1. First of all I would like to thank the organizers for giving me the opportunity to speak at length about my ongoing research project. It regards anonymous architectural drawings by mostly French-speaking draftsmen and their larger context. But I will talk about the drawings only in the last part of my paper after an extensive introduction into this context which fits better into the program of this workshop. — What you see here is the place I have the pleasure to work: The Library founded by Werner Oechslin at Einsiedeln where you would find most of the books you may ever want to read on the history and theory of architecture and the connected disciplines.

2. After this shameless advertisement, I want to commemorate Andreas Tönnesmann who helped me to start this research in 2013: It goes back to my dissertation about drawings for Antonio da Sangallo the Younger's last project for Saint Peter's in Rome. These drawings are now kept in Berlin at the *Kunstbibliothek* and were investigated for the first time by Christof Thoenes for the exhibition of architectural models from the Renaissance in 1994. He suggested to study them more in detail. During my work on these drawings I realised that the other drawings of the same so-called Codex Destailleur D, many of them showing ancient Roman buildings, deserve more interest than they received since the late 19th century when they came to Berlin. – But more on this later. First I would like to introduce the so-called *Accademia della Virtù* and its project.

3. Imagine you were living in Rome around 1540 and saw a need to establish a system of rules for a new architecture: All contemporary architects and patrons agree that the classical Roman architecture is the best example for what a modern architecture should look like, but there is no set of rules systematically based on the ancient texts and buildings. — Therefore: First of all, you would start with a new, reliable edition of Vitruvius' *Ten books on architecture* and reconstruct all the drawings he mentions: They once were attached to every book but got lost. And because not everything is simple and clear in his text, you may want to add some new drawings, too.

4. To be able to reconstruct the text of this new edition, you would have to compare all existing editions as well as manuscripts.

5. With the help of some philologists among your friends, the many complicated, even dark passages from Vitruvius' text could be discussed. Of course it would be helpful (and best philological practice) to compare these passages with other Latin sources to get an idea about what Vitruvius could have meant or his readers would have understood.

6. Soon you would realise that Vitruvius' Latin is not the best and that some of his rather unusual expressions could be understood by comparing them, too, with other Latin authors. At least the philologists among your friends would suggest such a comparison.

7. After that, you may feel tempted to create a new edition of Vitruvius in a *better, corrected* Latin.

8. Surely, a translation of Vitruvius into a modern language would be helpful, too, especially for your intended audience, architects and their patrons. Italian would be a good choice, and the philologist would agree, that Tuscan would be the most appropriate Italian dialect.

9. For the work on your editorial project and for your audience and readers, a vocabulary explaining the complicated Latin terms used by Vitruvius and the places were they can be found in his books would be a very helpful tool.

10. And the same can be said about the many *Greek* terms Vitruvius used in his books.

11. Another *vocabolario* with explanations of the architectural terms also would be helpful for your readers: It would allow to compare these ancient terms with modern ones.

12. And again, the same can be said about architectural parts and tools mentioned by Vitruvius.

13. But this would only be the „theoretical“ part helping to understand ancient Roman architectural theory: The architects among your friends would already have realised by measuring ancient buildings that there is hardly one following the rules given by Vitruvius. Therefore, it would be useful to carefully measure and document every ancient building in Rome.

14. But to understand the ancient buildings in their historical development and context you would need to correctly place them in the fabric of time and space. Therefore, a historical reconstruction of Rome's urban development could help to understand which building was built when and in which architectural as well as functional and stylistic context.

15. The architects among your friends would already have realised that there are many architectural parts scattered all over Rome that can *not* be traced to certain buildings anymore but are obviously very well made and could serve as examples for modern architecture, too. Therefore, they would suggest to document these elements.

16. After this philological reconstrution and interpretation of Vitruvius' texts and its meaning and after the corroborating documentation of ancient architecture in all its details and its historical and urban context, it would be time for a comparison between both: the text and the material remains. This could provide your readers with a catalogue of alternative and ideas to chose from.

17. So, now you would be ready to build as the ancient Romans did – or would you? Of course not. Even in the late 18th century it still would have been impossible to build something like the Pantheon's *Pronaos* or dome ... Therefore, a (theoretical) reconstruction of the machines mentioned by Vitruvius and others should be very helpful.

