

1. First of all I would like to thank the organizers for giving me the opportunity to present today some aspects of my recent research on a large group of anonymous architectural drawings from the Renaissance. — [This is the place where I have the luck to work: It is the most beautiful (modern) library in the world, a public library founded by architectural historian Werner Oechslin at Einsiedeln, Switzerland, containing almost every old and rare book that you may ever want to read on architecture, its theory and history as well as all the connected disciplines already mentioned by Vitruvius: Altogether some 20'000 old prints from the 15th century onwards and some 50'000 modern books with secondary literature. End of the shameless advertisement.]
2. The main corpus of these drawings once was owned by the French architect and collector Hippolyte Destailleur, who sold his first collection of about 5'700 drawings to the Library of the royal museum for crafts and arts in Berlin, today the *Kunstbibliothek* i.e. Library of Arts. Among them were three volumes which Hermann Egger in 1903 suggested to call 'Codex Destailleur' when he discovered a group of parallel drawings at the *Albertina* in Vienna.
3. This Berlin Codex Destailleur *D*, modern signature Hdz 4151, consists of 120 sheets, usually in *folio* format and containing up to 24 single drawings of ancient Roman buildings with many details as well as some of the most prominent contemporary buildings in Rome from the first half of the 16th century like Bramante's Tempietto, Sangallo's Saint Peter's or the Palazzo Farnese. Among the topics mentioned in the Call for Papers, these drawings could be grouped under 'history', in part also under 'education'. But the more appropriate subsumption would be 'documentation': a documentation created to reconstruct Roman architecture as the reliable foundation for a new one. The reason to present this material here are the complex relations between these drawings, but also their documentary value : As you can see in this example, the sheets unite *hand*-drawings in a strict sense, i.e. drawings made by hand only without the help of ruler or compass like those on the left, and other drawings made using these devices like the one mid-right (at least: using a ruler): The corrections and the overall uniformity of the drawings on this sheet support the hypotheses that even those drawings using the ruler have been made on-site, which has often been excluded for Renaissance drawings. In fact, most of the drawings from this Codex and the related drawings in other collections must have been made free-hand 'on-site' with portable drawing tables to allow the usage of ruler and compass when needed.

4. For instance: To reconstruct the ground plan of the Colosseum geometrically with a compass and then insert all the measurements would not only have taken too much time but it would also have been wrong – supposing a regularity that is not there: The draftsmen realised that the ground plan of the Colosseum *is not* a geometrically correct oval but something different: Otherwise, the ‘radiuses’ from the main axe could not cross each other. I don’t know of any other measured drawing or print of the Colosseum up to the late 20th century demonstrating this irregularity.
5. This is only one example for what I would like to call the ‘philological approach’ to document every building and its details *as they are* and not *as they were expected to be* – an approach you may hardly find in archaeology before the late 19th century. And, as in this case, this discovery would not have been possible if the draftsmen would have used a compass to construct a beautiful regular oval *before* starting their measurements. So, maybe the usage of *hand* drawings in the strictest sense, i.e.: without any tools, was a conscious decision . . .
6. Another example for the complex relationship between *hand-drawing* and others done with rulers and compass are these two: the one on the left shows the – nowhere else – recorded ‘roof landscape’ of the Baths of Diocletian; while the corresponding part of the groundplan on the right clearly is a *handdrawing* done at the site. This case may support the conclusion that the drawings do not represent a completed but a discontinued project.
7. Other remarkable drawings from this group show technical details, for instance here the partial plan and section of the heating system in the Baths of Diocletian. The draftsmen obviously were aware of the function of these underground rooms as the flames in the middle opening show. While other architects sometimes drew these parts, too, they usually were not very interested in taking precise measurements, and the reason seems to be obvious: Of course, no one would expect a Peruzzi, Sangallo or Palladio to build such a heating system anew. So, they were only important for people with a documentary approach interested in ‘everything’ related to ancient architecture, not only in its ‘re-usable’ parts.
8. The same can be said about the water supply system of the Baths of Diocletian: While you may find some other drawings by Peruzzi or Ligorio showing the large reservoir on the right (but not as detailed as here), no-one recorded the water supply system for the entire complex – as far as it was still recognisable in the 1540s. Due to the later destruction of the reservoir these are in many cases

the only surviving sources providing information which should be of interest for archaeologists, historians of architecture or technology.

