 117–21; and Cavazzini, “Famiglie e palazzi romani,” 23
Monsignor Pamphilj returned to Rome after his first trip to Madrid, the nate him in a consistory. Gaetano Moroni, Dizionario di erudizione storico-intention of raising someone to the Sacred College but did not yet nomi-revenue with it.

Benesi first published the documents concerning the division of the inheritance (ADP 86.19.4, fols. 8–8v; ADP 86.2.2). Ibid., 120–22.

Benesi clarified the date on which Giovanni Battista first rented the Teofili property as on or before 9 September 1619 (for 200 scudi annually), based on the financial records in ADP 86.2.3, fol. 6v. Ibid., 121, 189 n. 15.

The pursuit of an ecclesiastical career in Baroque Rome is a central theme of Ago’s Carriere e clientele.


On his diplomatic career, see Ciampi, Innocenzo X, 16–17; Pastor, History of the Popes, 30: 26–27; and Benesi, “Villa Pamphilj,” 123–34. When Monsignor Pamphilj returned to Rome after his first trip to Madrid, the pope rewarded him with the title of Patriarch of Antioch, which brought revenue with it.

“Il freggio nella sala del Teofilo e acertato come saranno sempre tutte le cose di V.S. et della Sra Olimpia che n’e stata l’autora.” ADP 1.5.1, fol. 182v. I thank Dott.ssa Patrizia Cavazzini for this reference.

Ago, Carriere e clientele, 50, 52, 69, 135.

In pectore was an intermediary stage in which the pope indicated his intention of raising someone to the Sacred College but did not yet nominate him in a consistory. Gaetano Moroni, Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica, 103 vols. (Venice, 1840–1877), 9: 303–8. On Pamphilj’s election, see Pastor, History of the Popes, 30: 27; and Ciampi, Innocenzo X, 16.

See Cavazzini, Il Palazzo Lancellotti ai Coronari, 5–12, on the family history; 13–37, on the palace; and Cavazzini, “Famiglie e palazzi romani,” 28 (see n. 29). According to Giovanni Baglione, Francesco Caprini da Volterra began the palace, and Maderno finished it after his death in 1594. Cavazzini has attributed the architectural decoration of the court, loggias, stairs, and entrance vestibule to Maderno based on a stylistic similarity with his work directed by Gabrielle Renzi, dated 21 March 1638 (1,737.71 scudi); stucco work signed by Bossi, dated 9 June 1636 (704.32 scudi); and stone work directed by Gabriele Renzi, dated 21 March 1638 (1,737.71 scudi). ADP 88.34.2.

Although the misuratore e stimatore (measurer and estimator) was often not the designing architect, Peperelli filled both roles in this project, and he named himself as Cardinal Pamphilj’s architect, in the misure e stime for the carpentry. “À 4 di Sett.re 1637. Misura e stima di Lavori e pezzi di leg-name fatti nel Palazzo dell’Em.mo e R.mo Sig. CardILE Pamphilj Consola fatt.r.a e Chiudi di mo Vincenzo Carinaldi falegname… misurati, e sti-mati per anbe le parti da me Francesco Peperelli Architetto di S.E. e p[ri]jima.” ADP 88.34, fol. 495. The career of Peperelli (an interesting figure) has not been adequately investigated. Elena Longo, “Per la conoscenza di un architetto del primo Seicento romano. Francesco Peperelli,” Palladio 5 (1990), 23–44, represents the most thorough study; and Joseph Connors, in The Dictionary of Art, vol. 24, 371, s.v. “Peperelli, Francesco,” offers a summary of his career. I have addressed his role as a palace designer and offered new conclusions concerning his formation (under Carlo Maderno) and clientele in my dissertation and will expand on these issues in my forthcoming book (see introductory note).

Benesi, “Villa Pamphilj,” 98–99. As was customary, Olimpia administered the goods of her dowry—very successfully—which largely derived from her inheritance from her first husband. From it, Pamphilj received an annual income of approximately 1,000 to 1,500 scudi. In exchange for her dowry, this ambitious and capable woman gained entrance into Roman society.

Benesi, “Villa Pamphilj,” 139, demonstrated that Olimpia helped finance Giovann Battista’s rise. For instance, she kept the receipt for his cardinal’s ring, which suggests that she had paid for it and other expenses.