18. And the same can be said about ancient tools and instruments, even though there may be some new ones that would fulfil the same functions in a better way.

19. Let's – for a moment – go back to the historical context of the buildings: Obviously, many ancient Roman buildings – in terms of their function – would not have a modern counterpart. But to achieve clarity about this, you first would have to know *which* special function an ancient building served. And therefore it would be helpful to use other sources for the interpretation of the known and even the unknown buildings: medals and coins would be a very good class of such sources.

20. But friezes and reliefs also would be helpful in this respect: If you understand the figures in a frieze found at an ancient building, you may easier guess what its function was.

21. Even better sources – not only for the buildings themselves in a strict sense but also for the reconstruction of the historical and urban developments – are, of course, inscriptions.

22. And while you are just working on these classes of sources, you may extend your documentation to tombstones and sarcophagi, too.

23. Besides coins, reliefs and inscriptions, statues also may help to understand the architecture: Not only as additional sources about the gods or emperors, but also to learn something about the decoration of ancient buildings like: which statue would be appropriate in which position.

24. And while we are talking about decoration of buildings: Vases and similar objects should also be documented to give some artistic guidance about decoration.

25. Of course, the same can be said about paintings: The may serve as sources for information about architecture as well as examples for their decoration. – And there we are: This would be an almost complete list of everthing needed for your project to establish a system of normes and examples taken from Antiquity for the best modern architecture one could have in 1550. Obviously, it is more or less an attempt to document *almost all* material remains of Roman antiquity.

26. Now let's re-arrange the list a little bit ... *et voilà*:

27. There we have the program of the so-called *Accademia della Virtù* as Claudio Tolomei described it in his famous letter to count Agostino de' Landi from 1542, published in 1547.

28. Because Tolomei does not give numbers, you may find in modern literature anything between 8 and 20 items. Surely, a slightly different number may be a question of interpretation ...

29. But what cannot be a question of interpretation is the purpose of Tolomei's letter: He does not ask count Landi to fund a hobbyists' curiosity project, but continously speaks of *books* that he and his friends want to *print and publish* ...

30. with the goal to *re-awaken* the *noble study of architecture*, which should be a *must* for every *great Prince*. In his introduction, Tolomei also says that this program – like all the arts and especially architecture itself – is a mixture, a *compositum*, of *Theory and Practice*. And therefore it seems to be necessary to unite *the prescriptions of the writers with the examples* of built architecture.

31. Tolomei is also very aware that this project might seem *far to ambitious* to his reader: *too big and too troublesome*. And this is exactly how modern interpreters have understood his letter. If they would have read it carefully, they would not only have realised that there are (at least) **23** items or rather: *books* that Tolomei and his friends want to *publish*, but also, that he knows how to achieve this: *By uniting the forces of many learned men in one project where everyone takes over a part according to his capabilities*. By doing so, it would be possible *to publish all 23 books* ***in less than three years***. — If we do *not* assume that Tolomei was lying to count Landi (from whom he hoped to receive support for the project!) and to the readers of his printed letters, than we may assume that his claim is based on some preparations already underway or even done – if not in 1542, then at least by 1547.

