

1. Good morning everybody! First of all, I would like to thank the organizers for letting me present my paper here. But this also requires a *captatio benevolentiae* – because I will present only hypotheses regarding the historical background of my ongoing research project on a large group of Renaissance drawings of ancient Roman buildings: This research goes back almost 20 years to material related to my PhD dissertation on drawings for Saint Peter’s in Rome.
2. Since October 2013 I have the pleasure to go on with this research thanks to my teacher, colleague, and – I may say – also friend Andreas Tönnemann who unfortunately died far too early last year. His support made this research possible in many ways.
3. Here you see about one half of the network and some of the possible or known relations I shortly want to introduce today. (I will come back to this map later.) The group of architects and draftsmen that I am actually working on is the one in the lower right corner.
4. During the work for my dissertation it became more and more clear that the draftsmen of the Saint-Peter’s drawings must have been simple craftsmen whom we could not really call professional architects. But their drawings are so incredibly accurate and systematic that there must have been someone ‘behind’ them. Someone whose aim it was to measure and document all buildings from Roman antiquity with all of their surviving parts: Even heating and water systems, roofs and many other parts that were usually ignored by others. I dare to say that for most of these buildings there are no better documentations showing more details – not even from the 19th or even 20th century. In addition, many of these buildings – or at least parts of them – have been destroyed since the 1540s, when these drawings were made.
5. Looking for a person or a group active in Rome during the 1540s and working on a comparable project, one encounters the famous – but rarely carefully read – letter by the Siennese humanist Claudio Tolomei to Agostino de’ Landi from 1542. Tolomei published it in a collection of his own letters in 1547.
6. This letter presents a descriptive list of 24 books –
7. – numbered here on the right –
8. that a group of learned people planned to publish:

9. They are usually identified as the Accademia della Virtù or Accademia Vitruviana, but there is also a personal overlap to the so-called Accademia dello Sdegno.
10. In fact, none of these Accademias is mentioned in the letter; so we may guess that the group was not a strictly formalized institution.
11. They started around 1537 as a group to discuss Latin and Italian poetry and to develop Italian into a language of comparable quality and distinction as Latin.
12. In almost all modern literature mentioning Tolomei's letter, you will find that the Accademia's aim was just to edit Vitruvius – which is only less than half of the truth – and that the number of books or research topics was 20 or even less, only 8 in a recent dissertation – which is simply wrong!
13. Unfortunately, this may indicate that many of my colleagues can't read or count . . . or they just cite others without looking at sources.
14. Tolomei's list is always interpreted as a research project – even though Tolomei clearly writes about books that will be published. Even more: He also claims that this could be done in three years only! From my point of view, this implies that some, if not many preparations had already been done (at least in 1547).
15. In the 1980s, the German art historian Richard Harprath and the archaeologist Henning Wrede discovered that 2 large and very systematically ordered collections of drawings of ancient tomb stones and sarcophagi at Coburg and Berlin not only belonged together but must have been preparations for one of the volumes the Accademia planned to print. The volumes were assembled in the late 1540s and early 1550s; one of them under the direction of Stephan Pighius, a dutch scholar with best relations to cardinal Marcello Cervini who died in 1555 as Pope Marcellus II.
16. Two very remarkable characteristics of these drawings are their astonishing accuracy – recording carefully only the surviving parts and all damages – and the attempt to identify and order the mythological figures and scenes systematically. In both points, these two collections differ from all others.
17. In some cases, where inscriptions are recorded with the reliefs, even their damages are represented very precisely.

18. Because Pighius and others related to these codices are mentioned as being members of the Accademia we may agree that the drawings belong to the list as preparations to book number 15.
19. In addition to these unpublished drawings, a published book has always been counted as the one and only result of the Accademia's work: Guillaume Philandrier's *Annotationes to the Ten Books on Architecture by Vitruvius*, published in 1544 and reprinted several times. Philandrier, who was introduced to architecture in Venice by Sebastiano Serlio, mentions among others the architects Antonio da Sangallo the Younger and his brother Giovanni Battista who helped him with their expertise.
20. Because of its early publication it may be no coincidence that exactly such a book with annotations to Vitruvius is mentioned as item number 1 in Tolomei's list.
21. In 1552 Philandrier published another book, this time combining the full text from Vitruvius with his own annotations. Usually, this is regarded as yet another boring Vitruvius edition. But the subtitle [says that it's not.] mentions that it is based on the comparison of all other editions and old „examples“ – maybe manuscripts.
22. In fact, it fulfills the description given by Tolomei for book number 3 on his list.
23. And because book number 2 is mentioned by Tolomei as the precondition for number 3, we may at least suppose that a manuscript representing the preparations for number 2 existed as a working tool.
24. Philandrier is often mentioned as a contributor in the large manuscript collection of Latin and Greek inscriptions by Jean Matal, today in the Vaticana. They, too, are remarkable because of their meticulous documentation of the originals. Again, any damages are carefully reproduced and all corrections explicitly separated. Often even the shape of letters is recorded as an historical evidence.
25. Unfortunately, I don't have a photograph from these manuscripts – so, this example on the left showing Matal's corrections in his edition of Mazzochi's *Epigrammata* from 1521 – a present by his friend Antonio Agostín – may serve as an example. And the drawing of the damaged inscription on the right from the *Codex Coburgensis* could also serve as a representative for Matal's way or working. You will have to trust me that Matal's collection shows the same characteristics and very often is even more precise.

