

Saturday, 16 June
9.00-11.45

Track: Discovery and Persistence
Room: *National Library, Corner Hall (Nurgasaal)*

REDISCOVERING THE REDISCOVERY OF ANTIQUITY: NEW SOURCES AND NEW INTERPRETATIONS OF OLD ONES

Session chair: Bernd Kulawik, Independent researcher

If we understand the Renaissance as the rebirth of Roman antiquity, then especially our built environment is still the best place outside of museums to study its consequences: from Brunelleschi to postmodernism, Roman architecture served as a template for studies or a background for critical, even ironical, remarks in built form. Therefore, we find citations from antiquity almost everywhere. While the main directions of this development have been described and the best known examples of studies have attracted researchers' interests since the beginnings of architectural history, many such studies have not even been examined, let alone edited. This is true for the largest surviving group of architectural surveys and studies ('Baufnahmen') from the sixteenth century, centred around the so-called Codex Destailleur D at the Berlin Kunstbibliothek and comprising some 850 sheets with more than 3,500 single drawings—most of them more precise than anything made before or later, and many showing buildings or details that disappeared already in the *Cinquecento*. But these drawings by anonymous (mostly French) draughtsmen were only one part of the far larger project by the (erroneously) so-called Accademia della Virtù or Vitruviana to document and study every Roman artefact related to architecture: buildings and parts of them, inscriptions, coins, reliefs, statues, vases, ornaments, paintings, etc., and, of course: Vitruvius' *Ten Books*. While it was always thought that this project (described in Claudio Tolomei's famous letter to Agostino de'Landi from 1542) never achieved any state of realization, it can now be said that—on the contrary—it was almost completely executed. The high documentary standard, equalling later research at least up to the nineteenth century, led Theodor Mommsen to use Jean Matal's collection of inscriptions (now in the Vatican) as the starting point for the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. For all the other sources, something similar still remains to be done. In addition, many important architectural books of the time (by Philandrier, Vignola, Labacco, Barbaro, Palladio) seem to be closely related to this project.

The aim of the session is to bring together researchers working on the rediscovery of this and other related materials from the sixteenth century and their (possible) later reception and who are interested in its contextualization within the large interdisciplinary, international network of archaeological research active in Rome between c. 1537 and 1555. The understudied materials presented in here have the potential to change our image of the rediscovery of ancient Roman architecture in the Renaissance.

PAPERS:

Mapping Across Space and Time: Renaissance Views of Ancient Rome

Flavia Marcello, Swinburne University of Technology

Rome is a city of ancient and Christian monuments where architectures from juxtaposed pasts stand out like stars or signposts against a compact array of streets, palazzi, houses, and open spaces. Its maps capture the city's different cultural, archaeological, and architectural strata across space and time to give an integrated image of how the Renaissance viewed antiquity. As *fons et origo* of the Roman past, the city yielded its many layers to scholars in the sixteenth century who documented objects, artefacts, inscriptions, and fragments in order to gain a more complete understanding of the many architectural remains that still stood half-buried, half-standing, or incorporated into the city's contemporary urban reality.

The 1570s also saw a rising interest in archeology and ancient topography based on the work of the Accademia and thanks to the important discovery of the third century marble Forma Urbis. Cartographers worked alongside antiquarians and architects like Ligorio and Vignola to give the ancient fragments an urban dimension by representing them within actual and imagined contexts. They either represented Rome's ancient monuments in their present state within the urban fabric of the sixteenth century *Roma nova* or as more or less fanciful reconstructions of an unspecified *Urbs antiqua*. But Étienne Dupérac and his rival Mario Cartaro did something rather unusual: they each created a map of an imagined past from the time of the emperors (*descriptio*) and they each drew up a spatially accurate urban present (*delineatio*) that foretold a future transformation under Gregory XIII (1572–1585) and Sixtus V (1585–1590). A comparative analysis of the maps by Dupérac and Cartaro will show the centrality of the city's ancient past for two popes intensely involved with their own political present and the urban future which would become the splendour of Baroque Rome.

Antiquated Antiquarianism and Enduring Invented Antiquities in the Sixteenth Century

Michael J. Waters, Columbia University

The archeological investigation and graphic reconstruction of the architecture of antiquity has traditionally been understood as progressing teleologically from inventive fifteenth-century all'antica drawings to precise, analytical mid-sixteenth-century studies. This overarching narrative of antiquarian progress has been revised to some extent in recent years, nevertheless it is widely accepted that the visualization of antiquity in the Renaissance progressively moved towards veristic representation. Consequently, few studies have examined how sixteenth-century draftsmen continued to reproduce seemingly antiquated reconstructions and even create newly invented antiquities. This paper seeks to begin to correct this lacuna by exploring how both of these phenomena transpired at the same time artists, architects, and scholars engaged in the vast archeological project this session seeks to understand. Specifically, this study will discuss how so-called Roma Antica drawings of fantastic church-like temples continued to be copied and reinvented in the sixteenth century. It will also investigate the propagation of a variety of invented centrally-planned temples and how this various material came to circulate along with highly accurate drawings of known monuments. Through their transmission and replication, the fictitious and authentic became part of an undifferentiated continuum in which ancient architecture was rendered progressively fungible. This process even continued into print with Jacques Androuet du Cerceau, who in 1550 celebrated finding some of these very same 'models of temples built in the ancient manner' which he 'reproduced with the most possible fidelity and truth,' while also 'adding others, drawn freely, without any model'. Thus, this paper aims to shed light on how the increasingly scientific study of antiquity had to contend with the continual creation, replication, and circulation of antiquated reconstructions and invented ancient buildings. In a culture steadily inundated with drawn and printed visual imagery, ancient architecture remained constantly in a state of graphic flux during the sixteenth century.

Palladio and the Knowledge of the Antique, c. 1550

David Hemsoll, University of Birmingham

While it seems that the Renaissance architects' studies of ancient Roman architecture have been the subject of already far too many studies themselves, the opposite seems to be true if we look closer into special cases. Michelangelo's reception of antiquity is characterized by the rather creative approach of an artist. Antonio da Sangallo the Younger tended to be a hyper-critical follower of Vitruvius and criticized or even corrected ancient buildings like the Pantheon. While even these pictures may not fully reflect the attitudes of these architects in all their complexity, the case of Palladio is even more confusing: He seems to be the most 'classicistic' architect—the forerunner of any classicist revival in architectural history—but his many surviving studies of ancient architecture, though looking very precise at first sight, show many differences in comparison to the buildings.

Even though Palladio's works have been studied, described, and copied many times, the same cannot be said about his studies of ancient architecture. It is not even known, for example, when exactly and how he took the measurements from which his later drawings derive. Surely, this happened during the 1540s while Palladio was in Rome for several months, accompanying his mentor Trissino who was an active member of Tolomei's circle. Therefore, it is no wonder (and has been observed by Heinz Spielmann already in 1966) that many of his studies closely resemble those in the Berlin Codex Destailleur D—but they are not identical. And this poses questions not only about Palladio's relation to the Roman circle, but also about the special interest he—as an becoming architect and not an antiquarian—had in Rome's architecture. That book IV of his *Quattro Libri* and Barbaro's edition of Vitruvius (to which he contributed not only the illustrations) seem to fit into the list of books announced by Tolomei makes his case even more interesting.