32. Before I present some of the sources that I believe to have originated from Tolomei's circle, let's have a look at the circle itself. Usually — and: I have to admit: in the title of my paper, too — the group is identified with so-called *Accademia della Virtù* active in Rome at least since 1537. One problem is, that Tolomei himself does not mention this name, not even *any* name of the circle of his *molti belli ignegni*. For me, this is a clear sign that this circle *did not* have the form of an established *Accademia* in any modern sense or maybe even in any contemporary sense of the word. Instead, we should think of it as a *network* of persons with congruent interests who were prepared to join forces. In fact, as fas as I know, the *Accademia della Virtù* to which some of the persons listed here belonged, is *only* mentioned with activities regarding modern Latin poetry and attempts to establish a new Italian that could substitute Latin as the language of learned studies. Later sources mention an *Accademia dello Sdegno* or *degli Sdegnati*, founded by some persons (among them Ligorio) who were embarrassed – *sdegnati* – by the destruction of Roman ruins. But this *Accademia*, also, can not be identified with the entire circle. — Another name, *Accademia Vitruviana*, only seems to appears in modern sources and go back to a misinterpretation of Tolomei's letter as a project to only study and edit Vitruvius, but nothing else. Even though Tolomei clearly states *on the first page* that the study of theory, in this case: Vitruvius, cannot be sufficient! Some of these interpreters refer to Vasari who mentions an *Accademia di nobilissimi gentil'huomini, e signori, che attendevano alla letione di Vitruvio*. But, from my point of view, this does not make the group mentioned by Tolomei to a *Vitruvian Accademy*, in a limited sense. Only one *almost* contemporary source, Egnatio Danti, Vignola's biographer and editor his *Le due regole della prospettiva prattica,* names the accademy an *Accademia d'Architettura* – which, again, is not a name but a description of its purpose.
    As you can see, my list of persons who at any time between 1537 and 1555 had some sort of relation to others we may regard as *members* of this network, comprises already some 70 persons – the craftsmen working for some of the subprojects not included. And I'm still counting ... I will refer to some of these names, here in bold letters, in the following parts of my talk.

33. Let's start with the only printed book that has ever been regarded as a result of the *Accademia*'s work – even though the *Accademia* is not mentioned explicitly in it at all, but only some of its members: Guillaume Philandrier's *Annotationes* to Vitruvius published in Rome in 1544.

34. It can, surely not by accident, easily be identified with the *first* book mentioned by Tolomei. It may seem strange that he does not explicitly name this book as some sort of a first *milestone*, but we should remember that the letter is dated to 1542. To rewrite it for the publication in 1547 by inserting Philandrier's book explicitly would have suggested that Tolomei had known already in 1542 that the book was to be published in 1544 ...

35. Philandrier's *Annotationes* may also be related to Tolomeis book number 3, because it contains some illustrations, even though they do not represent *all* the drawings Vitruvius mentions himself.

36. The main disadvantage in using Philandrier's book surely would have been the need of a full text edition to use both books side by side: After all, Philandrier's book is rather only a helping tool

for reading Vitruvius. Therefore, it was only a question of time when a publisher would join both books in one edition: In 1552 Jean de Tournes in Lyon did just this.

37. But can his edition be identified with book 3 in Tolomei's list? As far as I know this question has never been investigated, because it would require to identify *all the editions and other sources* that Tournes and, maybe, Philandrier himself may have used.

38. At least, the book *claims to be* based on such a comparison among all available sources: Its subtitle says that it was derived from *omnibus omnium editionibus longè emendatiores, collatis veteribus exemplis.* So, we may include it as more or less corresponding to book 3 of Tolomei's list.

39. The only other group of Renaissance previously related to the *Accademia network* are the *Codices Coburgensis* (now in Coburg, Germany) and *Pighianus* (now in Berlin). They do not only contain ancient reliefs like many other drawing books, but are also carefully ordered: 30 years ago, art historian Richard Harprath and archaeologist Henning Wrede came to the conclusion, that this ordering would allow to call the *Coburgensis* „the *first* archaeological book" in a modern, academic sense: The main ordering principle was the genealogy of the ancient gods and their myths.

40. One of the very modern characteristics justifying Harprath's and Wrede's classification can be observed here: the drawings very accurately show the ancient reliefs and their inscriptions in their conditions *without any corrections or additions.*

41. Therefore, we may count these two codices among the preparations for books 14 and 16. — **So:** According to modern research, that would be everything the *Accademia* ever achieved. You may already guess, that I don't think so ...