Around 1600, a similar house bought by Giovanni Francesco Aldobrandini was criticized as unattractive and uncomfortable by an anonymous author, who cited its small stair, little rooms, and lack of a central courtyard; Jack Wasserman, “The Palazzo Patrizi in Rome,” JSAH 27 (May 1969), 99–114, identified the palace as located in the Piazza delle Cornac-chie (now Rondanini).
The court measured 63 x 70 palmi.

Vicolo della Cancelleria. Olimpia paid the rent for these spaces, at the ADP 88.34.2, fols. 148-56. The entrance of the Casa Teofili was 72. Waddy, Seventeenth-Century Roman Palaces, 61-66 (see n. 27).

request of her brother-in-law. ADP Archiviolo 138, b. 1.

It only extended to the present third floor, which had five mezzanine windows, smaller than the present ones, and the second floor had five larger windows of uniform size (unlike the present five of differing sizes). The two large, arched windows of the stairs were recorded, yet the existing arched window of its piano nobile landing was not mentioned and, therefore, may be a later addition.

75. The new stair was located on the site of the Teofili stair, which was enlarged and entirely rebuilt, ADP 88.34.2, fols. 102-14.


77. Gianfranco Spagnesi, “Palazzo Del Bufalo-Ferraioli e il suo architetto,” Paladio 13, no. 1–4 (1963), 143, characterized Peperelli’s style and noted an affinity between his stair in the Palazzo Del Bufalo and the Pamphili stair; however, he thought that the stair had been designed by Girolamo Rainaldi between 1644 and 1650. S. Sinisi, “Il palazzo Santacroce ai Catinari,” Palatino 7, 3rd ser., no. 1–4 (1963), 12–17.

78. Cavazzini, Palazzo Lancellotti ai Coronari, 22 fig. 16, 25 (see n. 43).

79. The dimensions of the Mattei and Pamphilj courts were also similar, 12 m x 15 m and 14 x 15 m, respectively.


81. On Fontana’s departure and Maderno’s assumption of the workshop, see Hibbard, Carlo Maderno and Roman Architecture, 35–38 (see n. 32). As a young man, Maderno left his birthplace on the southern end of Lake Lugano (now Canton Ticino in Switzerland) and moved to Rome, like many of his relatives in the masonry trade. Once in the papal city, Maderno joined a group of builders from his homeland that included Domenico Fontana (1543–1607). Fontana’s status as a builder rose enormously when his patron Cardinal Montalto was elected Pope Sisto V in 1585. The new pope placed Fontana in charge of his extensive building program. Although Maderno’s precise activity during these years remains unknown, he worked alongside his uncle on papal projects and perhaps began to make architectural designs, gaining a solid training in technical building. Maderno emerged as an important designer in his own right in the 1590s.


83. Waddy, introduction, Seventeenth-Century Roman Palaces (see n. 27).

84. The new loggia (62 1/2 x 19 3/4 palmi) replaced a smaller loggia on the site (40 1/4 x 16 3/4 palmi). ADP 88.34.2, fols. 71–75.

85. Four columns were of bigio stone and the two of cipollino had been reused from the old property and cut to adjust their height. ADP 88.34.2, fols. 247v–49v (stonecutter’s work), 211v–13 (work in stucco).

86. ADP 88.34.2, fols. 230v–40, identified these rooms as an apartment. For work in the sala dei palafrenieri, see ADP 88.34.2, fols. 6v, 45v–52 (masonry), 209 (stucco), 230v–33 (stone). Bricks from the existing rooms were recut and adjusted to make a uniform pavement measuring 67 1/4 x 34 3/4 palmi. Although the Casa Pamphilj had a large “sala vecchia” (Figure 11, room 1) (51 x 29 1/2 palmi), its location on the Piazza di Pasquino side made it unusable in Cardinal Pamphilj’s new apartment.


88. “Per la colla piatta simile rifatta in due quadri pa dipinti in d.o fregio, e con ordine di S. Em.za disfatti.” ADP 88.34.2, fol. 50.

89. ADP 88.34.2, fols. 52v–63 (masonry), 233–34v (stone).

90. The vicolo was incorporated into the new building on all floors. ADP 88.34.2, fols. 5v–6, 55–56.


92. Cardinal Pamphilj intervened by ordering that the door from the first to the second anteroom be enlarged. ADP 88.34.2, fol. 234v.


