

1. First of all I would like to thank the organizers for giving me the opportunity to present some new side results from my ongoing research on a large group of anonymous architectural drawings from Renaissance Rome. Though I presented an earlier version already in Rome in 2014, I guess not everyone here was in Rome – and those who have been may not remember every detail: Therefore, I will give a short resume which will also serve as the background for the new results. — [What you see here is not the *Accademia*, of course, but the place where I work: The library founded by architectural historian Werner Oechslin at Einsiedeln, Switzerland, and designed by Mario Botta. It contains almost every old or 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 – from geometry and mathematics to history, geology or even medicine: Altogether some 20'000 old prints from the 15th century onwards and some 70'000 modern books. *End of the shameless advertisement.*] — Since I sent my abstract for this conference a few months ago, my doubts have increased that the name *Accademia della Virtù* would be correctly applied to the circle or rather network I want to talk about. Therefore I decided to change my title a little bit. There's not enough time to discuss the reasons here, but the short explanation would be that the *Accademia della Virtù*, active in the late 1530s and dedicated to Latin poetry and Italian philology, only was something like a nucleus from which a few of its members later started the project to document everything regarding ancient Roman architecture. But this circle is almost never referred to as an *Accademia*, and certainly not as the *Accademia della Virtù*.
2. Two of the very few notes by persons participating in meetings of this *Accademia* and *calling* it so, are the information given by Jacopo Strada in the prefaces to two books by Onofrio Panvinio he published 1557. In this first one, Strada gives an overview of the disciplines represented by the members of this *eruditissima Accademia*: And because they are always mentioned in the plural, we may assume that every discipline was at least represented by two persons: So, the more than 20 disciplines or faculties and arts may stand for more than 40 members – even though in some cases one person may have been a specialist in two fields.
3. In the second introduction, Strada gives some very few names, among which Antonio Agustín may be the best known. [By the way: If you want to correct any preconception about Jacopo Strada, his immense productivity as well as his vast network and influence on some underestimated architecture and other artifacts, please read the forthcoming book by Dirk Jansen.]
4. Among the few other short references to this *Accademia* naming it as such are

these two notes by Vasari and Egnatio Danti regarding the life of Jacopo Barozzi da Vignola. Vasari may be the source for the mistake that led to the invention of the term *Accademia vitruviana*, even though his claim that the *Accademia di nobilissimi gentil'huomini e signori che attendevano alla letione di Vitruvio* is contradicted by his own remark in the same sentence, that this *Accademia* ordered Vignola to *misurare interamente tutte l'anticaglie di Roma*. Therefore, the interest of this *Accademia* must have extended far over the pure reading of Vitruvius.

5. In 2014, I had identified 56 persons who were members of the *Accademia* or stood in close contact with it, worked for it or inherited some of the material it had collected.
6. In the meantime, this network could be extended to some 85 known and at least 25 anonymous persons, the latter mostly serving as draftsmen for project.
7. Our main source of information about this project is the famous – but hardly ever carefully read – letter by Claudio Tolomei to Agostino de' Landi written in 1542 and published by Tolomei himself in this collection of his letters in 1547. In it, Tolomei describes the project as a *publishing* project and consequently speaks of *books to be published*, not just of fields of curiosity or research. He also explains that this project *was not* intended to satisfy the curiosity of some antiquarians, but that its aim was to collect *all* available information about ancient Roman architecture as the basis for the establishment of a new architecture – the best one could have if that of ancient Rome was regarded as some kind of an unsurpassed paradigm and model setting the standards for what had to be achieved. So, one may speak from a planned *Renaissance* in the strict sense of the word. [Fortunately or unfortunately, they didn't succeed and Michelangelo's 'post-modernism' took over and lead to the baroque...]
8. Depending on how one counts, this program describes 23 to 25 books — not 20 as you can read everywhere — many of them obviously containing several volumes. The first eleven were to be dedicated to a philological *tour de force* on Vitruvius' *De architectura libri decem*, containing a new edition based on a comparison of all available sources, commentaries, vocabularies or rather: lexica, translations and summarized sets of rules etc. The other 12 books – according to the material to be documented in them the by far larger part of the project, should include a chronological documentation of Rome's urban development in Antiquity and *all* available artifacts somehow related to architecture: from the surviving buildings themselves to *all* tombstones and sarcophagi, *all* statues, *all* friezes and reliefs, *all* architectural elements like bases or capitals that could not be related anymore to any known building, *all* vases and other similar objects used for the decoration of

buildings, *all* tools and instruments, *all* inscriptions, a list of *all* paintings, *all* medals and coins and finally *all* building and hydraulic machines as well as aqueducts.