42. The example on the right could have reminded modern scholars of a very large group of sources:

43. A large collection of Latin inscriptions that may have been preparations for book 20:

44. Its author is Jean Matal who lived in Rome from 1546 to 1550 as secretary and friend of Antonio Agostín, a lawyer at the papal *Sacra Rota Romana.* Both had studied law with Andrea Alciati, and therefore were introduced to the philological studies of ancient inscriptions. In his six volumes containg thousands of Latin inscriptions, Matal used to clearly distinguish the transcriptions and his annotations and additions. Among Matal's collaborators many familiar names regularly appear like: Guillaume Philandrier, Stephanus Pighius (the owner of the *Codex Pighianus*) and Antoine Morillon, the main author of the *Codex Coburgensis.*

45. So, we may count Matal's codices in the Vaticana among the preparations for book 20.

46. Now I come to some material, printed as well as in manuscript form, that I would propose to be considered as being part of the preparations for Tolomei's program or at least as resulting from the work done for its realisation: The connection usually lies in relationships among the responsible persons who belonged to Tolomei's circle and / or the content that can be related to one of the planned volumes. — Because my own research started with the anonymous architectural drawings

by French draftsmen in the Berlin Codex Destailleur D and other collections, I would like to start with these now in short and come back to this group later:

47. At the moment the drawings from this codex and its context sum up to some 660 sheets with more than 3'200 drawings. Some of them are very large, others show minute details like those from the Colosseum. As you can see, the draftsman does not try to follow the established, proportional method of representation developed and used by Italian architects in the first half of the 16th century, but rather tries to record all available information, even if this demands a disproportional representation, that is: something *very common* among French carpenters. That the main person among the almost 20 draftsmen responsible for this large group of drawings, the so-called *Anonymous Destailleur*, in fact *was* a French craftsman and carpenter and *no* architect can be shown from accounts of the *Fabbrica di San Pietro* in the Vatican.

48. Because of indications from the drawings that I will explain later, we may include this large group from the Berlin Codices Destailleur D and A, some 50 sheets from the *Albertina* in Vienna, and many more into the list as preparations for Tolomei's book 13.

49. Among this group there are many drawings showing single architectural elements:

50. Because such 'lonely' anonymous drawings usually are not in the focus of architectural historians, there rarely have been made suggestoins to explain their origin or purpose.

51. Therefore, I think we may provisionally count them as preparations for book 17.

52. Another large group of drawings not studied comprehensively yet, are the over 9'000 drawings after ancient coins from Jacopo Strada's workshop.

53. Before moving to Rome for two years, Strada published in Strasbourg his *Epitome thesauri antiquitatum*, a history of Roman emperors, representing them with images from their coins. Strada seems to have had access to collections in Rome and, therefore, been there before 1553.

54. In Rome, as he proudly claims in the opening *letter* to his edition of Panvinio's *Epitome Pontificum Romanorum* from 1557, he was invited to the meetings of an *Accademia* of learned men from all disciplines and crafts: Under the protection of cardinal Alessandro Farnese „*one would meet theologians, philosopers, astronomers, mathematicians, historians, poets, doctors, lawyers, philosophers, architects, engravers, painters, sculptors, antiquaries, gem-cutters, goldsmiths, and soldiers: in short, people proficient in all the useful and fine arts.*" — In his edition of Panvinio's *Fasti et Triumphi* also published in Venice in 1557, he mentions some of the accademia's members:

55. Antonio Agostìn, Gentile Delfini, Achille Maffei, Benedetto Egio and Gabriele Faerno.

56. In Rome, Strada had access to the largest collections of ancient coins and – in his function as merchant of antiquities – to many traders; therefore, he could collect an incredible amount of drawings which later must have served as models for fine drawings like these. That they do not reflect the 'archaeological' approach of the *Accademia* still requires explanation...

57. But still in most of the cases the original coins and medals can easily be identified from Strada's drawings. And even if some Renaissance falsifications may be among them: as far as I know this is (again) the most complete and methodological coherent collection of this kind. Only in last December two colleagues, Dirk Jansen and Volker Heenes, could start a research project to study these drawings. Today almost all of them are in the collection of Gotha Castle in Germany.

58. Because of Strada's close connection to the *Accademia* at least between 1553 and 1555, we may include his drawings among the sources somehow related to the *Accademia*'s work.

59. And we should add Antonio Agostìn's work, too: He wrote the then most important book on the study of coins and inscriptions, his *Dialogos de Medallas, inscriciones, y otras antiguedades* from 1587, reprinted in its Italien edition several times throughout the next century.