94. ADP 88.34.2, fols. 52v–58v.

95. “Per haver messo li Chiodi grossi nella Camere de la detta stanza dove è il d.o fregio, e fatto li 4 reipieni di cacie, e materia grossa per fare li 4 Vasi alto . . . Per haver attaccato il gesso sopra li 12 quadri de paesi nel fregio e fatto di basso rilievo il corpo delle due sfingi e concluoglia nel mezzo sopra ciascheduno.” ADP 88.34.2, fol. 54. This description largely accords with the present state of the frieze, except that the stucco sphinxes no longer exist and the present medallions between the twelve panels were not mentioned. The beamed ceiling was also painted.

96. On the theme of seascapes, see Cavazzini, Palazzo Lancellotti ai Coronari, 61–75 (see n. 43). According to Passeri, Tassi “painted there [in the palace of Cardinal Pamphilj] some rooms, both friezes and ceilings, so beautiful that when the Cardinal became pope and enlarged the palace . . . he did not want to destroy these rooms.” See Hess, Die Künstlerbiographien von Giovanni Battista Passeri, 111 (see n. 6). Regarding the attribution, see Deoclecio Redig de Campos, “Palazzo Pamphilj. La decorazione pittorica,” in Bosticco, Piazza Navona. Isola dei Pamphilj, 163–65 (see n. 6); and Patrizia

97. ADP 88.34.2, fol. 209v. The painter was apparently dissatisfied with his work since the frieze was replastered several times (“Per haver fatto li ponti attorno le d.e facciate e fatto la colla del fregio per il pittore fatta in piu e diversi tempi a volunta di d.o pittore”). ADP 88.34.2, fol. 57v.

98. Cavazzini, “Agostino Tassi and the Organization of His Workshop,” 412–14. Previous scholars interpreted the “single room” as the one with the seascapes (Figure 11, room 17), and the Moses frieze was attributed to Giacinto Gimignani. The conference between payments between 15 April 1648 and 20 September 1653. See Redig de Campos, “Palazzo Pamphilj. La decorazione pittorica,” 161–63. However, Cavazzini convincingly argued that the presence of Caroselli and Lauri, who were both figure painters, negated the possibility that they had painted in room 17.

99. Only the chapel’s north wall was newly built. Its south wall, in ruinous condition, was given a new lining wall. ADP 88.34.2, fols. 61–64v, 68, 111v. For the stucco decoration of the cube vault, which remains mostly intact (only the cornice no longer exists), see ADP 88.34.2, fols. 210v–11v. The chapel was also accessible from the piano nobile landing of the stair, an unusual arrangement.

100. The other two noble apartments at the Palazzo Barberini had designated oratories; Patricia Waddy, “Inside the Palace: People and Furnishings,” in Stefanie Walker and Frederick Hammond, eds., Life and the Arts in the Baroque Palaces in Rome: Ambiente Barocco (New Haven and London, 1999), 29–30; and Waddy, Seventeenth-Century Roman Palaces, 188–89, 199. On worship and the household, see Waddy, “Inside the Palace,” 30. On room 22, see ADP 88.34.2, fol. 78: called the “stanzia [sic],” its function was not recorded in the documents. Even though it was included in the work of the so-called old apartments, it probably belonged to Cardinal Pamphilj, since he intervened in its reconstruction.

101. Waddy, “Inside the Palace,” 30–31. Papal permission, ostensibly granted only when someone was unable to go to church, was required for others to have a private chapel; however, popes often deemed family ties to be sufficient reason.

102. The stanzino pensile measured 17½ x 8 palmi, and its height (11½ palmi) plus that of the chapel below (18 palmi) roughly equaled the height of the adjacent audience room, 23 (28½ palmi). ADP 88.34.2, fols. 64–64v.

103. The stanzino pensile measured 17½ x 8 palmi, and its height (11½ palmi) plus that of the chapel below (18 palmi) roughly equaled the height of the adjacent audience room, 23 (28½ palmi). ADP 88.34.2, fols. 64–64v.


