

1. Good afternoon! I'm very glad that so many listeners are interested in this topic – and I hope or am even convinced, you will not be disappointed, even though I presented a paper on a closely related topic last year at Vancouver. But there I talked about the project of the *Accademia* from an architectural point of view and mentioned its other aspects only in short. — Today, I want to present these other parts and some new findings from my ongoing research regarding the interdisciplinary character of the program and its remaining results. Because many of these findings seem to fit almost too well into my hypothetical reconstruction of the *Accademia* network and because I am afraid that something so obvious could not have been overlooked by researchers over decades and centuries, I would like to use this talk as a platform to test my hypotheses and ask for your critical comments.

After this *captatio benevolentiae* I want to present here what I, at the moment, regard as the *first international interdisciplinary research network* in the history of the European Humanities. And, I may add, one of the most productive of all times.

First of all, I will give an overview of the *Accademia* and its program. Following will be an attempt to list those books and manuscript materials that – from my point of view – may be seen as fulfillments of or, at least, as preparations for the program's points.

What you see in the background is not the *Accademia* but the place where I have the luck to work: The Werner Oechslin Library at Einsiedeln in Switzerland. If you are interested in the history and theory of architecture or any related discipline – from history to mathematics, from medicine to archaeology – you can find there almost all old and rare books related to that field. So, please, come and visit us. – End if the short shameless advertisement.

2. This is the list of persons related to the *Accademia* that I presented last year at Vancouver, comprising some 80 persons.
3. And this is the updated version with about 100 persons connected somehow to the *Accademia* during its existence between 1537 and 1555: Like almost every other scholar I identified this circle with the *Accademia della Virtù*. But the *Accademia della Virtù* was a group of poets and philologist, churchmen and physicians, who were interested in modern Latin poetry and tried to establish a modernised Italian as a new, even *the* new language for poetry, research, philosophy and any

other scientific or humanist purposes. The very few facts about this *Accademia* that I know of are related to *these* interests, but not to the (philological) study of Vitruvius or even to architecture in general. So, at the moment it seems that the attribution of the following program and other sources to the *Accademia della Virtù* is a mistake, mainly caused by some personal coincidences between the two networks. But while the *Accademia della Virtù* was an established circle with rules and events, an annually elected “Rex” and other aspects that may allow to call it an established *Accademia* in the sense of the 16th century, the *Accademia d’Architettura* seems to have been a rather loose network.

4. This “non-institutional” character may be the reason why this network is not named at all by Claudio Tolomei in his famous letter to Agostino de’ Landi from 1542, published by Tolomei himself in 1547. Tolomei only speaks of “*molti belli ingegni*” that are working together on the program he describes in this letter.
5. In 1557, the *Accademia* is again mentioned in two books by Onofrio Panvinio and published by Jacopo Strada: In his first introduction, Strada gives a list of the disciplines involved in that *Accademia* that he was invited to join when he came to Rome in 1553.
6. In the other introduction, Strada even gives a few names of members of the *Accademia*. But even Strada, who has been its member for about 2 years, does not give a special name for the *Accademia* itself but simply calls it “*eruditissima Academia*”!
7. More than 10 years later, Giorgio Vasari mentions an *Accademia* that, he claims, was dedicated to the study of Vitruvius. Only from the following lines we can deduce that this *Accademia* did *not only* study the text of the *Ten Books on Architecture*: Because Vasari mentions that the architect this passage is about, Jacopo Barozzi da Vignola, completely measured all the antiquities of Rome entirely – *misurare interamente tutte l’anticaglie di Roma* – for this *Accademia*. So, their interest must have extended over the pure philological studies of the text. And *this* is the (only) known link so far that connects Vignola and the *Accademia* with Tolomei’s program! But Vasari also gives us a few names like Cervini, Maffei, and Manzuoli, so we know that some of the members of this *Accademia* had already been members of the *Accademia della Virtù*.

Again 15 years later, Vignola’s biographer and editor of his book on perspective,

the geographer, mathematician and astronomer Egnatio Danti, finally calls this *Accademia* an – or the – *Accademia d'Architettura*. But 28 years after it seems to have stopped to work, this may be a later conjecture. One may also doubt the reliability of Danti as a source because he uses almost the same words as Vasari did. But because we know that Danti stood in contact with Vignola and inherited the preparing materials for the book on perspective from him, and because Vasari also stood in personal contact with Vignola, I guess, we can trust both sources. In all other sources from around 1550 (that I know of) mentioning a circle or learned men studying Vitruvius and ancient artifacts, this circle is not called an *Accademia* at all.

8. The program published in Tolomei's letter lists these 23 volumes that the group around Tolomei planned to publish. Its focus, as I explained last year, was the establishment or re-establishment of the ancient knowledge on architecture and everything related to it, for instance regarding its decoration, as some kind of *handbook* for the modern architect and patron.