60. Among the other printed sources that may stand in some relation to the *Accademia*, there is a book corresponding to Tolomei's book 11 by giving an overview of the architectural rules formulated by Vitruvius and comparing them with examples from ancient architecture:

61. Jean Bullant's *Reigle generalle d'architecture* from 1564 closely resembles Tolomei's description.

62. Bullant claims to have measured all his examples in Rome himself, but we still do not know when exactly he did this. Born around 1515, he must have been in Rome before 1541, when he started his activities as an architect in France, which, of course, does not exclude later travels to Rome.

63. While Bullant gives extensive explanations, another architect only used so few words, that they could be engraved in his plates. Also, content and purpose of Vignola's *Regola delli cinque ordini* from 1562 are quite different: Instead of *comparing* ancient examples to Vitruvius, he creates his own system that is based on his studies of ancient buildings, but differs from them explicitly.

64. The system of his *Regola* has the great advantage to allow the application of the architectural orders to any building by being based on *one* common module. Therefore the singular in his title: *Regola* instead of *Regole*, is fully justified — even though sometimes misunderstood.

65. But can we relate Vignola to the *Accademia?* — „Yes, we can!"

66. Vasari as well as Vignola's biographer Egnatio Danti mention that the young architect measured *all the antiquities in Rome* for the *Accademia*, which Danti calls an *Accademia d'Architettura*. Interestingly, Vignola did this even before he left Rome in 1537. I could later propose an explanation why we do not seem to have any of these measured drawings by Vignola's hand.

67. So, we may connect Vignola's work somehow to book 11 and possibly even so Bullant's. — And: Two other books seem to fulfil Tolomei's description also quite well: the translation of Vitruvius' *Ten books* into modern Italian, i.e. book 8, and another Latin edition resembling book 3.

68. In 1556, just one year after Cervini's death – which seems to mark the end of the Roman *Accademia* –, Daniele Barbaro published his annotated translation of Vitruvius to which Palladio provided illustrations and architectural advice. Barbaro stood in contact with Giangiorgio Trissino

who 'discovered' the young talented stonemason *Andrea di Pietro della Gondola*, gave him the name *Palladio* and took him to Rome in the 1540s where Trissino attended the meetings of the *Accademia*. Trissino also had a discussion with Tolomei about the forms of letters to be used in the new Italian that both wanted to establish.

69. So, we may assume that Bartoli's annotated edition from 1556 has some relation to the *Accademia.*

70. And the same could be said, of course, for his Latin edition from 1567.

71. To fill more gaps, let's have a look at n° 12: the annotated chronology of Rome's urban development.

72. It has already been observed that members of the *Accademia* are mentioned as assistants who helped Bartolomeo Marliano to prepare the second edition of his *Topographia antiquae Romae.* The first edition was printed in Rome *and* Lyon in 1534. The differences among this first and the second edition from 1544 may have justified to change the title to *Topographia urbis Romae*.

73. One of these important differences is the inclusion of simple maps, that are usually regarded as the first somehow archaeological maps of ancient Rome, ...

74. ... and at least the third one could even claim some academic approach.

75. So, even if Marliano's second edition does *not* give a complete history of Rome's urban development, it is for a long time the only such attempt. An additional link may justify to see Marliano's second edition in relation to the *Accademia*: It was printed by the Dorico brothers calling themselves the *press of the Roman Academy.* Because Pomponio Leto's *Accademia* had ceased to exist after the *Sacco di Roma* 1527, I think the imprint from 1544 could only refer to Tolomei's circle.

76. And there is still more to add to the list: Let's look at book 23 on building and hydraulic machines:

77. Recently Dirk Jansen pointed my attention to a book that also may be related to the *Accademia*:

78. In 1617 Jacopo Strada's grandson Ottavio published a book with 50 illustrations of hydraulic machines that he reprinted with 100 illustrations in 1623. Ottavio states that the original drawings were made by his grandfather but that he died before he could publish them himself.

79. There are at least 2 volumes of drawings from Jacopo Strada's workshop that can be identified as the sources for Ottavio's prints: A codex now in a private collection, and another one in the *Museo delle Scienze* in Florence. (In addition, there are 2 volumes by Ottavio at Vienna.)