105. ADP 88.34.2, fols. 64v–71, 235–37. The room measured 42½ x 26½ x 28½ palmi.

106. Waddy, Seventeenth-Century Roman Palaces, 102, 308.

107. ADP 88.34.2, fol. 64.

108. On the typical ceremony, see Waddy, Seventeenth-Century Roman Palaces, 5–6.

109. ADP 88.34.2, fols. 58v–62.

110. It was raised 1½ palmi. ADP 88.34.2, fol. 209v.

111. See Redig de Campos, “Palazzo Pamphilj. La decorazione pittorica,” 161, for the attribution to Gimignani (see n. 96). Susan Russell, “Frescoes by Herman van Swanevelt in Palazzo Pamphilj in Piazza Navona (Rome),” Burlington Magazine 139 (1997), 171–77. Cavazzini responded to Russell by agreeing that Swanevelt could have painted these frescoes but proposing that he belonged to the Tassi’s workshop. Cavazzini, Palazzo Lancelotti ai Coronari, 184 (see n. 43).

112. On the secret stair, see ADP 88.34.2, fols. 69–70. On the small stair, 70–71; on the study, 75, 39v.

113. ADP 88.34.2, fols. 61v–63, 240.

114. ADP 88.34.2, fol. 66.

115. Waddy, Seventeenth-Century Roman Palaces, 188–89, 199. The noble apartments belonged to Cardinal Francesco, his sister-in-law Anna, and his brother Taddeo.


117. “Per haver smurato il Camino di mischij, qual era nella testa della Sala vecchia Teofili con piu et diversi ornamenti . . . et ultimamente reportati nella nuova sala.” ADP 88.34.2, fol. 49. “Per haver fatto la calce fermata con chiodi l’ossatura e corpo delli doi vasi sopra il Camino di d’A Sala nel pian nobile abbozzati simili, e stuccati con polvere di marmo con diversi intagli di basso rilievo con suoi manichi et sopra fattoci molti frutti et spighe di granio et altri.” Ibid., fol. 209. “Per haver rotato lo scudo di marmo del’Arme sopra al Camino.” Ibid., fol. 232v–33. For the work on the other fireplaces, see ADP 88.34.2, fols. 53 v (first anteroom); 57v (second anteroom); 60v–61 (bedroom); 63 (service room).

118. ADP 88.34.2, fol. 101. The record of stone work described this side as “Nell’altro Appartamento del Pian Nobile delle p.me stanze della Casa Pan- filij.” ADP 88.34.2, fol. 240.


120. Waddy, “Giacinto Del Bufalo,” 175–76. By the seventeenth century, the Del Bufalo family had three branches; one had gained the noble title of marquis in the late sixteenth century, while the line from which Giacinto hailed produced the family’s first cardinal, Innocenzo, in 1604.


122. “Nella Sala Vecchia Verso Pasquino,” ADP 88.34.1, fol. 102. The expansion of the identification was repeated in the misure e stime of the post-1644 expansion.

123. “Nella Sala Vecchia di d.o Appartamento della Signora,” ADP 88.34.2, fol. 241v. I identified 2b as the “saletta” based on the misure e stime of the stucco work, where it followed the “stanzia di Panfilij.” ADP 88.34.2, fol. 240.

124. On the use and location of gardens in Roman palaces, see Waddy, Seventeenth-Century Roman Palaces, 29.

125. “Segue l’Appartamento verso la Piazza di Pasquino et verso la Strada, che va all’Anima,” ADP 88.34.2, fol. 143v.

126. ADP 88.34.2, fol. 240.

127. ADP 88.34.2, fols. 148–53. The old wall had decayed into an extremely perilous state, and much work was needed to rebuild it.

128. “Stanza nel Pian Nobile accanto la Casa del Rossi,” ADP 88.34.2, fols. 45v–46v.

129. “Nella p.m.stanza nel pian Nobile accanto il Pozzo nel Cortile grande dove è il fregio dell’Arpie,” ADP 88.34.2, fols. 93–95, 210. The room was grouped in the “Appartamento di fianco al Cortile” (79%). On room 9, see ADP 88.34.2, fols. 79v–82v: it was described as next to the room with the porta, or turnbox, which was 11.10.

130. On the composition and duties of the famiglia and its affect on palace design, see Waddy, Seventeenth-Century Roman Palaces, 31–46; on housing the famiglia, 41–44. The houses of Renaissance cardinals and noblemen, of all sizes, typically lived within the palace, but in the seventeenth century the apartments of the principal occupants expanded and left little room for the servants.

131. The residents of the Palazzo Pamphilj were recorded in the stati d’anime. S. Lorenzo in Damaso, no. 65, Archivio Storico Vicariato, Rome (hereafter ASVic.). On the size of famiglia, see Waddy, Seventeenth-Century
Roman Palaces, 31–35 (on Cardinal Maffeo Barberini, 32). Papal families maintained much larger households, such as the 142 persons supported by Prince Marcantonio Borghese in 1621, or the 224 persons that his cousin Cardinal Scipione Borghese retained.

