Typology is a central device in the Sistine chapel frescoes of the fifteenth century where it works, in a quite canonical way, as a model of historical temporality with strong institutional effects. In the frescoes by Luca Signorelli and Bartolomeo della Gatta representing various episodes from the life of Moses, including his death, every gesture and action of Moses is an announcement – a figura – of Jesus Christ’s institutional accomplishments represented on the opposite wall [Fig. 1]. Some of these devices operate on a figural level rather than in mere iconographical terms; the death of Moses, for instance, is a Pathosformel: the leader of the Israelites dies in the pose of the dead body of Christ, while his attendants adumbrate the Lamentation of Christ. Here, the attitude of the defunct Moses is ‘intensified’ by the return of the pathetic formula embodied by Christ's
corpse, that is, by the paradoxical return of the figure who is prefigured by Moses himself.

As Leopold Ettlinger extensively showed, the main ideological purpose of the Quattrocento cycle is to support and incontrovertibly to adduce papal primacy.\(^1\) Nevertheless, if we look at these frescoes from an anthropological point of view, we are compelled to observe the extent to which they appropriate the history of the ‘Other’ – in this case the history of the Jews – entirely transforming it into a sort of prophetic premise for Christian history itself. That is to say that Christian typology presents itself as objective and neutral, concealing the violence of the claim it exercises over Jewish history. This aspect of the chapel remains implicit in my essay, even if I cannot fully explore it here.\(^2\) The question I shall pose is rather: what happens to visual typology at the moment that precedes the end of time, when there is nothing else to announce since human history has been nearly concluded, its forward motion all but foreclosed? What licenses such an abstract and speculative question is the singularly concrete history of the creation of the Sistine Chapel. The chapel was progressively painted in three main phases: first the \textit{historie} of Moses and Christ (1480–1482), then the Genesis cycle on the vault (1508–1512), and finally the \textit{Last Judgment} (1536–1541). These three cycles – connected in various ways by narrative, allegorical, and figural links – articulate the totality of Christian history starting with the Genesis, continuing with Moses and Christ, and culminating in the Last Judgment. One single and singular artist, Michelangelo Buonarroti, was confronted twice with the task of visually constructing the links between the three sets of the Sistine frescoes: the first time in 1508, when he added the frescoed vault to the Quattrocento program, and a second time in 1536, when he added the \textit{Last Judgment} to the whole. I will focus my attention on the last part of this linking operation of ‘montage’, looking at the Sistine frescoes from the point of view of the \textit{Last Judgment}. This anachronistic perspective is founded theologically on the primacy of the future in the Messianic conception of history that organizes the Sistine chapel. Only at its end shall Christian history become completely intelligible. Yet, my question makes sense only if one acknowledges that the last element added to the ensemble