80. It should be interesting to find out if all of these machines were designed by Jacopo or if some of them could be regarded as reconstructions of machines mentioned in ancient sources.

81. Book 15: Obviously, Jacopo Strada was a very productive man and led a productive workshop. But almost none of his material has been studied yet at all. Another interesting part among his manuscripts is a collection of 174 drawings after ancient statues. It can be seen together with 102 drawings of ancient busts of emperors and their families: As far as I know, both collections have never been studied in detail, even though they seem to be the *by far* largest such group from the 16th century made in a systematic approach to record ancient statues in a uniform way.

82. Because they are all drawn on Roman paper (while Strada's numismatic drawings, for instance, are on paper from Germany) and because Strada could have studied these statues only in Rome, we may insert them into Tolomei's list as relating to the preparations for book 15.

83. Another large group of drawings from Strada's workshop in two codices in Vienna and Florence shows vases and similar objects: Many of them seem to be pure fantasies, but, again, no investigation ever has even tried to prove this supposition. So, there may be many drawings among them that could be related to original ancient objects and therefore to book 18.

84. To come to an end of this part: Of course we can also assume that some elements of Tolomei's list must have existed *before* the editions and translations of Vitruvius could be done at all. This regards the philological, comparative list of all known editions and manuscrips (book 2) – at least Philandrier's edition must have been based on such a comparison.

85. Some sort of the Latin vocabularies of Latin and Greek terms with annotations (see books 4 and 5) must have been used for the interpretation of Vitruvius as well as ...

86. ... the Italian vocabularies of architectural terms (book 9), ...

87. and some collection of instruments and parts for non Latin-reading architects and craftsmen (book 10): We know that some of them took part in the *Accademia*'s meetings, so it would have been helpful to give them something like this as a helping tool for the discussions. Unfortunately, none of these seem to have been printed, and manuscripts have not been found yet, but we may safely assume that something closely resembling this 'handbooks' existed in the *Accademia* network.
So: I think this is *a very impressive list* of documents, manuscripts and printed books that – from my point of view – could or should be related to the project described by Tolomei in his letter. Of course, I don't want to claim that *all of these books and sources* are *direct results* of the *Accademia*'s work, but I think the resemblances to Tolomei's list and the personal relations among their authors are close enough to justify further investigations: At least, already now it can be said that most of these sources did *not* originate from several *single persons private hobby*, but that they may have been influenced by the *idea* of this project and / or that they may have, in one sense or the other, tried to contribute to it and benefitted from other members' work.

88. This is especially true for the group of architectural drawings I already mentioned briefly and that I want to introduce now a little bit more in depth. As I said before, my ongoing research and, in fact, the whole interest in the *Accademia* started with some drawings from the so-called *Codex Destailleur D* at the Kunstbibliothek Berlin. It contains a large group documenting Antonio da Sangallo the Younger's last project for St. Peter's in Rome. In 1903 Hermann Egger suggested to name the codex and its main draftsman, the „Anonymus Destailleur" after its last (and first known) owner, Hippolyte Destailleur – himself an architect and collector: After he sold his first collection of 5'700 drawings to Berlin, he gave a second one of several thousand sheets to St. Petersburg. And after his death it still took three auctions to sell the remaining heritage!

89. Hermann Egger came across the Berlin drawings while working on his catalogue of drawings after ancient Roman architecture at the *Albertina* in Vienna. He thought that the anonymous

French draftsman of the largest single group in Vienna *copied* his drawings from the Berlin codex. Therefore, he called the draftsman: *Copyist of the Anonymous Destailleur*. By now it is clear that there did not exist such a one-sided relationship: Both draftsmen (and many more) worked together over a long period of time. And while the main draftsman in Berlin could be identified as a certain *Guielmo franciosio* working at the *Fabbrica di San Pietro* between 1544 and 1547, the other French draftsmen could not be identified – though some of them seem to be those named together with *Guielmo* in the working lists of the *Fabbrica*. — Based on handwritings in different collections and other characteristics, this list represents the current state of groups of drawings I could identify as having some relation to the Egger's Destailleur group at Berlin and Vienna.