9. In some cases the drawings may also help to correct errors: This room from the Baths of Caracalla and its counterpart are usually regarded and named as ‘libraries’ – one for greek and one for latin literature. The problem is: They had no roofs like the passage to the right. Another problem: The librarians would have to be very tall to reach the books in their shelves when the niches containing the books started 2.70 meters or 9 feet above the ground. I should mention that these draftsmen were the last to see these rooms standing, because they themselves took part in their destruction in 1546 and 1547 when they were working in the service of the *Fabbrica di San Pietro*. What we see today – in the photograph above – is a modern reconstruction of the surface covering the inner concrete remains of the ancient walls which were not removed to be used in St. Peter’s and the Palazzo Farnese 470 years ago.
10. While the draftsmen did *not* document any decoration that could not be regarded as *architecture* in a strict sense – like reliefs or inscriptions –, the recorded panels with incrustations like this one from Santa Costanza,
11. which was destroyed in the 17th century and never again documented.
12. Santa Costanza was regarded as a Temple of Bacchus because of its decoration showing wine. Therefore, the long structure in front of the ‘temple’ – in fact, the remains of an early christian basilica – was misunderstood as a circus, called *Circo di Baccho*. Only our draftsman recognised that this ‘circus’ had some unusual features like a wooden roof and columns along the inner side of the racecourse. So, he does not dare to offer a new interpretation for the entire complex, he remarks his findings in the drawing in a ‘French’ Italian – obviously addressed to his patron. Or would you make a note about an interesting finding on your own drawing in a language that you do not really master? ... if you needed a note at all to remember such an astonishing discovery?
13. While the Berlin Codex and the complementing drawings in Vienna show almost all important ancient Roman buildings, the Pantheon, the best preserved Roman building and surely one of the most impressive, is missing. – But there is a set of drawings by another French draftsman in the *Goldschmidt* scrapbook at the Metropolitan Museum of Art demonstrating the same features as those in Berlin and Vienna. Again, we have a mixture of drawings in part drawn with ruler and compass and in part free-hand additions of details and measurements.

14. Some of the New York drawings show the ancient bronze roof trusses – and even though they do not contain measurements, they are the most precise ever made – except those done by Borromini some 80 years later when he had direct access to all parts while the roof was deconstructed under Pope Urban VIII.
15. Two Pantheon drawings are kept in Berlin: the left one showing only *those* measurements from the room between *Portico* and *Rotunda* that the New York draftsman forgot to take – and on the right this fascinating handdrawing: Here the draftsman obviously tries to include all levels of the three-sided staircase leading up to the room shown on the left in one drawing!
16. One last example from the Pantheon: Only this French draftsman recorded the slight inclination of the main inscription from the *Portico's* frieze – as is demonstrated by the plum lines beside the letter S. As far as I know this inscription was never documented as careful as here – and its inclination was „corrected“ in the 19th century.
17. The draftsmen – mostly writing in French and using French feet – were working for someone else: a patron, or rather: a group of patrons, they address here in French: „If my work gave you pleasure, reserve other / more of it with contentment ...“ — But in other cases they try to write their notes in Italian with a strong French accent, one may say: These notes usually explain remarkable findings. Around 1545 everyone could have known from Serlio's book that the doric order of the Theatre of Marcellus does not have a base ... except this draftsman annotating here that the „teatro di marcel [...] non A basa alcuno“. This is another indication that the drawings were not made by architects but by craftsmen working for patrons who were not at the site.
18. But there are also other drawings in this group, for instance these rather finished drawings. They are so different from the others in regard to this feature, that I did not regard them as being part of the group until I recognised that the handwriting of the draftsman also appears a few times among the other drawings. And this makes sense: after all, all the drawings with their immense amount of very precise measurements must have been made with clean final drawings or even prints in mind, like the one on the right showing one of the ancient columns from the altar of Saint Peter's.
19. This can also be concluded for instance from a comparison between the drawing on the left from Vienna showing the cornice of the Temple of Hadrian – again

as a *handdrawing* in the strictest sense – and the one on the right, now in Stockholm, showing the same cornice in an elaborated manner even with wash.