26. So, we may count Matal's manuscripts as preparations for number 21 on Tolomei's list. Though these manuscripts are very well known among epigraphers – in fact, they served as the fundament for the *Corpus Inscriptorum Latinarum* started by Mommsen in 1853s and still underway today as a project of the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften. But – as far as I know – the CIL is only interested in the inscriptions themselves, not in the history of these manuscripts and their possible methodological background or relations to other antiquarian work of the time.
27. Another person mentioned in Matal's manuscripts as contributor, is the architect Andrea Palladio. His *Four Books on Architecture*, published in 1570 – under the patronage of the *Regina Virtùs!* – do not only include basic information for architects and Palladio's own works as examples, but also –
28. in Book IV – a collection of ancient buildings with historical remarks and other, not specifically architectural information. Palladio also planned to publish books on triumphal arches and the imperial baths.
29. But Palladio also provided most (if not all) the illustrations for Daniele Barbaro's commented Italian translation of Vitruvius from 1556 and his commented Latin edition of 1567, which originally was planned to be published in 1556, too.
30. So: May we count these books as results from preparatory work originally done for the *Accademia*? Let's have a look at some of Palladio's drawings:
31. This sheet shows the *Porta Maggiore* on the *Recto* and parts of the monumental substructions from the *Temple of Claudius* on the *Verso*. Obviously, these are drawings made at the studio and based on measurements taken earlier.
32. An example for such „field drawings“ can be found in the so-called *Codex Destailleur D* at Berlin. Interestingly, like Palladio's sheet, these drawings of the *Porta Maggiore* and the *Claudianum* also appear on *Recto* and *Verso* of one sheet.
33. Another example for such a „coincidence“ is this sheet by Palladio. It shows – among others – the plan of the *Basilica of Maxentius* and the construction of a spiral, presumably the volute of an Ionic capital.
34. Again, the same combination appears on a sheet from Berlin.
35. And if we put the spirals on top of each other, we see, that they are even almost identical.

36. The reason for these „coincidences“ may be that Palladio was in Rome for three years in the 1540s when also the Berlin drawings were made. But he can not have measured all the buildings alone. I don't see any possibility that an unknown stonemason from Vicenza organised, led and paid such a team himself. Fortunately, he visited Rome with his mentor Giangiorgio Trissino who regularly attended meetings of the Accademia and also disputed philological questions with Tolomei. In addition, Trissino is known not only for supporting – one may even say: creating – Palladio, but for his general interest in architecture and Antiquity. – So, I guess we may count Palladio's drawings as part of the preparations for book number 14 in Tolomei's list, especially with regard to Palladio's collaboration with Daniele Barbaro, who also stood in contact with Trissino and Tolomei.
37. Let me explain why I think the Berlin drawings were made for the Accademia: Here you see the Colosseum and, on the right, its representation in the Codex. Even if you are not an architectural historian and specialised in Renaissance drawings, you may see that the elevation in the left part of the drawing is out of proportion with the original building – which is a strange fact if you know that exactly the proportionate representation became a standard in Rome at that time. But, on the other hand, you may notice that the cornices and other details on the far right contain very many measurements – more than any other Renaissance drawing of these parts!
38. An even more astonishing drawing from the Berlin Codex is this quarter of the Colosseum's ground plan. You see, for instance, the two measurements taken for every arch of the outer arcade? Because of the elliptical form they are all different. But does the Colosseum have an elliptical or oval ground plan?
39. No, it doesn't. That's why most of the drawings and prints of the Colosseum showing a geometrical ground plan are simply wrong. But the draftsmen making these drawings (or rather: their advisor) must have known – or at least: – supposed this irregularity. And, therefore, they measured the ground plan as it is, not supposing any geometrical regularity! My personal guess is that this methodology is based on the philological experience in the Accademia.
40. Another interesting characteristic of the drawings is that – while all the architectural elements are measured very precisely – inscriptions and reliefs are completely missing. To me this could be an indication that the draftsmen knew that these parts would be recorded by others: Inscriptions by Matal and his collaborators –

reliefs by the Codex Coburgensis group, for instance.