Regarding the position of maestro di camera, see Waddy, Seventeenth-Century Roman Palaces, 31; Sestini da Bibbiena, Il maestro di camera (see n. 25); Cesare Evitascandalo, Il maestro di casa, 2nd ed. (Viterbo, 1620), 157–64; and Francesco Liberati, Il perfetto maestro di casa (Rome, 1658), 29–32.

For 22.13, see ADP 88.34.2, fols. 26, 39; for 22.23 (identified as “stanza sotto tetto del S.r Auditore sopra d.o Salotto”), see 237; for the stair, see 45. Concerning the position, see Evitascandalo, Il maestro di casa, 4.

In ADP 88.34.2, fol. 227, the entry “Nella Stanza del Segretario” followed the one for the guardaroba; on the guardaroba, see fols. 8, 15–19, 30v–32, 226; on the loggia, see fols. 12, 16. On the location and use of the guardaroba, see Waddy, Seventeenth-Century Roman Palaces, 39–40.

S. Lorenzo in Damaso, no. 65, ASVic. The parish records listed the household of the cardinal and his brother separately. Typically, each principal resident had his/her own household, but those of Pamphilj and Olimpia were listed as a single entity.

The rooms were described as “the stanza del Cameriero del sig[no]r Panfilio verso Pasquino” and the “Stanza [sic] di Don Gironimo” in ADP 88.34.2, fol. 143v.

“Stanza [sic] sotto tetto.” It was identified as 23.4 because it was next to the room that was contiguous to the neighboring Casa de’ Rossi, which must be 23.5. ADP 88.34.2, fol. 144v.

Waddy, Seventeenth-Century Roman Palaces, 28–30. The apartment of women attendants normally included a separate kitchen equipped with a fireplace and a lavatory. At the Palazzo Pamphilj, mezzanine room 10b in Figure 21 might have served this purpose since a lavatory and sink were installed here, although no fireplace was noted; ADP 88.34.2, fols. 91v–92.

“Stanza sotto detta verso la Strada che serve per le Donne.” ADP 88.34.2, fol. 144. On the “Stanza accanto sopra il Pozzo” (22.8), see ADP 88.34.2, fols. 87v–88v.

ADP 88.34.2, fols. 82v, 85–85v, 90, 95–97. Waddy, Seventeenth-Century Roman Palaces, 30.

One only of each type of service was recorded in the misure e stime for the Palazzo Pamphilj. On the service rooms in a palace, see Waddy, Seventeenth-Century Roman Palaces, 35–41.

ADP 88.34.2, fols. 114–15. Room 8 in Figure 24 was called the “Stanza Mezzanine dove si fa la Credenza,” and 24.10 was also identified as the credenza in the work on the stair (fols. 103v).

ADP 88.34.2, fols. 114v–16: the work on the new scalone located the bottiglieria on the stair’s second landing, between the ground floor and the piano nobile (fols. 103v).

ADP 88.34.2, fols. 117–17v. ADP 88.34.2, fols. 126v–27v. ADP 88.34.2, fols. 122–26v, 220v. Many foundation walls were built in this area to support the superstructure.

On palace kitchens, see Waddy, Seventeenth-Century Roman Palaces, 36–38.

Even modest houses like the Barberini’s “Casa Grande” at Giubbonari (1609–12) had separate kitchens. Waddy, Seventeenth-Century Roman Palaces, 38. On the tineletto, or small dining hall, see ADP 88.34.2, fol. 267v.

Examples of early modern Roman palaces with shops include the Palazzo Alberini-Ciciaporci and Palazzo Branconio dell’Aquila (Frommell, Der römische Palastbau der Hochrenaissance, 2: 1–22 [see n. 87]), and in the early seventeenth century the “Casa Grande” of Cardinal Maffeo Barberini, n. 58 above. While cardinal palaces retained them, the seventeenth-century palaces of papal families did not.

151. ADP 88.34.2, fols. 170–76v. The conversion of the old entrance into a shop required major work. The preexisting space was destroyed, new foundation and dividing walls and the vault were built, and new cellars were made. ADP 88.34.2, fols. 181–84.