20. Besides the many drawings documenting entire buildings with overviews and details, there are also many others showing only single details like capitals and bases like those from Vienna, Paris and New York. Unfortunately, these drawings often have been separated from their original context and, therefore, can only be rediscovered and identified by chance.
21. Sometimes such drawings have also been simply misattributed: The drawing on the left was attributed by Hermann Egger to an Italian of the 17th century, while it is in fact by the main French draftsmen of this group and, therefore, from the 16th century. Errors like this one in catalogues or publications make it difficult to identify *all* the drawings once belonging to this group.
22. By now, almost 700 sheets in 12 collections with more than 3'300 single drawings can be regarded as part of this group – and almost none have ever been studied carefully, even though, as I hope to have shown, they are of great importance. — But then, you may (or should) ask: Who is responsible for this documentation which – as far as I can see – is the largest of its kind and therefore, the result of the most comprehensive survey *ever* undertaken in Rome?
23. We know of such a project exactly from the 1530s and -40s: the project of an *Accademia* of Italian and French members to „entirely measure all the ancient buildings in Rome“ – *misurare interamente tutti l'anticaglie di Roma* – as Vasari describes it in his passage about Jacopo Barozzi da Vignola. Almost the same words were used by Vignola's biographer Egnatio Danti 15 years later. Because both of them stood in personal contact with Vignola, we may trust them. But we do not have any drawings by Vignola supporting this information. . . ?
24. Or do we? There are underdrawings made with graphite in most of the sheets showing one very remarkable feature: the 'expertness' of their draftsman: He obviously knew how to prepare a survey drawing and how to divide the sheet into areas for the appropriate partial drawings. He also had some experience in perspective. Though by now I don't want to claim that these underdrawings were made by Vignola – yet, but I am sure that the craftsmen were *not* able to make these underdrawings. Because the main draftsman from the Berlin Codex can be identified with a certain *Guielmo franciosio* working as a craftsman or helpmate at the *Fabbrica di San Pietro* between 1544 and 1547, it also seems

implausible to see him and his colleagues as the persons who developed the project and oversaw its execution over almost two decades.

25. But this astonishing project itself was only one part of an even larger project – described in a famous (but rarely carefully read) letter written by the Siennese humanist Claudio Tolomei in 1542 and published in 1547.
26. Its project was not only to study Vitruvius (as Vasari claimed) but to document all ancient Roman remains and writings somehow related to Architecture – with the explicit aim to establish a solid theoretical and practical foundation for a new architecture: a *Renaissance* in the best sense of the word.  
Therefore, besides all ancient buildings it was intended to document: the urban history of ancient Rome, all tombstones and sarcophagi, all statues, friezes, reliefs, single architectural elements, all vases, all instruments and tools, all inscriptions, all paintings, all medals and coins and all aqueducts and machines as far as they could be reconstructed – in short: more or less the program of Classical Roman Archaeology. — It is no wonder then, that modern research has regarded this program as completely over the top, even megalomaniac. Especially when or even though Tolomei claims that the workload would be divided among many learned persons and therefore would be finished in *less than three years*. — So, was Tolomei straight lying into the face of his supposed sponsor as well as into the faces of his readers? I don't think so. . .
27. At least a few sources relatable to this *Accademia's* project have been identified:
28. Guillaume Philandrier's *Annotationes* to Vitruvius printed in 1544 – explaining the dark and difficult passages in Vitruvius, . . .
29. the second edition of Marliano's *Topographia*, also from 1544, containing
30. for the first time archaeological reconstructions of ancient Rome and,
31. thereby, its urban development
32. and the Codices Coburgensis and Pighianus, showing ancient reliefs and sarcophagi with the same archaeological approach documenting the objects as they are, not as they might have been or should be.
33. I am convinced that the Codex Destailier Group also belongs to this project
34. and we may add six volumes with roughly 10'000 ancient inscriptions, following the same approach, today in the Vatican Library. After Theodor Mommsen

had studied them in the 1840s he used them as the foundation stone for the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* in 1853 which is still an ongoing research and publication project in Berlin . . . Though this collection of inscriptions from the *Accademia* has been studied in detail as the only one from this context, it was never put in relation to the other sources mentioned. (So much about the modern concept of ‘inter-’ or ‘multidisciplinarity’ hailed at least since the 1990s . . . but invented, I would say, by the same *Accademia* some 450 years earlier.

35. Finally, I would like to add all the other printed books and manuscript sources that I think belong to the *Accademia's* project because of the close personal contacts between their authors, all of them known to have been members – at least temporarily – of this circle or rather: network in Rome –
36. This international and interdisciplinary network consisted of at least 100 persons . . . and so you may believe me that I do *not* think of Tolomei as a liar, but that we, instead, still may expect lots of
37. News from ancient Rome. – Thank you!