41. It is no contradiction to this observation that in some drawings the geometrical decoration of the architecture is also recorded precisely – like the decoration in the drum of Santa Costanza which was destroyed during the late 16th century.
42. Another example I would like to show is not this ground plan of the central building from the Baths of Diocletian – there are other drawings like this, even if non of them contains as many measurements, but . . .
43. . . . this „roof plan“. As far as I know there are no other drawings comparable to this one! Note that even the steps and constructional details of the domes are documented!
44. These measured drawings showing the water reservoir (on the left) and the connecting water supply system from the Baths also has no parallel. And again: these parts were destroyed already in the 16th century.
45. So: Why do I think these drawings were made for the Accademia? – First, on the left, the French draftsman asks his French speaking employer for additional work. Secondly, he often makes annotations like the one on the right in – very bad – Italian! They usually appear when the draftsman wants to make sure that the drawings show the reality and any missing parts are not his own errors. So, in this case – he states that the Doric order from the Theatre of Marcellus really has no base – a fact that would have been known to architects at least since 1537, when Serlio published it in his Third Book, but not to our draftsman! And: obviously at least one among his employers must have been Italian. Or would you make a note for yourself in a foreign language? Especially, after you excavated this part and made that drawing? I don't think so . . . So, in my opinion, the draftsman here clearly addresses someone else. And it should be sufficient to remember that the Accademia had Italian as well as French members.
46. Only a short addition: Among the drawings in Berlin and their counterparts in Vienna, there are no drawings of the Pantheon, the most famous and best preserved building from Roman antiquity. But there are drawings of it by French draftsmen in New York showing the same characteristics as the rest of the group.
47. Among them is this recording of the main inscription, showing it in its original form – that is, before it was „restored“ in the 19th century. Only from this

drawing we can learn that the original letters had a slight inclination to the right – demonstrated by the plumbs on both sides of the letter „S“.

48. Recently it was discovered by Carolyn Yerkes that the New York and the Berlin drawings belong together: She recognised that the drawing on the right from Berlin does not belong to the Baths of Caracalla, as even the (almost) infallible Christian Hülsen thought 120 years ago. Instead, it shows a room inside the Pantheon that is also represented in New York (on the left). But the relation is even closer: The Berlin drawing contains only those measurements and details that are missing in New York!
49. So, I hope you agree that we may add the drawings from the Berlin Codex Destailleur D, a complementary group from the Albertina in Vienna and the group from New York as preparations for number 14 in Tolomei's list.
50. Tolomei and his friends were aware that many single elements of lost Roman buildings survived. So they had to be recorded as well. – This could correspond to many anonymous single drawings showing such architectural elements. Even if these two here show the famous and very often drawn capitals from the Pantheon's Pronaos, you may notice the difference among the (also) French draftsman on the left and the drawing from Berlin: The last one is more accurate and shows a perfect elevation, while one on the left rather could be called a „measured view“.
51. But I think it may be justified at least to search for indications if many of these „solitary“ drawings may have been part of the Accademia's project.
52. Do we have any confirmation that architectural drawings were made for the Accademia? – Yes, we do: Giorgio Vasari claims that the Accademia employed Vignola to measure all the antiquities in Rome. Later, Vignola's biographer and editor of his treatise on perspective, Egnazio Danti, confirmed this and added that this work and the profound knowledge acquired through it enabled Vignola to write his famous *Regola delli cinque ordini*, published before 1562. But we have no drawings by Vignola himself corresponding to these claims. I guess, because he was the leader of the group, not an ordinary draftsman.
53. Here Vignola compares the Doric order from the Theatre of Marcellus – that one without a base – with a „synthetic“ Dorica invented by himself, based on many good examples from Rome. As a result from his work for the Accademia, it must have been obvious to Vignola that there is nothing like the Doric (or any other)

order. Instead, all surviving examples differed remarkably from each other and from Vitruvius' rules. So, Vignola's conclusion was to invent his own modular system of the orders based on the best classical examples. By doing so he gave architects a basic set that was reprinted more than 500 times in the following 500 years!