As you can see, the first 11 volumes are dedicated to the edition, translation and interpretation of Vitruvius' *Ten books on Architecture*, while the following 12 should contain a description of Rome's urban development in antiquity followed by annotated documentations of all ancient Roman buildings, all tombstones and sarcophagi, all statues, all friezes and reliefs, all single architectural elements like displaced capitals etc., all vases and similar objects used to decorate buildings, all tools and instruments, all inscriptions, all paintings, all coins and medals and all machines (as far as they could be reconstructed) and the Roman aquaeducts – in short: the general program of classical Roman archaeology, one may say ... and obviously impossible to fulfill. Or is it?

The first mentioned volume in the program about difficult passages in Vitruvius

9. has long been identified with Guillaume Philandrier's *Annotationes* published in 1544 and still today a very helpful tool. Though Philandrier mentions some members of the *Accademia* who helped him, he does not refer to the *Accademia* itself by some name or general term – even though we know that the book is the fruit of long discussions among some of the members of this network and architects like Antonio da Sangallo the Younger.

10. The second of three sources related until today to the *Accademia* is the second

edition of Marliano's *Topographia urbis Romae*, on the right, published in 1544. In it, he thanks three members of the *Accademia* for helping him, but he also does not mention the *Accademia* itself.

11. This is only done by his printers, the Dorico brothers, calling themselves proudly *Academiae Romanae impreßorum*. The simple denomination as *Accademia Romana* can not refer to the *Accademia* founded by Pomponio Leto, because this *Accademia* — as far as we know — ceased to exist with the *Sacco di Roma* in 1527 — and I don't think that 17 years later a publisher would claim to work for an *Accademia* that did not exist anymore. But some persons who were related to it before 1527 show up in the circle of the new *Accademia*; for instance, one common “point — or rather: person — of reference” seems to have been Pietro Bembo.
12. This is the second edition — the first came out in 1534 in Rome and, published by Rabelais, at the same time in Lyon — and is the first edition of the *Topographia* containing illustrations among which the plans of the three states of the ancient *urbs* are the best known and usually regarded as the beginning of scientific topography (at least: of Rome).
13. Despite their rough character they are astonishingly correct — and only for us today it is hardly comprehensible how difficult it must have been around 1544 to establish such a map.
14. Besides these two printed — and a few times re-printed — books, the third source related to the *Accademia* is the *Codex Coburgensis* at Veste Coburg, that is: the castle of Coburg in Germany, and the related *Codex Pighianus* in Berlin. The collector of the latter, Stephan Winand Pighius was secretary to Marcello Cervini until his untimely death as Pope Marcellus II in 1555. The drawings in these codices document reliefs and similar artefacts as well as inscriptions in a very precise way with all their damages — just like modern archaeologists would do it.
15. Though these are all invaluable sources in themselves, this sounds rather disappointing compared with the immense and ambitious program . . .
16. And they obviously *do not* justify Tolomei's claim at the end of his letter: That his entire program — and he is not speaking of some wild ideas for research projects here but of *books* to be *printed!* — that this vast program could be finished in *less*

than three years: “*non è dubbio che’n manco di tre anni si condurrann tutto a fine*”! – So, was Tolomei straightly lying into the face of his readers and, first of all, also into that of his addressee, Agostino de’ Landi from whom he hoped to get at least some support for the project?

If we can think of a renowned philologist and writer, diplomat and ambassador and, later, even bishop, and generally speaking, a well-known public figure like Tolomei as a brazen liar, than we are done here. But you may guess, that at least I don’t think so. In fact, I am almost convinced that there is a huge amount of material sources from the Renaissance documenting ancient artifacts that can (and should) be related to the *Accademia*.

17. Let’s go back to Tolomei’s letter..
18. Last year, my list of materials related to the *Accademia* looked like this: printed books as well as manuscript sources, mostly drawings and collections of inscriptions. It would take too much time to explain in every case, why I think this materials could or should be related to the *Accademia*. Just for the architectural drawings in preparation for book 13: This is the material I have been dealing with now for about 20 years, with some long breaks. In fact, only during the last 3 years I could go on to search for all related drawings and concentrate on their complex interrelations.
19. Pighius and Philandrier – as well as Ligorio, Smet, Morillon and many others are also mentioned in another large set of sources regarding Roman Antiquity: the collections of ancient inscriptions compiled in Rome between 1545 and 1550 by the French secretary and friend of the Spanish Bishop Antonio Agustín. Since Matal left Rome in 1550 these collections are preserved in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana – whose cardinal librarian Marcello Cervini had been since 1548. Like the reliefs from the Codices Coburgensis and Pighianus, the inscriptions also show the careful separation between the documentation of the ancient remains with all their damages and the interpretations and additional information about where they can be found, who transcribed them and even who checked the transcription.
20. The material that led me to the *Accademia* and still is my main research topic and will hopefully be for a few more years, is a group of architectural drawings around the so-called Codex Destailleur D at Berlin:

21. I started with 120 sheets in Berlin and 39 in Vienna, each containing 1 to 15 single drawings: Last year I had found roughly 619 sheets with 3,000 drawings.
22. Actually, the counter is close to 700 sheets and 3,300 single drawings.
23. These drawings are characterised by a remarkable comprehensiveness, documenting every aspect of the surveyed ancient (and some modern) buildings, even technical aspects never recorded by anyone else: like the heating system and
24. the water supply system of the Baths of Diocletian,
25. or the today mostly reconstructed so-called *Libraries* from the Baths of Caracalla that cannot have been libraries at all, because they had no roofs.
26. While usually showing no interest at all in the ornamental decoration of the buildings like reliefs or in inscriptions, they recorded the form of letters in the case of the Pantheon and even their slight inclination – which was unfortunately “corrected” in the 19th century. . .
27. Also astonishing is the philological approach, as I like to call it: documenting every single feature *as it is*, not *as it was expected to be*. One example: The Colosseum has always been drawn as an ellipse or oval following some rule of plain geometry. Only these draftsmen realised, that the form of this famous building cannot be that simple: Otherwise, the lines drawn from distinguished points on the central axis simply following lines of visibility through the building, could never cross. But they do.
28. And if we look on the Colosseum from above, we can at least recognise, that its arena does not have the regular oval form that is supposed in all other drawings and prints up to the 20th century that I know of.
29. Another large group of drawings related through the person of Jacopo Strada to the *Accademia* and its book 22 that should contain all ancient coins and medals is the group of 9,000 [!] such drawings today in Gotha, Germany. A short description of every depicted coin fills 11 volumes and is kept today in Vienna and as a copy in Prague. The drawings and the comments seem to have been written in Rome, because Strada used a sort of Roman paper that was also used by the draftsmen of the “architecture group” working for the *Accademia*.

30. So, I think these drawings should be related to the preparations for Tolomei's books 22.
31. In Vienna there are also three codices by Strada containing festival costumes but also ancient statues. With 174 statues and 104 portrait busts of emperors and their families this is the largest systematic collection of such drawings of statues that I know of and may be related to volume 15 of Tolomei's list, ...
32. while the first volume of these three in Vienna contains vases and other object, usually interpreted as fantasies by Strada who was trained as a goldsmith in his youth – but Strada himself claims in the introduction that all of his drawings are based on ancient originals or depictions in ancient reliefs etc.
33. So, maybe this volume 1 of the Codex Miniatus 21 can be related to Tolomei's book 18.
34. In 1617 Strada grandson Ottavio published 50 drawings of hydraulic machines; an edition he extend to 100 illustrations in 1623. All of them had been prepared by his grandfather for publication, as he writes in his introduction. Today, there are 3 volumes of drawings from Strada and his workshop that resemble these prints, but also seem to contain even more machines.
35. Unfortunately; I did not have time or chance to see them, but I guess we may relate them to Tolomei's book 23
36. Because of the lack of time I will not present the argumentation why the books by Barbaro, Palladio, Vignola and Bullant are also included in this list, and we may even add Panvinio's books – who proudly claimed to be a student of Jean Matal and inherited most of his material – or the *Inscriptionum antiquarum* by Lipsius and Matal's collaborator Marten de Smet published in 1586.
But we may suppose that books like numbers 4 and 5 as well as 9 and 10 may have been a requirement for the discussions in preparation for the other volumes, and therefore we may suppose that at least some kind of preparatory material for *these* books must have existed, too.
So, the only really missing books are number 19 – the book on ancient tools and instruments – and 21 – the list of all surviving and / or known ancient paintings. If you know of such material that may fit into this program, please let me know!

37. Only for books 6 and 7 I do not expect to find any preparations, because they rather seem to be an idea a little bit too strange to really have been in the making by the *Accademia* network with its more scientific approach and its vast productivity of about 3'300 architectural drawings, about 500 drawings after ancient sarcophagi and reliefs, almost 300 drawings of statues and busts, 9'000 drawings of coins and 1- to 200 drawings of machines. . . Only the more than 10'000 inscriptions have been subject of modern research in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* – but of cause, as source of documentation, not as source of an importance on their own for our knowledge about scientific and collaborative work in the Renaissance.

So, if my hypotheses should be correct that we did not only inherit this large amount of material, most of it not studied yet, but that it is the result of one co-ordinated effort by a network, the *first scientific* international network of interdisciplinary research, – something that could be proven only within a new international interdisciplinary research network – I am sure we may expect lots of

38. News from ancient Rome. Thank you!