152. ADP 88.34.2, fols. 167–69v (leather goods shop), 176v–77v (barber), 177v–80v (osteria). The shop in the corner (10.14) was located in “il francese” (184–85).

“Botteghe dietro al Palazzo,” ADP 88.34.2, fol. 186.

Burroughs, The Italian Renaissance Palace Façade, esp. ch. 1, made the point for the Renaissance palace (see n. 27).

156. “Lavori fatti nella facciata del Palazzo unita, e congiunta delle due prime Facciate delle due Case de’ Teofili et Panfilij,” ADP 88.34.2, fols. 188–98 (masonry); 253–58, 265v (stone work). Israel Silvestre’s engraving of the Piazza Navona (1643), is the only print that predates the palace’s subsequent expansion (1645–50) to its present state. It shows a single palace on the site of the former Casa Pamphilj and the Teofili property. However, his rendering of the palace depicts only seven bays (rather than the actual twelve) so it cannot be considered accurate.

157. ADP 88.34.2, fols. 192v–93, 201–2 (masonry); 259–64 (stone work). The portoni measured 11 1/2 × 2 7/8 palmi, in agreement with the present openings.

158. The frieze was reused from the Casa Teofili: “Pelle piana del fregio quale si torno ad abbassare per cancellare le letter maiuscole del nome, et cognome de Teofili.” ADP 88.34.2, fol. 263v.

159. “Per l’intaglio delle 2 cartelle di d.e fin.e...con suo corpo et listellini in faccia con sua voluta a piedi e fianchi con sua fascia corrente, e baccelli ingiagliati nel voto di d.e e fatto le 3 campanelle sotto con doi Intaccat.e.” ADP 88.34.2, fol. 256v.

160. “Per haver fatto la colla granita, e riccia con il pen’ello senza cres- tocini.” ADP 88.34.2, fol. 195.

161. For example, see ADP 88.34.2, fols. 195v, 196v, 197.

162. For a comprehensive discussion of this technique, see Elisabetta Pallottino, “Stucchi di esterno. La nuova sbrociolasi delle superfici nell’architettura del Seicento romano,” in Manuela Kahn-Rossi and Marco Francioli, eds., Il giovane Borromini. Dagli esordi a San Carlo alle Quattro Fontane (Milan, 1999), 315–21.

163. “Il color de trevert.o.” ADP 88.34.2, fol. 198.

164. “Stucco di polvere di marmo.” ADP 88.34.2, fol. 221. Later changes to the palace did not alter the cornice. The architect Andrea Busiri-Vici, who added a floor in 1685, retained the original architectural architecture, ADP, Cartelle 5, int. 92.

165. The seventeenth-century use of heraldic devices on palaces continued this Renaissance tradition. See Ceen, “The Quartiere de’ Banchi,” 107–71 (see n. 18), on the sixteenth-century use of heraldry in the via Papale to announce familial identity or allegiances; and Burroughs, The Italian Renaissance Palace Façade, 25–29, on the development of impresse and their use, along with heraldic devices, on palace façades.


167. Coincidentally, both façades were asymmetrical, but at the Palazzo Lancellotti the site masked the discrepancy since the narrow street approaching the palace (later replaced with an open piazza) prevented a view of the façade in its entirety. Cavazzini, Il Palazzo Lancellotti ai Corrari, 20 (see n. 43).
168. Sinisi, “Il palazzo Santacroce ai Catinari,” 12–17 (see n. 77). Recorded in Rome since the mid-thirteenth century, in the period under discussion, the Santacroce’s fortune was tied to the Church; two family members had been raised to the Sacred College before Antonio. The building history of the Palazzo Santacroce has yet to be studied fully, but we know that Peperelli’s palace incorporated an existing core built by Maderno between 1598 and 1602. Although the work was paid for by Valerio Santacroce, who as the secular capofamiglia must have owned the palace, Baglione identified the newly built palace with Cardinal Santacroce. A comparison between its interior spaces and those of the Palazzo Pamphilj might yield further conclusions concerning seventeenth-century cardinal palaces and Peperelli as a palace builder.

169. I am presently at work on a book on this topic (see introductory note). Innocent X’s intentions were articulated by the Venetian ambassador; for the published reports, see Nicolò Barozzi and Guglielmo Berchet, eds., Relazioni degli stati europei letti al senato dagli ambasciatori veneti nel secolo decimossimo. Serie III—Italia, relazioni di Roma, 2 vols. (Venice, 1877), 2: 90.
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