90. We already saw this drawing with its remarkable „un-Italian“ features.

91. This one shows the ground plan of the Colosseum and reflects some consciousness about its geometrically *irregular* plan:

92. A short comparison with an areal view shows that the Colosseum's form in the quadrant documented in the drawing, is not an oval or ellipse but somehow elongated.

93. While this cut of the Colosseum looks like many others, there is an interesting detail below it: Here, the draftsman notes with two measurements that there is a *tunnel* to evacuate the water below the ground level of the building. This may serve as only *one* example for the interesting intention of the draftsmen to record even parts that contemporary architects usually ignored.

94. Another example: While there are a few drawings showing the inner rooms of the triumphal arches and their staircases, none of them contains so many measurements.

95. This drawing of the *Arcus Argentariorum* shows another characteristic of many drawings from this group: While all architectural elements, including ornamental decoration belonging to the orders, are recorded with accuracy, the inscriptions and reliefs are missing — as if the draftsman *knew* that someone else would record these details.

96. Before the Codex Destailleur D came to Berlin in 1879, Heinrich von Geymüller saw it in Paris and immediately realised, that this drawing representing the lost decoration of the drum of Santa Costanza has no parallel – and therefore decided to publish it.

97. Today, and since the second half of the 16th century, the building itself looks like this. So, this is only another example demonstrating the documentary value of these drawings.

98. Because of its decoration, Santa Costanza was believed to have been a temple of Bacchus, and, accordingly, the ruins of the late antique basilica in front of it were called *circo di Bacco*. Our draftsman notes in this drawing that he found wooden beams in the *andito* and obviously wanted to record *in Italian* that this indicates a roof and would be a very strange feature for a a circus.

99. This is an areal view of the Baths of Caracalla in their current condition, compared with the reconstruction in the *Model of Rome*. I want to draw your attention to the two rectancular

buildings at the far end of the perimeter wall: These are usually identified as *libraries* – one for Greek and one for Latin literature – of which only the ground walls remained.

100. Around 1547 our draftsmen saw these buildings almost completely standing. Without any prejudice about their function they measured the height of the niches later supposed to be for bookshelves. But these niches started some 6 to 7 feet above the ground! So, either the Romans had very tall librarians – or these were no libraries. And when we look at the room on the right we see a reconstructed roof above the staircase: This is comparable to similar situations in other drawings where the reconstruction of roofs always seems to have been based on careful observations of traces in the ruins themselves. If the so-called *Libraries* did not show any trace of a roof at all and even had an open facade, they simply *cannot* have been *Libraries*.

101. This photograph demonstrates that the modern reconstructions of the walls have almost nothing to do with the original situation as it was documented in the drawings around 1547.

102. Even more extensively than the Baths of Caracalla the draftsmen recorded the Baths of Diocletian, then owned by the French Cardinal du Bellay, whose physician Rabelai published the first edition of Marliano's *Topographia* 1534 in Lyon. The draftsmen obviously measured the Baths before Michelangelo changed parts of them into the church *Santa Maria degli Angeli*.

103. In Berlin we have (as far as I know) the only measured plan of the still intact large original roof of the main building, while the *Albertina* owns the according ground plan.

104. But the drawings in Berlin also contain measurements of the heating system, and the draftsmen obviously were aware what these undergrund constructions were used for.

105. With even more precision they recorded the big water reservoir, later destroyed, in plan and cut with details, and also its system of water tunnels connecting it to the baths (on the left).

106. Another very interesting group that can now be attributed to the Destailleur circle are the most precise drawings of the Pantheon now being part of the so-called *Goldchmidt* and *Scholz* sketchbooks at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. As far as I know, Prof Burns was the first to study them in detail some 48 years ago. His papers preserved together with the drawings still are of invaluable help for everybody studying them. The drawings are – again – by a French draftsman and show all the same characteristics as the drawings in Berlin, Vienna and elsewhere.

107. One characteristic feature that the Pantheon drawings have in common with the Destailleur group is the precision and interest in every minute detail. For instance: As far as I know this is the only drawing recording the slight inclination of the letters from the original inscription.