54. Therefore, it could be justified to put Vignola also on Tolomei's list – especially with regard to the main aim of the whole project: to give a reliable „handbook“ for a new architecture – based on Vitruvius but also on all other ancient buildings. One may say that Vignola's book is not really fulfilling Tolomei's demands for book 12. But we may take into account that – after the dissolution of the Accademia around 1555 – many people were in possession of those preparatory materials and used them for their own purposes.
55. Another example of such a „relic“ may be the „Reigle generale d'architecture“ published by Jean Bullant in 1564. We do not know when Bullant was in Rome, but he certainly was. So he very well may have been a member of the „measuring group“ led by Vignola and may have used his own copies of the drawings later for his book.
56. In contrast to Vignola, Bullant not only compares well known examples of the orders with each other, but also with the descriptions given by Vitruvius.
57. So, Bullant's book may even better than those by Barbaro, Palladio and Vignola serve as an example for what was intended for Tolomei's number 12. – But we are not done yet: As you can see, number 13 was meant to give the historical background for Roman architecture by providing a history of the Urbs with its chronological development – mainly to explain the location and alterations of single buildings.
58. I would like to suggest that preparations for book number 13 – if not the book itself –, may be seen in Marliano's Topographia:
59. While the first two editions from 1534 contain only text, the revised edition from 1544 contains the famous general reconstruction of Rome in Late Antiquity.
60. But the book also contains two maps showing earlier states: the left one represents the mythical „Roma quadrata“, the one on the right the walls in early imperial times.

61. These maps with their detailed explanation by Marliano may have served as starting points for the famous map of Ancient Rome by Pirro Ligorio, who stood in close contact with the Accademia, but himself was no member of it.
62. A map of contemporary Rome from 1557 by Francesco Paciotto required more accurate measurements – and they could have been done for the Accademia: Paciotto was asked by Tolomei in 1548 to measure the Baths of Caracalla with all details – if he had not already done so. The Berlin drawings of the Baths were made between 1545 and 1548 when they were used as quarries for St. Peter's. In fact, the French draftsmen, working for the Fabbrica di San Pietro, were taking part in the destruction of the Baths which also offered the last chance to measure them in their original splendor. Because Vignola was not in Rome at the time, Paciotto then could have been the leader of the group.
63. The fact that three of Marliano's collaborators are also mentioned as members of the Accademia may allow us to count his work as somehow related to number 13. – I'm closing with a last group of sources: As number 23, a book on all medals and coins was planned because they would be useful as historical sources for all kinds of information.
64. Jacopo Strada is known for his activities in the art and antiquity market – and for his „Epitome“,
65. a rather typical history of the Roman emperors illustrated with their coins. But he was – as he claims himself – in close contact with Antonio Agostín (we remember: the friend and supporter of Jean Matal) and with Marcello Cervini. Strada even planned to give up his safe position at the imperial court at Vienna to go to Rome when Cervini was elected Pope in 1555. But Cervini, unfortunately, died already three weeks later.
66. Over decades Strada collected coins and medals and had a group of draftsmen make drawings of them like these: Some are very accurate, some with fantastic additions usually correcting damages. So, he did not strictly follow the „philological rules“ we may find in Matal's collection of inscriptions, in the drawings of tomb stones and architecture. But this methodological deviation was at least supported by Agostín himself. Strada's surviving collection comprises 9'000 (!) drawings and a few thousand pages of comments!

67. So, I guess these drawings could also be regarded as preparations done for the Accademia.
68. That means, we – still hypothetically – may end up with this list (in blue) of material from the Renaissance that may go back to work done for the Accademia's project. All of their creators were in contact with each other or worked together.
69. And, taking into account that large parts of this material have not been investigated yet at all or – at least – not with regard to the Accademia, we may consider that even for the other volumes some sources still may exist. – Henning Wrede, after almost 30 years, is again working on a catalog of the Codices Coburgensis and Pighianus (number 15). Dirk Janssen and Volker Heenes hopefully will receive funding for the first research ever on Strada's immense corpus of drawings (number 23). – And I myself will go on with the architectural drawings presumably for volumes 14 and 18. At the moment I found some 500 sheets with almost 3000 single drawings ... still counting.
70. Finally I come back to my rather odd representation of the Accademia's Network. Now the relations mentioned are shown in blue. Some of the names I mentioned, others not – and the full list comprises some 30 people more ... But I am convinced: Even if some of these hypothetical reconstructions of the Accademia's network and the research done by and for it may not be confirmed by future research, you may agree that there would still be enough left to expect many fascinating ...
71. „News from Ancient Rome“. – Thank you for your patience!