9. Of course, this project always was regarded as ‘megalomaniac’ and Tolomei’s letter was read as something one could not really take seriously. – *Even though* Tolomei clearly says how the project was to be realised: The enormous workload was to be divided among many specialists, and therefore, he says, it should be no wonder that all of it could be realised in *less than three years*. – Of course, we all know that you have to give some very optimistic estimations when applying for funding, but could Tolomei honestly expect to convince count de’ Landi to become a financial supporter with a project so grossly *over the top*? Was Tolomei straightly lying into the face of his potential patron and his readers in 1547? I don’t think so.
10. Up to now only four Renaissance sources have been assumed to be the result of the *Accademia*’s work: Guillaume Philandrier’s *Annotationes* to Vitruvius, parts of the illustrated second edition of Marliano’s *Topographia urbis Roma* – both from 1544 – and the so-called, closely interrelated *Codices Coburgensis* and *Pighianus*.
11. Among these, Marliano’s *Topographia* is of special interest because it was printed by the Dorico brothers who call themselves here *Academiae Romanae inpreßorum*. And in 1544 this can hardly refer to the first *Accademia Romana* founded by Pomponio Leto, which ceased its activities in 1527 with the *Sacco di Roma*.
12. The drawings of reliefs, statues and sarcophagi in the *Codices Coburgensis* and *Pighianus* were identified as belonging to the *Accademia*’s work only 30 years ago by Richard Harprath and Henning Wrede: These drawings and some inscriptions are very remarkable because of the precision with which the draftsmen recorded their objects: They show them *as they were*, not *as they were expected or supposed to be*. They did not complete them or mix in their own interpretations. My guess is that this methodology was developed by the philologists in this circle. One of the main draftsman of the *Codex Coburgensis* seems to have been Antoine Morillon.
13. In addition to these four sources, the at least 6 volumes with Latin inscriptions collected by Jean Matal with the help of – among many others – Philandrier, Morillon and Martin Smet should also have been part of the list long ago, because they were known at least since Theodor Mommsen used them as the foundation for the still on-going project of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*.
14. Again, they recorded the inscriptions in the same manner as the reliefs were recorded in the *Codices Coburgensis* and *Pighianus*: documenting the sources *as they are*

without interpretation or corrections that would not be clearly distinguished from the original document.

15. Because of my research regarding the so-called *Codex Destailleur D* (Hdz 4151) I am convinced that this group also belongs to the preparatory work done for the *Accademia*, especially for its book 13 in the list.
16. When I started to take up the work on this codex done for my dissertation three years ago, I expected to find some 50 sheets with drawings more than the 120 in Berlin and 40 in Vienna already known. As you can see, the number has „slightly“ increased from about 210 sheets with some 1'000 single drawings to almost 700 with ca. 3'300 drawings. This is not only the largest surviving group of drawings stemming from the same background, but also the group with the most precise measurements ever taken in an co-ordinated attempt by a some 20 draftsmen over almost 20 years. It may therefore be the result of the largest survey of ancient Rome *ever* undertaken – and done in a time when many of the ruins where in much better condition than they were later in the 19th and 20th century when comparable surveys were made for single buildings.
17. The anonymous, mostly French draftsmen who created these architectural drawings also recorded the ancient buildings with the same precise and archaeological method used for the reliefs, sarcophagi and inscriptions. They also show many details that – to my knowledge – no-one ever recorded – or did not record in such detail – up to the 20th century. That they recorded the remains of the buildings *as they are*, not *as they might have been* or *migh have been expected to are*, can be seen for instance in this ground plan of the Colosseum.
18. These draftsmen recognized what can now be seen with any maps application easily on the internet: That the Colosseum's ground plan is not an oval or any other regular geometrically correct and reconstructable form: Otherwise, the radiuses from the main axes could not cross each other.
19. They also documented the 'roof landscape' of the Baths of Diocletian and...
20. the underground heating system, as well as ...
21. the water supply system with the reservoir, later destroyed and never recorded as precisely as in this drawing – together with the main water supply pipes or tunnels.
22. This was roughly the amount of sources attributable to the *Accademia* two years ago when I presented a first overview at *Making of the Humanities IV* in Rome.