108. In addition, the drawings of the ancient roof of the *pronaos* with its bronze beams are the most precise from the 16th century, i.e., before its destruction under Pope Urban VIII.
So, these New York drawings seem to belong to the whole group. There is only one problem: The handwriting in the New York Pantheon drawings is *unique*, it does *not* appear in Berlin or Vienna or in any other sub-group from this context that I know of. And, vice versa, the other hands do

not show up here. But besides the common characteristics, another fact is astonishing: Obviously, the Pantheon is one of the largest and most prominent ancient buildings at all, and by far the best preserved: So, why is it missing in all the other collections that seem to record *every* minute detail of *every* ancient Roman building? Could this absence be explained by simply adding the New York group as one of the *first* surveys done in the context of the Destailleur group?

109. In 2013, Carolyn Yerkes discovered the missing link: She realised, that this drawing of the room in the block between the *pronaos* and the *rotunda* has a parallel in Berlin. But the Berlin drawing was attributed by no-one less than Christian Hülsen to the Baths of Caracalla: A short comparison of the measurements could have shown earlier that it simply does not fit there. Carolyn pointed me to this relation, but did not draw any conclusion from it. In fact, there is a very interesting one: The Berlin draftsman does *only* record those measurements from this room that are *lacking* in the New York drawing. So, he must have *known or possessed* the drawings now in New York.

110. Two other interesting details in the New York drawings wer observed by Geoffrey Taylor already 12 years ago: The first one, on the left, is this view of the entrance from inside the *Rotunda*: It obviously used Raphael's famous, often copied view of the same entrance *from the outside* as its model – but enhances it with the measurements of the available details.

111. And in these drawings Geoffrey observed these interesting lines indicating a direction or visibility.

112. He compared this with the other famous Pantheon drawing by Raphael and found that the lines in the New York drawings obviously were used to indicate the point of view, from which Raphael's drawing was made. — So, both cases show that the French draftsman of the New York Pantheon drawings clearly knew Raphaels drawings, and therefore, we may guess, that some continuity between Raphael's circle and the later *Accademia* existed. This is, of course, easily to imagine taking into account that at least Raphael's assistant at St. Peter's, Antonio da Sangallo the Younger, was (for some time) a member of the *Accademia* network.

113. One final example I would like to show to enforce the interpretation that the drawings from the Codex Destailleur D group in Berlin and elsewhere were made for the *Accademia*: The drawing on the right shows the lacking base of the *Dorica* from the *Theatre of Marcellus*. The French draftsman made a special note: It seems that he did *not know* that the Dorica of this building has no base, an observation already made by Peruzzi and published by Serlio in 1537. Therefore, he found this fact re*mark*able. If he wanted to make sure that he did not forget his finding (as in other cases like at the *circo di Bacco*), we would expect a short note in *French*. But instead he writes – or rather: tries to write – in *Italian*: „dorica del teatro di marcel [French!] la quale non A [!] basa alcuno [f!]". Why should he take a note in a language he did not fully master, if not to inform his patron that he *really* did not make a mistake or somehow forgot to measure the base? — And the second annotation I want to make regards the note on the left from the drawings documenting the Baths of Caracalla: It does not record the draftsman's name – a certain *Simon Travail*, as Lanciani thought –, but asks a patron to reserve more and other work for the draftsman if this work „pleased him". So, it clearly addresses a *French* speaking patron. And

therefore, I think we can assume that the patrons the Berlin Anonymous, our *Guielmo franciosio* and his colleagues were working for, were French as well as Italian: And in the 1540s there is only one group of antiquarians in Rome that fits this description, and that is the *Accademia della Virtù* or *Accademia di Architettura.* — If only half of my interpretations and hypotheses are correct or plausible, I'm sure it would be very interesting and useful to reconstruct the *Accademia* network, the first international and interdisciplinary research network, and the documents it left regarding ancient Roman architecture, inscriptions, coins, reliefs, statues, machines, and the studies of Vitruvius. Because only parts of this material has been studied yet, I guess, we would surely re-discover lots of

114. ... News from ancient Rome. – Thank you.