23. In the meantime I found or was pointed to many other manuscript sources and printed books that might or should be added to the list, because their authors stood in close contact with the *Accademia*'s members or were members themselves, and / or because these sources strongly resemble items from Tolomei's list. In most cases their deviation from Tolomei's original description can be explained through the end of the *Accademia*'s work seemingly caused by the untimely death of Marcello Cervini in 1555 three weeks after his election to the papal throne as Marcellos II. — The question marks in my list point to the possibility that at least some of the preparations for the according books must have existed at least in manuscript form and may still be unidentified and, therefore, maybe could still be found. The only exception, from my point of view, may be volumes 6 and 7, because I regard these parts as a little bit 'beside the point' of the entire project.
24. Thanks to Dirk Jansen's extensive research on Jacopo Strada, we may include in the list also the so-called *Codex Miniatus 21* in Vienna:
25. It contains 174 uniform drawings of ancient statues and 102 of busts, equally uniform, of Roman emperors and their family members.
26. As far as I know this is the largest such collection and the only one with a systematic approach. But unfortunately, it has not been studied yet or seen in context to Strada's other activities or even the *Accademia*.
27. We may also add, presumably, Strada's *Magnum ac novum opus*, originally consisting of 30 Volumes with drawings after ancient coins. The remaining 29 of them are now in Gotha, Germany, and for the first time being investigated by Dirk Jansen and Volker Heenes – you may hear more about this project in March at the RSA annual meeting in Chicago. At the moment it seems that Strada's project started independently from the *Accademia* and was extended later far beyond its original aims: But because many of the drawings seem to have been made in Rome before 1555 when Strada was attending the *Accademia*'s meetings regularly, I would like to see here at least a close connection.
28. In addition, there are also two versions of a book on hydraulic machines printed by Strada's grandson Ottavio in 1617 and 1623.
29. He mentions that they are based on drawings by his grandfather who did not live long enough to publish them himself.
30. There are at least 3 volumes with even more drawings than printed in the book – but I haven't seen them yet. Though they mostly seem to represent inventions from the

16th century, maybe by Strada himself, by now it cannot be excluded that at least some of them are reconstructions of machines described by Vitruvius and others ancient authors made for the last book in the list.

31. And finally, recent findings of connections between drawings in Vienna and Ferrara and prints in Antonio Labacco's *Libro appartenente all'architettura* from around 1552 suggest,
32. that at least a part of book 13 from the list was making it into print. It is very likely that Labacco intended to book to be extended with more plates and that it was to form a close relation, even a complementary set, with Vignola's *Regola*, printed in or before 1562 on the same machine in Labacco's house in Rome.
33. So far, these can only be first estimates and hypotheses regarding the *Accademia's* program: As I mentioned, my own research regards only the architectural drawings. I guess you may agree that it would require a truly interdisciplinary, international research network and project to rediscover the material left behind by the *Accademia* and its complex networks of persons as well as sources: Like in the case of the books on architecture and coins, my impression is, that after the death of Cervini in 1555 many members of the *Accademia* later used the material in their possession to publish their own books with a now somewhat *different* approach or aim. This may be the case in Labacco, Vignola, Smet, Pighius, or Agustín and others. — In addition, some persons who had not been members of the *Accademia*, got hold of some parts of the material and used it for their own purposes – like Onofrio Panvinio and Paulo Manutio who more or less inherited Matal's codices, or Justus Lipsius who came to Rome in 1567 as the secretary of cardinal Antoine Perrenot the Granvelle who himself had been been in close contact with and employed Academicians like Morillon and Pighius before. — And a third group may include persons like Barbaro who over years stood in close contact with Academicians like Trissino. Trissino attended the meetings of the *Accademia* during his stay in Rome, had a long dispute with Tolomei about the usage of letters in a new Italian and was accompanied by the young Palladio to Rome who during these years in the 1540s must have made his measured drawings of Antiquities – I would guess: in cooperation with the *Accademia's* group of surveyors. So, it seems plausible that Barbaro took up the idea for an annotated and illustrated translation and edition of Vitruvius after Cervini's death together with Palladio as his architectural adviser from the *Accademia's* program. — I guess you may agree that this *Accademia*, the large amount of incredibly detailed and rich material it created as well as its astonishing methodology would be worth to be rediscovered and studied in a co-

ordinated approach by in interdisciplinary international research network: Not only as a source for our knowledge about the *Renaissance* of Antiquity but also as sources for many lost or ill preserved ancient monuments – as well as an impressive example for what could be achieved already in the middle of the 16th century by a large network of people who – as I think – deserve to be honoured through recognising their work. In doing so, I am convinced, we may still receive lots of

34. News from Ancient Rome. – Thank you.